

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 62 No. 5

SEPTEMBER - OCTOBER, 1983

The Big Idea

By C. H. DOUGLAS

THIS TREATISE, HERE CONTINUED, WHICH FIRST APPEARED SERIALLY IN THESE PAGES BETWEEN JANUARY AND MAY, 1942, AND LATER IN BOOKLET FORM, WILL NOT BE FAMILIAR TO MANY OF OUR PRESENT READERS. FOR OTHERS A RE-READING SHOULD PROVE ENLIGHTENING.

IX

If the Social Credit Government of Alberta had done nothing—and it has done many things—to justify its existence, the demonstration afforded by its enemies of one fundamental factor in the world situation would still have made it a landmark in human history.

That factor, completely demonstrated by the actions of the Canadian Federal Government in Disallowing every Act of the Provincial Legislature directed to the inauguration of Social Credit, is that the Secret Government is determined to keep the world in turmoil until its own rule is supreme, so that one uninformed mob may be mobilised against another, should either become dangerous. I do not think that anyone who will take the trouble to consider the actions of the Canadian Federal Government, can fail to apprehend exactly why centralisation, Federal Union, and other "Bigger and Better" Governments are the most deadly menace with which humanity is faced to-day. There could hardly be a more concise picture of the events which followed the demand of the largest majority ever obtained by a Canadian Provincial Government that it should be allowed to deal with its own difficulties, than that contained in the following statement issued by an authoritative source in Alberta:—

Credit of Alberta Regulation Act

Why passed

1. Because there was widespread poverty and distress throughout Alberta.
2. Because Alberta, one of the richest provinces in the Dominion could produce abundance for her people.
3. Because the only reason why Alberta's people were living in poverty was the lack of purchasing power.
4. Because such purchasing power should be made available to the people by using their own credit, as would enable them to obtain, at all times, what they wanted.
5. Because this could be done by a scientific balancing between money and goods produced.
6. Because control of Credit being in the words of Hon. McKenzie King, "A public matter not of interest to bankers alone, but of direct concern to every citizen," credit policy should be vested in an authority responsible to the representatives of the people.
7. Because banks, being manufacturers of credit and functioning as public utility concerns, supplying a service of

primary and vital importance to the lives of the citizens of Alberta should be licensed and subjected to supervision only in regard to policy—the results they provide, and unless the people of Alberta can use the resources of their own Province as they desire, and determine the results which shall accrue to them, they have no property and civil right in the full sense. (Banking administration being under Federal Jurisdiction was in no matter affected by the Act.)

What happened

Disallowed by Federal Government August 17, 1937.

What it would have done

1. Would have secured the results demanded by the People—a lower cost to live, and monthly dividends.
2. Would have provided markets for Alberta manufacturers and traders.
3. Would have led to tremendous industrial development in manufacturing Alberta goods by processing Alberta produce.
4. Would have resulted in rapidly absorbing every unemployed person into useful employment and relieved the aged and infirm of the necessity of working for a living.
5. Would have led to increased business activity in which industrialists, wholesalers, retailers, and banks would all have benefitted.
6. Would have enabled taxation to be reduced drastically.
7. Would have made it possible to deal with the debt problems.

Bank Taxation Act

Why passed

1. Because under the present system, the Government has one source of revenue only—Taxation.
2. Because the people of Alberta are already taxed beyond their ability to pay.
3. Because banks are the only institutions claiming the legal right to monetise the credit of The People to such an extent that they create and issue monetary credits many times in excess of the legal tender money they hold.
4. Because banks can thereby create money out of nothing.

5. Because the present method of taxation of individuals is confiscatory and unnecessary.

What happened

Assent withheld by Lieutenant Governor. Declared unconstitutional by Supreme Court of Canada. Appeal by Province from Supreme Court decision to Privy Council dismissed.

What it would have done

1. Would place over Two Million Dollars new money in circulation.
2. Would have permitted an equal amount, otherwise paid in taxes, to remain in the ordinary channels of industry, thus aiding employment and acting as a tremendous impetus to business generally, or,
3. Would have enabled the Government to embark on a six million dollar highway and market roads programme under the three way Dominion-Provincial-Municipal plan, or,
4. Would have provided a hospital and medical service in districts where those are not available, or,
5. Would have set up a fund for Crop Insurance, or,
6. Would have given decreased School Taxes.
7. Would have provided increased purchasing power for the People of Alberta.

