

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 49 No. 18

SATURDAY, 29 NOVEMBER, 1969

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

Review of the Crisis

(Originally published in *The Australian Social Crediter* in 1947)

(Continued)

(13)

It must not be thought that the Fabians are the exclusive political instrument of the 'managers' in Great Britain. The chief instrument for the time being at any time is the Government of the day *and the set-up behind it*. The same policy, the policy of Monopoly, concentration of control, rationalisation and so on has been pursued steadily irrespective of the label of the titular Government. It is, indeed, quite probable that only a so-called 'Labour' Government was suitable to these present developments, and there is no doubt that everything possible was done by outside agencies to ensure its victory in the 1945 general election. During the war, the Army Bureau of Current Affairs saturated the troops with Socialist and Planning propaganda; and the American troops for so long quartered on the British Isles were markedly anti-Conservative and anti-'Imperialist', and had no hesitation in saying so.

On the other hand, it is very likely that the Conservative Government under Baldwin was the most appropriate instrument for certain preliminary steps. The complex period between the two wars cannot easily be summarised, and readers should refer to *The Brief for the Prosecution* for an analysis of the salient features.

But in view of the steps yet to be taken, special attention must be directed to the subject of coal. In 1926 the Coal Commission (under the chairmanship of Sir Herbert Samuel) recommended that the State should acquire the property rights in coal by compulsory purchase from the owners. This acquisition was authorised in the Coal Act of 1938, and occurred in July, 1942. The National Coal Board took over in 1947, completing the transfer of the ownership of coal from private individuals and bodies to centralise it in a semi-government 'Authority'. Coal is the most valuable tangible asset of Great Britain, and the chief raw material of the chemical industry.

The chemical industry is an international cartel, represented in Great Britain by Imperial Chemical Industries which was founded by the German Zionist Jew, Alfred Mond, whose immediate colleagues were Herbert Samuel, Godfrey Isaacs, of the Marconi scandal which implicated members of the British Government, and Rufus Isaacs, who negotiated the agreement with 'America' in 1916/17, and whose son married the granddaughter of Alfred Mond.

The main clauses of the agreement negotiated with Rufus Isaacs' opposite numbers in New York have never been disclosed, but that complete secrecy with regard to them was

one of the main provisions is certain. The immediate effect of the agreement was that the American German Jews who controlled finance in America transferred their support from Germany to the Allies, and their nominee, Woodrow Wilson, declared war on Germany. The more remote, and more important, effect was the institution of 'American' control over British policy, symbolised and made effective by the unprecedented continuation of Montagu Norman as Governor of the Bank of England with two American Jews as his 'advisers'; in those days, the monopoly of credit, exercised by the Bank of England, was the major instrument of control of policy.

Mond, Isaacs, and Samuel and their kin were not *British*; they were Jews resident in Great Britain as a matter of convenience for longer or shorter periods, but having their real and effective affiliations with similar Jews resident in Germany and America. Their interest in such entities as Imperial Chemical Industries was not a British interest, and in fact the limits placed on the operation of such a concern by the conception of British national sovereignty, and by the private ownership of its primary raw material, were contrary to their interests. National sovereignty is an impediment to the international operations of Big Business.

The essence of this matter ought to be simple enough to grasp. An inner and cohesive group of Jews, scattered between several countries, consciously repudiate the idea of any allegiance to the country of their more or less temporary residence; on the other hand, they acknowledge loyalty to their group and its ideals. Through money-power—i.e., the control of financial *policy*—they are in a position to exert a major influence on the governments of the various countries in which they reside. Their objective is to replace the nationalistic structure of the world with a corporate structure, the control of the corporations being in the hands of this group. This is the Empire of Big Business, with the Financier as Emperor. And they recognise war as a major means to this end: "It is indispensable for our purpose that wars, so far as possible, should not result in territorial gains: war will thus be brought on to the economic ground. . . . and this state of things will put both sides at the mercy of our international *agentur* . . ." (*Protocols*, II 1.)

The group works to a strategy. One member (Mond) sets up a chemical cartel, linked with America and Germany. Another (Samuel) recommends the ownership by the State of coal. Isaacs negotiates an agreement with the 'American' representatives (Kuhn, Loeb & Co., who, via Jacob Schiff,

(continued on page 4)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

PUBLISHED FORTNIGHTLY

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 Tel: 01-534 7395
Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London NW1. Tel: 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 I. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1. 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.

