

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 35. No. 5.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1957.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper.
Postage: At home 2d., abroad 1d.

6d. Weekly.

Egypt*

Viscount Bruce of Melbourne: . . . for four years, as independent chairman of the World Food Council, I went to the United States about four times a year. There seems to be something between the rough Australians and the Americans which finds a sort of touch. As a result of my meetings with the Americans, I am quite certain at this moment that if we are to get back to good relations, the last thing we should do is to stand in a white sheet and fawn upon America. What they want from us is exactly what we think and feel. They like plain speaking. So far as I am concerned, they are going to get it.

The first point that I would put to the Americans is this: "You have uttered the most virulent and violent criticism of us because we have done something—namely, going into Egypt to protect what we believe was a vital interest of ours. Have you not done it in the past at Panama and Guatemala? Would you not do it again if you thought that one of your own vital issues was concerned?" It is essential that we should say that to the Americans.

For a considerable time we have been criticised in every way by America regarding our policy in the Middle East. I venture to say that during that period America has done everything to thwart us and make our position more difficult. I do not wish to suggest that the American policy has been influenced by the oil lobby, nor do I suggest that they had any reason other than the highest motives for the attitude they took up. The real reason is, in my view, that their policy in the Middle East has been about as inept as anything ever was. And the last result of their foreign policy has been to reinflate the bullfrog Nasser when he was hopelessly defeated and completely discredited.

The other point I want to put to them is this: "Within the record of this century, with our part in the two wars, the unflinching support we gave to you in Korea, the way we have been the best and most loyal friend that any country could have asked for, do you not think you might have shown a little more tolerance and understanding for the difficulties and troubles we have been up against?" And, finally, I put to them this: "You have said a good deal about us. Suppose you had taken some action you thought vital and we had said anything like as much about you as you have said about us, would you not have been consumed with anger?" I finish by saying: "Let us forget the whole business. The time is over for recrimination. We must now get together almost to save the world and

preserve humanity. We must forget these things and start again."

What about the future? The present position is that Great Britain and France have withdrawn or are withdrawing from Egypt. The United Nations has sent an International Force into the Middle East and has taken over the position. Now the great and difficult problems of Egypt and the whole Middle East are "on the plate" of the United Nations. What I often wonder is, does everyone quite realise what that means? Do they really understand what are now the responsibilities of the United Nations in that area? . . .

. . . I can think of nothing more dangerous than to have large armed forces at the control of the United Nations, as it is at present, when God knows how they would act or what they would do with them!

Lord Cherwell: . . . I intend to deal mainly with one particular matter, the United Nations Organisation, which I think ought to be analysed, and at which I shall not be able to throw quite so many bouquets as most speakers seemed to do. Like the noble Viscount, Lord Bruce of Melbourne, I hate living in a fool's paradise, and though, like everyone else, I wish U.N.O. could work, I have come reluctantly to the view that in its present form it cannot. It is composed, of course, of men full of the best intentions, and its admirers are equally well-meaning. But I cannot help feeling that people tend to overestimate its power for good and to underrate its potentialities for evil. We know all too well nowadays how easy it is for people to fall victims to phrases, to be hypnotised by slogans, and I am afraid that that is what is happening in the case of U.N.O. "Send it to U.N.O." is becoming a sort of incantation. In many quarters it seems to be treated as a shibboleth. You have only to mouth the words and go through the ceremonial, and all will be well.

There are obvious psychological reasons for this curious attitude of mind. During the war many men in the Forces positively revelled in the fact that they did not have to think out the consequences of their actions and that all they had to do was to obey. It seems to me that something similar is happening on a bigger scale. People in authority—and in a democracy we are all involved—have to take decisions, and sometimes terrible decisions. How tempting to unload this burden! If slavish obedience to U.N.O. is regarded not merely as respectable but positively meritorious, what a splendid way of escaping from these awful responsibilities! I cannot help feeling that some sort of subconscious longing of this sort may be at work in many minds.

We are often told that U.N.O. is the only hope of

(Continued on page 4.)

*Extracts, necessarily abridged, from speeches in the House of Lords.

THE SOCIAL CREDITER FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which 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 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.
Offices—Business and Editorial: 11, GARFIELD STREET, BELFAST.
Telephone: Belfast 27810.

From Week to Week

The present situation is, fundamentally, the same situation as the Great Depression—it arises from the manipulation of a centralised financial system. Superficially there are great differences, arranged to conceal the identity, since the public was taught by Major Douglas how the trick of poverty amidst plenty was done. But inflation and planning have led to a planned poverty amidst an exported plenty, with a camouflage of prosperity provided by a wickedly diluted currency. And a disarmament, *relative* to the fantastic armaments of the day, is being enforced.

