

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol.61 No.5

SEPTEMBER–OCTOBER, 1982

Programme for the Third World War

BY C.H. DOUGLAS

THIS TREATISE, HERE CONTINUED, WHICH FIRST APPEARED SERIALY IN THESE PAGES BETWEEN APRIL AND AUGUST, 1943, AND LATER IN BOOKLET FORM WILL NOT BE FAMILIAR TO MANY OF OUR PRESENT READERS. FOR OTHERS A RE-READING SHOULD PROVE ENLIGHTENING.

XVII

While there may be room for much difference of opinion as to the factors which go to make up social direction, I do not think any competent observer can dispute one of them. It is simplicity itself.

If war, and particularly modern mechanised war, is innerent in society, then all society must take organisation for war as its primary objective, and that implies a slave state.

I do not propose to discuss this proposition at length because anyone can see for himself not only that individual interests are swept into a functional policy of "everything for the war effort" but also that "the surrender of our freedom" is taken to be axiomatically inherent in *success* in war, so that we can say that the shortest way to enslave a society is—"only in war, or under threat of war."

At this point, a short digression on the fashionable phrase "over-simplification" seems to be desirable. It may be noticed that all really respectable comment on matters of moment is at some pains to disclaim anything of this nature, and the more complex the comment, the more certain is it to be accredited as respectable. When the explanation of any phenomenon is so complex, and takes so many factors into consideration that no one of them, if subjected to modification, can be expected to produce much alteration, it can be predicted with some certainty that it will be commended as a solid contribution to the solution of world problems.

All problems are, however, just as complex as you care to make them. Let us suppose that you wish to explain the light by which you are reading. You may say that it proceeds from a heated wire enclosed in a glass bulb, which could not operate without this and such arrangements of rubber-covered wires. Someone is sure to say that the rubber shortage will inevitably threaten your lighting system. When the supply of power from the grid fails, a considerable body of opinion will blame the Japanese invasion of Malaya and the shortage of rubber. But if you say that your light proceeds from the transformation of one kind of energy into a different manifestation of the same energy, you are not only more generally accurate, but you set up a more useful train of thought, and cut out many irrelevancies. In general, a cause is more likely to be comprehensively identified if you consider it a long way back from its effect, and the attribution of an effect to a complexity of causes is,

a priori, a suggestion of a shallow analysis. It may not be, but in relation to public policy, it generally is so. Or to put the matter another way, a political effect rarely has only one immediate derivation, but it generally has one primary cause.

Bearing this in mind, it is true to say that the cause of war is economic—that men do not want to fight, but they will fight if they believe that otherwise they will starve, just as it is indisputable that revolution always relies on a promise of economic betterment, although it rarely or never fulfils that promise. But exactly at this point, we come to what may be a newly identified factor in world history. We have evidence of two major revelations.

The first of these is that the accepted idea that the poor are poor because the rich are rich has no foundation in fact and therefore class *economic* war has no factual justification. Poverty amidst plenty was not, and quite possibly never has been, due to the circumstance that supplies were inevitably limited, and only some could get enough. And the second revelation, the final proof of which we owe to the Social Credit Government of the Canadian Province of Alberta, is that *there is an organisation consciously determined at any cost, of war or revolution, to uphold the economic war* (of which military war is only one phase) and to use it as a weapon in the *cultural* war. That is why Mr. McKenzie King, the Federal Prime Minister of Canada, disallowed Bills which, if translated into Acts, would have demonstrated that the *economic* standard of the poorest can be raised without impinging on the economic standard of the richest.

Now we are perhaps able to see to where this revelation is going to lead us. Is there a traceable link between the power which disallowed the Alberta legislation, financed Hitler, emasculated British military power, and ushered in the Second World War with a determined attempt to turn Great Britain overnight into a State Capitalist undertaking with an unknown board of Directors? We have beyond peradventure to find out, and if it exists, to identify it.

And this information has to be obtained, and the individuals have to be identified in the spirit, not of propaganda, but of a judicial trial which will be followed by a sentence. That trial, if its impartiality could be assured, would desirably be an official trial. But the Riom Trials were intended to be that kind of enquiry, and we know what happened to them. So it may have to be a trial organised outside the usual legal structure.

