

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 63 No. 3

MAY - JUNE, 1984

"Wheresoever the Carcase Is. . ."

By C. H. DOUGLAS

Since its original publication in The Social Crediter in 1941 this analysis has been repeated before in these pages. It deserves repeated study and this reprinting will serve to acquaint our newer readers of the profound understanding of the late C. H. Douglas.

(I)

Now that Mr. John Winant, millionaire, assisted by Mr. Benjamin Cohen, has come from the International Labour Office at Geneva, as Ambassador and instructor to Mr. Ernest Bevin on the Labour Policy of Great Britain, Mr. Averill Harriman, multi-millionaire, has come to take charge of our Finance, Mr. Wendell Wilkie has taken our temperature, and Mr. Harry Hopkins, late of the Federal Loan and Mortgage Board, remains as bailiff's man, and all of these are enthusiastically welcomed by the Socialist Party, it is perhaps of some interest to find an answer to the riddle — "When is a rich man not a rich man?" (for the purposes of Socialism).

The first answer can be obtained by inspection, as our Maths. Master used to say. It is when his riches are the result of monetary manipulation, and particularly, the result of bond flotation and sale. Each and every one of our, probably long-term, guests is in the orbit of the Kuhn, (i.e. Cohen), Loeb Finance Group. Not one of them is a manufacturer, or an agriculturalist, but all of them are here primarily to fix the conditions under which both manufacturing and agriculture are, they hope, to be carried on for the next five hundred years. And all of them are in enthusiastic agreement with the Socialists in the main tenets of Socialism. These are:

- (1) A preamble that sets out the many glaring defects of the present Economic and Social Systems. (No mention or criticism of Finance permitted.) Obviously this gets a majority vote at once.
- (2) "Labour creates all wealth." Wealth is the object of life, especially if not used but exported. Therefore *Present* labour has a right to all wealth so long as it exports it. Anyone who has the enjoyment of wealth without labour, is a parasite. (From this postulate is derived the curious inversion that anyone paid by the State is *ipso facto* not a parasite.)
- (3) The holding of property, particularly land or buildings, by an individual, is robbery of the Public and is likely to lead to the use of property for pleasure. The holding of property by *any* organisation is better, and the larger the organisation and the more secure it is from criticism by individuals,

the better it is. The State, which is immune from Prosecution by Legal Process, is better still, at the moment, but a World State, which would be Omnipotent, would be best of all.

- (4) Everything can be reduced to a Book of Regulations. For this reason, a Civil Servant in Whitehall, or Washington, or Geneva, can farm land in Ross and Cromarty, or Cheshire, or Alberta much better than the farmer who lives on the land. Or if he can't, it doesn't matter much, does it? Nobody knows the Civil Servant's name, he'll never see the farmer or the farm, and anyway, both the farmer and the Civil Servant will be dead soon.
- (5) The main objective, therefore, is to take everything from the individual, vest it in an untouchable organisation, the larger the better, and thus change the choice of minor tyrannies, which are vulnerable into an overriding single tyranny, which is invulnerable. Taxation is the primary tool by which to attain this desirable end, but restrictive Law, and in particular Licence Law, is a valuable auxiliary. But Law is the Agency both of taxation and Licensing.

When you have done this, you can put everyone on the wage and salary list, and invent a job for them, even if it's only filling in Forms to show how many people are filling in Forms. Then you will have solved the unemployment problem, which is the curse of Capitalism — if you don't know enough to recognise it as the coming of the Age of Leisure. And if people don't like filling in Forms, well, "He that will not work, neither shall he eat."

Now, there is every justification for the acceptance of Socialism of this character by a very large majority of the population at this time, for reasons which a little later, I propose to recapitulate briefly. It is a remarkable tribute to the sound instincts of the Anglo-Saxon public that the majority is not larger, and that it is far from solidly convinced.

But before dealing with the grounds for the views somewhat reluctantly held by this majority, let us for a few moments consider their millionaire friends, for instance, Mr. Winant, Mr. Averill Harriman, or even President Roosevelt, not forgetting Mr. Benjamin Cohen, *et al.*, in the background. Why are they so anxious to vest all property in the State, at any rate in England, and to tax the private property owner out of existence?

Why, for instance was it freely stated in Washington in 1920 that a certain notorious witness was given £10,000

from New York to advocate the nationalisation of the coal industry; that the Railways, although ostensibly Company owned, are since 1920 entirely divorced from the control of their Shareholders; that Mr. Montagu Norman "welcomes" nationalisation; that the London School of Economics, founded by the Fabian Society but mainly endowed by Sir Ernest Cassel, is practically a manufactory for Bureaucratic Socialists with international financial doctrines; and much other evidence to the same effect?

