

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 61 No. 3

MAY – JUNE, 1982

Programme for the Third World War

By C.H. DOUGLAS

THIS TREATISE, HERE CONTINUED, WHICH FIRST APPEARED SERIALLY 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.

VIII

The curious myopia (possibly resulting from the exoteric interpretation of Genesis which was supposed to indicate the date of creation as about B.C. 4000) which regards history as the events subsequent to the landing of Norman William, with his select body of Jews, in A.D. 1066, enables the statement that "Christopher Columbus discovered America at the end of the fifteenth century" to be accepted as accurate. Apart from the fact that Columbus never saw America, the mainland of which was "discovered" by John Cabot, who sailed from Bristol in 1497, there is strong reason to believe that various Scandinavian peoples had fairly constant intercourse with the North American Continent hundreds, if not thousands, of years earlier. Their traditional name for it was Markland.

There are, however, certain features in regard to the rediscovery of America which are worth attention. Christopher Columbus was a Jew, and John Cabot, although his ship and crew were English, was a Venetian. But the extraordinary and significant fact is that there was in Bristol at that time a secret Jewish community 'who handed on their tradition by word of mouth' (Lord Melchett: *Thy Neighbour*, p. 90).

It is obvious that both Columbus and Cabot had information of a fairly definite character to guide them. Both of them set a compass course which was approximately correct. And both of them had connections with banking—Columbus with Jewish banking, and Cabot with the banking-City-State of Venice, and almost certainly with this secret Bristol Jewry. The essence of banking has always been what in military circles is called "intelligence"—information in its widest sense, spying being an important component, and it seems highly probable that the existence of the American continent was known in banking circles when it was quite unknown outside them. If this was so, it is reasonable to assume that when action was taken in regard to this knowledge it was considered action.

Quite a different type of individual is required to pioneer a new country from that required to develop it subsequently, and it is not without significance also that the original British settlers were followed by a wave of Dutch, who for the most part remained on the Atlantic seaboard as traders and bankers. One of the real effects of the American War of Independence was that although a facade of the original settlers of British stock held most of the titular offices of Government, the control of development and policy rapidly passed to a tiny Dutch minority

(not to be confused with the much larger German element frequently called Dutch in the United States by a corruption of the word *Deutsch*). Such names as Rooseveltd, Astor, Vanderbilt, Van Ranselaer, Van Cortlandt, etc., immediately occur to anyone in this connection. The Dutch were the Chosen Instrument of Finance.

This is not an attempt to write a history of the United States. It is a suggestion that the United States is a definite and very important item in a plan which was interrupted by the expulsion from England in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries of the Jews and their associates whom we now call Freemasons, but who were then called Knights Templars.

By common consent, the real framer of the Declaration of Independence was Thomas Jefferson. Jefferson's mother was a Randolph—probably, with the Lees of Virginia, the most aristocratic family of the New World. There is quite indisputable evidence that Jefferson was an international Freemason, and that the revolutionary elements in America, who were greatly in the minority, were the same elements who were fomenting trouble in France (Jefferson was actually United States Ambassador to France at the time of the fall of the Bastille).

The famous phrase "Life, Liberty and the pursuit of happiness" originally read "Every man is entitled to the possession of life, liberty and property," and Jefferson in person struck out "property" and inserted the quite meaningless abstraction "the pursuit of happiness."

Jefferson was almost a perfect example of the aristocratic abstractionist—the man who is born with a power complex which he inherits, who disdains apprenticeship to his constitution-making. He was a student and a lawyer from the age of seventeen, and nearly every one of his policies was in direct conflict with his own mode of life and fundamental sympathies, and conveys the suggestion of outside influence on inexperience. Although he was President (a very different office to that now attached to the title) and is credited with the Louisiana Purchase, the picture presented of his Administration is that of a man with an inherited aptitude for dealing with large matters, but taking his instructions on them without much consciousness of the reality they embody.

Perhaps the most indisputable evidence that I am not unduly fanciful in this matter is provided by the Great Seal of the United States, which was the work of Jefferson, John Adams, and Benjamin Franklin, all Freemasons, the obverse of which consists of a truncated pyramid, with the headstone bearing a picture of the All-Seeing Eye, the symbol of

Freemasonry, suspended above the Pyramid. The motto is "*annuit coeptis*"—"he prospers our origins."

The pyramid is the symbol of world-government. The rest of the symbolism is obvious. Seen in the light of this clue, the history of the United States is consistently bound up with Whiggism, Lutheranism, Calvinism, and with the "mergers," financial buccaneering, and political corruption of the super-capitalism which accompany Judaeo-Masonry. The political corruption is not adventitious—it is essential. The type of Government, and the type of legislator in the main prevalent in this country during the last half of the Victorian era, although very far from ideal, would never have tolerated for a week the financial piracy of the Vanderbilt-Harriman era which co-existed with it in the United States. It is not brains of which the Plotters are afraid—it is integrity. This type of British Government was definitely one of tradition, not of expediency, and traditional Government imposes certain standards in much the same way that a Gothic Cathedral discourages ribaldry.

