

SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 71 No. 1

JANUARY – FEBRUARY, 1992

PUTTING THE WORLD IN ORDER

The current activity surrounding the European Community is but one manifestation of a global dream – the much-touted if shabby New World Order. It has long been in germination. As far back as march 1942, *Time* magazine ran a piece on The Commission to Study the Basis for a Just and Durable Peace. It was established by the U.S. Federal Council of Churches with John Foster Dulles as chairman. He went on to become a U.S. delegate to the newly-formed United Nations Organisation in 1945 and served as President Eisenhower's Secretary of State from 1953.

Time quoted the Report:

"...Industrial nations must give up their armed forces except for preservation of domestic order and allow the world to be policed by an international army and navy... The ultimate goal: 'a duly-constituted world court with adequate jurisdiction, international administrative bodies with necessary powers and adequate international police forces and provision for enforcing the world-wide economic authority.'"

Time added:

"The Commission recommended, at the same time, a universal system of money, world-wide freedom of immigration, progressive elimination of all tariff and quota restrictions on world trade and a democratically controlled world bank."

So George Bush's New World Order is pretty hoary stuff. Indeed, as far back as 1935, it was made common currency. U.S. Treasury Secretary Henry Morgentau put the Great Pyramid on the U.S. dollar with the slogan 'Novus Ordo Seclorum'.

This was mis-translated to the American people as 'New Deal'.

But whatever the twist on words, the idea is plain enough and the machinations go on. The one question persists, however:

"Quis custodiet custodes" as Aldous Huxley put it.

Who will mount guard over the guardians – who will engineer the engineers?

For C. H. Douglas, the answer was clear – Matthew 28, verses 18 and 20.

To understand how Christian faith and practice is the ultimate service to mankind, there has to be a clear line drawn between sin and evil. It is failure to discern the difference that has rendered the Christian Church virtually impotent for its Founder. Evil is the unforgivable sin. It is the state that exists and is promoted by spiritual forces opposed to God and to His Christ. Sin against Jesus as a concept can be forgiven since sin is basically an accident. It is aberrant. It is transitory. Evil is the

persistent and consistent adherence to a fallen state. By its nature, evil cannot be forgiven and it cannot be ignored. There is no mercy seat for evil. Evil can only head for the abyss. By definition, it carries no chance of repentance.

Given that distinction, we are then in a position to aver that whoever is chosen to be our international police force, our international bank, our international jurisdiction will be sinful at best, evil at worst. The kings chosen to reign over us will necessarily have to oppose the Kingdom of God, the birthright within every creature. It cannot be otherwise.

Social Credit has seen this fundamental truth – that only the personal grasp of a God Who is There and Who is Not Silent, as Francis Schaeffer puts it, will suffice. Only obedience to Him and service to each other before His face will work.

Social Credit has pinpointed three issues of the day that the Christian Church should address:

- 1) Forgivable sin as against unforgivable evil – a personal state against a pervading force.
- 2) The Judaic theme of Rewards and Punishments perpetuated in a Church founded on Grace and Mercy.
- 3) The insistence on religion instead of The Way, The Truth, The Life.

C. H. Douglas fulfilled the Church's lack. He emphasised the rights and potential of every individual, as a creation, irrespective of status or creed. It was not for him to differentiate between human beings. God's gift was a universal offer, made available in and through creation, not through a cultural concept. Jesus Christ embodied that gift through creation and indeed, acted out the final, logical phase of the culture he was born into, reliance upon Rewards and Punishment. That he thus satisfied the demands of the religion he was born into does not negate the fact that he effected salvation for the rest of the peoples of the world who embraced his message, mission and meaning.

Douglas held that every person answers to God directly through the appointed Christ – and what he called 'the will to

(continued on page 4)

THE MAASTRICHT SUMMIT

Our printing schedule precludes comment on the outcome being made in this issue. Our next issue will carry a considered view.

Editor, TSC

From the beginning of the 12th century the kings of England used tallies made of wood as the money to pay for government requirements. These tallies were brought into existence free of debt and interest and were used by the public as the national money supply. There was no national debt.

At the end of the 17th century when William III needed a great deal of money to pay for wars in Europe, some financial sharks in London founded the Bank of England and lent him money far in excess of the gold they possessed, at 8% interest. As William Paterson, who was mainly responsible for founding the Bank, said "The Bank hath benefit of interest on all moneys which it creates out of nothing".

This is what the banking system has been doing on all loans ever since. But although the banks issue credit to cover the amount of the loan they do not issue credit to cover the interest on it. The public is thus continually being placed further into irredeemable debt to the banking system. The National Debt keeps rising and it cannot do otherwise under the system in force, and the same thing happens with private debt resulting in bankruptcies and widespread poverty.