However reluctantly, I feel that we must abandon any explanation of these phenomena which assumes, for instance, that Messrs. Winant, Harriman, and Hopkins (assisted by Mr. Benjamin Cohen) have come over here to commit financial suicide, or to sell all they have, and give to the poor. I feel almost certain that the "New Order" in Europe, and Great Britain in particular, like the Socialist Paradise in Russia, while it may impoverish and enslave millions, and destroy the culture and achievements of many centuries, will still leave Messrs. Harriman, Kuhn, Loeb, *et al.*, assisted by Mr. Benjamin Cohen, in a situation which they regard with complacency. That is, of course, if nothing goes wrong.

We have therefore to approach Socialism, in order to appreciate it as a policy, from a somewhat unfamiliar angle. What is it that is concealed in a doctrine whose first postulate is a protest against economic inequality, which makes it so attractive to a special group of international millionaires who are the outstanding beneficiaries and primary cause of the inequalities attacked?

Obviously, the answer to this most important question will be found, not in what Socialists have said, but in what Socialism has done. And the first step to understanding what Socialism has done, is to be clear in regard to what Socialism has *not* done, such as invent and develop railways, roads and bridges, motor cars, dynamos and aeroplanes. The activities of Socialists have been almost exclusively in the field of Law (assisted by Mr. Benjamin Cohen *et al.*), and the situation in which we find ourselves is only to be understood by considering the Socialist legal trend against a background of scientific advance for which Socialism can take no credit whatever, but for the use of which it is responsible to the extent that its legislation has affected such use.

(II)

It is, I think, important to keep in mind this fact that Socialism is simply a system of Legalism, because it is not a British product and all Legal Systems must be based on some particular conception of Society and must aim at realising or perpetuating that conception. Socialism is "German," in the same sense that the Rothschilds (*Red-shields*) are "German," or that the Reformation was "German," or that Kuhn, Loeb, or the Warburgs are "American." It is, and has been always, primarily a theory for export, and in the country of its nativity, has been, and is, kept severely in its place which is to crush independence. The hey-day of "German" Socialism was in the day of Bismarck, who said of it "We march separately, but we fight together."

The downfall of Russia in 1917 was consummated by the introduction, in a special train from Germany, of Lenin and Trotsky. Freemasonry, financial and moral corruption,

and Socialism, accompanied by a horde of petty bureaucrats, have brought about the downfall of France; and the strong tendency of the better elements of French society, in all classes, to Anglophobia is the result of the widespread conviction that the British Government is now merely the tool of the same Dark Forces.

The situation we have to consider, therefore, is simply this. Two quite distinct influences have been at work for at least two hundred years. On the one hand, we have had the material progress of the industrial arts, which, as most people know, has been easily sufficient, considered by itself, to raise every member of the British public, by the use of power, to a position of economic independence, while at the same time reducing the necessity for economic labour to a small fraction of that available. Almost contemporaneously with this, we have witnessed a systematic expansion of Legalism, of which Socialism is an increasing part, which ignores and in fact systematically attacks and distorts this situation. And the nett result is insecurity, more labour-hours, poverty, and war.

While it is probable that a majority of those who are interested understand how this situation has been brought about, it may be desirable to recall that the *physical* causes have been: Export of production, either unpaid for, inadequately paid for, or paid for in raw material only useful in the production of further material for export. The objective of this has been exchange manipulation. Grossly unbalanced production — too many machines, too few comforts. Sabotage: Artificial trade booms and slumps, with the breakup of plant and organisation.

Large-scale "Rackets" such as the Grid Electricity Scheme, which was an imitation of, and inspired from the same source as the Utilities racket in the U.S. Hundreds of millions of pounds worth of magnificent machinery and plant was consciously and unnecessarily broken up in connection with this scheme alone. All of these were rendered possible by subtle propaganda which treated money as wealth, and only employment paid for by money as being the production of wealth.

The *political* cause was the determination to maintain the monopoly of credit and to buttress that monopoly by Law. The most vital result of this was that purchasing-power was, and is, inadequate to buy the goods produced at the prices at which the price system requires that they should be sold, so that a majority of production has to be given away to an enemy, while the purchasing power involved in its production is used to make up the deficit in respect of the remainder. At the same time, the controlled Press hypnotises the public to demand universal employment. Of course, nothing could be more favourable to the temporary re-establishment of this system than the present holocaust of sabotage and free gifts to the enemy if the world is still foolish enough to agree.