In 1935, a year which probably marked the disappearance of any real prospect of peace, the Secretary of the U.S. Treasury announced that in future the obverse of the Great Seal would be printed on the back of all U.S. paper money.

I should like to emphasise, for the benefit of those to whom it is necessary, that not only is the mass of the modern American people unconscious of the part it has been billed to play, but is very uneasy as to its part in world affairs.

Whether leading American statesmen understand the situation is also not plain. I rather doubt it. But that there is a small inner ring which does, I am confident. I have met at least one of them.

One of our nineteenth century statesmen begged Englishmen to cultivate the habit of studying large maps. With a world war on our hands, we require above most other things, to realise that evil designs can be, and are, built up from innocuous components, and in consequence, short views of history may be very deceptive.

IX

Although British professional, trained, diplomats, like British Generals, are all incompetent, ill-informed, and old-school-tie failures, immeasurably inferior both in intelligence and judgment to the staffs of the *Daily Worker* and its threepenny edition, nevertheless in their unanimity on the German mentality they are supported by so many foreigners that we must reluctantly accept their view. Germans from the time of Frederick the "Great," whether under Monarchies, Republics, or National Socialism, have, as a people, part of them actively, and the rest of them passively, accepted war as the primary national industry.

Now, so-called democracy is definitely pacifist and strongly pro-German, while Socialism both in Russia and Germany is strongly militarist. The pseudo-democrat of Great Britain or the United States views war with weary distaste and is not easily persuaded to retain sufficient armed strength to enable his diplomats to make their voices heard.

I believe that I am stating an ascertained and incontestable fact when I say that Germany, Great Britain and the United States, beyond any other great powers, have been at all significant times dictated to, in matters of policy, by Jews, and predominantly by German Jews. Although, for instance, Lord Vansittart is most careful not to attribute German policy to Jewish control, the point that he makes,

which is that there is no change in German policy during the past century; that it has been, and is consistent, amounts to saying that it has always been Jewish, because we know, beyond peradventure, that during the period in which it was most obvious, the period of Bismarck and Wilhelm II, it was moulded and organised by such men as Rathenau, Ballin, Bleichroeder and others, all Jews. It should be observed that there was during this period a facade of violent anti-Judaism in Germany of about the same effective value as that professed by the National Socialist Administration. Practically covering the whole of this period, the German-Jew, Sir Ernest Cassel, was probably the most powerful single individual in Great Britain, and his opposite number and correspondent, Jacob Schiff, the patron of Presidents in America.

If anyone is naive enough to suppose that these people knew nothing of the underlying policy of each other, then I would ask him to consider the fact that the chief financial advisers at the Peace Conference in 1919, representing both the "victors" and the defeated, were all cousins, all Jews, and all connected with one German-Jew bank in New York.

As Premier Stalin said (and we had better take notice), "Hitlers come and Hitlers go, but the German people and the German State remain." He made it clear that he intended them to remain, more or less as they are.

It must surely be obvious that if you have a single effective control over three ostensibly independent nations, and in one of them you exalt militarism to the status of a religion, and in the other two you finance pacifism, together with adulation of the militarist nation (it sounds impossible, but it has been, and is being, done) you cannot conceivably have any primary policy but one. You desire war. Since war in itself is, to put it conservatively, disagreeable, you obviously do not intend to take part in it, but to use it to further conditions satisfactory to you.

If the Germans are to be credited with elementary intelligence, they must see that nothing could ensure the safety of the Jews so effectively in a European War as a ferocious display of anti-Semitism (I use this misused word advisedly in this instance). It immediately establishes the "persecuted" as non-combatants; it provides a mass of "refugees," many of whom are perfect spies and propagandists, and it puts them in the well-known position of backing every horse in the race. I am completely agnostic as to the extent of genuine barbarity by Germans to Jews. Some of the atrocity stories, such as the use of Jewish babies as footballs, are merely idiotic. But even if I were convinced that it is considerable in extent, my comment would be that it is not a tithe of the suffering endured by the fighting troops, and is an example of using an army, not without loss, but with a minimum of loss, and the minimum of risk of final defeat. I am convinced that the Jewish High Command desires the ultimate victory of Germany, and will fight tooth-and-nail, *not to end the war*, but to see that Germany is not defeated in the peace.

That, alone, is a sufficient reason for the complete defeat of Germany.

Since Great Britain is, and always has been, the great obstacle to the Big Idea, it is obvious that however much of the fighting is done by her, and however much (and the more the better) her loss and damage, she is to return, like the butler in Barrie's play *The Admirable Crichton*, to that self-effacing hush which is supposed to be becoming to the good. (Anyway, General Eisenheuer won the North African campaign, didn't he!) The Armistice period is incompre-

hensible other than as a well arranged plan to emasculate and demoralise this country and its people.

