

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 49 No. 1

SATURDAY, 5 APRIL, 1969

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

The Situation and the Outlook

Originally published in *The Social Crediter* in 1946.

By C. H. DOUGLAS

(I)

The termination of large-scale military activities on the Continent of Europe—the pivotal theatre, to which the others were subsidiary and on which their destiny depended—is now sufficiently a matter of history for it to be possible to estimate their relationship to an ultimate objective, and to see also the pursuit of that objective “by other means”. Any attempt to do this intelligently must proceed from one of two hypotheses; either the world was, and is, in the grip of blind fate, “written in the pyramids” *etc.*, or it is exhibiting the results of a policy derived from thinking man, in which case mundane fate, while conditioned to some extent by previous action and persistent deduction, is susceptible of “repentance” (thinking again or against) and compensatory action. It is on the latter hypothesis that the comments which follow are based, and if it is fallacious, it is obvious that neither they, nor perhaps any others, have any consequence. No policy, no cure.

It is necessary, in my opinion, to bear in mind that a policy *must* derive from a philosophy; and for this reason, and with some reluctance because I am well aware of the antagonisms which are aroused, I feel it would not be honest to omit the expression of an opinion which has been crystallising, so far as I am concerned, for some years. The more conventional form in which the idea to which I refer is phrased is that we are engaged in a battle for Christianity, and that is true. But it is surprising in how many ways, practically, realistically, factually, it is true. And one of these ways is almost unnoticed, except in its derivations—the emphasis placed by the Roman Catholic Church on the family, and the steady unrelenting effort to destroy the very idea of family and to substitute the State, by the Communists and Socialists, who, with the World Financial Group, are the real body of Anti-Christ. Please observe that what most people mean by family nowadays is a unit *contemporaneously* composed of parents and children. It has no extension in time; the flash of consciousness we call the present is all that is allowed to this idea of “family”; and therefore it has no stability, because it lacks a dimension.

Now it is this very idea of impermanence and scorn of tradition which can be seen to be the key-note of the New Order which Mr. Anthony Eden, for instance, was so well informed as to prophesy almost before the first shot was fired in 1939. Life now is to have no stable principles; property is yours just so long as an institution does not want it; you are no judge of what is best for you, and what you want does not matter. Everything is to be conditioned by “the common good”. The group is supreme over the individual, the flower exists for the benefit of the field.

This lack of stability is closely connected with a curious inversion. *Demon est deus inversus*. We mouth Social Security and live in a prison on the edge of a volcano. We decry privilege in favour of “the common good”, double our Cabinet Ministers’ salaries, and institute and maintain priorities in every one of the decreasing facilities of a dying civilisation. We cannot build houses, so we steal them. We cannot play the game, so we change the rules. In the face of the greatest crops in history we ration bread. We export immense quantities of goods we need ourselves to *e.g.*, France, and refuse to take payment in wines, having raised the price of Algerian claret from about twopence a litre, its cost of production, to about fourteen shillings, its “Government” price. We talk about the necessity to avoid inflation, and we negotiate immense and irrational wage increases unrelated to any intelligible wage policy and prevent the goods to which they relate from reaching the wage market; and, having with the support of fifty years’ propaganda against profits obtained control of the national resources, we install a Chancellor of the Exchequer who disposes of the National Credit to our disadvantage, and cuts off the National dividend at its source—a rate of interest on the national capital account—while arranging that the real wealth produced goes abroad to be credited to the national capital account of our active enemies.

These matters are not episodic, they are all connected with an intelligible philosophy. And the raw material of that philosophy is “the common man”—the amorphous group, the tool of that terrible Power which fights relentlessly for our destruction. It is very necessary not to confuse “the common man” with any economic class, perhaps more necessary in these days than ever before, although its characteristic does not change. “Crucify Him. Release unto us Barabbas. Now, Barabbas was a robber.”

Majority “rule” with a secret ballot is the organising mechanism of “the common man”, the vehicle of the subconscious, the animal man. “Father, forgive them, they are *unconscious* of what they do.” Intellect is not concerned.