We are now perhaps in a somewhat better position to proceed with our examination of the apparently contradictory attractions of Socialism, *if we realise that it is simply more Law, an extension of exactly the process which has stultified the process of the industrial arts. There is no more prospect of producing a tolerable state of Society by passing more Laws, and imposing more sanctions, than there is of repairing a motor car suffering from a choked*

carburettor by devising a fresh tax upon it. The world is suffering from a fantastic and unnecessary book of Regulations, every additional one of which, while apparently beneficial at the moment, exacerbates the disease.

There are thus two aspects of Socialism, attracting very different supporters. There is the aspect which attracts Messrs. Winant, Harriman, and their like, with Mr. Benjamin Cohen, the Incarnation of Law, joyously assisting. These people see in Socialism, quite correctly, a line of thought which can only lead to the concentration of power in their hands, power they are determined to maintain and extend, just as Stalin and Hitler have power which the Czar and the Kaiser never had. The aspect which attracts the rank and file of Socialists is in the main something much more subtle, I think.

Passing over the fairly obvious influence of the revenge complex on the part of the under-privileged (who have for the most part been kept in that position by the millionaire "Socialists" in order to be used as a disintegrating force) and the attraction offered by petty bureaucracy to lovers of power without responsibility, I believe that one definite delusion accounts for more Socialists than any other single cause. It is the delusion of the supremacy of the intellect, with the derivative that an order is the same thing as its execution.

Now, anyone with reasonably wide experience of life and affairs knows that the intellect has very definite limits. "The Professor" is recognised as a legitimate butt for mild humour, not so much on account of his knowledge, as for the lack of any ability to use it in his daily life.

We recognise that what is lacking, is something we call judgement, or (very misdescriptively) "common" sense, and that this faculty, so rare that when it is combined with intellect it can almost command its own price, is an ability to check constantly and almost automatically, theory and ideas, against experience. It is exactly the lack of this faculty which is conspicuous in Socialist circles, which by common consent draw their support largely from the influence of well-meaning elementary school-teachers. The modern State-controlled school is the perfect model of bureaucracy, designed primarily for control by the Government rather than for any genuinely educational objective. There is no standard of output, except *Si momentum requiris circumspice*. Once again, it is evidence of the magnificent material of the British people that a large and increasing proportion of these teachers are revolting against this tendency. But a good deal of harm has been done.

Now to this type of mind, the fact that you can multiply x by itself five times, for instance, and the result is called x^5 is not merely proof of a fifth dimension, it is ground for a political world of five dimensions. Or to put the matter another way, "the-Government" can order golf-club secretaries to grow asparagus in bunkers. Therefore asparagus will grow in bunkers. This confusion between Aristotelian and Baconian thinking is one of the most valuable tools of arch intrigue.

At this point, it may be desirable to dispel the idea, if it exists, that international financiers spend their time hatching out, e.g. Socialism.

To paraphrase a well known example from the theory of Chance and Probability, if ten monkeys tapped ten

typewriters long enough, they would be bound, eventually, to write Karl Marx's *Das Kapital*, as well as everything else, even if they didn't understand it. But that would not mean that it would be broadcast weekly with variations by the B.B.C., commented upon by the "Woof," sponsored by the "Daily Poursuivant," modified for use in schools and Churches by the London School of Economics, and hailed on the outbreak of war as the Blue Print of the New Order. It is control of *distribution* upon which international financiers rely to stultify *production*, either of goods or of ideas.

What happens is that a comprehensive watch is kept on proposals of every kind and from every source, which have the smallest bearing on major issues. As an instance of the rapidity and efficiency with which this intelligence service acts, I might perhaps cite the fact that in less than three weeks from the publication of what might be called the first article on the relation between Finance, Centralisation and World Hegemony, which appeared in the *English Review* in 1918, an important member of the Rothschild family had sounded an alarm in appropriate quarters about it. If a proposal is dangerous to financial and high political interests, the press is closed to it. On the other hand if it is an attack on any interest *other* than these, and particularly if it is buttressed by "moral" argument, it is subterraneously assisted, since the destruction of these interests does not mean that they cease to exist—it merely means that they are transferred to international Finance. It is hardly too much to say, at this time, that if a policy of social reform is not attacked in the Press, or refused reasonable publicity it is certain to contain, hidden in it, a conspiracy against the plain man. The torrent of abuse, misrepresentation, downright lying and calumny, which has been directed against Social Credit, more particularly in Canada and Australia, is probably the highest compliment to its potential effectiveness which could be offered by the world's mischief makers.

(III)

It is clear, I think, that it is exactly in the realm to which Socialism has contributed nothing, the realm of individual initiative, invention, and scientific discovery, that we have made our progress towards a leisure civilisation, security, and culture. And exactly in the realm in which Socialism operates exclusively, that of Law and the infringement upon the liberty of the individual, that the major and increasing frictions of Society occur, and the stultification of Science is accomplished. It is not the concern of Science to deal with Distribution. And with regard to Finance, which is the mechanism of Distribution, Socialists and the Financier have always been of like mind.