I do not wish to be misunderstood. I don't believe that in the consummation of the Great Plan, the Germans would fare very much better than anyone else. But it appears evident that the Germans are the ideal people to do the dirty work antecedent to the coming of the New Jerusalem, and are already "air conditioned" to hand over the reins of power at a suitable moment.

X

In the sense in which the word Education, with a capital, is understood by the Headmasters' Conference, I should be the first to admit incompetence as a critic of it.

But on the *policy* of education I do not feel so entirely unqualified. No reasonably observant individual with average geographical and social experience (which schoolmasters, and particularly elementary schoolmasters, generally lack) could fail in acquiring a deep sense of misgiving as to the results of "educational" policy over the past fifty years. First as to the facts.

The word "educate" means "to lead out." Words are very important things—they are the only link we have in common between a fact and an idea. The first point to notice is that the underlying idea of the standard type of school is "to put in," not "to lead out." I do not think that the Public School emphasis on character provides an answer.

Demon est deus inversus.

The less important result of this is that, as Mr. Sorabji pointed out, only about five in every hundred acquire any profit either to themselves or anyone else by the process, and such faculties as the remainder possess are "blunted and stunted" by the system. Much more germane to the well-being of the social structure is the fact that this "putting-in" process is operative at an age when the critical faculty, even in the case of individuals who might later have developed it, is almost non-existent. In consequence, such ideas as are absorbed are accepted as equally factual—"twice two equals four," and "labour produces all wealth," being statements of the same importance and credibility.

It is safe to say that in varying degree all victims of this mental drill spend the second twenty years of life in dehypnotising themselves of the subconscious attitudes absorbed in the first twenty.

The complete pragmatic failure of the policy is demonstrated by Germany, which drove the cramming technique perhaps farther than any other country. And the final stage is now openly proclaimed by the National Socialists—that the end and aim of "education" is to mould every German into a slave of the State and a fanatical worshipper of its Führer.

It should be remembered that this system is highly modern. The oldest Public School in England (excluding one or two slightly romantic claims to existence in the Dark Ages) does not antedate the fifteenth century, and in those days Public Schools were public schools.

During the Middle Ages, in which the common life of these islands, bearing in mind the state of the industrial and domestic arts, was probably higher than it has been before or since, the child of well-established (not necessarily rich) parents, spent his early years, after infancy, in the household of a great lord as a page. He was reasonably disciplined in behaviour, mixed with other pages and all

social classes, and learnt to be useful, while observing the ways and success or otherwise of his elders. Later, he travelled, or went to the foreign wars (not a very dangerous field sport in those days), and then, if the urge was with him, visited the Universities and imbibed what he could from books. Notice the complete inversion of principle to which we have been led. Instead of, as in the Middle Ages, applying the experience of the present to a consideration and criticism of the *records* (not the facts) of the past, we make the *records* (not the facts) of both the present and the past a standard against which to assess experience undergone "with blunted and stunted" faculties. Could any more Satanic method be devised of hindering the human individual from profiting by experience than to ensure that he is incapable of applying any unwarped intelligence to it!

Let anyone who imagines that this picture is over-drawn talk to the average mechanic between the ages of twenty and thirty on the subject of Russia. A handful of enthusiasts for so-called Russian Communism have, in the past decade, gone to Russia to work.

I am not aware of one single instance in which, where return was possible, the verdict was not wholly condemnatory, and to the effect that conditions might suit the Russians for the moment, but they would never be tolerated here. I met Max Eastman, the fanatical Russian-Socialist enthusiast, twenty years ago, when he was convinced that Russia was the coming Paradise. There is no more bitter critic of the Soviet system alive.

A short time ago a technically trained Soviet woman engineer was taken round this country as a kind of seventh-day wonder of Russian progress. A British woman engineer of long experience, rather bored by the naiveté of the exhibit, enquired as to the whereabouts of several Russian University women she had known who were over here in the days of Imperial Russia to add to their engineering experience. The enquiry was considered to be in the worst of taste.

None of this kind of thing, and not even the reports of Trades Union delegations, have the slightest effect on the readers of the lamented *Daily Worker* whatever may be the private opinions of those who read its threepenny edition. The effect of so-called universal education is to condition the average mind for the reception and retention, in the face of reason and experience, of any myth which seems to connect with some cliché absorbed before leaving school. Anyone who desires unbiassed information on Russia from a Russian should refer to an article by M. Paul Haensel in *Contemporary Russia* for May, 1937.

I am satisfied that nothing will right this situation but a complete reversion, under modern conditions, to the earlier sequence. After a lengthy but not isolated childhood, the simple elements mentioned by Mr. Sorabji, of reading, writing, and the simplest arithmetic (can anything be more idiotic than to teach the average child the extraction of cube roots?) and an "*au pair*" system, or its school equivalent, should be arranged which would diversify social experience at a fairly early age, to be followed by short hours in economic life of some description. At about the beginning of the twenties, work overseas should be undertaken and three or four years afterwards, entrance to a University should be encouraged.

The inculcation of social or industrial theories at an early age should be discouraged by every means available.

