

SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 69 No. 4

JULY—AUGUST, 1990

THE DEVALUED VOTE

The cry echoes down the corridors: "More power for the European Parliament" — more decision-making, more people, more "democracy". As the European masses are stampeded in their 320 millions by arrogant herdsmen into a United States of Europe without so much as a by-your-leave or referendum; as the Treaty of Rome comes up for rescinding and rewriting without a referendum — what hypocrisy is this we hear on all sides about "democracy"?

However many new elected members are added to a much enlarged organisation, no group of them and no majority of them can hope to adequately represent the needs and cares of even a fraction of this huge constituency with its disparate climates, social mores, mixture of faiths, range of skills and manufacturing bases, forms of farming, concepts of law and justice at local level. To think that even 3,200 intellectuals could serve 320 million notionally like-minded individuals is sheer lunacy but we are being seriously asked to embrace much less representation in a more centralised structure. All this being an expansion of "democracy".

Not only that: the same system is being asked to cater for double the number as eastern bloc nations, EFTA members, Turkey and even the Soviet Union are openly proposed as eventual entrants.

In face of this, where stands the humble vote — the kind so cherished and defended in the name of "democracy"?

It must be stated quite bluntly that the vote was never worth much and is valueless now. The behaviour of President Mitterand and Chancellor Kohl shows as much in regard to "political union" when they can knock up a scheme of life-changing importance over the phone, acting in the name of "France" and "Germany". The British media hypes the suggestion that this is "national interaction" by calling Margaret Thatcher "Britain" and adding the word "isolated" for good measure.

How can we let this kind of thing happen? Simple — by casting our vote for a party of our choice; albeit in our estimation the best of a bad lot.

This is a degrading use of freedom; a damnable abuse of our conscience; a corruption of our better nature.

No one votes for a party believing it embraces all our best hopes and most precious dreams. We the people plump for compromise; we associate with types round the hustings we would not have over the doorstep. We put into Parliament characters we would not share a table with. We give up responsibility to the irresponsible, our case to the unaccountable.

It is seen most blatantly at the ballot box. We the people have put a cross against a name we hardly know; a life we have not shared; a claim we have not checked out. And we think we are acting judiciously and we are gratified that we live in a place where we are allowed to vote. This, we say, is "democracy in action".

Yet the truth is: we are deemed of no more value than the cross we have put on paper. We are reduced to a token, an impersonal digit that the checkers and/or computer will lose in a mass of figures, spewing out our alleged choice and lost choice. That is held to be acceptable.

Majority voting is accepted even in proportional representation. We the people accept being classified with every other fist capable of grasping a stub of pencil — our say, whatever our contribution to society and our grasp of the situation, is no better than the next man's. Indeed, no matter that he is here to wreak havoc in our cities, murder our police, slaughter our kids in the name of the IRA; no matter that he is here to undermine free speech, destroy the Christian faith, assassinate foreign diplomats, smuggle arms, subvert the law in the name of Islam — the principle of "one man, one vote" is considered sacred. Again, under new legislation, no matter that he is a tax exile or a fugitive from British justice in Marbella — he once shared the common lot of those he robbed and conned and he can still exercise his right to perpetuate our misery without facing the consequences.

Thus for every corrupt vote that may be garnered from abroad, how many "convenience" votes will sail in from Irish Americans and Anglo-Irish Americans picking up on dual citizenry and loyalty to "armed struggle" over Ireland? Under new legislation, it is now possible for Irish Republicans to establish brief residence in the U.K., gain voting rights, return to Eire or wherever and then when the time comes swamp the national ballot to the point of rigging. Such is the generally perceived concept of democracy as religion.

What then is to be done?

The key to truly democratic government lies in control of the agenda. At present, we are allowed every four or five years to vote on a number of "Manifestoes" designed by party machines to give a spurious "mandate" for the implementation of a whole raft of diverse policies. The agenda is thus set by the political parties.