If the responsible individuals during the years 1915-1940

are identified and punished, we may avoid a Third World War. If not, we shall have a Fourth and Fifth.

XVIII

Before there is a *prima facie* case for a trial there must be evidence of a crime.

What is the crime against civilisation whose commission requires the identification and punishment of its perpetrators? A satisfactory answer to this enquiry is not quite so simple as it might appear at first sight, and is certainly not comprised in the type of phrase always current in time of war, as, for instance "Hang the Kaiser"; "It's that man, Hitler."

The first axiom, and I think it is a genuine axiom, of responsibility is contained in the Latin tag *Quia fecit per aliam, fecit per se—He who does it through another, does it himself*. Primary intention is the essence of crime. There is, of course, the accessory before and after the fact. But remove the planner, the instigator, and there will be no crime.

This is the background against which the fact, or otherwise, of a continuous policy in relation to which wars, economic friction, poverty amidst plenty, and the other too familiar features of our contemporary world must be judged. If it is true that these insanities simply proceed from sheer inability to understand how they can be eliminated, *i.e.*, pure incompetence, then not only is no one to "blame," but, what is much more to the point, nothing will be gained by punishing anyone. This "village idiot" theory of events is steadily publicised. I think it is the failure to grasp the necessity for an antecedent decision on this point which is the cause of the extraordinary divergence of opinion as to what ought to be the type of peace imposed by the victors in the present military incident. There is not much doubt as to the type of peace which would be imposed if Great Britain lost the war, because there is no mental confusion in the minds of the rulers of Germany as to the existence of a continuous policy.

Now there is one unchanging feature of every social, economic, and military conflict of the last two thousand years at least. Governmental systems may change, kings may be replaced by presidents or dictators, feudal customs may give way to oligarchies or soviets. Through them all runs the dual thread of money and prices.

Yet this purely artificial, and fundamentally helpful, system has been the target of attack throughout the ages. Not once, but many times, men have risen to denounce the evils which they have traced to its perverted use. And all of these men, so far as I am aware, have come to the same conclusion. The evils which have arisen from a defective use of the credit system are without exception due to the use of it as an instrument of policy and not as an accounting and distributive system. This is the financial embodiment of the basic cleavage between Socialism and Social Credit, between Judaism and Christianity. No one with any knowledge of the question ever said, "Money is the root of all evil"; but the greatest have said, "The love of money is the root of all evil."

Money has been defined, and correctly from certain aspects, as a licence to act. To the extent that it is an exclusive licence to act, which is broadly true of large undertakings involving the activities of considerable numbers of men without comprehensive knowledge of the tendency of their combined action, it is permissible to make three statements:

(I) Conscious policy and large-scale finance are concentric.

(II) International Finance must traverse national interests. It is a licence issued to a citizen of A to initiate action on the part of a citizen of B irrespective of the interest of B and without the citizen of B having an opportunity to express his opinion on the objective of his labour.

(III) Genuine national interests are cultural interests.

For instance, when Mr. Montagu Norman committed the Bank of "England" to underwrite German activities during the armistice period, he committed John Smith of Coventry to assist in the bombing of Coventry. Who kept Mr. Norman in office? If it be contended that Mr. Norman didn't and couldn't know the consequence of the exercise of his powers, the answer is simple. No man ought to have power for which he is not responsible.

It is the initiators of policy who are responsible for the effects of policy. The indictment for world crime requires to be directed to the identification of those individuals who licenced world crime.

There are significant facts which are available to anyone interested, but the facts are unexplained.

We know that:

The Marconi Scandal connected the effective Government of the United Kingdom with the Isaacs family during the last war.

We know that Rufus Isaacs negotiated some kind of deal with the United States Government in 1916, but we do not know the details.

We know that the Bank of "England" was a counter in the deal, because it was completely re-organised under American supervision, and physically rebuilt, after 1919.

We know that Rufus Isaacs was made Viceroy of India against all tradition, and that a raging propaganda against British control of India is proceeding in America.

It is commonly stated in well informed quarters that the Bank of "England" pursued an independent foreign policy in opposition to the Foreign Office for several of the critical armistice years.

We know much, and suspect more, regarding the interference of foreign interests in the affairs of this country for the last twenty-five years.