Deus est demon inversus.

XI

About four years before the outbreak of the second world war, seven broadcasts on "The Causes of War" were delivered from London, one of which it was my fate to give.

The seven broadcasts were summed up by Sir Austen Chamberlain. Each of the broadcasters emphasised a different cause, but all, together with Sir Austen, some by implication and others in so many words, agreed unanimously on one thing. Major Douglas was wholly wrong. War was a very complex thing, and the more causes you gave, the more likely you were to be right. I notice that none of the complex causes have received any attention since the broadcasts, but that energetic action was taken on the first day of war to institute measures which would make war as attractive as possible to large numbers of people who would have preferred peace, but not the kind of peace they were getting. The measures bear, I think, a recognisable relationship to the matter of the derided broadcast.

I suppose that about two thousand millions of individuals are affected by the present war. I should place the number of individuals who would be quite unable to say with approximate accuracy what it is about at roughly nineteen hundred and ninety nine millions, so that we are left with this simple alternative. Either the total population of the world likes war without knowing what it is about; in which case it is obviously absurd to do anything to abolish it, or, on the other hand, we can find the causes of war if we examine the actions of a minority hidden amongst less than a million individuals.

It appears to me (but, of course, I may be wrong) to be elementary and incontestable that it wouldn't really matter much what this minority did or thought, if they were not in control of mechanisms which enabled them to force the other nineteen hundred and ninety nine millions to take part in a war they didn't understand and didn't want. If I am not wrong in this, it appears equally incontestable, that you can prevent war amongst the nineteen hundred and ninety nine millions if you destroy the power of the small minority over them.

For my own part, there is no spectacle I should applaud more heartily than the outbreak of war amongst the minority, and I should do everything to see that it lasted as long as possible and broke out again with the shortest possible intervals.

Now it is equally incontestable that every effort possible is being made to increase, and, in fact, render impregnable, the power of this minority over the majority.

Unless there is some flaw in the argument which has escaped me, war is even more certain and more certain to be universal and devastating, as a result of this increased concentration of control, than it was in 1939. Fascism and Bolshevism only enter into it as the two parties enter into a Parliamentary contest. As Lionel Gerber says in his book, *Peace by Power*, "Power never vanishes. If you do not wish to retain or wield it, somebody else will. You may feel the effects of power as a passive recipient; you may deal with it as an active agent. There is no escape, no immunity—none so far above the battle that by it he, too, is untouched"

And, to interpolate one word into Lord Acton's famous observation, "All (delegated) power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely." To which the Chatham

House gang would no doubt reply, "So what?"

Really, this matter is quite simple if we can convalesce to even a moderate extent from our "education." It is not necessary to rely upon such statements as that of M. François Coty, as proceeding from Walter Rathenau, that "the world is governed by less than four hundred men, every one of whom knows all the others." Such a statement has its value, because it suggests a source from which to obtain the names of the specific four hundred. But the general fact is observable by anyone. Take the "fetich of efficiency," to give it a technical name, and put it alongside "the problem of full employment," to give that another. Take the "peace comes from Law backed by overwhelming force" racket, and put it alongside our declaration of war to preserve the sovereignty of Poland. Take the statement of the Secretary of the Royal Institute of International Affairs ("Chatham House"), Dr. Arnold Toynbee, at Copenhagen in 1931, that "we are working discreetly but with all our might to undermine the sovereignty of our respective nations," and consider that this egregious collection of pink intriguers was carefully evacuated to Oxford at the beginning of the war, and its staff is being paid by the British public, which is spending fourteen million pounds a day and has already had a million casualties to preserve that sovereignty which Dr. Toynbee boasted of attempts to destroy.

Consider the statements of such publicists as Mr. Douglas Reed that their despatches warning the British public that Germany was feverishly re-arming were consistently suppressed. Consider the amazing fact that, not only did the Maginot Line terminate "in the air," but the hastily fortified line from its termination to the sea was held by the worst quality troops, with the worst officers, in the French Army. Consider the newspaper control which is almost openly admitted, and the ownership of the main news-agencies without which no newspaper can function.

Consider that "class differences," as distinct from cultural differences, are almost solely a question of money, yet official Socialism and Communism, which the international Press of every country advertise and favour in every way, never attack bankers or the money ring, or question the credit system. Consider Viscount Snowden, Socialist Chancellor of the Exchequer, the darling of the "City," a soured exponent of an inferiority complex if ever there was one, and his ecstatic remark that "The Bank of England is the greatest moral force in the world" (God help us!).

These are evidences of the forces which have been dominant in the past. Is anyone simple enough to suppose that they are all ranged on the side of Fascism, or Bolshevism? Or that the elimination of one of these modern names for the Liberal and the Conservative would destroy the controllers of the other? Consider the German Herr Menne: "The large-scale industrialists had two powerful allies on their side, two surprisingly dissimilar allies—the Kaiser and the German Socialists."

