

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 54 No. 6

SEPTEMBER, 1974

15p. Monthly

Russia's Ultimate Aims

By C. H. DOUGLAS

(Originally published in *The Social Crediter*, February 10, 1945)

The Comte de St. Aulaire, from whose remarkable book, *Geneva versus Peace*, we quoted recently, remarks "The League of Nations was conceived in Berlin. . . We learn this fact from Von Bulow . . . it is at Berlin that the ring is completed, after traversing Washington, Paris, London, Budapest and Petrograd. The mutual affinities of its ancestry, plutocracy, revolution, Freemasonry and Pan-Germanism are so close that it may be wondered if there is not, beneath them all, another identity."

In this, the gravest crisis of the world's history, it is essential to realise that the stakes which are being played for are so high that the players on one side, at least, care no more for the immolation of the peoples of a continent than for the death of a sparrow.

They have no nationality, no morals, no scruples and no regrets. The League of Nations was conceived in Berlin, yes. But it was proposed and pressed by Wilson, the representative of men who had fought (well, a little anyway) to defeat the country in which it was conceived. It is not accidental that a film, and we know who controls the films, has appeared at this time which presents Wilson as a giant among statesmen, instead of, as he was, a second-rate schoolmaster completely dominated by Schiff, Strauss, House, Baruch and Brandeis.

To a world not distracted by rocket-bombs and Ministries of Fuel and Power, it would be uniformly obvious that a manipulated clamour is being raised in favour of the scum of the underworld in each country as it is "liberated". This scum has obtained arms in large quantities under the pretext of resistance to the Germans during the occupation. How much resistance was actually offered, we may, or may not, learn at a future date. We may, or may not, also learn the principles on which the arms of the resistance movements were distributed. But we already have sufficient experience of what happened in Greece, Belgium, and parts of France (always backed by a prepared clamour from the "British" Socialist Party) to be assured that a massacre of the Right has been prepared. The text-book is available to anyone who supposes that we are alarmists. It is written by Stalin, and its title is *Problems of Leninism*. In a valuable commentary which should be read by everyone (*What are Russia's Ultimate Aims?*, 9, Hazlewood Road, Glasgow), Mr. H. W. Henderson remarks "No one acquainted with Communist tactics in Germany before the advent to power

of Hitler, can fail to be impressed with the fact that unity between the Communist and Socialist Parties could have kept the Nazis out. This was however rendered impossible by the actions of the Communist Party, acting under instructions from Moscow." Now, the Russian Revolution, and its spate of murder, was financed from New York with the assistance of Germany by some of the richest men in the world. And these same men are those who have persistently opposed effective monetary reform with the obvious intention of retaining an army of discontent for use against the Right. That is to say, there is a working coalition between the scum of the underworld and the richest men in the world to murder those from whom alone redemption for the underworld can come, in order that any threat to the power of the financier may be removed. The underworld will be dealt with just as easily as Stalin deals with any opposition, when the underworld has done its job.

* * *

The quotation referred to, with comments by Douglas, are from our "Week to Week" notes for February 3, 1945:

"Russia . . . is the victim of a syndicate organised to destroy the nations. . . Why are the New York bankers, along with the German General Staff, the responsible authors of the Russian Revolution? . . . The solidarity of faith which obtains between the New York bankers and the Bolshevist leaders, and the feelings inspired by the sufferings of the Jews in Czarist Russia, are not a sufficient explanation of this paradox. . . However, are we not paying too great an honour to freemasonry when we attribute to it the greatest share in the genesis of the League and in responsibility for its acts? Is not this secret society a society with limited responsibility, not only by reason of its mental weakness, but also because it is above all else the instrument of forces more secret still, and more to be feared? Is it not unjustly accused of all the sins of Jewry? And if freemasonry is but an instrument, then President Wilson was but the instrument of an instrument."

The preceding quotations are taken from *Geneve contre la paix* by the Comte de St. Aulaire, Ambassador to Great Britain (1920-1924). The English translation is published by Sheed and Ward. It must be remembered that it is written, not by a propagandist, but by a trained professional diplomat of wide experience. It should be read by every serious student of contemporary events.