Vol. 49 No. 18

Saturday, 29 November, 1969

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

Spectator: Oct. 25, 1969: "... Mr. Jenkin's decisions make no sense in the context of the balance of payments. . . . What Mr. Jenkins fails to comprehend, however, is the damage he is doing now. . . . Such are the consequences . . . of having a Chancellor with so tenuous a grasp of the art of economic management. For Mr. Jenkins clearly does not understand either the delayed effect of policy changes. . . . Of course the time will come when even Mr. Jenkins will see the red light. . . . But by then it will be too late to avoid the icebergs that lie in the economy's path. By his own actions the Chancellor will have created a situation that is out of control. . . . We face, then, a winter of strikes and bankruptcies; a winter in which the economic and industrial fronts alike will for all practical purposes be out of control. And in each case this lack of control is a direct result of well-intentioned government action ostensibly intended to impose control on an otherwise 'anarchic' system".

Enoch Powell: Oct. 24, 1969: "It is not only 'the £ in your pocket' that Harold Wilson has devalued. He has devalued the people of this country in their own estimation and is now engaged in making that the means to perpetuate his own power". (*Daily Telegraph*, Oct. 25, 1969.)

Quintin Hogg: "My own fear is that unless we can place a Conservative Government in Westminster we might have some form of dictatorship in this country within ten years. The classic recipe is there; a humiliated nation, a ruined middle class, an inflated currency and a Labour Government of the second internationale". (Quoted by Andrew Alexander in *Daily Telegraph Magazine*, Oct. 3, 1969.)

Daily Telegraph, Oct. 23, 1969: "The truth is that the decisive battles are no longer fought at Westminster. Against the background of all this humdrum and innocent legislation, the Government constantly extends its grip on the economy by administration rather than law-making".

Brig. W. F. K. Thompson: Oct. 14, 1969: "Thus, it has only taken riots in two cities in Northern Ireland to expose the foolhardiness of the cuts imposed on the Army and its inadequate capability of responding to even minor unforeseen circumstances". (*Daily Telegraph*.)

Desmond Donnelly: Oct. 6, 1969: "Mr. Wilson is a gambler. . . . The rising cost of living is another reason why Mr. Wilson cannot wait. The floodgates are about to burst on his prices and incomes policy. Mrs. Castle's Ministry has just issued a survey showing how the country is having to spend much more on necessities to keep up with rising costs. . . . Rents, food, clothing and transport are all rising. House owners are now paying hitherto unheard of prices for their mortgages. All this adds up to a huge new round of wage demands in 1970 and a possible wages-prices shambles by next winter". (*News of the World*.)

Edward Heath: Oct. 26, 1969: "We shall certainly be ramming home the contrast between the failures of the present Government and the achievements of the Conservative Government between 1951-64". (*Sunday Times*, Oct. 26, 1969.)

Evidently, in Britain's modern, progressive, permissive, 'civilised' society the only remaining unspeakable dirty words are Communism and Marxian Socialism; and, among 'Conservatives', the in-word is "incompetence". Perhaps Mr. Quintin Hogg was greatly daring in referring to "a Labour Government of the second internationale"; but he was perfectly correct. The Second Internationale of 1889 was the offspring of Marx's First Internationale of 1862, and the progenitor of the Fabian Society. The British Labour Party is a creature of the Fabian Society, and the alleged 'incompetence' of its Parliamentary leadership is quite simply the mask behind which its long-range policy objectives are concealed. The most immediate of these is the permanent destruction of the mechanism of decentralised control of the economy in the interests of international cartelisation—which is proceeding apace via mergers and take-overs.

Thanks to the planned penetration of educational establishments over three generations—Harold Wilson taught Fabian inspired economic doctrines at Oxford for several years—ideas destructive of the order which Conservatives are thought to stand for are accepted as axioms of economic 'science' by numerous 'Conservative' politicians. The economic arguments for joining the Common Market are a prime example. The fundamental idea is to sell more goods to get more money. But hardly anyone seems to notice that the countries of the Common Market are highly industrialised—that is to say, quite capable of supplying their own home markets. Yet Conservative official policy seems to regard Europe as a vast undeveloped area as, relative to Britain as the industrial revolution gained momentum, it once was. From a Fabian point of view, however, the objective of 'entry' is not economic, but political; the inner group of Fabians envisage a consortium of 'strong' Social Democratic governments as a large and irreversible step towards a strong (i.e., irremovable) World Government.

An election on any issue other than agreement or disagreement with the fundamental *policy* of the Labour Government would be fatal. But the attitude of the Conservatives is: We agree with what the Government is *trying* to do, but we consider them incompetent to do it ("the failures of the present Government"). But the prior question is: What is the Labour Government *really* trying to achieve? If it is taking "giant strides towards Socialism", where are its failures? The economic destruction of the middle classes—i.e., that part of the community which stands between

total government on the one hand, and full employment (i.e., complete servitude of the masses) on the other—is a policy objective of Socialists; a wrecked economy and balance of payments 'crisis' is the virtually indispensable basis of such a policy. Is it really credible that the 'brilliant' Mr. Wilson would employ as Chancellor such an economic moron as *Spectator* represents Mr. Jenkins to be, if he wanted results other than those he is achieving? What, then, if Mr. Wilson wants "a situation out of control"? What if he wants a situation which even a repentant Conservative Party could not rectify?