Reduction and Settlement of Debt Act

Why passed

1. Because under the present financial system debt cannot be paid without creating new and larger debts. The People of Alberta possess only about 20c. for every \$1.00 of debt—this they owe to the banks, and they can get no money except as a debt to the bankers.
2. Because private debts, largely due to accumulated interest, had increased to such an extent that they were out of all proportion to value received.
3. Because many outstanding debts had been incurred during the war and immediate post-war years when values were high.
4. Because the original debt had already, in many cases, been paid in interest charges while the principal remained unchanged or showed little reduction.
5. Because people could no longer continue to pay interest of 8 to 10 per cent.
6. Because financial corporations refused to recognise that the inability of people to meet their obligations was due to lack of adequate returns on what they produced.
7. Because no people or country can prosper and progress so long as they labour under a burden of those who deal in money as a commodity.

What happened

Declared *ultra vires* of the Province by the Courts.

What it would have done

1. Would have established a basis of settlement for all outstanding debts.
2. Would have reduced all debt incurred previous to

July, 1932, by applying all interest paid from that date to the passing of the act on reduction of principal.

3. Would have settled definitely question involved in debts which had become uncollectable.

4. Would have led to a restoration of confidence and encouraged those who, through no fault of their own were living in poverty and struggling against odds which they could not possibly overcome.

Act to Ensure Publication of Accurate News Information

Why passed

1. Because the control of news and the control of credit are both exercised by the financial interests.
2. Because "The freedom of the press" has become license to distort news, misrepresent facts and withhold information from the public.
3. Because this anti-social aspect of the press, under inspired direction, is being used to thwart the people of Alberta in their struggle against finance.

What happened

Assent withheld by Lieutenant-Governor. Declared unconstitutional by Supreme Court of Canada. In the appeal of the Province of Alberta from decision of Supreme Court of Canada, the Privy Council refused to hear Alberta's argument by their counsel.

What it would have done

1. Would have ensured that all newspapers in Alberta would publish all the facts in their news reports of Government matters so far as this was possible, and if from any cause false statements appeared, equal space would be given for authoritative correction.
2. Would have ensured that the same information which every publisher demands from correspondents to his columns, i.e. the names of contributors of articles, would be available to The People when demanded by their representatives.

Home Owners Security Act

Why passed

1. Because under stress of world conditions and a falsified financial system, over which individuals had no control, many were forced to mortgage their homes.
2. Because conditions had changed since these loans were received so that commodity and labour prices bore little relation to the continued high price of money.
3. Because there was grave danger of many Alberta Citizens losing their homes.
4. Because in most cases, these homes represented the total life savings of many people.
5. Because it is just as much the duty of any Government to protect the homes of individual members of Society against the confiscatory practices of unscrupulous money-lenders as it is to defend its people against the invasion of a foreign aggressor.

6. Because there can be no Sanctity of Contract which does not recognise that human life has, at least, as much value as considerations of "money."

What happened

Disallowed by Mackenzie-King Government, June 15, 1938.

What it would have done

1. Would have prohibited foreclosures or sale under mortgage proceedings of any farm home.
2. Would have prohibited foreclosure or sale under mortgage proceedings of any home in a town, city or village, unless the plaintiff first deposited \$2,000 with the Court which would be paid to the owner if dispossessed to enable him to purchase another home.
3. Would have induced debtor and creditor alike to seek equitable basis of settlement through medium of the Debt Adjustment Board.
4. Would have enabled home-owners to enter into new contracts commensurate with their present ability to pay.

Security Tax Act—1938

Why passed

1. Because the Government required additional revenue for one year to replace the loss of revenue from the Bank Taxation Act before the Privy Council.
2. Because the additional revenue was essential to provide the people with the benefits they needed.
3. Because it was equitable that equitable companies and similar institutions should make good some of the taxation they have escaped for years.
4. Because the Government is pledged to the people to remove the burden of taxation from individuals, and until we gain control of our credit resources, this can be done only by transferring it to institutions which are better able to bear it.

What happened

Disallowed by Mackenzie-King Government, June 15, 1938.

What it would have done

1. Would have realised \$1,500,000—sufficient revenue to balance the Provincial Budget.
2. Would have helped the Government considerably to give tax relief, to provide additional relief projects, increase School Grants, and undertake many other benefits planned for the people.

Credit of Alberta Regulation Act, (1937 Amendment)

Why passed

Because Credit of Alberta Regulation Act had been disallowed by the Dominion Government.