"The Social Crediter"**FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM**

PUBLISHED MONTHLY

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 £2.60. Six months £1.30, Airmail one year £3.50.

Offices—
Business: 245 Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone, London, E.11 3NL.
Tel. 01-534 7395

Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, 2 Park Village East, London, NW1 7PX.
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 L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, 2 Park Village East, London, NW1 7PX. Telephone: 01-387 3893. Liaison Officer for Canada: Monsieur Louis Even, Maison Saint-Michel, Rougemont, P.Q., General Deputy Chairman and Secretary, H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001.

Retrospect

Ten years ago we said ". . . that post-war developments have in themselves made it plain to see that what C. H. Douglas (to the consternation of some of his supporters) definitely stigmatised in 1935 as an international conspiracy to achieve World Government, naked and ruthless, and what is now generally recognised as the International Communist Conspiracy, are one and the same thing. From 1939, and ever more urgently through and after the war years, Douglas devoted his efforts to endeavouring to effect an exposure of this Conspiracy, and repeatedly warned that the only hope of saving Christian civilisation lay in dealing with the conspirators, the most important of whom, of course, were in control of the U.S. Government. The war, as Douglas saw so clearly, was in essence a prize-fight, arranged by 'promoters' to destroy European civilization, so that the world could be reconstructed by a World Government, operating through, for the time being, Russia and America until the United Nations organisation could take over officially."

The matter was so important that we re-published, for the benefit of old as well as of new readers, Douglas's succinct summary of the situation, originally published in T.S.C for Feb. 10, 1945. This summary is repeated on page 1.

* * *

Bearing in mind Douglas's repeated warning against expecting salvation from ballot-box 'democracy' which, he said, makes our final collapse as a nation and a culture a mathematical certainty, we re-publish on page 3, an interesting paper which appeared in *Chamber's Edinburgh Journal* in 1860; about the time of the introduction of the secret ballot for parliamentary elections in Great Britain.

Blasphemy

Instances of the abuse of the Gospel multiply. The All-Africa Conference of Churches has a General Secretary, Canon Burgess Carr, who baldly announced a year ago that the aim of this body was to "harness the potential marginal groups for agitation and restructuring society . . . this is how we perceive the meaning of evangelism and salvation today." He was more specific at the body's assembly in Lusaka, Zambia, in May, 1974. He stated that unequivocal support must be given to liberation movements "because they have helped the Church rediscover a new and radical

appreciation of the Cross. In accepting the violence of the Cross, God, in Jesus Christ, sanctified violence into a redemptive instrument for bringing into being a fuller human life" (*Occasional Newsletter of the Rhodesian Christian Group*, June, 1974).

Fr. Lewis comments that "were it not for this sustained external intervention, the races in Rhodesia could long ago have come to terms on the progressive sharing of responsibility." He points out that the Roman Catholic Bishop of Umtali has opposed as inadequate every practicable step-by-step advance. Bishop Lamont—and he apparently has the Papal blessing—said in New York on May 30th, 1974 that the Rhodesian Government authorised summary executions and torture. Yet, says Fr. Lewis, "250,000 foreign Africans come from 'liberated' countries to live and work voluntarily because they like it" in Rhodesia.

Fr. Lechundi of the Burgos Fathers also went pretty far, for he disclosed that he last year did "some recruiting work for the Frelimos among young Africans," this being the reason for his deportation from Mozambique by Portugal. He with Fr. Berenguer, who reported Wiriyamu, "visited Frelimo camps in south Tanzania" and accompanied guerilla commandos into Mozambique. He said he was in sympathy with the Frelimo movement and although its ideology was "African-nationalist, atheistic and Marxist, none the less the Frelimos are quite prepared to collaborate with 'some' missionaries" (*The Tablet*, June 29, 1974).