The British electorate is probably capable of grasping the fundamental issue underlying the present situation if the Opposition would put it to them in its correct terms—i.e., that the British are essentially the victims of competent conspiracy. For Fabian Socialism is conspiracy, even more so than outright militant Communism, which does not conceal its aims, whereas the essence of Fabianism is deception as to ultimate aims—which are purely Marxist. Fabianism was adopted as a strategy more likely to succeed with the British than violent revolution, but the elimination of the middle class was, and is, just as fundamental an objective. Now the defeat of Socialism entails the restoration of the power of the middle class—which means creating the conditions by which anyone with his own enterprise and initiative can acquire an increasingly independent income.

This sounds like a tall order under present circumstances; but it has to be grasped that "present circumstances" are the outcome of Fabian strategy, and that in fact independent incomes might by now have been universal in the absence of that strategy. Of course, it is quite impracticable to go at once from where we are to where we might have been; but it is essential to aim in that direction.

Despite the fact that the present British Government was elected, it might just as well have been imposed on the British by say Germany, had Germany won the war; it is, in essence, a 'Quisling' government acting on behalf of a potential World Government. Nobody doubts that Hitler would have established a World Government had he been able to.

Unless the Conservatives actively repudiate this conception of government—which means, in the event of an electoral victory, disengaging from the *business* of government, drastically reducing taxation, and repealing restrictive legislation—Britain as a distinctively Anglo-Saxon community is finished.*

*For amplification of current situation, see *The Trap*.
K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 245 Cann Hall Road, London, E.11.
1 copy 2/6 posted. 3 copies 5/9
6 copies 10/3 12 copies 17/6

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.

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

Bang and Whimper

Within a few weeks, Bishop Pike has died in the desert and Bishop Robinson has retired from Woolwich, as the 'permissive decade' winds up in the stench and filth of the hippies' leavings, and London reigns as the abortionist's bonanza.

Little wonder that Christopher Booker writes (*Sunday Telegraph*, Oct. 5, 1969) on "Road Back From Fantasy" and says "I have been driven inexorably to the conclusion that what I have been describing as fantasy . . . would have been understood by our forefathers as the ever-present force in any human society of Evil . . . ultimately the only 'scientific' way in which the world can be reduced to sense is . . . the eternal struggle in fallen man between the Good which binds him together with his fellows and with God, and the evil which produces fantasy and discord". These problems it is "the whole practical purpose of religion to explain and surmount". In his own case, it has led him to "an acceptance, not of the watered-down and progressive Christianity which is as much a product of our age as any of its other neuroses, but of that complete and unchanging world-view provided by Christianity throughout the past 2,000 years".

He wrote these words shortly after the appearance of M. Belgion's *Worship of Quantity* (Johnstone), a brilliant analysis of our ills and mistakes, which comes to the conclusion that we can find a solution to man's tragic state "only in the light of a religion".

If Dr. Robinson and his cronies called these views a 'backlash', I do not know what further epithet would remain in their scanty stock to describe Enoch Powell's article (*Sunday Express*, Oct. 5, 1969) called "Make No Mistake, Britain IS Great". He says that if it had been a conspiracy "it could hardly have been more skilfully or, so far, so successfully conducted. I mean a conspiracy to talk the British into losing all faith and confidence in themselves". He points out that importing and exporting for its own sake is "a fetish", and that our recent misfortunes "we inflicted on ourselves".

While ecclesiastics and Councils burble about sending still more "aid" to the ends of the earth—another form of taxation—we may be grateful to those who encourage us to regain our self-respect and our faith. Yet the world has become very dangerous, and as far back as August 30, 1969, *Human Events* reported that the Soviets were "deploying missile sub fleets around U.S.". Henry J. Taylor then wrote, "it appears that the Kremlin intends to station these permanently along the entire Atlantic seaboard . . . the Kremlin has fundamentally revised the fleets' strategic role and changed it increasingly to an attack basis. Meanwhile Britain has dropped out of this costly competition".

The evidence points to a diabolical and world wide plot, in which Britain has been progressively stripped of the means of self-defence and been morally undermined, notably by Mr. Wilson and his socialist adherents. Those with no stakes in the success of the conspiracy might find more support than they would have expected a short time ago.

—H.S.