We know that the policy of the Bank of "England," using its own vocabulary, and the policy of the Socialist Labour Party, have been identical and that both have been directed to the establishment of a bureaucratic dictatorship of which the outlines are contained in P.E.P., the organisation largely directed by a Russian Jew. We know that the interests connected with this organisation wanted war, and screamed for it when it would have meant the annihilation by Germany of this country.

Numbers of sinister incidents marked the early months of the war. Many of them have been raised in Parliament. They require elucidation.

The Canadians want to know a good many things about Mr. McKenzie King, and the Bank of Canada.

When we know the answers to these questions, we shall know whether we can avoid another world war. If we have not the courage to force an answer to them, and to make it clear that we have outgrown the idea that it's no use raking up the past, and that the Statute of Limitations protects all plotters after three months, then we had better choose the type of servitude we prefer while there is yet time.

(To be continued)

The Middle East

From Dr. Bryan W. Monahan's writings we have extracted the following:

The Middle East . . . has become a condominium of the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. under cover of a conflict maintained by these powers. . . .
(*Freedom and Inflation* - 1973)

By the time Chapter VI of "*Whose Service Is Perfect Freedom*" was published, World War had been resumed. In this Chapter Douglas wrote: "The real objectives of the 1914-1918 war were the Bolshevik revolution in Russia, the League of Nations, and the financial subjugation of Great Britain." We think that a further objective, the extraction of the Balfour Declaration from the British Government by the Money-Power in New York should be added. It was following this Declaration that the U.S. entered the war. The Declaration is not much remembered these days, but of Lord Balfour the *Encyclopaedia Britannica: Micropaedia* Vol. 1 says: "His most important action occurred on Nov. 2, 1917, when, prompted by the Zionist emigres Chaim Weizmann and Sakan Nokolow, he wrote a letter to the 2nd Baron Rothschild, head of the English branch of the famous Jewish banking family. The Balfour Declaration, pledging British aid for Zionist efforts to establish a home for world Jewry in Palestine, gave great impetus to the movement that eventually resulted in the establishment of the state of Israel".

There was a good deal more to it than that. In *Betrayal By Rulers** Prince Michel Sturdza, former Rumanian Foreign Minister, writes:

"The opening by the British Foreign Office of its confidential pre-1918 files showed how the Zionist ideas had developed from the cherished imperial dream of a few individuals to the point of execution. In 1916 the military situation of Great Britain and France on the battlefields and the ocean routes was at its lowest ebb. That was the year when Chaim Weizmann and Samuel Landman, two influential British Zionists, finally succeeded in convincing the responsible British and French authorities that the best way, perhaps the only way, to induce the American President to come into the war was to secure the cooperation of Zionist Jews, and then to mobilise their surprisingly powerful forces in America and elsewhere in favor of the allies on a *quid quo pro* basis....

"The Balfour Declaration of 1917 was the result of the secret agreement of 1916. It stated that the British government would provide for the establishment in Palestine of a national home for Jews, 'without prejudice to the civil and religious rights of non-Jewish communities existing there.' The last obstacle to Zionism's full cooperation with the allied cause was removed with the fall of the Tsarist regime. And finally, in response to repercussions from the carefully prepared *Lusitania* incident, President Wilson consented to abandon his 'too-proud-to-fight' posture and threw the United States' might on land and sea into the war on the side of Germany's enemies".

L. Fry, in *Waters Flowing Eastward*,† quotes from a letter written by Louis Marshall (President of the Jewish delegation at the Peace Conference) to Max Senior, an anti-Zionist associated with Rabbi David Philipson: "The Balfour Declaration with its acceptance by the powers, is an act of the highest diplomacy. It means *both more and less* than appears on the surface. Zionism is but an incident of a *far-reaching plan*: it is merely a *convenient peg* on which to hang a *powerful weapon*.... All the protests they [non-Zionists] may make would be futile. It would subject them individually to hateful and concrete examples of a most impressive nature. Even if I were disposed to combat Zionism, I would shrink from the possibilities which might result."