Nearer home, a clear line is never drawn between the Roman Catholics of Ulster and the Republicans. Doubtless some Roman Catholics are in favour of union with Eire, but the unwarranted conclusion is drawn that all Roman Catholics desire the end of Ulster's independence or connection with Britain. If the Protestants were seen as anti-republican, not as anti-Roman Catholic bigots, some progress could be made and some lives could be saved. But again, religion is dragged in to add flavour and distortion.

We have to turn to an African chief for words of wisdom in the confused scene. Chief Lucas Mangope, leader of the Tswana people, proved critics of Bantustan leaders and joined the Zulu leader, Chief Buthelezi, in emphasising the reality of "the Bantustan concept" (*Times*, Jan 18, 1974). The Bantustan leaders were meeting in Cape Town for the annual conference of the Institute of Race Relations, and Chief Mangope said that it was the task of responsible politicians to "reconcile ideals with harsh realities."

He further complained, "so much of the advice thrust upon us with such fanatical insistence by practically the whole outside world is either useless or outright destructive." For the advice fails to take into account what is attainable "and how best it is attainable in the face of our complex realities."

—H.S.

Mr. Oestreicher and Human Rights

The Chairman elect of the British section of Amnesty International, the Rev. P. Oestreicher, writes about "Being Good Neighbours" (*Church Times*, June 28, 1974) and gives his views about human rights. One fifth of the citizens of the United States, he reports, "feel about as hopeless as the inmates of a Soviet labour camp" owing to their poverty, whereas "when the Soviet Government talks of respecting human rights, this is not sheer hypocrisy. It is merely being selective. Soviet citizens do have the right

to work and eat, to health and education." Mr. Oestreicher is further quoted (*East-West Digest*, Jan., 1974) as holding that "the Marxist analysis of religion (mainly Christian) based on observed history is, broadly speaking, right . . . Christians have spoken of the Kingdom of God. Marxists, more simply, have spoken of Communism. When one day they are seen to be very nearly the same thing, the dialogue will have reached its proper conclusion." I should prefer the view of Fr. von Straaten, the Beggar for God as he is known, whose denunciation of the evils of capitalism "is almost as strong as that of Communism, which he sees as the Anti-Christ of the Apocalypse" (*East-West Digest*, May, 1974). He particularly deplores the neglected sufferings and heroism of the Eastern Rite Catholics in Rumania and the Ukraine.

The Roman Catholic Church itself is split on the issue. On the one hand, Hervé Leclerc holds, in his (*Institute for the Study of Conflict*) pamphlet *Marxism and the Church of Rome*, that the Church is corroded by Communism and is partly responsible for leaving the West open to domination by the Kremlin. On the other hand (*The Tablet*, June 22, 1974) hopes for a "constructive approach to the Marxist challenge" and prints an article by Professor Cameron, a Catholic convert from Marxism, who criticises Leclerc, and says that in some cases we may find ourselves "closer to the Communists than we are to the nice people who live in the better housing areas," and calls the Latin American communists "bureaucratic parties of the moderate left."

This type of euphoria, or downright deception, takes no account of what actually happens in Marxist countries. A not very favourable review, entitled "The Trouble with Solzhenitsyn". (*Spectator*, June 29, 1974), pays tribute to this writer's comparison of Imperial Russian with Soviet penological procedures and remarks, "Soviet practices have been and remain incomparably more brutal than those of Tsarist times is indisputable, but is worth restating if only because the world's folk-brain seems incapable of assimilating this easily demonstrable fact." The reviewer, Ronald Hingley, complains that *Gulag Archipelago* is below the level of the author's best work and states, "as for its political message, that of course will be ignored by the world at large, as it always has been. That the dead Hitler maintained atrocious concentration camps we all know and are being constantly reminded. That Soviet concentration camps have a record every bit as evil in its very different way—and one which is by no means dead—is a fact too inconvenient to be accepted even with the eloquence of a Solzhenitsyn to present it."