In 1875, the Lord Chief Justice of England, Sir Alexander James Cockburn said:-

"The issue which has swept down the centuries and which will have to be fought sooner or later is the people versus the banks".

William Cobbett wrote in "The Political Register XVIII", July 14th 1810:-

"I set to work to read the Act of Parliament by which the Bank of England was created (in 1694). The investors knew well what they were about. Their design was to mortgage by degrees the whole of the country... lands... houses... property... labour, the scheme has produced what the world never saw before – starvation in the midst of abundance".

Thomas Jefferson, the third President of the United States, about 1800, said:-

"I believe that banking institutions are more dangerous to our liberties than standing armies. Already they have raised up a money aristocracy that has set the Government at defiance. The issuing power (of money) should be taken from the banks and restored to the Government and to the people to whom it belongs. If the American people ever allow private banks to control the issue of their currency, first by inflation and then by deflation, the corporation that will grow up around them will deprive the people of all their property, until their children will wake up homeless on the land their fathers conquered".

Abraham Lincoln, U.S. President, 1861–65, in Senate Document No. 23, 76th Congress, page 91, said:-

"The Government should create, issue and circulate all the currency and credit needed to satisfy the spending power of the consumers. The privilege of creating and issuing money is the supreme prerogative of Government, the Government's greatest creative opportunity".

During the Civil War, Lincoln made the following statement to congress:-

"I have two great enemies, the Southern Army in front of me and the financial institution in the rear. Of the two, the one in my rear is my greatest foe".

It was the desire of the financial institutions to gain control of the South which was the real cause of the Civil War. The slavery issue was only the propaganda smoke-screen.

Few people realise that it was Czar Alexander of Russia who saved the American Union from destruction. He understood the

MONEY – CREDIT

intrigue behind the Civil War and came to Abraham Lincoln's support. The international bankers had arranged for some European powers to land troops in Mexico. When they were preparing to march into the United States in aid of the South the Czar informed the powers concerned that if any one of them put a single soldier on American soil it would immediately be at war with Russia. On September 8th, 1863, Admiral S. Lesowsky arrived with a Russian Squadron in San Francisco and on September 11th, 1863, the first battleship of Admiral A. A. Popoff's Russian Atlantic Squadron reached New York. The Czar's orders to both Admirals were "Be ready to fight any power and take your orders from Abraham Lincoln".

Bismarck knew the truth about the American Civil War and revealed it to a German, Conrad Siem, in 1876. His statement was published in "La Vieille France", page 216, March, 1921. Bismarck said:-

"The division of the United States into federations of equal force was decided long before the Civil War by the financial powers of Europe. These bankers were afraid that the United States, if they remained in one block and one nation, would attain economic and financial independence, which would upset their financial domination over the world. The voice of the Rothschilds predominated. They foresaw tremendous booty if they could substitute two feeble democracies indebted to the financiers, for the vigorous Republic, which was practically self-providing. Therefore, they started their emissaries in order to exploit the question of slavery and thus to dig an abyss between the two parts of the Republic: Lincoln never suspected these underground machinations. He was against slavery and he was elected as such. His character prevented him from being the man of one party. When he had affairs in his hands, he perceived that these sinister financiers of Europe wished to make him the executor of their designs. They made the rupture between the North and the South imminent. The masters of European finance made the rupture to exploit; Lincoln's personality surprised them. His being a candidate had not troubled them; they thought to easily dupe the wood-cutter. But Lincoln read their plots and understood, that the South was not the worst foe, but the financiers".

After the war, Lincoln was determined to set up a Constitutional Money System, as laid down in the Constitution by the Founding Fathers, for he realised the ultimate fate of the nation if foreign bankers were allowed to dominate the nation. He was assassinated and Bismarck made the following statement regarding his death:

"The death of Lincoln was a disaster for Christendom. There was no man in the United States great enough to wear his boots, and... (money creators) went anew to grab the riches of the word. I fear that foreign bankers with their craftiness and tortuous tricks will entirely control the exuberant riches of America, and use it to systematically corrupt modern civilisation. They will not hesitate to plunge the whole of Christendom into wars and chaos in order that the earth should become their inheritance".

As Lincoln was struggling to set up an honest money system, the London banker-controlled newspapers were expressing the great fear that the United States would establish an

- SOVEREIGNTY

WATCHING OUR STEP

honest money system and be forever free from the clutches of the International Bankers. The following is taken from "The Times":

"If that mischievous financial policy which had its origin in the North American Republic during the late war in that country should become indurated down to a fixture, then that Government will furnish its own money without cost. It will pay off its debts and be without a debt. It will have all the money necessary to carry on its commerce. It will become prosperous beyond precedent in the history of the civilised governments of the world. The brains and the wealth of all countries will go to North America. That Government must be destroyed or it will destroy every monarchy on the globe".