It is much more difficult to “put across” an adequate understanding of the present situation than it was in the thirties to expose the monetary foundation of Poverty Amidst Plenty. Yet that is the task before us. In retrospect, the connection between the depression and the building up of Hitler to annihilate us, has been clearly demonstrated by Douglas; but just the same sort of connection exists between what is happening now, and what is intended.

We are, in industrial potential, vastly richer now than at the time of the depression when, in turn, we were richer than at the turn of the century, the time of our greatest apparent prosperity—a prosperity founded in effect on giving away a large part of our production in return for a *financial* result: the process by which we became the world's creditor nation. Two wars, and behind-the-scenes financial manipulation, deprived us of our ‘credits.’ But it is the real assets they are after this time.

We recently read a crime novel, the plot of which turned on the necessity confronting a mob of gangsters of murdering two witnesses to a crime, but in such a way that their deaths would appear to be unrelated accidents. The custodians of the witnesses took most elaborate precautions to guard them, but despite these, ingeniously contrived accidents disposed of both. It took time, skill, money, and connivance; but it was done.

Familiarity with gangster methods is of some importance, since our real rulers are international gangsters. Their present activity is the concoction of an international ‘accident.’ Clearly, it is essential to make a pretence of ‘guarding’ “the West” from Communism. The American *people* already are showing some signs of uneasiness at the deterioration of the situation, and it is doubtless mainly to re-assure them that the appearances of an ‘accident’ will be contrived.

Yes: history in our time is a fantastic crime story, complete with time, skill (the best brains that money can buy),

gold, dollars, credit—and connivance. No doubt some of our political careerists are conveniently blind to what is going on, and to be Prime Minister is merely to achieve an ambition; probably some are black-mailed. But some themselves are rogues.

The Background to Zionism

In its issue of March 27, 1948, *The Australian Social Crediter* re-published an alleged Funeral Oration from *The Patriot*, February, 1948. The Oration was stated to have been pronounced in Prague in 1869 over the tomb of the Grand Rabbi Simeon-ben-Jhuda. *La Vieille France* re-produced it from *La Russie Juive*, of Volsky.

We cannot vouch in any respect for the authenticity of the alleged Oration. But it is virtually identical, in a very abbreviated form, with the *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion* which, in our opinion, both because of its virtually exact specification of the course of events culminating in the present world convulsion, and because of its points of resemblance to the authenticated records of Illuminism, is the authentic programme of *World Revolution*.

The “Oration,” then, is a version, however derived and abridged, of the authentic programme of *World Revolution* accomplished on the one hand by money-power, and on the other through the incitement of the mob to destruction of the social institutions which protected it. Despite its omissions and, as compared with the *Protocols*, its minor inexactitudes (*e.g.*, the treatment of the land: the *Protocols* proposes to dispossess the landed aristocracy by means of heavy taxes), it will serve to acquaint those of our readers who have not read the *Protocols* with the essentials of the plan they embody:

“All these centuries we, *the Sages of Israel*, have been accustomed to meet in Sanhedrin to examine our progress towards the domination of the world which Jehovah has promised us, and our conquests over our foe, Christianity. This year, united over the tomb of our reverend Simeon-ben-Jhuda, we can state with pride that the past century has brought us very near to our goal, and that this goal will very soon be obtained.

“Gold always has been and always will be the irresistible power. Handled by expert hands it will always be the most useful lever for those who possess it, and the object of envy of those who do not. With gold we can buy the most rebellious consciences, can fix the rate of all values, the current price of all products, can subsidise all State Loans, and thereafter hold the States at our mercy. Already the principal banks, the exchanges of the entire world, the credits of all the governments, are in our hands.

“The other great power is the Press. By repeating without cessation certain ideas the Press succeeds in the end in having them accepted as actualities. The theatre renders us analogous services. Everywhere the Press and the theatre obey our orders. By the ceaseless praise of democratic rule we shall divide the Christians into political parties, we shall destroy the unity of their nations, we shall sow discord everywhere. Reduced to impotence they will bow

before the law of our Bank, always united, and always devoted to our cause.

"We shall force the Christians into wars by exploiting their pride and their stupidity. They will massacre each other, and clear the ground for us to put our people into . . . In the name of Social Justice and Equality we shall parcel out the great estates; we shall give the fragments to the peasants who covet them with all their powers, and who will soon be in debt by the expenses of cultivating them. Our Capital will make us their Masters. We in our turn shall become the great proprietors, and the possession of the land will assure the power to us. . . .