(II)

In order to disembarass oneself of the confusion involved in the use of words such as Fascism, Communism, Socialism and the like, and to avoid the elementary fallacy of supposing that our troubles began with the present so-called Labour Government, and can be ended by merely replacing it by a so-called Conservative administration, there is no better discipline than to turn back to the Mond-Turner Conference, and to observe its absorption in P.E.P.

(continued on page 3)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which was founded in 1933 by Clifford Hugh Douglas.

The Social Credit Secretariat is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: Home and abroad, post free: One year 45/-; Six months 22/6; Three months 11/6.

Offices: Business: 245 Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone, London E.11.

Telephone: 01-534 7395

Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London NW1

Telephone: 01-387 3893

IN AUSTRALIA—

Business: Box 2318V, G.P.O., Melbourne, Victoria 3001

Editorial: Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001

(Editorial Head Office).

THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Personnel—Chairman: Dr. B. W. Monahan, 4 Torres Street, Red Hill, Canberra, Australia 2603. Deputy Chairman: British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1. Telephone: 01-387 3893. Liaison Officer for Canada: Monsieur Louis Even, Maison Saint-Michel, Rougemont, P.Q. Secretary: H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

"... When it became impossible any longer to disguise the impending catastrophe, Mr. Baldwin ("Honest Stan") instead of being impeached and shot, was given an Earldom, control of a fund of £250,000, and put to raising more money for the Jews." (C. H. Douglas, *Whose Service Is Perfect Freedom*, 9 December, 1939.)

This refers to the policy pursued by (then) Great Britain between 1918 and 1936, which Douglas characterised as "so suicidal as to pass all possibility of mere stupidity or incompetence". In all essentials, the policy pursued by Britain since 1945 is the same policy all over again, and it has proved equally suicidal. Where has it got us?

To avoid quoting ourselves, we quote from a letter to the *Times* (Feb. 24, 1969) from Mr. R. T. Paget, Q.C., Member of the House of Commons: "Our forces stationed on the North German plain are further from their deployment positions than are the Russians facing them in East Germany. If the Russians, after troop movements no greater than could be accounted for by manoeuvres, were to move at last light they could be on the Rhine in force by first light next morning and from then onwards would be moving across NATO communications and pushing NATO troops into concentrations where they and not the Russians would present the nuclear targets."

The objective of the policy pursued by Great Britain under Honest Stan was resumption of World War to further the ends of Communism. But in those days, much less was known of the International Conspiracy underlying Communism than is known now, so that it is at least possible that Honest Stan knew not what he did. But whoever put him up to it knew; hence the Earldom. In the light of all this, however, it is much less possible that Harold Wilson and Co. know not what they are doing. Yet in a broadcast to America on 11th September, 1939, Mr. Anthony Eden let the cat out of the bag: "... our new civilisation must be built through a world at war. But our new civilisation will be built just the same."

Mr. Wilson is a child of the Fabian Socialist Society, the chief 'British' protagonist of a 'new civilisation' to replace

what it regards as the obsolescent Graeco-Roman Christian civilisation under which European culture was spread throughout the world. Just as Mr. Eden accepted a devastating European war as a necessary step towards a New Civilisation, so the Wilson Administration accepts the horrors of Communism's advance as the "wave of the future". It is Russian war material which sustains the war in Vietnam, but it is Wilson's policy to trade with Russia.

Militarily, the threat to Britain is so palpable that the accelerating British disarmament in the face of it can only mean that Wilson and Co. have inner knowledge that there will not be war, and contemplate surrender of British sovereignty (for which millions of British youths gave their lives in good faith) to International Socialism.

If this is what the British want, they will certainly get it. If they do not want it, they must realise that Mr. Wilson holds the position of responsibility. What he is doing "passes all possibility of mere stupidity or incompetence". Is he to be allowed to get away with it?

Gone are the days when it was sufficient to blame a defective monetary system for our troubles. It is *persistence* in a policy, of which a defective monetary system is a component, which constitutes the crime, and calls for punishment. Only that, with its attendant exposure and publicity, offers any remaining hope.