What happened

Assent withheld by Lieutenant-Governor. Declared unconstitutional by Supreme Court of Canada. In the appeal of the Province of Alberta from decision of Supreme Court of Canada, the Privy Council refused to hear Alberta's argument by their counsel.

What it would have done

Would have brought all the benefits of the Credit of Alberta Regulation Act, which it supplanted.

X

Like all undertakings which have been pursued to the stage of realisation, the Big Idea has firstly an objective, secondly a method of technique, and thirdly a dynamics by means of which the human individual can be made to conform to the technique so that the objective may be realised or attained.

The objective is World Dominion.

The technique is centralisation by a graded executive, operating through Law and Finance.

The dynamic forces are Fear and Desire.

There are numbers of fairly intelligent people who accept the idea that the world is moving inevitably to Dictatorship of the type adumbrated by Stalin, in the same way that the drawing rooms of the mid-nineteenth century were filled with believers in the inevitability of "Progress." The two ideas are not unconnected—they are the direct consequence of the delirium of materialism—the acceptance of the dogma that the one end of man is gadgets, that he must at all costs be kept employed under discipline making more and more gadgets, and carrying the blessings of his gadget civilisation to the benighted heathen.

That this is not mere unconscious error is easy to demonstrate to anyone open to conviction. There is not a large newspaper in the world which has not misrepresented the technological increase of production per man-hour as "unemployment," and as a failure of statesmanship. Not because things which ought to have been made, were not made, which may be true, but because of the determination, conscious and vicious, to keep unemployment and poverty synonymous. And that this misrepresentation is part of the Big Idea, is, I think, demonstrated conclusively by the dangerous nonsense being circulated by all the machinery of propaganda at this critical time in regard to the Russian Social and Economic systems.

To anyone who wishes to obtain an unbiased and objective view of Soviet Russia I can recommend the Russian section of *Looking for Trouble*, by the American journalist, Virginia Cowles, who took considerable risks to get away from the spoon-feeding which is the usual treatment of investigators. The following paragraph gives, I think, a clue to the real situation:—

"I saw nothing new. The factories, club-houses, and schools I was shown were third-rate imitations of Western progress. All this I had expected; but what I hadn't expected was that I should be asked to marvel at the most commonplace conveniences, as though I had come from a jungle... the misinformation and ignorance of the conditions in the outside world were grotesque."

"For a nation that sent its disciples abroad to convert the pluto-democracies to the leadership of Moscow, it seemed to have little to offer from a practical point of view, other than squalor and poverty. But far more disconcerting than the wretched conditions was the tyranny that gripped the capital. It was estimated that the purge, which had swept the country during the past two years (1936-7) had sent over six million people to concentration camps."

(Continued on page 7)

**THE SOCIAL CREDITER
FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM**

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which was founded in 1933 by Clifford Hugh Douglas.

The Social Credit Secretariat is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: Home and abroad, post free. One year £3.00.

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

Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, 2 Park Village East, London NW1 7PX.

Tel. 01-387 3893.

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

THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

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

What is Social Credit?

Early in 1951, Douglas, to counteract the tendency of the Social Credit movement, as of all movements which have a philosophical basis, to develop its perspective disproportionately, drew up a schema embodying a definition of Social Credit by specification in answer to the question,

WHAT IS SOCIAL CREDIT?

This specification follows:—

Social Credit assumes that Society is primarily meta-physical, and must have regard to the organic relationships of its prototype.

PHILOSOPHY

POLICY

Economics

Administration

Consumer Control of Production

Integral Accounting

Hierarchy

Contracting-Out Mechanisms

OBJECTIVE: Social stability by the integration of means and ends.

INCOMPATIBLES: Collectivism, Dialectic Materialism, Totalitarianism, Judæo-Masonic Philosophy and Policy. Ballot-box democracy embodies all of these.

This schema has been published a number of times in these pages. It deserves repeating again, particularly for the benefit of our newer subscribers.

Judaism and Social Credit

The following is a "Week To Week" note by C.H. Douglas originally published in *The Social Crediter*, Feb. 7, 1948:

We believe that there is a small number – loyal and valued members of our public – who although, because of their loyalty, they accept our views on certain aspects of the Jewish race, yet have an idea that these are an excrescence on "Social Credit" and, they feel, might have been left unnoticed. We are not concerned with the reactions of the crypto-Communists and their accusations – "anti-Semitism", "racism", "negative criticism" and other catchwords; – but we are ready at all times to explain to our friends what we recognise as a very excusable failure of comprehension.

Perhaps the simplest way in which to deal with this matter is to enunciate certain propositions.