"We count among us plenty of orators capable of feigning enthusiasm and of persuading mobs. We shall spread them among the people to announce changes which will secure the happiness of the human race. By gold and by flattery we shall gain the proletariat, which will charge itself with annihilating Christian capitalism. We shall promise workmen salaries of which they have never dared to dream, but we shall also raise the price of necessities so that our people will be greater still. In this manner we shall prepare revolutions which the Christians will make themselves, of which we shall reap the fruit. . . .

"We have already established our own men in all important positions. . . . But above all let us monopolise education. By this means we spread ideas which are useful to us and shape the children's brains as suits us. . . .

"Let us take care not to hinder the marriage of our men with Christian girls; for through them we shall get our foot into the most closely locked circles. If our daughters marry 'Goyim' they will be no less useful, for the children of a Jewish mother are ours. Let us foster the idea of free love, that we may destroy among Christian women attachment to the principles and practices of their religion.

"For ages past the sons of Israel, despised and persecuted, have been working to open up a path to power. They are hitting the mark. They control the economic life of the accursed Christians; their influence preponderates over politics and over morals. At the wished-for hour, fixed in advance, we shall let loose the Revolution, which by ruining all classes of Christianity will definitely enslave the Christians to us. Thus will be accomplished the promise of God made to his People."

The Enemy

Here's an odd business. The Arabs shout that they will never tolerate the continued existence of Israel.

Nasser attacked her until she retaliated more effectively than he liked. U.N.O. slaps down on her. The U.S. does likewise.

But in all the hullabaloo we haven't heard a word out of our old Hollywood friend Ben Hecht, whose heart sang with joy every time a Jew shot a British soldier.

He hasn't attacked Nasser. He hasn't criticised the U.S. Not a word has he said against U.N.O.

What's come over Ben? Does he only support the Jews when they are fighting the British?

—John Gordon, in *The Sunday Express*, January 20, 1957.

Quite so, Mr. Gordon. The British are the enemy.

Know Your Enemy

We repeat notes written by Major C. H. Douglas ten years ago:

There can be few people who have given sober and unbiassed consideration to the state of the world without reaching a reasonably sound apprehension of the root cause of its parlous plight. It is not in any one thing in itself, such as industrialism or even finance as a device. It is the devilish ingenuity which is applied to each and all of these, the perversion of good ideas to bad uses, the misrepresentation of information in itself beneficial or harmless, in short, the real-conscious wickedness which governs our affairs, to which we have to look. That is why it is absolutely vital to clear our minds of cant. It is not in the opinions of the majority that policy is formed today, and it is not by attempting to change the Cahmon Man and forming him into a Party that salvation can conceivably come because it is not in the Cahmon Man that the wickedness is conscious. The Cahmon Man is just average, and just average is not good enough in what it takes to battle with uncommon, conscious, Incarnated Wickedness.

'Know you enemy' is the first axiom of survival, and your Enemy's first concern is to divert your attention in the wrong direction, and his second, to make you work and fight for your own undoing.

Bearing all this in mind, it is easy to understand that the drive for "Full Employment," "More Exports," "Work or Starve" means one of two things and can mean nothing else. Either it is a preparation for war camouflaged under recapitalisation (new tools, etc.) or it is a threat of war if the perversion of industrialism is not pursued in this country for the benefit of the . . . States. There are no other alternatives; considered *in vacuo*, the policy is so insane that only a diseased imagination in *delirium tremens* would contemplate it with a moment's complacency. As to war, not the merest fraction of the world's peoples desire it, or even now are conscious of what it implies; and if it comes, it will be because we have not localised and obliterated that mysterious little body of men to whom Rathenau referred as the three hundred who ruled the world, and appoint their successors.

The Money Swindle

The following letter to the Editor appeared in *The Times*, January 17, 1957.

Sir,—Those who are, as I was, close to the centre of affairs know well enough that Mr. Graham Hutton, in his letter on January 11, is, in the main, quite right. But they have personal loyalties and responsibilities which prevent them from saying so.

When the policy of honest (*i.e.*, stable) money was deliberately discarded in favour of what can properly be called "the money swindle," the rest was bound to follow, as night follows day. What is surprising is that unlike those who in France and Germany suffered the same fate, we in this country are still taken in by the double-talk which, professing honesty, practises the swindle.

Believe me, etc.,

H. A. SIEPMAN,

The Athenaeum, Pall Mall, S.W.1.

EGYPT—

(continued from page 1.)

the world for avoiding war and, therefore, that we ought to believe that it must and will succeed in this laudable object. I wish I could see the logic of this. One might just as well say that if a man's only hope of avoiding bankruptcy is in winning a football pool, all right-thinking people ought to believe that he will do so. Somehow, the proponents of U.N.O.'s infallibility have managed to persuade themselves that anyone who does not put his complete faith in the Organisation is not anxious to maintain peace—in fact is almost a warmonger. Some of them have reached a hysterical state of mind in which merely to question whether U.N.O. will succeed in establishing peace in the world is considered wicked. No doubt I shall incur their severe displeasure, for what I intend to do is to attempt to analyse dispassionately the utility and value of this important—I said “important” not “impotent”—organisation.