Naked Neo-Colonialists

The Portuguese Foreign Minister, Franco Nogueira, has shown that a new type of exploitation which he calls neo-colonialism, has succeeded to the responsible colonists in the third world. This new brand extracts raw materials from the "independent" territories on the harshest terms.

Unfortunately Britain has involved herself in this sordid traffic, according to Margaret Green, who has just returned from two months in Biafra, whose people she has known for thirty years. She welcomes the view of Bishop Crowther that surrender is out of the question, and points out that Colonel Ojukwu said in his 1969 New Year pronouncement that Biafra was "ready for a cease-fire and negotiations *without preconditions*", whereas Mr. Wilson has said on television that Biafra is "blocking the way to a cease-fire by preconditions". (*Church Times*, Feb. 14, 1969.)

She further pays tribute to Colonel Ojukwu for his "moderation and statesmanlike attitude" and calls the idea that he is a megalomaniac dragging a reluctant Biafra behind him "a fantastic illusion". A cease-fire, she says, is the only real answer, but the people will not prefer surrender to starvation.

"News Comment", in the same issue of the paper, notes the opposition between France and Britain on Biafra, for the French are openly supporting the Biafrans, while Britain and France are rivals for "future influence over Nigeria and its rich resources". Lord Chalfont at the WEU meeting condemned the Biafrans as solely responsible for the war, but Miss Green's evidence "gives the lie to the official British pretence that only the Biafran leader is blocking the way to a cease-fire by insisting on preconditions". The Federal Government itself seized power "by force of arms and assassination".

But the change in Britain's status does not stop there. Commenting on the Lord Wigg's assertion that Mr. Healey's

policy has left us with the alternatives of suicide or surrender, *The Sunday Express* (Feb. 23, 1969) remarks that the Socialist Government, after over four years of muddle, has "left Britain utterly naked".

The present administration has evidently left us without either honour or defence, yet still presumes to preach at Rhodesia and South Africa and even at Portugal. They call it changing from a world to a European power, but in fact they have pawned both defence and decency.

—H.S.

The Situation and the Outlook (continued from page 1)

The Mond-Turner Conference consisted of six of the most powerful industrialist employers in Great Britain, dominated by the international Zionist Jew, Sir Alfred Moritz Mond and his able coadjutor, and co-racialist, Sir Hugo Hirst (Hirsch). Mond had belonged to both main political Parties; so had some of the others. The six so-called Labour members of the Conference included Right and Left Wing Trades Unionists, Socialists and a Communist.

It would be difficult to get together a body of men less "political" in the Parliamentary sense. They were not there to discuss policy; they were there to make a given policy work. That policy was the World Empire of Big Business. "The high purpose of the Conference could not be more amply illustrated than by the fact that the first agreed resolution *published to the world* (my italics) was a Joint Memorandum on the Gold Reserve and its relations with industry.

"It is merely necessary for me to point out that the issue of that Memorandum to the Chancellor of the Exchequer had a definite result in the policy which he pursued."—Sir A. M. Mond, at Harvard University, 1928.

His Master's Voice, in fact.

It is necessary not to lose sight of the undiscussed question of policy; but, before dealing with it, the sequence of events following the Mond-Turner Conference should be noted. The Conference was in 1926. The Bank of England centralised currency in 1928; the financial crash and the world depression began in 1929; P.E.P. and the U.S. New Deal became dominant in 1932. Selected nominees of Big Business trained at the London School of Economics were installed in key positions in Australia and Ottawa. Mr. Coldwell, an Englishman, with a strong dislike for England, had the extraordinary fortune to meet Mr. Nash of New Zealand at Regina when he was so successfully founding the Canadian Socialist Party, and discovered that their views were identical. Dr. Arnold Toynbee announced that "we" are working with all our might to undermine the sovereignty of our respective nations. "Hitler" undermined them by force, and at the outbreak of war a carefully prepared but unsuccessful propaganda was launched for "Union Now with Britain" (*sic*). "Union" was, of course, carelessly disguised absorption of the British Empire by the United States.