The democratic alternative is for voters themselves to unite in formulating their own demands for specific results irrespective of their elected representative's party label. In direct contrast to the mass cajoling of voters by party machines at periodic general elections, initiatives by non-party electors can exert pressure from the grass-roots continuously between elections. It works well at local level whenever passions are aroused by some insensitive development. It can be made to work just as well at national level, given only the spirit of initiative by people of independent mind aware of the true nature of current events. Accountability for results is the essence of responsible government. That is what governs any well-run club. Why should we accept less at national level?

There was an early warning: in the March, 1972 issue of *Nation's Business*, Baron Edmond de Rothschild predicted "There will be a Euro currency, but I don't know if it will come in ten years. Making a time guess would be loose talk. One currency in Europe will not precede unification. . . ."

And so it has come to pass that in the fullness of time, the informed guess of this eminent Bilderberger would reach its climax in the combined efforts of French President Mitterand and West German Chancellor Kohl to bounce the United Kingdom and the lesser partners of the European Community into what they are pleased to call "political and monetary union" — the emphasis being on the political before the cash-economic. And yet the latter measure was long sounded before the former.

This simply bears out what Lord Acton wrote about the French Revolution:

" . . . the appalling thing is not the tumult but the design. Through all the fire and smoke we perceive the evidence of calculating organisation. The managers remain studiously concealed and masked, but there is no doubt about their presence from the start."

So what was the start — and what will be the end?

We are pitched into the middle of a scenario and most of us do not know it. Week in, week out, British television viewers are afforded commentary on what is happening around us and furth of us on the BBC's "Newsnight" — and we are supposed to think that the experts are objective and devoid of vested interest. How could such great names as Henry Kissinger and Edward Heath, so regular celebrities on the box, be accused of vested interest in world affairs? Of course, they cannot be other than dedicated to doing the best for humanity, such is their own abundance of riches. They have no need of perks nor even praise. So what makes them fight so tenaciously for an ideology that destroys the concepts of nationhood and sovereignty?

To them personally, it must be something akin to religion, but corporately it comes from a stable-mate, the source of most of "Newsnight's" pundits — the Royal Institute of International Affairs. Here men are being called upon to offer objective assessments without disclosing that they are part of the action. Does the preponderance of such appearances stem from ignorance in the BBC or from wilful bias?

Either way, there is no denying the clout of the RIIA and its steady progress. According to political analyst Hilaire du Berrier, its roots go back to the Treaty of Versailles when the French "father of the Common Market" Jean Monnet and City of London financiers began negotiating with American power-brokers headed by the Dulles brothers early in 1919 (one decided post-World War II U.S. foreign policy, the other at the CIA implemented it). In the following year, Monnet and friends in the City introduced the RIIA and a year later, its companion body the Council on Foreign Relations emerged in New York. The purpose was to place and sustain like minds in high office all over the world, preparing for a "New World Order".

Thereafter, much missionary endeavour in the U.S. and U.S.S.R. yielded funds and influence, and some other strands of one-world doctrine were woven into place, including the Marshall Plan. As Mrs David Bruce put it in her memoirs of the post-war years:

"A great deal of the making of Europe was between Dean Acheson (who would not turn his back on Alger Hiss), Jean Monnet and Robert Schuman, who would meet at the American embassy in Paris when my husband was ambassador there. . . . One could actually see the idea

THROUGH FOR

crystallising. The talks went on daily and in the end they beat out what was originally the plan for the Common Market."

Meanwhile, back in the States, there were developments, too. The late Norman Dodd, former Director, Committee to Investigate Tax Exempt Foundations, U.S. House of Representatives, was to testify in 1978 about an encounter with the President of the Ford Foundation, in 1953. He reported "practically his exact words", *inter alia*:

"We shall use our grant making power so as to alter life in the United States that it can be comfortably merged with the Soviet Union."

A year later, President Eisenhower was convinced of the need for an organisation to combat anti-Americanism in Europe and so the highly secretive Bilderberg Group was formed. Its aim was to consolidate Europeans for self-sufficiency and survival.