Note this lying and clever appeal to the monarchs who had become their debtors.

This paragraph in "The Times" was, of course, a remarkably incautious and foolish confession of the London bankers to the efficacy of the "greenback" ("Fiat money", "printing Press money", as they were fond of calling it). But they got away with it; due, presumably, to the corruption, ignorance or stupidity of the British Press and politicians. If Lincoln had succeeded in doing what he wished, the resulting prosperity of the United States would have become obvious to the people of other nations and all the other nations would have cast off the shackles of the private money manipulators.

Gladstone once stated:

"From the time I took office as Chancellor of the Exchequer (1852) I began to learn that the State held, in face of the Bank (of England) and the City, an essentially false position as to finance... The hinge of the whole situation was this; the Government itself was not to be a substantive power in matters of finance, but was to leave the Money Power supreme and unquestioned".

The Rt. Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King, one time Canadian Prime Minister said:-

"Once a nation parts with control of its currency and credit it matters not who makes the nation's laws. Usury once in control will wreck any nation. Until control of the issue of currency and credit is restored to government, and recognised as its most sacred responsibility, all talk of sovereignty of Parliament and of democracy is idle and futile".

Mayer Amshel Rothschild, who founded the great international banking house of Rothschild which, through its affiliation with the European Central Banks, has dominated the financial policies of practically every country in the world, said:-

(continued on page 4)

This is the age of the Charter. Everyone is producing them - government departments, local authorities, pressure groups. U.K. Premier John Major probably didn't realise that with his "Citizen's Charter" he was starting a fad.

These various documents have a common professed aim - to increase the power of the citizen in his dealing with public providers of services. They are one practical face of a Conservative Party belief in "devolution to the individual", the other being the policy of privatisation.

British Conservatives under both Mrs Thatcher and Mr Major laid great stress on their commitment to freedom of the individual. Yet when their policies on this issue are examined, they can be seen to be limited by their frames of reference: what we see is a consumerist approach to individual liberty. New citizens' freedoms are largely to do with economics.

This is brought into stark relief when Mrs Thatcher's policies of economic liberalisation while Prime Minister are compared with her inability to see the adverse implications of the 'community charge' legislation for individual freedom. A Prime Minister professedly committed to personal liberty promoted and defended to the last a system of taxation which, for the first time in the U.K., compulsorily required citizens to notify the authorities of their, and others', whereabouts. This was a major shift of political power away from the individual and towards the State.

We can expect the State to garner more power of control over the citizenry whoever wins the next election. The U.K. Police Federation recently decided at its conference to campaign for a U.K. national identity card. In a rare show of political sophistication, the Federation also acknowledged the inevitability of a Euro-identity card, probably machine readable.

A key feature of C. H. Douglas's philosophy is his opposition to the centralisation of power, and the proposition that individuals within society should be afforded as much control over their own, and the community's, destiny as possible. Douglas's profoundly democratic idea of the State as servant is not yet on offer to the Party-bound U.K. electorate (although there is a chink of light in Canada where some leading politicians are demanding that electors have the right to recall their MP, and where even the federal government is proposing a loosening of the Party system with more free votes in Parliament). Instead, in Britain, the power of the State grows and grows.

The apparently uncontroversial field of road traffic law has been used to test acceptance of a particularly worrying encroachment on civil liberty: surveillance by camera. Filmed evidence of your committing a traffic offence is now permissible in a court of law. (Even crowds of shoppers in some urban streets in Britain are now under watch by camera.) When objections are raised to this, the classic riposte is: "If you aren't breaking the law, you have nothing to fear". In fact, we have everything to fear - like the seat belt legislation, once the principle is accepted, the extent of application will ever-widen. What resistance will we have to the argument that since child abuse is so widespread (as we are told by media and social workers), then camera surveillance in the home would be a small price to pay for the protection of our children?

The complacency of many with regard to these twin trends - the encroachment of the law into more and more areas and the

(continued on page 4)

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

NAME:

ADDRESS:

.....

.....

Enclosed: £

WATCHING OUR STEP (Cont)

growth in the surveillance of citizens – shows that the attitudes of mind these policies foster are already rooted and growing: firstly, the meek acceptance by the citizen that “State knows best”; second, the assumption that if we all break the law then maybe we ordinary people are like real criminals, and need even more to be controlled by the authorities.