Two main features of this period can be discerned without much difficulty: The pressure to organise larger and larger units was accompanied by bigger and worse disasters. This pressure is the outcome of what, at one end of the industrial scale, is called Socialism, at the other end, Rationalisation. Both mean Monopoly under the guise of Collectivism, and both mean de-Nationalisation—an economic not a political organisation. And the second feature is that the British Empire is an insurmountable obstacle as

such, and must be disintegrated before it can be replaced by economic world control. It may be recalled that William Randolph Hearst made just such a statement in an unguarded moment many years ago.

The outcome of the last catastrophe, the Second World War, is a fresh drive towards both these objectives from the same origins. And the two ends of the scale are, one unconsciously and the other consciously, working towards both objectives at the same time. That is what is coming to be called the Financier-Socialist Plot.

At this point, the divergence between a political and a business Empire becomes easier to discern. British Statesmen of the pre-twentieth-century type were constantly accused of hypocrisy. Without examining the grounds for this charge too closely, the mere fact that it was made is instructive. Hypocrisy has been well and truly defined as the tribute vice pays to virtue. British tradition, therefore, either had, or pretended to have, a policy. What was it? Certainly not, traditionally, "business". Napoleon's gibe that we are a nation of shopkeepers was meant to be, and was accepted as, offensive at the time it was made. Nowadays we are not such successful shopkeepers, but regard shopkeeping as our highest aim.

Many books have been written on this subject, but a trivial phrase is perhaps as illuminating as any of them. In even remote parts of South America, thousands of people, many of whom have no idea whether England is a continent, a country, or a planet, and may never have seen an Englishman, assure each other of their sincerity by saying *Palabra de Ingles*—"On the word of an Englishman". Notice the suggestion of stability, of continuity, and the contrast with the predatory methods of "Enabling Legislation", the Managerial State, and other current fashions which accompany our decadence.

The point is not so much—although, of course, that is important—that a political Empire has a certain set of principles. It is that those principles should be stable. Out of this, as it were by a side wind, came success and power. The conception is closely allied to "quality".

Now the *direct* aim of an Empire of Business is power, and the ultimate *material* power is that over Life and Death—War. But the intermediate device is Fashion—Instability, Change. *Palabra de Ingles*, if it has any place at all in it, is a business device helpful towards increased exports. Use it on your letter headings. Learn from Marx and Lenin the uses of lying. In fact, learn from anybody or anything except the makers of your own history and from that history itself.

Consider then Karl Marx (Mordecai): "The mode of production in material life determines the general character of the social, political and spiritual processes of life" (*Critique of Political Economy*). If that means anything at all—I am not sure that it does—it means that our desperate social, political and spiritual processes derive from "the mode of production".

I don't think "the mode of production" was even remotely understood by Marx. What he meant was the business system. And I should say myself that it is the political and spiritual processes which are evidenced by the business system. Hence the projected World Empire of Big Business and the increasing desperation of our plight.

(III)

A dispassionate consideration of such events as the Mond-

Turner Conference (not to mention the deliberations of less known bodies) ought to convince anyone that the Materialistic Conception of History, which Marx popularised, but did not originate, is, like so many other theories and ideas which are current, an inversion of the truth. Mond, and possibly others with him, was perfectly conscious of what he was aiming at, and was animated by a *conscious* hatred of the traditional English way of life, which represented an *unconscious* subordination of the "employment" and production systems to spiritual and social needs. It was the remnant of Christian Europe. Given that conviction, it is not difficult to see that mass production, majority democracy, collective bargaining and collectivism, one world government (intended to be ruled by Zionists) and World War and World Annihilation are all of a piece. They are the inescapable results of a choice—conscious in a small minority, unconscious and essentially passive in "the Common Man".