In 1971, David Rockefeller and Zbigniew Brezinski had a series of meetings culminating in the Trilateral Commission. Its European branch was founded by Jean Monnet in Paris in October, 1973, under the President of the European Movement, Georges Berthoun. Today's leaders are Herve de Carmoy, Director of Societé Generale Belge (Europe), David Rockefeller (U.S.A.) and Isamu Yamashita (Japan). Latest estimates put the Trilateral Commission as controlling over 60 per cent of the world's wealth through banks, presidents of multi-nationals, politicians and university authorities. Since the elections of June, 1989, Trilateralists are said to hold all of the centre and 13 per cent of the socialist section of the European Parliament (now demanding more "democratic" power).

It was in that climate that European Commission President Jacques Delors could call for single money, single central bank and national governments relegated to ratifying what the European Commission and Parliament decide. Governors of national central banks are now being called upon to "co-operate". And the British Prime Minister alone says "No". She says "no" amid unprecedented baying and harrying by domestic opposition on that and other issues; and amid the cynical and unscrupulous hijacking of all forms of debate and deliberation by other EC leaders.

It is the eleventh hour and the masks are off. On 6th July, 1989, Gorbachev claimed the U.S.S.R.'s place in what he called "the common European home"; and on the same day 18 Comecon delegates were assigned permanent seats in the European Parliament. He was able to move thus safely because he now had the assurance that Margaret Thatcher had been taken care of. A political assassination of a reputation, the sabotage of a calling and the surrender of a nation had been arranged.

During the weekend of 11th to 14th May, 1989, the Bilderberg Group met on the island of La Toja off the Atlantic coast of Spain (near Pontevedra) with Spanish King Juan Carlos and Prime Minister Felipe Gonzales present. Also there: that top dog of the Trilateral Commission and eminence grise of the Bilderbergers — Henry Kissinger.

LAND AND SMOKE

Its secrecy was impressive. There was a complete mainline news blackout. A computer search for the word "Bilderberg" showed it had not been used during the first 15 days of May by the Associated Press, United Press International, the *New York Times*, the *Los Angeles Times*, the *Washington Post* or any other of the major news magazines. This is not surprising: media moguls are always part of the company. In the U.K., names such as Sky Television's Andrew Knight (Rupert Murdoch's new man) and Conrad Black, Canadian proprietor of the *Telegraph*, come to mind. Also in the U.K., attendees have been Sir David Steel, Malcolm Rifkind, Denis Healey, Prince Charles and — once — Margaret Thatcher. The resident advocate is Edward Heath. Yet most constant of all, wherever the meetings are held — the ubiquitous Henry Kissinger.

The Spanish island meeting centred on their required downfall of Margaret Thatcher because she would not cede the last vestiges of sovereignty to a "united Europe". The idea was for her to yield on "Europe" to save her own and her government's skin.

Earlier, that April, the Trilateral Commission met in Paris to sort out the troubles of Mikhail Gorbachev. In return for eastern bloc "reforms", American tax dollars would be sent to prop up the Soviet economy. And sure enough, this May, President Bush was relaxing export restrictions. Precisely as outlined by the Trilateral Commission: western technology, managerial know-how and capital on offer. There are at least 17 multi-billion dollar joint ventures involved.

A week after the Trilateral Commission meeting in Paris, President Bush promised a billion-dollar aid to Poland to help with "freedom". The Kremlin was still to have ultimate control of that "freedom".

The scheme was proposed by Kissinger and Rockefeller and others in January, 1989, to Gorbachev; to leaders in Poland and Hungary in March; and was approved in Paris in April by the Trilateral Commission.

This suits the trading passions of the conglomerate members of the Bilderberg Group and no doubt the humanitarian instincts of the innocents they put in the mix (like Queen Beatrix of The Netherlands on a return visit — her father Prince Bernhard was the group's first chairman).