"Thus", writes Fry, "Zionism gained its ends: in Berlin and Petrograd by subversive activities, in London and New York mainly by diplomacy. Without the influence of Zionism in America during the Wilson administration, and American money, the Balfour Declaration, obtained by the efforts of Weizmann and Sokolow, would have remained a dead letter". ‡

This is not the history taught in schools; but it is history nonetheless, and an understanding of it is essential to an understanding of the present and of the almost certain future. Prince Sturdza, in this context, writes: "Jerusalem is, in the last analysis, the centre of the Palestine problem, the centre of the whole Middle East problem, and it might easily become the centre of the world peace problem too. For Jerusalem is not, for Zionism, just one more locality to be included in the Jewish state. It is the longed-for capital for which the Jewish people have sighed for two thousand years, the symbol of its force and cohesion, the Metropolis (soon to be inhabited by millions of refugees from Russia) which already dreams of the Euphrates as the limit of its dominion.

"Jerusalem as the capital of the Jewish state cannot subsist at the extreme edge of a long, narrow corridor, surrounded by hostile populations. To be truly viable, Jerusalem must be the navel of the Zionist state, broadly and safely soldered to the rest of the territory, and with secure outlets to the Mediterranean and the Red Sea...."
(*Zionism* - 1977)

"Zionism is something very different to a simple scheme for the return of the Jews to Palestine. That is incidental to the moulding of events and Governments to procure a World Dominion for 'Israel'. The objective involves a perfectly clear, coherent, and continuous policy on the part of the Zionists. The conditions for successive and major crises must be created and maintained in the world; the means to deal with each crisis as it arises must be in the hands of Zionist Jews, directly or indirectly [our emphasis]: and the use of these means must only be granted to the highest bidder in the surrender of power or the guarantee of its use in the interests of Jewry. In the past, the control of money, gold, and credit, has been the primary weapon of the Zionist.

"But the money myth has been exploded; and legal control of raw materials is essential to the pursuit of the policy to a final and successful issue. Genuine and unfettered private property of any description whatever is absolutely fatal to it . . ." (C. H. Douglas in *The Brief for the Prosecution* - 1944).

Now it simply will not do to write this off as an expression of 'anti-Semitism'. It expresses too exactly the course of world affairs since 1945.

In the first place, not all Zionists are Jews, just as not all Semites are Jews; and not all Jews are Zionists. In the second place, via the agency of UNNRA and the complicity of diverse Governments, masses of Jews were transferred to Palestine, simply as troops; and after a typical Communist-type campaign of terrorism, and again with the complicity

*Western Islands: Boston 1976.

†The British American Press, Chatou (S. & O.) France: Third Edition, 1934 (Later, revised and enlarged, editions published by Britons Publishing Co., Devon.)

‡ The attentive reader may have observed that the authorities quoted in reference to the Balfour Declaration give different names for Chaim Weizmann's 'companion', or witness. The *Encyclopaedia Britannica* is merely dismissive of the whole incident - a mere act of statesmanship on the part of Lord Balfour. But it is well established that the adoption of cover names is a powerful ingredient of conspiracy. All that can be said is that Weizmann was accompanied by a companion in this delicate negotiation which has led to the present state of the world.

of diverse Governments, this time through the agency of the UN, the State of Israel was created and recognised as an independent Power. This Power has now seized control of the Middle East, the strategic centre of the world. The emergence of the State of Israel requires that the Zionists of all races stand up to be counted in the conduct of world affairs.

("Week to Week" note in *The Social Crediter*, Dec. 2, 1967, and later included in *The Moving Storm* – 1969)

Sir John Glubb spent thirty-six years living among the Arabs. From 1939 to 1956 he was in command of the Arab Legion, the little army of the State of Trans-Jordan. By reason of this, he knew at first hand and with military perspicience the realities military, strategic and political of the Israeli war on the Arabs with its typical Communist atrocities and propaganda. He writes of all this in his book *A Soldier With the Arabs**.

As early as 1939 the late C. H. Douglas recognised that the creation of the State of Israel was one of the real as opposed to the ostensible aims of the second world war, and that this aim was a strategic objective of what we now recognise as the International Communist Conspiracy. Glubb Pasha, as Sir John is more widely known, recalls that within hours of the ending of the British mandate in Palestine, the U.S. and Russia recognised the State of Israel, and that during the U.N. 'truce' in the Israeli-Arab war "an aerial ferry was working constantly between Czecho-Slovakia and Israel, bringing in more arms from behind the Iron Curtain". When Israel's victory was assured, Russia consoled the Arabs with (unfortunately, well-based) propaganda that their defeat was due to England and the U.S.A., who under the U.N. truce embargoed arms supplies to the Arabs.