XII

There is probably no more infallible key to a policy than to analyse its Myth, and no surer indication of its source than to trace its channels of publicity and propagation to their origin. Obviously, we must, in order to achieve this end, know beyond peradventure the nature and properties of a myth.

Like so many other words in common use, it has become to many people something which its derivation, the Greek word *mythos*, does not justify. The word simply means a story—not an untrue story, or a “true” story, but just a story. The distinction is highly important, because the nature of the myth and the use to which it is put go down to one of the great mysteries of the universe.

Although the root ideas of idealistic philosophies such as Christian Science are all enshrined in Virgil's *Aeneid*, I think it was Prentice Mulford, the inspirer of the New Thought movement, who first used the phrase “Thoughts are things.” To what extent that is an accurate statement may be open to doubt, but there is no doubt whatever that under certain conditions, thoughts *become* things. The literal truth of this was strikingly illustrated in the well known “miracle of the Salpetrière” in which a patient in that famous French mental hospital, who was afflicted with acute religious mania, and imagined himself to be the Christ, developed the marks of the nails and spear on his feet, hands and side. Obviously, the delusion was not “true,” but the *belief* was both real and effective.

Now High Politics and Priestcraft were once openly identified, and it is certain that in technique they have never been divorced except in appearance. Recent pronouncements by the Archbishop of Canterbury, as well as those of his predecessor, have the authentic ring of contempt for the masses, and the belief in the necessity of providing them with a myth.

There are, of course, a large number of High Political myths which can be seen to have dominated history. There is the Holy Grail, the Crusading myth, Joan of Arc's voices, the Money myth, the blessedness-of-poverty myth, with its corollary that the many are virtuous while the few are wicked, so that if you make everyone poor, you make everyone good; the Problem of Employment myth, and many others.

But I have no doubt whatever that the Chosen Race myth, with its corollary of Messianism, is the key myth of history, and that in it we can find almost a complete explanation of the world's insanity (e.g., divorce from reality); and an almost complete indication of the path to recovery. Those are large statements. It is only possible to look at certain of the many contemporary proofs of them.

Now it must be obvious that when a myth attains the immense power which comes from belief by large numbers of people over a long period of time, it ceases to be the possession of its originators, and in fact becomes far stronger than they are. It is for this reason that I believe that the so-called Old Testament, with its claims in regard to an obscure and turbulent tribe, most probably of very mixed blood, is the matrix of contemporary Germany. There is not a single feature of National Socialism which is not Judaic, from the *Herrenvolk* idea to the Sacred State under the Hitlerian Messiah. And the observable fact that half the world is fighting the other half, while, behind the gladiators, all the features of the Judaic *Civitas Dei* are being quietly introduced under the plea of military necessity, is simply a measure of its extent.

I suppose no-one is naive enough to believe that the claim to be Chosen People is now either the sole possession of the Jews or the Germans. Read Nicholas Murray Butler's *Age of the Americas*. Or consider the title of an article in an American magazine: *America: a World Idea*. There is, in fact, an American myth; and the world had

better appreciate that fact. It is profoundly significant that while the Jew and the German claim to supremacy is based on race, the American claim is based on exactly the opposite ground—that “race” is nonsense. Yet the U.S.A. is politically Jewish.

I suggested that it was not of the essence of a myth that it should be “true.” Yet I think and hope that there is a real difference between a “true” myth and a “political” myth and that the test of this difference is simply whether belief in it is self sustaining, or whether it requires organised maintenance. And there are many instances of the myth which was once approximately true, but no longer corresponds to fact, and yet is kept in circulation by a conscious effort of organisation because of its usefulness to the organisers. The identification of democracy with parliamentary suffrage is such a myth.

Originally, and quite possibly until the passing of the Reform Bill, it had a factual basis. Voting, as a mechanism for deciding action, arose from the eminently sensible idea that if God was on the side of the largest number, instead of proving it by bloody battles, you would achieve the same result by counting noses. It will be noticed that the argument is not on a high intellectual level, and assumes that each voter would, in the last resort, have the same length of spear, or throw the same weight of rock.

In the so-called democratic countries ballot-box suffrage is nearly universal, and the more nearly universal it is, the more we are driven to ponder on the nature of the God who, as indicated by this process, is on the side of the big battalions. The fact, of course, is that a parliamentary vote gives no effective control, and the more widespread the vote, the less the control. Obviously if you “nationalise” everything, you remove everything from identifiable and responsible control, and place it under unidentified and irresponsible control.

And yet there is an increasing number of well-meaning people who are clamouring for the nationalisation of the banks, without even going to the trouble of finding out who controls the Bank of “England.”

Which brings us to the British Israel and “Pyramid” myth.

XIII

If I have conveyed my conception of the nature and powers of the myth with any success, it will be clear that a wide distance separates disbelief in such matters as “British Israel Truth,” “Pyramidology,” and Dr. Grattan Guinness's views on the Book of Daniel, from the assumption that it is a matter of no importance that millions of people do believe them.