Concisely stated, Marxism has a wrong view of man and of religion and aims at wrong objects, being an instrument of absolute power. Such as Mr. Oestreicher, in their genuine concern for improvement, should look elsewhere to solve our problems. He says that he is "far from despairing of the Churches," and perhaps we are far from despairing of Mr. Oestreicher, who after all has been ordained, benefited and given responsible positions in this country. He moved here, for he is not indigenous, to gain freedom, and it would be a poor return for the wide freedom of expression which he enjoys for him to offer us this ultimate form of slavery and terror. He should find out who financed Soviet Russia, who armed it and who gave it technology.

—H.S.

There should be an Act of Parliament etc.

(From *Chamber's Edinburgh Journal*, June 23, 1860.)

When a Briton sees anything wrong which the law does not already provide against, he is pretty sure to be heard saying: "There ought to be an act of parliament to put it to rights." But in nine cases out of ten, it will be found that an act of parliament on the subject would only do further harm, and no good; and this is because in nine out of ten cases in which the Briton wishes for legislation, he is only expressing offence at something displeasing to his own prejudices or inclinations, but which is agreeable to the prejudices and inclinations of other people: he wants, in short, to impose a restraint upon the liberty of some of his fellow-citizens, in points indifferent to the general interest, conveniency, and taste, and which, therefore, had much better not be meddled with.

Though our function is not political, we may be permitted to express surprise that so much attention has been given for eighty years past to possible improvements of the legislative power, and so little to the character of the acts which it is desirable to see any legislature pass. While we think of the claims of Jack and Tom to vote in the election of a legislator, and deliberate whether Little Peddlington should have one or two representatives in the Lower House, scarcely a remark is ever heard about what are and what are not the proper objects of legislation. The great body of the public remains on this subject very little enlightened. It must be admitted that things were at one time worse in this respect. In the seventeenth century, it was considered as proper and fitting that parliament should prevent the use of expensive dress; that it should compel holders of grain, during a scarcity, to bring it to market, and sell it at a price below its value; and even that it should prescribe the proper stuff in which a corpse should go to the grave: while much more lately, it was allowed to the legislature to forbid the lieges to deal with foreign countries for needful articles; in other words, a modified starvation in the community was absolutely enforced. We have cleared ourselves of these errors; but many remain behind, and above all, that of a too great tendency to look to government for the enforcement or prohibition of things beyond its sphere.

The evil, in reality, consists in an inclination we all have to impose what we think salutary rules and restraints upon each other. Generally, the object aimed at is something we think highly moral, something we believe to be fraught with great blessings to the community. Only let us get it embodied in a law binding on all, and which the executive must enforce, and a step will be made towards a regeneration of society. The intention is usually good, and this naturally makes us only the more earnest in our desire to effect our purpose. But the worst things that fanaticism ever dictated were based in good intention. We are bound, in the first place, to consider if we have a right to impose our own views upon others, to the detriment of their liberty of action. We are bound to make sure that, in working out this supposed good for our fellow-creatures, we shall not inflict upon them great and overbalancing evils.

Now, every restriction that is put upon our own healthy spontaneous action, we feel to be an evil—this is acknowledged by all. That we submit to any restraint, indeed, is

only a concession we make for the sake of some indispensable good. Each man is entitled to the free exercise of his judgment regarding matters concerning himself, whether of a secular or a religious nature, so long as he does not allow this to interfere with the like freedom of others. Each man is entitled to the free use of his faculties of body and mind, for the promotion of his own material interests, so long as he respects the same rights in others. If this be granted, it must follow that there is more need for a government to be watchful to prevent, than to favour the imposing of clogs on our several freedoms of thought and action. In all matters affecting our personal movements and habits, the way we shall spend our time, the access we shall have to enjoyments and recreations, or what we severally consider as such; in all matters in which our profoundest feelings and convictions are concerned; if a state power is to interfere at all, it should be as a guardian to protect each individual and group of individuals from the restraints which others would impose.