While this goes on, the mechanics of the operation grind inexorably to their conclusion. A recent paragraph in the papers tells us a new, smaller light-weight coin will replace the heavy shilling piece by December. Then in June, 1992, there will be another "continental" change — this time, an unspecified 5p-size coin for the 10p.

Enter the ECU?

As a recent Special Advertising Section of *Time* magazine says:

"The ecu is winning a place alongside other foreign currencies for inter-company deals and financial market trading. It is also beginning to become accepted as a payment option for home loans and on a growing number of credit and charge card networks. . . .

"Other ecu-dominated products which have proved more popular with individuals include unit trusts and home loan mortgages. . . .

"Most of the ecu-dominated financial products in use today are for the inter-bank or large company market where trading in ecu helps to contain currency losses. It has also become one of the main trading currencies for Eurobond issues where banks and multi-nationals raise some of their cheapest finance.

"As for individuals using ecus for banking and in the shops, much depends on the growing use of the currency by companies paying salaries or issuing shares. It is that switch, rather than promotion by governments, which will transform Europe's own currency into a real rival to the pound, the franc and the Deutschmark."

To the objection "does it really matter, so long as there's some kind of pound in our pocket" — the answer has to be: when 320 million people share that pound, it consolidates the power of those who issue it.

If the U.K. is to survive, it must keep the in-built protection of a national currency — a stance stoutly maintained by Mrs Thatcher against those promoting the ecu as a *single* rather than as a *common* European currency as proposed by Mr Major. Under upcoming circumstances, "uncle" would be the European central bank — in private hands.

The only possible way out, short of direct exit, is that known as the twin-track system whereby those on the continent who would indulge in international usury may go that way; and those who would wish to retain the chance of flexibility in their monetary system should be allowed so to do. A kind of inner and outer circle. It is thought that the "inner circle" should be allowed to form on the basis that it is corrupt at heart and has within itself the roots of its own destruction. The "outer circle" would comprise those newcomers from the EFTA group and such as the U.K. who wish to retain a fall-back national sovereignty. This would be the connection to the other world, the internationalist approach: the link with the Third World, the tangible proof that there is life outside the EC.

Most people are there, and that is where we should be — outside the camp (Hebrews 13: 13). After all, the question is: do we really want to be Dives when Lazarus festers at our gate?

IAIN MCGREGOR.

RECOMMENDED READING

Benson, Ivor	This Age of Conflict.
Burkitt, B. & Baimbridge, M.	What 1992 Really Means: Single Market or Double Cross?
Douglas, C. H.	The Brief for the Prosecution. The Development of World Dominion. Economic Democracy. The Monopoly of Credit. The Policy of a Philosophy. Social Credit.
Maré, Eric de	A Matter of Life or Debt.
Monahan, Bryan W.	The Moving Storm. The Survival of Britain. Why I am a Social Crediter.
Robertson, Thomas	Human Ecology.
Social Credit Secretariat	Elements of Social Credit. Zimunism.
Sutton, Antony C.	National Suicide — Military Aid to the Soviet Union. Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution.
Tether, C. Gordon	The Great Common Market Fraud.

Full booklist and prices upon request.

SPOTTING THE LEOPARD

Early in the new year, the Cardinal Secretary of State of The Vatican, Mgr Agostino Casaroli, addressed the diplomatic corps on the momentous events in the eastern bloc. He said Mikhail Gorbachev had "master-minded" them — they were not due "to the sole agency of forces, either internal or external". There had been, he said, "a conscious and deliberate choice, with the intention of canalising and seeking to direct the course of events so as to avoid the possibility that the great river, too closely confined between artificial banks, should overflow them sooner or later".

But Gorbachev can speak for himself. In a speech to the Supreme Soviet on 2nd November, 1987, he said:

"We see our acts and pre-occupations of the ideas and practice in the development of Socialism, as continuations of the ideas and practice of Leninism. We have only one history, and it is irreversible. The goal of *perestroika* is the restoration, in the full sense, both theoretical and practical, of the Leninist conception of Socialism. In 1917 we abandoned an outworn world by definitively rejecting it. We are advancing towards a new world: the world of Communism. We shall never turn aside from this path."