It has often been observed that there has been a steady degradation in the attractiveness of life in England, and perhaps to a less extent in Scotland, as the statistical wealth of the nation has increased. Since (a) the population has increased—rather mysteriously—and (b) the rate of production per man-hour has been accelerated by a factor of at least one hundred and probably more, it is indisputable that something must be happening which is ignored. There are many factors of this character. The first is that most of our production has little value in adding to the pleasure of life. The second is that a startling amount of our exports are a complete loss, from which we get no return. A third is that we get less return each year per unit of export, so that the amount of labour paid per unit of *import* tends to remain constant, or to increase irrespective of the productivity of that unit. At the present time, as a result of labour agitation reinforced by the failure of this policy to raise living standards, actual output tends to drop.

That is the system, and its apotheosis is, "full employment" for unspecified ends. Now, in fairness to many people whose education and daily work renders it nearly impossible that they should comprehend the insanity of this policy, it has to be admitted that war is its justification. If we are to contemplate more world wars, competitive armaments, not absolute standards of military strength, are inescapable. Put quite shortly, the world is doomed, and at no distant date, if this is the only conceivable policy by which to deal with the threat of war on a modern scale.

But there are at least two policies which can be applied to the situation. One of these is being publicised by every means which modern methods can suggest. It is the policy of the omnipotent World State. And the second is hardly mentioned and still more infrequently understood. It is the policy of the Free Individual.

It is difficult to pick up any newspaper at this time without reading a suggestion of the growing risk of war, accompanied by the remark, "Of course, nobody wants war". Well, if nobody wants war, from whom do wars proceed? The answer is: From the Common Man, manipulated by his Greatest Enemy, the Power Maniac. Without the common man, the Power Maniac is helpless.

There is really no room for argument about this matter. Not a day passes without some action being taken to make the individual more impotent and to transfer his individual initiative—his personal power—to the mass. The Trades Union, the Co-operative "Movement" (Co-operation between

High Finance and the "Labour" Party to monopolise and cartelise distribution), the Producing Cartels, the various infringements on real property, and, most deadly perhaps of all, the combination of calculated inflation, taxation and "coupon" restrictions are all steps to Russian serfdom.

Perhaps the greatest disservice to struggling humanity which the past hundred years has witnessed has been fostered by those "money reformers" who have supported the "nationalisation" of the Bank of England. It is simply appalling in its implications that men, well educated in the everyday sense, should be so unconscious of the very roots of the democracy for which they profess such admiration that they cannot or will not grasp two elemental propositions. The first is that genuine control of genuine finance was the core of a genuine Parliamentary system, not its electoral devices, and that this involved getting the money from Parliament not from a Ways and Means Account, and that "nationalisation" of the Bank of England has now made it quite unnecessary to bring financial questions into the House of Commons at all. So evident has this become that the proposal to vote thousands of millions of pounds merely empties the House.

It ought to be elementary, but it is not, that if no considerable number of individuals, as *individuals*, can be found to say they want war, then the way to prevent war is to prevent those individuals from being coerced or deceived, by desire for money or State action, into a war which only a tiny minority *do* want, because of its indispensability to a Power World Organisation. The present Administration is going further and faster than any previous Administration along the course in which Mr. Churchill's Administration concurred, and against which the so-called Conservative Opposition is making no real protest—the transfer of power and initiative from the individual to the institutions controlled by International Finance. And no Power on earth can avert the consequences, failing a reversal of the policy and the discredit of its Philosophy. Those consequences are war and the death of civilisation.

(To be concluded)

"Whose Service is Perfect Freedom"

(The Fig Tree, No. 4)

by C. H. Douglas

5/9 posted

K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 245 Cann Hall Road, London, E.11.

Extra copies of this and all recent issues are available to subscribers at 4d. posted while stocks last. Contributions towards costs will be appreciated.

Communism, Conspiracy and Treason

A brochure with an introduction and a list of books on Fabian Socialism, International Communism and International Finance which are concentric and form an International Conspiracy.

Free on request

The Brief for the Prosecution

A penetrating examination of the period of uneasy truce between 1918 and 1939, by C. H. Douglas, wherein he lays bare a coherent, conscious, over-riding policy in full operation in every country and traceable to a central origin. This policy is still in operation to-day.

9/6 posted

Printed by E Fish & Co Ltd Liverpool