So far as the veridical aspect of these “theories,” or whatever one likes to call them, is concerned, the fundamental proposition they involve is, to put it mildly, comprehensive.

If the people who designed and built the pyramids five thousand years ago knew that there would be a war in A.D. 1914, then obviously nothing could be done to stop it, and our political efforts are, and always have been, a waste of time. This inference is of importance when we come to consider a second theory—that the object of all these movements is to paralyse action against revolution.

So far as the Book of Daniel is concerned, Porphyry, and since him many others, have regarded the whole work as

a fabrication of a Palestinian Jew who lived in the time of Antiochus, and have concluded that its express purpose was to bolster up the "Chosen Race" idea.

If we are to take the authenticity aspect seriously, this criticism has a considerable bearing on the British Israel cult, since the Stone Kingdom supposed to be Britain is that mentioned in the Book of Daniel.

It may be said at once that there can be no doubt that these Pyramid myths have a Masonic origin, although it is not publicised. I have previously referred to the appearance of the pyramid on the Great Seal of the U.S.A. Many people will remember the appearance of full page pyramid diagrams accompanied by prophesies, in several of the London daily papers a few years ago. Apart from the money cost of them, at advertisement rates, which represented at least £20,000, it is improbable that the newspapers in which they appeared would, in the ordinary way, accept matter of this character. I have been informed on good authority that the publicity was arranged, and paid for, by the New York B'nai Brith, the Jewish Masonic Society. Whether it was so paid for or not, the prevalence of this propaganda, the vogue of astrology, and the appearance of organisations calling themselves World Servers and similar high-sounding names, all of them insisting that they are the heralds of a New Order, are too reminiscent of the French and Russian Revolutions to be accidental, and I do not believe that the newspapers in question were unaware of it.

But the profoundly significant fact is that certain momentous happenings do correspond with these prophetic dates, and we know that they were consciously timed to correspond.

For instance, the "great economic blizzard" (notice the suggestion that it was a phenomenon of nature) struck the world in 1929, and if ever there was a conscious and deliberately produced catastrophe it was the five-year depression. And May, 1928 was one of the Pyramid dates. On the day predicted for a momentous event, the Act of Parliament handing the British Currency over to the Bank of "England" became law. There are other instances known to me, and I am satisfied that the dates were consciously arranged. I was informed in 1920, from a source closely approximating to that which initiated the "blizzard," that it would occur about 1928.

Viewed in the light of subsequent events, the Currency Act of 1928 can be seen, and I think can only be seen, as a conscious preparation for an arranged depression, together with the best possible defence against any interference with the depression by relieving its cause. It is a damning piece of evidence which ought to hang its perpetrators even yet.

For obvious reasons I refrain from enlarging on the anticipatory emphasis placed on King Edward VIII, "exactly one hundred generations from King David" and known in the family circle as David.

August, 1938, was to be the date of the outbreak of war culminating in Armageddon. And it would have been, if it had not been for the efforts of Mr. Chamberlain, who was apparently stronger than the pyramid. There is nothing in all history more astounding than the contrast, on the one hand, of the relief both in England and Germany at the subsequently abortive compromise of Munich, and the hysterical rage at it of the American Press—notably the same Press which fought tooth and nail to keep the U.S.A. out of the war, but which has now turned its attention to

making sure that once-Great Britain loses the Peace.

Mark the Editorial views of a widely read "American" review:—

"Among international agencies of a more political character which ought to be functioning now, or all ready to function, might be mentioned:

"A colonial administration to act as receiver for defunct colonial empires (it would be folly to try to return the East Indies to Britain (*sic*) and the Netherlands).

"A European Federal Judicial system, perhaps under the World Court, to try cases of war criminals and to lay down standards for adjudicating the tangled property rights left over from the war.

"A European Police Force, or International Army."

Compare this with the views of Dr. Arnold Toynbee.

It should not escape notice that these "prophetic" theories, whether pyramidologist, "lost ten Tribes" or interpretations of the prophet Daniel, came into currency much about the same time, *i.e.*, just after the Franco-Prussian War, which was the event marking the emergence of the "United States of Europe" policy of Freemasonry, sponsored by Frederick the "Great" and pursued by Bismarck and Hitler.

The pyramidologists refer to the final chamber of the Pyramid, which marks the "end of the age," as the Hall of the Grand Orient.

It may be objected that the inference is pro-British. To which the answer is that just to the extent that these myths are a factor in policy (certain British Ministers, Mr. Baldwin's 'white-haired boys,' resigned at the time of Munich, and rushed off to New York for further instructions) they are firstly, pro-war, and finally pro-German-American-Jew, since they all hint at the Federal Union of the British Empire and the U.S.A.—a Union in which the British Empire would disappear in a slave world ruled by Jews, including, no doubt, a few German-British Jews.

The accessible officials of the organisations propagating the British-American myth are probably sincere, and are of minor importance. Who is behind them?

(To be continued)

From Decade to Decade

The following "Week to Week" notes, which show the unmistakable mind of Douglas, are reprinted from *The Social Crediter*, July 22, 1950. It is not difficult to relate them to current affairs.