First, what is this super-body to which we are to confide our fate? U.N.O. consists of some seventy-nine nations supposed to be sovereign and independent, though in some cases this is a somewhat dubious claim. They range from the giant Powers, Soviet Russia and the United States, to tiny entities like Panama and Iceland. The population of the biggest is more than 1,000 times greater than that of the smallest. The discrepancy in wealth and power is far more than ten thousandfold. Yet in the Assembly, which is the ultimate governing body of U.N.O., each has an equal vote. Thus rarely 5 per cent. of the world's population can carry the day against the other 95 per cent.; and 10 per cent. could claim a two-thirds majority in the Assembly. Or, to put it another way, half the population of the world is represented by four delegates, and the other half by seventy-five delegates. What is more, these nations are represented in the Assembly by any group or body or individual which may succeed in seizing power.

There is, it is true, a so-called Credentials Committee. But it does not appear to be at all strict in making the delegates show that they represent the views of the majority or of any properly elected or selected Government. Anybody who has seized power—I believe, for instance, Mr. Kadar in Hungary—can, and does, send a delegate to vote on his behalf. In fact it is even worse than I have said, for these sovereign independent nations vary enormously in their standards of education and outlook. Some are the most highly civilised and educated countries on the planet. The inhabitants of others can scarcely read or write. Yet no attention is paid to this fact. Only recently, there was a very close vote for the Vice-Presidency of the Assembly, between (I think it was) Italy and Liberia—Italy, one of the oldest and most civilised cultures in history; Liberia, a small artificial State which has been in existence barely a hundred years, and very few of whose inhabitants have any conception of the outside world.

This is the Assembly, as I have said, the ultimate governing body of U.N.O. We were recently told that it is “the highest tribunal in the world,” whose decisions all must obey without hesitation or question. As I have said, and, I hope, shown, the constitution of this body is utterly indefensible. . . . The long and short of it is that justice cannot be found by counting the votes, however weighted, of interested parties.

This brings me to the word “tribunal,” in the phrase “the highest tribunal in the world.” Nothing could be more inept as a description of the Assembly. There is no pretence that it is a judicial body. No sworn evidence is taken or is obtainable; there is no judicial summing up, or any recognised body of law to which nations have an obligation to conform. The Assembly is split into a number of *blocs*. There are the Afro-Asian *bloc*, the South American *bloc* and the Iron Curtain *bloc*, the members of which tend to vote together on their likes and dislikes, in accordance with instructions from their home Government. No one pretends they are influenced by the evidence or the speeches. Judicial impartiality is the last thing that seems to matter. To describe a majority vote of such a body as “a decision of the highest tribunal in the world” is simply laughable. To pillory as criminal any nation which hesitates to comply with its decisions is monstrous. A judicial decision is one thing; a vote by a number of interested parties, without pretence of impartiality, without evidence or a body of laws to guide them is totally different.

Yet it is to this body that the Leader of the Opposition, only a few days ago, told us to say, “We obey you. We accept whatever you say.” The absurdity of the constitution of the Assembly was, of course, recognised from the start by those framing the Charter of U.N.O. No nation could be expected to submit unquestioningly to such a body. Only if the great Powers were in agreement would there be any chance of its decisions being respected or enforced. If they were, it was hoped they could prevent small local wars among the minor Powers. If they were not, it was realised that it would be useless to expect the machine to operate.

To ensure this a sort of executive body, the Security Council, was instituted, on which the five great Powers had permanent seats. Six more seats were allocated for two years at a time to other nations, selected by the Assembly. It is perhaps typical that, at the recent moment of crisis, apparently Siam presided over the meetings of the Security Council. According to the Charter, whilst the Assembly can recommend, only the Council can act. All the signatories of the Charter undertook to accept and carry out the decisions of the Council, but not those of the Assembly. Since what were at that time regarded as the five great Powers had a Veto in the Council, obviously action could never be taken against one of them, because no nation was under obligation to obey resolutions of the Assembly. This sensible intention appears now to be cast aside.

(To be continued.)

Social Credit and Suez

The article under this title, which appeared in two previous issues, is now available in pamphlet form, price 3d.

12 copies @ 2/6. 24 copies @ 4/6.

50 copies @ 8/-. 100 copies @ 15/-.

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,

11, GARFIELD STREET, BELFAST, N. IRELAND.

Published by K.R.P. Publications Ltd., at 11, Garfield Street, Belfast.
Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton, Liverpool.