"Ah! freedom is a noble thing," says old Archdeacon Barbour, "Freedom makes man to have liking." Seeing how all enjoyments are a mockery without it, how *with it* even poverty may be blest, it becomes of importance that the control which we exercise over each other by mere force of opinion should also be conducted with gentleness. To most men, ridicule is as terrible as an act of parliament. There may, consequently, be as great a tyranny exercised in censorious remarks on our neighbour's dress and manners, the way he spends his leisure hours, and the opinions he is known to entertain as there could be through the medium of statutes and police-offices. It would be well that we took more liberal views of all such matters, since a greater freedom in them would undoubtedly conduce to the general happiness. It is remarkable that liberality in this particular does not necessarily advance hand in hand with political freedom. On the contrary, America, the freest of states, has a people believed to be more enslaved to each other by the tyranny of public opinion, than is to be found in any other country.

The Baron Wilhelm von Humboldt, brother of the celebrated Alexander, and a man of large experience in high political situations, wrote a work on *The Sphere and Duties of Government*, in which he gave the weight of his great authority to the conclusion, that the solicitude of the State should be confined to the preservation of the security, and not extended to the positive welfare, of the people. We are not inclined to discuss this proposition at present. At the utmost, we would ask our friends to keep it in view as a principle which it would be well to lean to in future, as that most favourable to our great object, the utmost possible freedom of individual action. With the account of M. von Humboldt's ideas, which has been given by an able English writer, we shall conclude this paper.

"His investigation starts from the postulate that the welfare of men as individuals is the end for which the state exists, and not the increase, wealth or prosperity of the *association* formed by those individual men, other than as the association is the mere sum-total of the elementary individuals. He proceeds to assert, that the happiness of men lies not in possession, but in activity, for it is activity and not possession which strengthens and elevates the faculties. It follows from this that men

require a sphere in which they can freely choose where and how to exercise their faculties; and, moreover, that a vast variety of situations should exist, so that each man may find a sphere suited to the specialities of his own individual case. But government implies authoritative direction, and leads to uniformity of situations. Authoritative direction suppresses the delightful action of the faculties which is necessary to the growth of the individual man; uniformity of situation, the necessary consequence of control from a centre, deprives the individual man of the choice of situation and circumstances for the exercise of his faculties which would otherwise naturally exist, and want of a harmonious situation enfeebles the faculties themselves. The suppression of the spontaneous action of the individual is followed by the decline of active energy and the deterioration of the moral character. Reliance on the care of and provision of the state is substituted for the vigour of personal interest and resolution, while essential right and wrong are confounded with mere external obedience to the accidental law. To think and cater for men may make them easy and quiet, the great object of despotic governments, but it is not to make them substantially happy. Men so treated are helpless. They are overwhelmed when inevitable emergencies happen; they do not rise under the pressure which should stimulate and strengthen them; they are dwarfed in spirit; they accomplish nothing great. Governments at best can look only to what is profitable; but the true nature of man requires abundant exercise about that which is great and good, independent of results, and which cannot be regulated, or even defined, by rules and forms, the necessary implements of government. Governments can contemplate only external issues; true life of man is concerned only with the spirit and manner with which a thing is done; the issues, in this view, are of inferior moment. Government can only impose command; but morality commonly grows feeble where its office is superseded by authority. Government can only act by general rules, framed according to the average condition of the mass; but the true life of the individual requires guidance according to the infinite fluctuations of circumstances, and government injures the individual whenever it hinders the corresponding adaptation. Government can only order its business in relation to the truths already discovered and interests already established but where true manhood is active, new truth is constantly appearing, and new interests are ever being created, the office of which is to discipline and exalt still further the manhood out of which they have sprung; but government, always and necessarily unprepared for them, inevitably embarrasses their operation, and greatly damages their effect. Finally, these interferences of government, once begun, always go on with ever-increasing necessity. The first of them creates relations and interests which could not be foreseen; these require new interferences, which in turn create new complications, until at length law becomes a mystery instead of a guide, and the spurious business of the state can be managed only by a vast class artificially raised up, and separated in feeling, views and interest from the people who have only to obey them."*

**Westminster Review*, October, 1954.