There could be no better example of the mockery called democracy than the course of events in this country at this time. Nine tenths of the population probably do not know where Korea is situated and do not care; about the same proportion cannot spell it; and of the remaining tenth not five *per cent.* could relate the invasion of, and British fighting in or off Korea, to any intelligible policy. Yet the intervention on behalf of "the Americans," without even the formality of notifying the House of Commons until intervention was a *fait accompli*, appears to raise barely a ripple. To say that it is a direct denial of the sovereignty either of *demos* (democracy) or of the British over themselves, while obviously true is far from disposing of the issue raised. We believe that Captain A. K. Chesterton, writing in our esteemed contemporary *Truth*, is putting the case as simply as it can be put—that though the first enemy of "the Americans," in the World War was the Axis, the next objective for elimination was the British Empire and the reduction of the British to insignificance.

We do not (and we think Captain Chesterton does not) identify "the Americans" with the average citizen of the United States of North America, any more than we should regard Sir Stafford Cripps, Mr. Strachey, Aneurin Bevan and Mr. Emanuel Shinwell as either typical or representative Englishmen. We think the connection between these kinds of people and the general population ends with the ballot box, either *in esse*, or *in posse*.

The relationship is one of convenience—if Mr. Snooks, Mrs. Snooks and (soon) the little Snooks believe that they elected Sir Stafford and Co.; it keeps them quiet and enables them to take a modest, if somewhat vague pride in the heights of political freedom and self-determination to which they have attained.

But we do not believe that any considerable portion of the electorate of this country would tolerate for one week what is going on, if they understood it, and we also do not believe that the forms of pseudo-democracy would be retained if the real rulers of the country were not satisfied that they can always prevent the majority of the electorate from understanding the trend of events. In Belgium, for instance, circumstances (and possibly the Church) have combined to present "the democratic" process with the only type of question on which it can conceivably function—a plain "yes" or "no" to an interrogation on a clearly defined course of action. The answer given by the Belgian electorate was not that desired by the sponsors of democracy everywhere, and after failing to get the decision reversed, the "principle" has been abandoned in favour of strikes, public disorders, and stark threats of "revolution."

Now if, as we believe, Captain Chesterton is right in his suggestion that "Governments" everywhere are serving the ends of a group of Satanists more or less in control of them, it must be indisputable that democracy is a sham.

We believe that this question transcends in *immediate* importance any other, because it conditions every succeeding action. Sovereignty controls policy, and it is a sheer waste of time to discuss policy except in relation to the *locus* of sovereignty.

The subject is too extensive for disposal in the limits of a short note, but one statement can be made with confidence. Whether or no the democratic idea in some form or another is sound, it is quite certain that ballot box voting does not embody the sound element. That is why the Satanists are so enthusiastically democratic. Any sound element must of the nature of the case be negative in form—contracting-out—and that is why compulsory voting is of the Devil.

The Social Credit Secretariat NOTICE

Mr. C.R. Preston, Chairman of K.R.P. Publications Ltd., has been appointed General Deputy Chairman of the Secretariat with effect from 12th March, 1982.

Dr. Basil L. Steele will continue as Deputy Chairman, British Isles and Mrs. J. Hyatt, who has been Secretary of the Secretariat in England for many years, will continue to serve in this role.

Mr. John M. Brummitt, who has been closely associated with the production of the English edition of *The Social Crediter* for over forty years, has accepted the position of Director of K.R.P. Publications Ltd., replacing Mr. W.J. Sim who died last September.

Loyal Subjects of the Crown

Under the above title, the following letter from Sir Ronald Bell Q.C., M.P. for Beaconsfield (Conservative), addressed to the Editor, appeared in *The Times*, London, December 28, 1981.

Sir Ronald died shortly afterwards at the age of 67.

Sir, Sir John Biggs-Davison expresses a forlorn hope when he asks (December 21) for a postage stamp to commemorate the United Empire Loyalists, who 200 years ago left the United States in order to remain subjects of the King. Of those who went to the Caribbean most went to Abaco. When independence was being given to the Bahamas, I was instructed professionally to appear for their descendants.

Those people were just as loyal as their ancestors. Pictures of the Royal Family were in every house: their devotion to Britain was total and touching. They wanted Abaco to remain a Crown colony. They got scant sympathy. A Foreign Office official said that we did not want "these toe-holds around the world" — we were going to exert our influence through Brussels.

A Foreign Office minister asked their delegation why, if they attached such importance to loyalty, they could not be loyal instead to the Pindling government in Nassau. They went away rebuffed, and saddened by the coldness of their reception.

It was much the same with the loyal Barotses on the break-up of the Central African Federation. Barotseland was a separate protectorate administered as a matter of convenience together with Northern Rhodesia. Again there was the same warm loyalty to England and the monarchy. They wanted to remain a British protectorate and I was instructed to represent them. It was soon clear that loyalty counted for little. The Barotseland Agreement, painfully negotiated and scheduled to the Zambian Independence Act, was torn up within 18 months. When I asked in a parliamentary question what was going to be done about that, the reply was that Zambia was an independent country and this was an internal matter.