This lucrative strategy was repeated with swift precision in the Israeli-Arab war of June, 1967. The USSR egged the Arabs on to certain defeat, and then supported the U.N. cease-fire. Under the guise of replacing Arab losses, the USSR moved in fresh military equipment, and technicians. It is reported that the Arabs are given instruction in Russian.

In the light of all this, what Sir John had to say concerning the effect of the first Israeli-Arab war is particularly instructive: "In former times, when armies moved overseas, they did so accompanied by their weapons and administrative requirements. Today, the transport of personnel and the transport of material are widely different problems. The men of whole armies can be flown over seas and continents in a matter of days, if not hours. But the material which they need has never before been so difficult to move. The problem of transporting tanks, guns, vehicles and heavy ammunition is immense. Not only so, but the maintenance of these weapons in the field requires an extensive organisation of workshops and stores. If, therefore, either side can pre-position its material in peace-time, in the theatre of possible operations, so that only the personnel need be flown out, then that army will be the first in action when the war begins."

The USSR and its 'satellites', the State of Israel, and the U.S.A. Administration—not the citizens of the U.S.A.—are all aspects of the International Communist Conspiracy.

*Hodder and Stoughton: London, 1957.

The strategic problem of the Conspiracy is to confront the citizens of the U.S.A. with a situation where it would be evidently impracticable for the U.S.A. to oppose militarily action by the USSR firstly in the Middle and Far East, and then in Europe.

("Week to Week" note in *The Social Crediter*, March 23, 1968, and later included in *The Moving Storm*)

Zionism

"I was in America at this time (1945) and thus saw the fulfilment of a prediction made in a book of 1943, when I wrote that, as the secret censorship was going, Chaucer, Shakespeare and Dickens would one day be defamed as 'anti-semites'. I thought to strain probability, to make a point, but it happened in all three cases: a Shakespearean actor-manager visiting New York was ordered not to play *The Merchant of Venice*, Dickens was banned, and the defamationists put Chaucer on their blacklist.

"A private organization [the Anti-Defamation League] which can produce such results is obviously powerful; there is nothing comparable in the world. Mr. Vincent Sheehan wrote in 1949, 'There is scarcely a voice in the United States that dares raise itself for the rights, any rights, of the Arabs; any slight criticism of the Zionist high command is immediately labelled as anti-semitic' . . .

"How is the oracle worked? By what means has America (and the entire West) been brought to the state that no public man aspires to office, or editor feels secure at his desk, until he has brought out his prayer-mat and prostrated himself to Zion. How have presidents and prime ministers been led to compete for the approval of this faction like bridesmaids for the bride's bouquet? Why do leading men suffer themselves to be paraded at hundred-dollar-a-plate banquets for Zion, or to be herded on to Zionist platforms to receive 'plaques' for services rendered?

"The power of money and the prospect of votes have demonstrably been potent lures, but in my judgement by far the strongest weapon is this power to control published information; to lay stress on what a faction wants and to exclude from it all that the faction dislikes, and so to be able to give any selected person a 'good' or a 'bad' press. This is in fact control of 'the mob'. In today's language it is 'the technique of propaganda and the approach to the masses', as Dr. Weizmann said, but it is an ancient, Asiatic art and was described, on a famous occasion, by Saint Matthew and Saint Mark: 'The chief priests and elders persuaded the multitude . . . The chief priests moved the people . . .'"

—Douglas Reed in *The Controversy of Zion* published posthumously in 1978 by Dolphin Press, Durban.

Alexander Haig

Il recule pour mieux sauter

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 £3.00.

OFFICES—Business: K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 26 Meadow Lane, Sudbury, Suffolk CO10 6TD. Tel. Sudbury 76374 (STD Code 0787).

Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, 2 Park Village East, London NW1 7PX. Tel. 01-387 3893.

In Australia (Editorial Head Office): 11 Robertson Road, North Curl Curl, N.S.W. 2099.

Personnel—Chairman: H. A. Scoular, 11 Robertson Road, North Curl Curl, N.S.W. 2099. General Deputy Chairman: C. R. Preston, Rookery Farmhouse, Gunthorpe, North Norfolk NR14 2NY, U.K. Deputy Chairman, British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, 2 Park Village East, London NW1 7PX.