- (1) Both Judaism and Social Credit are rooted in philosophies. Even in the case of non-orthodox Jews, race and philosophy are inseparable. Heine refers to Judaism as "the portable Fatherland".
- (2) Social Credit is Christian, not primarily because it was designed to be Christian, but because it was painstakingly "dis"-(un)-covered reality. If Christianity is not real, it is nothing; it is not "true", it is *Truth*. "Ye shall know the Truth, and the *Truth* shall make you free".
- (3) Judaism is implacably anti-Christian, and it is, by definition, an Incarnate Lie. "Ye do the deeds of your father . . . he is a liar, and the father of it".
- (4) Both philosophies have a policy and these policies cannot live together. The Founder of Christianity was quite unequivocal on the question. "I came not to bring peace, but a sword". It is remarkable that many people who complain of the suppression of vital information by the Press and the Broadcasting Agencies, will resent the exposure of Jewish policy, even if the exposure is merely the publication of statements made by Jews themselves.

Bearing these propositions in mind, it must be recognised that the practical problem which we have to face is not intellectual, it is militant. Mere conversion to an understanding of the A + B Theorem, the creation of credit by the banks, the foreign Acceptance swindle, and the whole network of International Finance *by itself*, leads nowhere. Probably ninety *per cent* of the adult population of this country suspect that they are being swindled. Even if they understood exactly and technically *how* they are being swindled, it would make little difference. But it does make a great deal of difference if they know *who* is obstructing the rectification of the swindle, and who is the major beneficiary. The general population of the country has been completely misled as to the identity of its enemies, and has turned on its most effective leaders, who were far from perfect, but were incomparably better than the mixture of Trades Union careerists and alien schemers who now afflict us. Witness the state of the country, and the worse future with which we are threatened.

For all these reasons and others, we conceive it to be our vocation to indicate, without prejudice but without favour,

those whom we conceive to be the enemies of our culture and ideals; to unmask their aims. It does not make a cheerful story; many people would prefer to escape into Utopia, just as “the workers” have been hypnotised into the Utopia which is spreading over Eastern Europe; but it is our conception of Reality at this time, and only from Reality can you proceed to Realisation.

Middle East Jigsaw Puzzle

Reprinted from Ivor Benson's *Behind the News* (P.O. Box 1564, Krugersdorp, 1740, South Africa) July, 1983.

Commenting on our June article *Unwrapping the Riddle of Russia's Rulers*, Mr. Wilmot Robertson, author of *The Dispossessed Majority*, writes:

“I want to thank you for the very fair review of my Russian thesis... About the only thing you left out, in my argument, was the foreign policy of Russia in regard to the Middle East. It would seem that becoming the self-proclaimed friend of the Arabs and funneling vast amounts of money and arms into the more anti-Zionist states is not exactly an exhibition of pro-Semitism. Also, we must not forget the various anti-Semitic speeches made by Russian envoys in the UN, the anti-Semitic utterances of Krushchev in Poland and even the statement of Gromyko that the Soviet diplomatic service cannot afford to use Jews in high places because they would have connections with non-Soviet Jews that might turn out badly for Russia”.

We agree with Mr. Robertson that any attempt to unwrap the riddle of Russia's rulers would be incomplete without an analysis of the Soviet Union's role in the Middle East. Such an analysis was provided by Ivor Benson in *This Worldwide Conspiracy*, published in 1972,* and only needs to be updated and slightly amplified to form another most necessary chapter in a forthcoming book.

Meanwhile, the shortest possible answer to reservations about the rulers of Russia is this: Soviet policy in the Middle East has served Zionist purposes admirably, plausibly justifying both Israeli expansionism and massive American backing for that purpose.

Stalin's biographer, Isaac Deutscher, writes as follows of the 1967 war: “Having excited Arab fears, encouraged them to risky moves, promised to stand by them, and having brought out their own naval units into the Mediterranean to counter the moves of the American Sixth Fleet, the Russians then tied Nasser hand and foot. Why did they do it? As the tension was mounting, the ‘hot line’ between the Kremlin and the White House went into action. The two superpowers agreed to avoid direct intervention” (Isaac Deutscher, *The Non-Jewish Jew*, Oxford University Press, 1968).