Review of the Crisis (continued from page 1)

financed the Russian revolution) binding the British Government to undisclosed terms. Sieff sets up Political and Economic Planning, which remarks that war is the time to force planning on an otherwise unwilling British Government. Cassel (London School of Economics) finances the training of Socialist administrators. Laski glamourises the idea of class (i.e., civil) war. The 'State' assumes the ownership of coal; the Wall Street financiers involve the 'State' in 'dollar' debt. The 'Socialists' bankrupt the 'State'; and the financiers foreclose on the coal. And in the whole process, the British are forced into the factories under the slogan "We Work or Want", are controlled by ration books and ticketed and dossierled by 'Social Security'; and next they will be told to *get the coal out*, or else . . .

(14)

The next step in the grand strategy is blue-printed by the Marshall 'Plan'. The European nations are to make an inventory of their resources, which are to be pooled for the 'salvation' of Europe. The British, organised as a slave state, will concentrate on providing the coal. Electricity will be cornered through a grid, and controlled by a Valley Authority on the pattern of the Tennessee Valley Authority (promoter, David Lilienthal). Food will be controlled, and doled out by the International Food Council via ration books. And if the threat of starvation is not sufficient, there will be the Atomic Development Authority, with a monopoly of atomic bombs, and controlled by Bernard Baruch and David Lilienthal and a string of financiers.

(15)

What is to be done? We quote *The Social Crediter*:

"If we are determined to improve our position, then the primary step to that end is to clean out the agents of the Financier-Socialist plot, who, for the most part, are not in the titular Government. And the next step is to lay bare the steps by which, both in 1916 and again in 1941, we were made to bear the whole weight, both financial and military, while 'America' took her time and collected all the pickings, so that, in both cases, she could 'win the war' with a minimum of loss, and then call for restitution . . ." i.e., the Marshall 'Plan'.

It has often been said that the German people deserved their fate, for allowing Hitler to set up his dictatorship, and for not overthrowing it once it was instituted. Now, for anyone who will look at the present course of events objectively, it is perfectly clear that we, the British—the English somewhat in advance of the Australians, but the Australians too —, are acquiescing in substantially the same series of steps as Hitler took. If we cannot learn by the object lesson, then our fate is sealed; and if the German people deserved what they got, so shall we.

If, on the other hand, we have learned, and wish to save ourselves (and no one else is likely to save us) effective *action* is essential.

The agents of the Socialist-Financier plot are only to be removed through appropriate mechanisms, and of these, the most suitable at the present time (and while it lasts, which

may not be much longer) is Parliament. There is only one real purpose for Parliament, and that is to impress the general will of the public on the bureaucrats and others whose function is to administer—not formulate—policy.

This conception lies at the very root of genuine democracy. Democracy can only operate in respect of *policy*, never of *administration*. At the present time, control of policy is resident in finance, in the centralised control of critical materials (e.g., food, oil, coal), in the power of appointment, and in the control of the main channels of propaganda. The pressure exerted on the titular Government by finance (e.g., the 'shortage' of dollars), by monopoly control of materials ('world famine'), by 'expert' advice tendered, in the British Empire, largely by London School of Economics trained, or P.E.P. affiliated, departmental officials, and by a misinformed mob opinion, far outweighs the pressure of the *genuine* desires—i.e., *policy*—of the individuals who compose the electorate.

A thoughtful consideration of these matters must surely make it evident that the power to formulate policy, at the present time, does not reside in the electorate, if only because the electorate as such does not possess a mechanism to formulate policy.

It can hardly be disputed that what the electorate wants—i.e., its present but unexpressed policy—is a better state of affairs than obtains at present. Now if the observations of the preceding sections are valid—and their verification is only a matter of pursuing the various references which have been given—it is clear that the present state of affairs is the outcome of a deliberate and alien policy, so that the destruction of that policy would at the least ameliorate the present situation, and clear the way to a better state of things. That is to say, the immediate necessity is a *negative* policy; we have to put a stop to the alien intrigues which are ruining us.

It can be done; and the way to do it is to organise a concerted demand, addressed to the only fraction of the 'State' which is susceptible to public opinion—the politicians irrespective of Party—that it shall be done.

The initiative in the formulation and presentation of the demand will, of course, have to come from the small number of individuals who have mastered the technicalities involved. But anyone can spread knowledge of the facts of the Financier-Socialist plot, and add his weight to the demand for the expulsion of its agents.

The situation is unprecedentedly grave, and the time to deal with it very limited. With the exception of a select number of the 'managers', every single individual in the community is in imminent danger of reduction to the status of a slave; and only personal acts of resistance, concerted if possible, but in the last resort isolated, and backed with the preference of death to slavery, will save them.

(Concluded)

SOCIAL CREDIT IN 1967

A Review for New Readers

3/- posted.

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

Printed by E. Fish & Co., Ltd. Liverpool.