One may equally reflect upon the way Fiji was driven into independence, upon the fate of the British in Rhodesia, upon the constant desire of the Foreign Office to be rid of the Falkland Islands, constantly so far balked by Parliament, and upon the urge to shed Gibraltar, Northern Ireland, Scotland, Wales and Northern England do not yet come under the Foreign Office, for which they should be grateful: but they are all possible candidates (unsuccessful, of course) one future day for commemorative stamps.

I have the honour to be, Sir, your obedient servant.

RONALD M. BELL,
House of Commons,
December 21.

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. 2089.

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 NR24 2NY. U.K. Deputy Chairman, British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, 2 Park Village East, London NW1 7PX.

Whither England?

Under the above title a leaflet published by S.A.S., Tisted, Hampshire, England, has come to our notice. The following extracts are taken from it. Although it has not been stated, it would seem that the emphasis could have been added.

• • •

"The bravest are surely those who have the clearest vision of what is before them, glory and danger alike, and yet notwithstanding go out to meet it . . ."

- Pericles

• • •

"We have no compassion and ask no compassion from you. When our time comes, we shall not make excuses for terror."

- Karl Marx

• • •

"We must communize the world, and encircle the United States; and, if they do not surrender, we shall destroy them."

- Lenin

• • •

" . . . a time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true Faith and ready hands,
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honour, men who will not lie."

- T.G. Holland (1819 - 1881)

• • •

"I might just as well not have hurried, for we are on the threshold of events which will themselves irrefutably convince the West of its own miscalculations."

- A.I. Solzhenitsyn 1980

• • •

" . . . For every enemy of this country recruited in the Thirties, and now revealed, there must be how many - twenty, fifty, one hundred? - as yet unrevealed, and carrying on, through their appointed heirs and successors, *the master-plan to bring this country down.*"

- Peter Simple, *The Daily Telegraph*, 9th Nov. 1979.

• • •

" . . . What cannot be deterred is the implicit threat inherent in the Soviet military buildup, and its explicit use on occasion to blackmail the West, supported in this country by Mr. Frank Ailaun and his friends, into compliance with Soviet policy."

- Brigadier W.F.K. Thompson, O.B.E., M.C., *The Daily Telegraph*, 23rd March 1980.

• • •

"All will rejoice that we have in the White House a partner who tells the world that a gun barrel is jammed full in his face and ours. The President warned our Prime Minister of a future clouded by every sort of challenge, and was promised the support

of an ally 'valiant, staunch and true'.

"That was accompanied by news of a Lords debate in which Viscount Slim assured the peers that, against nuclear, chemical or conventional attack, our defence is 'virtually nil'. So what price this ally that for 17 years was wallowed in a morass of Anglo-Communism, with a party waiting in the wings apparently pledged to surrender?"

"As our Service chiefs try to protect a country tricked almost to impotence, let us ponder the words of one of their number: 'We must be active counter-agents to those foolish visionaries who . . . would destroy what 2,000 years of Christendom has built up . . . To work for peace from weakness and fear will spell ruin and desolation. To work for peace from courage and strength may just be salvation.'"

- Samuel Scott, *The Northern Echo*, 10th March 1981.

• • •

"I would expect that, no matter who won at the polls, no one could possibly pursue a policy of that kind." (Cancellation of Trident and Cruise).

"Unless they had resigned themselves to come and accept the fact of complete *subjugation of the country to the Soviets*. And I can't envisage anybody doing that."

- U.S. Defence Secretary Casper Weinberger questioned upon effect of a Labour election victory on N.A.T.O. *BBC Panorama*, 18th May 1981.

• • •

Special Branch and counter-terrorist officers investigating the Brixton riot have uncovered plans . . . (that) included an assault on Brixton police station with drums of burning petrol. *Officers would be attacked as they tried to escape. Guns were to be available for an "urban uprising."*

- *The Sunday Express*, 14th June 1981

• • •

" . . . interceptions of Soviet aircraft around Britain risen from an average of four a week in 1978 to nearly six, quite clear that the Russians recognise the dominant role that air power would play in any conflict."

- The Chief of the Air Staff to the Royal Air Force Association (14th June 1981).

• • •

The aim (of the new U.S. Defence policy) is to give the military sufficient manpower and equipment to take on the Russians in Europe, while fighting a separate full-scale action in the Middle East, with the oil fields as the prize.

- *The Daily Telegraph*, 16th June 1981.

• • •

"We must not, by our silence, let our people be deluded into a false sense of security and complacency."

- Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, 16th June 1981.

• • •

Claire Sterling . . . "shows conclusively that the grand master of the Soviet Union's terrorist network is Boris Ponomarev, received with honour by Mr. Jim Callaghan and the Labour party five years ago."

- Brian Crozier *The Daily Telegraph*, 18th June 1981.