This is the sort of “1984” thinking which destroys faith in one’s own judgment and disables the faculty of critical thought. Told what is good for him and so distrusted that he is under constant watch, how can the citizen confidently oppose further undermining of his freedom, dignity, and self-respect – such as fluoridation and other mass medication? Such as the imposition of the national identity card without which we cannot go about our daily tasks? Or, as is happening now, the keeping of secret records on individuals by our largest companies, without our consent? And how can the confused ordinary citizen reconcile the decrease in *his* freedom with the apparent increase in the freedom of the criminal classes to go about their malicious, truly unlawful business?

The Big Brother Society – the relationship between the individual and the State – is the unexploded political firework of the 1990s. In *Economic Democracy*, Douglas wrote of the potential for abuse inherent in centralisation of power. Sixty years on, today’s technology makes that potential almost total. We must resist.

Steve Miller

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 £10.00; overseas surface mail £12.00; overseas airmail £15.00; 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 Australasia (Subscriptions, Business and Books): 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 The Social Credit School of Studies, 3 Beresford Drive, Samford, Queensland 4520.

ADDITIONAL COPIES of THE SOCIAL CREDITER and back numbers are available from the above address.

U.K. enquiries for editorial and publicity phone 031 657 4740.

RECOMMENDED READING

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>Benson, Ivor Burkitt, B. & Baimbridge, M. Douglas, C. H.</p> | <p>This Age of Conflict. What 1992 Really Means: Single Market or Double Cross? The Brief for the Prosecution. The Development of World Dominion. Economic Democracy. The Monopoly of Credit. The Policy of a Philosophy. Social Credit. The Global Manipulators. A matter of Life or Debt. The Moving Storm. The Survival of Britain. Why I am a Social Crediter.</p> |
| <p>Eringer, R. Maré, Eric de Monahan, Bryan W.</p> | <p>Human Ecology. Elements of Social Credit. The Great Common Market Fraud.</p> |
| <p>Robertson, Thomas Social Credit Secretariat Tether, C. Gordon</p> | <p></p> |

PUTTING THE WORLD IN ORDER (Cont)

power’ has not to intervene. Yet at every level and in every way, petty and massive, every one of our lives is affected by someone, somewhere taking over this place of God. At every turn, we find someone, some institution – some power – seeking to govern us ostensibly for our own good, in that power’s judgment. Inevitably and inveterately, the bottom line of that power is economic, the ‘Mammon’ Jesus said directly confronted God.

Douglas, speaking at Swanwick, Derbyshire, in 1924, responded this way:

“The end of man, while unknown, is something towards which the most rapid progress is made by the free expansion of individuality, and that, therefore, economic organisation is most efficient when it most easily and rapidly supplies economic wants without encroaching on other functional activities.”

Iain McGregor

MONEY – CREDIT – SOVEREIGNTY (Cont)

“Permit me to issue and control the money of a nation, and I care not who makes its laws”.

The Rt. Hon. Reginald McKenna, one time Chancellor of the Exchequer and for a long time Chairman of the Midland Bank, said on Jan. 25th, 1924, when addressing the bank’s shareholder:–

“I am afraid that the ordinary citizen will not like to be told that the banks can, and do, create and destroy money. The amount of money in existence varies only with the actions of the banks in increasing and decreasing deposits and bank purchases... and they who control the credit of a nation, direct the policy of Governments and hold in the hollow of their hands the destiny of the people”.

Sir Josiah Stamp, a director of the Bank of England said:–

“Banking was conceived in iniquity and born in sin... Bankers own the world. Take it away from them, but leave them the power to create money and control credit and with a flick of the pen, they will create enough money to buy it back again”.

Today, it must be obvious to all with eyes to see that a nation cannot be sovereign unless it is in control of its own money supply. If we merge Britain irrevocably into the European Monetary System and a Single Currency, we will, in effect, sacrifice our national sovereignty and identity.

The Lord Treasurer Burchell, First Minister of Elizabeth I, prophesied “England could never be ruined but by a Parliament”. Now, in the reign of Elizabeth II, we have the misfortune to see Parliament, apart from a few individuals, apparently determined to subject us to foreign rule, all in order to further the policy of the international Money Power to destroy Christendom. Current moves to bring about world government by means of centralising power into a few supranational blocs are Satanically inspired. There is no other interpretation possible.

L. Youn

THE INCREMENTS OF ASSOCIATION

Readers interested in forming a Social Credit group in the London area, or in the Edinburgh area, are invited to write in the first instance to The Editor, The Social Crediter, 21 Hawkhead Crescent, Edinburgh EH16 6LR.