Gorbachev saw no reason to change his mind later. In his recent book, he writes: "We are going to strengthen Socialism, not put a different system in its place".

Whatever the current appearance, he is consistent with original guidelines and indeed may well be seized with a sense of destiny. As Dimitri Manuilsky put it in a speech to the Lenin Institute in 1931:

"When the moment comes, we shall launch the most spectacular peace proposals of all time. There will be amazing overtures and unheard of concessions. The capitalist countries, stupid and decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will give us their friendship and will jump into our arms. It is then, when their guard is down, that we will smash them with our clenched fist."

Gorbachev himself has no doubts on this score. As he told the Politburo in November, 1987:

"Gentlemen, do not be worried by what you are going to hear concerning *glasnost*, *perestroika*, *demokratie* in the coming years. These things are principally for external consumption. There will be no significant change in the U.S.S.R. other than for cosmetic needs."

Ivor Benson writes

From time to time we get a glimpse of *larger purposes* being promoted high above the heads of countless myopic local politicians.

"A vision of a Greater Europe also embracing the United States and Canada has been revealed by Mr Edward Shevardnadze, the Soviet Foreign Minister," reported the *London Times* on 11th April.

In an article (May) in the Brussels-based *Nato's Sixteen Nations*, a magazine dealing with international security issues, Mr Shevardnadze argues that this can be achieved by creating a formal framework for the Helsinki process, based initially on the joint structure of the North Atlantic Organisation (NATO) and the Warsaw Pact, with a united Germany as a member of both (report in *London Times*).

The Times report goes on: "Mr Shevardnadze states his firm belief in the profound involvement of the U.S. in Europe and sees the need, for the foreseeable future, for the continued existence of both power blocs, albeit transformed into closely co-operating political-military alliances."

The proposed arrangement would take the form of a Greater Europe Council consisting of the heads of the 35 member states which originally subscribed to the Final Act in Helsinki in 1975.

The Soviet Foreign Minister has thus set the agenda for a process aimed at bringing the Soviet Union, all Europe and North America into a *single* global power bloc. All this is proposed in the name of security. But, whose security? Security against whom?

The more likely explanation is that it has nothing to do with security but everything to do with *power expansion*; for it would need just such a combination of Western powers to try to subordinate all the nations of the East — Muslims, Chinese, Japanese, etc. — to the requirements of a *world-government* ambition firmly centred in Western high finance.

(Behind the News, May 90.)

History Lesson

We, the oppressed peoples of Russia, the oppressed peoples of Eastern Europe, watch with anguish the tragic enfeeblement of Europe. We offer you the experience of our suffering; we would like you to accept it without having to pay the monstrous price of death and slavery that we have paid. But your society refuses to heed our warning voices. I suppose we must admit, sad though it is, that experience cannot be transmitted; everyone must experience everything for himself.

—*Alexander Solzhenitsyn*, March, 1976, BBC address.

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, founded in 1933 by Clifford Hugh Douglas. The Social Credit Secretariat is non-party and non-class, neither connected with nor supporting any political party.

Subscription rates (one year): U.K. inland £5.00; overseas surface mail £6.00; overseas airmail £7.50; Australia \$10.00; New Zealand \$11.00; New Zealand airmail \$12.00.

- Offices — Business: K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 26 Meadow Lane, Sudbury, Suffolk CO10 6TD. Tel. 0787 76374.
- Editorial: 21 Hawkhead Crescent, Edinburgh EH16 6LR.
- In Australia (Editorial, Business and Books): Tidal Publications, 11 Robertson Road, North Curl Curl, N.S.W. 2099. (Subscriptions): Tidal Publications, 3 Beresford Drive, Samford, Queensland 4520.

BOOKS and booklets on the subject of Social Credit and allied subjects are available from Bloomfield Books, 26 Meadow Lane, SUDBURY, Suffolk, England, CO10 6TD; and in Australia from Tidal Publications, 11 Robertson Road, North Curl Curl, N.S.W. 2099.