The act of betrayal was completed when the Arabs saw the Soviet delegate at the United Nations vote in unison with the Americans for a cease-fire without any conditions for a withdrawal of Israeli troops. Red China's rulers were more blunt: they called it collusion.**

**This Worldwide Conspiracy*, Ivor Benson (New Times, Box 1052-J, GPO Melbourne 3001, Australia).

**See also *The Middle East Crisis* by Brigadier Sir John Glubb (Glubb Pasha); *Behind the Scene* by Douglas Reed containing a summary of Chaim Weizmann's autobiography, and Reed's *The Controversy of Zion*.

The Convenient “Nought”

In his essay “Moses” (*Thoughts and Adventures*, Thornton Butterworth, London, 1932) Winston S. Churchill wrote that there is much dispute as to the number of Israelites who marched to the neighbourhood of Mount Sinai, the northern inlet of the Red Sea. The bible story, he writes, says they were 600,000 men, with women and children in addition. “We may without impiety doubt the statistics. A clerical error may so easily have arisen. Even to-day a nought or two is sometimes misplaced. But more than two thousand years had yet to pass before the ‘nought’ and all its conveniences was to be at the disposal of mankind. The earlier forms of notation were more liable to error than our own. Unless the climate was very different from the present it is difficult to see how even 6,000 persons could have lived in the Sinai Peninsula without supernatural aid on a considerable and well-organized scale”.

Unwrapping the Riddle of Britain's Rulers

From a correspondent (dated June 14, 1983):

While the recent General Election result is to be welcomed as giving proof of considerable sophistication on the part of British electors, who recognised the danger of the present, Marxist-dominated Labour Party, the nature of the second Thatcher administration also bears eloquent witness to the basic Judeo-Masonic nature of British society. For three of the key positions (Home Secretary, Chancellor of the Exchequer and Secretary of State for Education and Science) are held by Jews: Leon Brittan, Nigel Lawson and Sir Keith Joseph respectively.

According to the *Daily Telegraph* of 13 June, 1983 Leon Brittan “aged 43... is the son of a Jewish doctor who, having studied in Berlin, came to Britain in 1927”.

As for Nigel Lawson, the same *Daily Telegraph* says of him: “age 51, the son of a tea merchant in the City, his ancestors were Jewish immigrants from Latvia...”

As for Sir Keith Joseph this illustrious Jew has held various Government posts since 1979, when he was appointed Secretary of State for Industry. *The Jewish Year Book* 1980 gives full details re his career.

It takes little imagination to realise how encouraged we should all have been – and also what an outcry it would have occasioned – had these three key posts been occupied by hard line, uncompromisingly Catholic Catholics – if indeed there were such to be found in Westminster....

P.S. In short, Mrs. Thatcher will be allowed to do whatever Judeo-Masonry permits.

Guess Who?

Cecil Rhodes was asked for a description of those qualities that he expected to find in a Rhodes Scholar. His biographer, Sara Mullins records that, “Rhodes defined them, with that defensive cynicism of the romantic, as smugness, brutality, unctuous rectitude and tact”.

Now! Who do you know as a Rhodes Scholar, and how in your assessment does he measure up to the prototype as envisaged by the founder of the scholarships?

Reflections on a 70th Birthday

The following letter to the Editor was published in the *London Times*, July 27, 1983:

From Sir Ian Gilmour, MP for Chesham and Amersham (Conservative)

Sir, In your article celebrating Mr. Begin's birthday (*The Times*, July 23) you say that "the view from Jerusalem is now comparably more healthy than it was when he became Prime Minister six years ago". And that "All in all Mr. Begin at 70 has cause for satisfaction".

Let us look at his causes for satisfaction and the way in which the view from Jerusalem has been improved: in March, 1978, shortly after he became Prime Minister, Mr. Begin sent the Israeli Army into Southern Lebanon and, during a short campaign which achieved nothing, up to 2,000 Lebanese and Palestinian civilians were killed.

In July, 1981, he ordered his air force to bomb Beirut and another 300 civilians lost their lives. Last year he invaded Lebanon yet again in an operation that resulted in the destruction of much of Tyre, Sidon and Beirut, the massacre of hundreds of Palestinian refugees at Sabra and Chatila, and a casualty list estimated at more than 20,000 dead and 30,000 wounded, 90 per cent of whom were civilians.

This wholly unjustified and unnecessary war has cost the lives of more than 500 Israeli soldiers and brought Mr. Begin considerable criticism from his fellow countrymen. Mr. Shlomo Argov, the former Ambassador in London, has said that "only charlatans can say that the war was worthwhile".

Another cause of satisfaction for Mr. Begin is, no doubt, his highly oppressive occupation of the West Bank and Gaza, his grabbing of thousands of acres of Arab land, and the brutal treatment of the Palestinian population (amply documented by the Israeli press and your Jerusalem Correspondent).

Those who believe that Israel's destiny lies in aggression and continued expansion will doubtless think that Mr. Begin's sabotage of the Palestinian half of the Camp David Agreement and his immediate rejection of last year's Reagan Plan have made Israel's position "incomparably healthier" than would a willingness to come to terms with the Palestinians.

That such an article as "Mr. Begin's birthday" can appear in *The Times* instead of a Zionist newspaper in New York clearly gives that gentleman further cause for satisfaction. The Arab world, as you rightly say, is in disarray and Israel is overwhelmingly the preponderant military power. Your suggestion that "the world should stand back a little and let raw facts do their work on local minds" is in these circumstances merely a discreditable formula for an unconditional surrender by the isolated and defenceless Palestinians.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
IAN GILMOUR,
House of Commons
July 26.

The K.G.B. and Australia.

Mr. B.A. Santamaria who writes "A Personal Viewpoint" column in *The Australian* each Tuesday is one of those rare commentators who have the ability to isolate the motive behind the political smokescreen and express that view in clear and unequivocal language. His comment on the real question to be answered by the Hope Royal Commission into the Combe-Ivanov relationship shines like a good deed in a bewildered world.

There is (he writes) "only one central issue - and that is what the K.G.B. was seeking to achieve in Australia through its agent Valeriy Ivanov".

The U.S.S.R. has stated through one of its top officials, Mr. B. Ponomarev, that control of Australia is vital to its plans to control the whole of South East Asia. One method used by the Soviet is to set up trading companies in the country it desires to infiltrate. It then uses those companies to launder funds to organisations where its selected and trained operatives are already installed. The appositeness of Mr. Santamaria's observation is immediately apparent. As he concludes, "What is, and should be, investigated is something different" (different that is to whether or not Combe was a security risk) - the way the Soviet Union goes about establishing a reservoir of funds for operating in target countries, and whether this was happening in Australia".

The value of such an enquiry would lie in the disclosure to the public of subversive actions that are well known to readers of this journal but not so readily understood by others. If such an enquiry was held some strange worms would be brought to light.

— E.L.W.

World Domination

In the ordinary sense we attach to the words "recorded history", the present period is unique in that all political movements and the events which proceed from them are world events, and their outcome is directed to a world outcome—domination.

One of the significant symptoms of this culmination is that there is now little or no attempt to conceal the control of so-called Anglo-Saxon—the name given to an alien-dominated "Britain" and a polyglot mob of European throw-outs ruled from Wall Street and Washington—Governments by Judæo-Masonic organisations. Mr. James Byrne's speech at Stuttgart might well be—and possibly was—composed by the Grand Council of the Grand Orient in consultation with B'nai B'rith. While the phrase "United States of Germany" was expunged from the actual speech as delivered, it appeared in the copy given to the Press, and, like the square and compasses on our new stamps, and the truncated pyramid surmounted by the All-Seeing Eye, the OGPU-Gestapo symbol of the Masonic World Government on the United States Treasury Bill, it would be recognised by any editor of consequence as the signature of Freemasonry. Obviously nothing in the speech itself could be more important than the assertion of its origin; but so far as we are aware, not one single suggestion of this has appeared in any newspaper in the British Isles or the United States or Canada. It is truly remarkable.

— C.H. Douglas in *T.S.C.*, Sept. 21, 1946.

The Dead Level

"Democracy is not all clear gain. For one thing, its methods of reaching decisions by voting creates the general impression that the majority is right. From a ladies sewing circle to the assembly of the League of Nations we count heads when we wish a matter settled. The result is that we modern democrats, who would scorn to truckle to an autocrat, truckle to the majority with all the obsequiousness of a courtier before his sovereign. Once the fashions were set by a monarch—the king could do no wrong. If he wore a beard, beards were fashionable; if he wore a ruff to cover a scar, ruffs were the order of the day. Democracy, however, which has largely abolished this mimicry of kings, has for many folk only substituted mimicry of the mob. We do not go through the outward ritual of kneeling to *their Majesties*, but in fact we continually bow before two great sovereigns of the democratic state—The General Average and the Majority Vote.