ADDITIONAL COPIES of THE SOCIAL CREDITER and back numbers are available from K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 26 Meadow Lane, SUDBURY, Suffolk, England, CO10 6TD; and from Tidal Publications in Australia, address above.

*Please send me **The Social Crediter** for a year.

NAME:.....

ADDRESS:

.....

.....

Enclosed: £

LET NATIONS LIVE

No political spectacle has been so odd this past year as that of West Europeans binding themselves ever tighter with supranational chains, while cheering on the shattering of such chains by nationalisms in the East. West Europe excuses this inconsistency, since its supranationalism is democratic. Nato, the European Community, even the "unions" of Great Britain, the USA and Canada, are the outcome of a sophisticated constitutional process. Eastern nationalism is primitive politics, asserted as the means to a nobler end.

Last week Canada gave this argument a salutary jolt. The ghost of past imperial conquest by the British against Indians and the French came back to haunt that peaceful federation. What price a sophisticated constitution when minorities see majorities as tyrants? English-speaking Ottawa may be impeccably democratic, but to Canada's French and Indian "nations", Ottawa embodies an alien culture.

The concept of the modern state as superior to the nation has long been fashionable among enthusiasts for centralised power. In *The Times* last Saturday the former Canadian prime minister, Pierre Trudeau, quoted Lord Acton approvingly: "The theory of nationhood is a retrograde step in history." To Acton, and to Mr Trudeau, the state is superior because it must protect the rights of all irrespective of nationality. Nationalism is a survival of some crude tribalism, outdated and dangerous.

Perhaps, but Acton's other dictum on the corrupting effects of power merits equal attention. From the citadels of Moscow, down the corridors of Brussels, even to the sleepy avenues of Ottawa, those ruling vast *congeries* of ethnic subgroups seem unable to avoid the uniformity, bureaucracy and arrogance that goes with the politics of bigness. Even the USA, the world's most outstanding example of multi-group democracy, is now tormented by ethnic unrest. Britain even, smug home of look-no-hands constitutionalism, has yet to secure consensual rule in its Irish possessions.

That some supranational unions are democracies and others dictatorships appears immaterial to those who claim to be oppressed by

centralised power. The Moldavians, the Basques, the Quebecois, Ulster's Protestants, Romania's Hungarians, all yearn simply for greater group independence. They suspect the cry of "economies of scale" and "big is beautiful" from the denizens of distant capitals. No longer will they take this cry at face value.

Scots are enraged by English who declare that "you would forget nationalism if you had to pay your own way". Nationalism has long triumphed over economics: ask any Irishman, or Finn, or Lithuanian, or even Bangladeshi, whether separatism is not worth more than all the supposed benefits of a greater federalism. Certainly, Eastern nationalism has been given impetus by the thought that it might bring prosperity in its train. But people who are ready to die for nationhood should at least be given the credit of being ready to starve for it.

Few people could nowadays believe that small units are economically unviable. Taiwan, Singapore, Hong Kong and South Korea give the lie to that. Nationalism has its dark side, already evident in the fog of the disintegrating Soviet empire. But the lesson of that disintegration, as of events in Canada, is that nationalism is not a good or bad thing, but a fact of world history.

States may supersede nations, but they will never suppress them completely. Worse, the centralism to which supranational government seems always to fall prey tends to exacerbate rather than allay national tension. It begins as a bureaucratic fussiness, of the sort familiar in Washington and Brussels. Sooner or later, centralism tends to overbearing intolerance, awakening the very nationalism it was formed, whether by force or consent, to supplant.

Nationalism deserves a better press. Threats to our sense of historical and cultural identity, an identity often bound up in language, should never be couched as democratic. A time when East European nations are re-emerging in all their diversity and glory is a time to recognise that the force that crushed them was not Communism but imperial centralism. The same force crushed the minorities of British Canada, with what looks like the same result.