"In political procedure it doubtless is true that the best way yet discovered to run a government is to elect public servants by popular suffrage. But to grant the wisdom of political democracy is a very different thing from saying that in any decision which calls for spiritual fineness the majority is likely to be right. Upon the contrary, the majority is almost certain to be wrong. Put to popular vote the query, which they enjoy the better, ragtime or jazz on the one side, or Chopin's Nocturnes on the other and where would the majority be? Put to popular vote the query, which interests them more, the movies or *Hamlet* and *King Lear*, and where would the majority be? Which are more popular, novels written by animated fountain pens that turn out love stories by the gross, or the great classics of our English speech? The idea that the voice of the people is the voice of God is mostly nonsense . . .

"The fact is that in any realm where judgment calls for spiritual fineness, only the minority who are above the average are ever right. And because a man is always tempted to live down to the average of his social group, a searching test of character is involved in one's relationship with this dead level of public opinion and practice . . ."

—*Twelve Tests of Character* (1923) by Harry Emerson Fosdick.

The Big Idea

(Continued from page 1)

This seems to me to be a good, non-technical, description of the salient characteristics of a bureaucratic socialist state. The determination to obliterate standards of comparison, the use of every means of publicity to represent a retrograde tyranny as a marvellous advance, the espionage and the mass cruelty are all there. If this is the New Order that we are fighting to establish, then Flanders Poppies should be superseded by a crown of thorns.

The writer goes on to indicate growths which are beginning to raise their ugly heads everywhere. "Minds were doped with distorted information until they became so sluggish that they had not even the power to protest against their miserable conditions . . . the contempt for intellectual and moral values, and the ruthless disregard for the indi-

vidual was not only depressing; it was evil. I felt the same way as I had in Spain and Germany; that if I didn't get a breath of fresh air, I would stifle. The physical appearance of Moscow helped to accentuate this feeling. The streets were as drab as the mentality of the people . . . not a single gay head-dress, a bright shop front or even a happy smile."

Remember that this Paradise was inaugurated by the introduction in a special train from Germany of a gang of New York Jews, and then consider whether, along this path, is the way to a better world. The matter has been much better put than I can put it.

"Ye are of your father, the Devil, who was a liar from the beginning. . . . By their fruits ye shall know them. Do men gather figs of thistles, or grapes of thorns?"

There is current in Germany a prophecy, known as the Lehnin prophecy, which is said to be one of Hitler's nightmares, that the last King of Prussia will have no successors, but that after him,

"Israel will dare a deed unspeakable, which only death can redeem."

Possibly "Admiral" Canaris*, whose real name is Moses Meyerbeer, and who is said to be the most powerful man in Germany, could throw some light on the story.

XI

It is becoming a commonplace to hear people say, "Of course, we're fighting two wars"; by which statement is meant that our enemies are not merely Germany and Japan but a vaguely apprehended and ill-defined factor in regard to which there is some hesitation as to its name.

I am a little doubtful as to the utility of this idea. As I see it, we are fighting Germany and Japan for the benefit of a third party, the Promoter. There are faint indications quite recently that the Promoter may get further into the *mêlée* than had ever been his intention, but the process will have to go to greater lengths before it can be called a fight.

I do not want to waste the time of the Superior Persons who have long ago risen above what they describe as hidden

**The Times* of June 4, 1942, writes in an article *Heydrich's Career of Crime*:—"At an early age he became a member of some ultra-nationalist youth organisation. In 1922 he joined the German Navy, and in 1928 he became intelligence officer in the Baltic Command. It was probably in this position that Heydrich got into contact with Admiral Canaris, Chief of the German Military Intelligence, a connection which, according to rumour, had never been broken."

THE CRIME AND THE CURE

A Social Credit Secretariat Analysis

With a supplement entitled CULMINATION

65p posted

BLOOMFIELD BOOKS

26 Meadow Lane, Sudbury, Suffolk CO10 6TD

(Agent for K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD., in respect of book sales only)

hand theories, but the rest of us must be impressed by the accumulating evidence that much more is involved than a nice, clean-cut war against Hitler and the Mikado. Let us contemplate our Prime Ministers for a few moments, omitting, for obvious reasons, Mr. Winston Churchill.

Mr. Mackenzie King, Prime Minister of Canada, commonly known as the Washington Post, has had a remarkable career. I may perhaps repeat as germane to the matter the remark made to me by a prominent Canadian when I said that I had been informed in Washington in 1919 that Mr. King (almost as unknown to the general Canadian public as was Mr. Stanley Baldwin to the British public of the same period) would be the next Prime Minister. My friend observed, "Well, we Canadians didn't know it, anyway."

To say that Mr. King's spiritual home is in Washington may perhaps be to limit his domesticity unduly, but it certainly isn't in Westminster. I should be the last to claim that the efforts of the Imperial Government, in the main dominated by Mr. Baldwin, were, during the fatal armistice years, either distinguished or even moderately courageous, but anything Mr. King could do to make them completely abortive, was done. The World Economic Congress of 1933 might—probably would, because of its limited agenda—have been a failure in any case, but Mr. King left nothing to chance in indicating, in able collaboration with Mr. Cordell Hull of the United States, that any putting-to-rights of world affairs, wherever else it might come from, would not be allowed to proceed from London.

It would be unfair, however, to omit the effective collaboration with the Bank of "England" for which reliance upon him could always be placed. The disallowance of the Acts of the Alberta Legislature, the appointment of an official nominated by Mr. Montagu Norman to control the Bank of Canada, and many other minor policies, obviously did nothing to cool the welcome he could always expect to the South of the Canadian Border, whatever the Canadians themselves may have thought, or of the repercussion on the Imperial link. And we may cast a glance in passing, at Mr. Curtin, the "Labour" Prime Minister of Australia, of whom few of us had heard until, like Mr. Baldwin and Mr. Mackenzie King, he appeared from nowhere with no false sentiment in looking to Washington to console him for any very slight regret for the passing of Britain. And there is Mr. Nash of New Zealand, of whom it was said that the interests of international Finance were quite safe while he remained *de facto*, if not *de jure*, Prime Minister. At this time of writing, Mr. Nash is representing New Zealand in Washington. It should not be overlooked that, while the "Liberal" or "Labour" Parties in the Dominions, which tend to be the dominant parties, seem curiously liable to develop a nasal accent, England, which seems incurably "Conservative," whatever that may mean, provides a touching example of Imperial Unity by providing Leaders from the Conservative ranks, who are delighted to conduct the calf to the water, even if it may subsequently transpire that there are difficulties in making it drink. The negroid sex-moans retailed by the "B".B.C. under the title of entertainment are no doubt expected to develop the right culture for the appropriate policy. Taken by and large, the British Commonwealth for the past 25 years provides a remarkable object-lesson on the workings of "d'markrazy."

The subject of what is commonly called India (which is as descriptive as a reference to Europe) is, of course, much too large to be dealt with in detail here, but certain facts are essentially relevant to a grasp of the larger picture. The first is that the Indian Congress (significant title) is not, and never has been, representative of more than the most insignificant fraction of the indigenous population. The second is, that it is known to be, and to have been for many years, financed from the same source as was the Russian Revolution.

And the third, and most significant, is that the so-called "Indian Problem" has assumed intractable proportions only from a date which is common to two incidents. The first of these is the foundation of the Federal Reserve Banking System by the Warburgs, which set the stage for the War, and to which I have already made reference. And the second, which at first sight would appear to be both wildly irrelevant and absurdly disproportionate, is the Marconi Scandal.

There can, I think, be no appreciation of the problem with which humanity is faced, and therefore no hope of a decisive and satisfactory outcome from it, without a recognition that States—Great Britain, France, Germany, the United States—are simply "Counters," in the sense that the word is used on the Stock Exchange. Exactly as shares are manipulated by the big Operators, the destinies of whole people are played with by the same type of Group, with as little compunction or respect for the results to the populations concerned as the big share promoter has for the public, where no question of legal danger is involved. M. Coty, the French millionaire, entitled his exposé, which dealt with some of the aspects of the situation, *Financiers who Sport with the World*.

To say that, for instance, the United States—still less the American people—is deeply involved in this policy is fundamentally as meaningless as to accuse the Pennsylvania Railroad of complicity. We have got to know, and the whole future of the world depends upon our knowing, who are the Directors who use one country after another as a base of Operations. As usual, the surest clue is to be found by a consideration of the enquiry "*Quis benefici?*"—Who benefits?

We can clear the ground at once of one candidate—nothing which has happened in the political field in the last twenty-five years, to go back no further, could conceivably be expected to advance the interest of the communities linked together by the British Crown. On the contrary, it is obvious that, for instance, the present war is being fought for the destruction of that association. The only question at stake appears to be which of the controlled Groups nominally takes over the assets, the hidden Promoters being in control of a majority shareholding whoever "wins." At the same time, it is essential that the assets shall be handed over in a condition which will not cause trouble. That is to say, they must be converted into Servile States forever unable to revolt against irresistible World Police under the orders of the Promoters.

Bearing this in mind, we can consider the events to which the Marconi Scandal made an important contribution.

(To be continued)