In this, we approach the answer to our original question — why does Socialism receive support from International Finance and specifically German-American-Jew Finance? That answer is that Law places the sanctions of the State behind the collection of taxes. Socialism with its slavish adulation of the State, aims continually at the transfer of Property to the State. This property then becomes available as security for State Loans created by the Financiers out of paper credits — i.e., the monetisation of the collective credit of the community concerned. The Bond-holders are exactly what their title would imply — they are the slave

(Continued on page 8)

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.

Welfare State, of which, at present, they are increasingly mere functions, there cannot be Social Credit, or freedom.

We cannot (at least in our more charitable moments) make out why it is that Social Crediters so often act as though they believed that Douglas's not infrequent hints concerning manners and behaviour refer exclusively to our opponents, or (if commendatory) exclusively to Social Crediters. Take, for example, the very last paragraph of *The Big Idea*—

"And the root of the matter is—mind your own business, and allow no man to make a business of minding you. Listen, in reason, to what advice seems to be backed by proper experience and ability, and pay no attention to windy idealism. And then—mind your own business. It is in sore need of your attention."

Surely, if that is sound advice at all (as we believe), it is just as good advice to 'the other fellow' as it is to you, and to you as it is to 'the other fellow'? Perhaps, like many other things, it is easy enough in theory, but difficult to practise. Douglas, by the bye, did not found the Social Credit Secretariat to mind other people's business but to mind his own. There were several negative indications, equally applicable, defining the nature of the business it was to mind. "We," he said—that is himself and the Secretariat (and the Secretariat's supporters)—"We are not Ishmaelites." (Who would believe it?) Again, "We are not reformists." And there were other definitions of what we are *not*. What are we?

That astonishing portent, M. Gustav Thibon, has a footnote to a short paragraph of his chapter, "Christianity and the Democratic Mystique" in his book *Back to Reality*, which is interesting in contrast to the moronic reactions of even the intelligent *non-voter* in this country whenever what we call "A Light Horse" is mentioned. It is this:

"This corruption of the religious sense is the only explanation of institutions so absurd as universal suffrage, in its present abstract and inorganic form. We have grown so used to the thing that we find it hard to measure its extravagance. It is obvious that political wisdom—quite as much as medicine, for instance, or philosophy—calls for personal qualities, long study and even longer experience; it is therefore accessible only to a tiny minority. Yet, unlike anything dreamed of for other branches of human knowledge, people act as though every man possessed it in perfection. My neighbour, a man of excellent sense, would be seriously offended if he were asked his opinion on the advantages of collapsing the lung in the treatment of advanced tuberculosis, but he takes it as a matter of course when electoral appeals consult him on the control of currencies or on whether alliance with the Soviet is opportune. How does this come about? How is it that the institution did not collapse at the outset under the weight of general ridicule? There is only one answer. Universal suffrage, however absurd it appears in principle and results, came to birth and remains in being because it corresponds to one of those secret necessities in the face of which logic is utterly power-

Looking Back

WE REPEAT OUR "WEEK TO WEEK" NOTES FOR MARCH 17, 1962

The following paragraphs originally appeared in these pages in 1955.

What was the original objective of what are now known as the Social Credit proposals? It is stated quite explicitly in Douglas's first book on the subject, *Economic Democracy*: to provide the conditions in which each man might pursue freely his own self-development. And if Christianity is anything but "a set of interesting opinions," those are the conditions necessary for Christian development.

By the beginning of this century, the physical basis of this essential freedom had developed sufficiently to make its wide distribution practicable; and the evolution of the Anglo-Saxon character and institutions, in particular, had developed in a direction on the whole favourable to a fresh flowering of human personality. The 1914-18 war was a devastating blow, but even so, the Social Credit proposals of 1920 had every chance of effecting an orientation towards a better world.

It is most probable that the application of the original proposals now would make a bad situation fatal. Two generations since then have been systematically mentally poisoned by propaganda and experience. There is no doubt that the 'man-on-the-street' now has an entirely different mentality and outlook from the man who returned from the war in 1918. The attitude to property, to work, to responsibility, to morality and to Nature has changed completely and disastrously.

Now while it is true that a bad economic system is making things worse day by day, and that a system at least arithmetically correct is a prerequisite of recovery, the vital necessity for the Social Credit Movement is to ally itself with and fortify whatever cultural forces exist from which a restoration of a genuine culture may germinate; or else to be such a cultural force. Mere technics will not save us.

At the present time, any Government, even a 'Social Credit' one, would be simply the manager of a managed economy; and *not* its director. What is necessary now cannot come from Government. Social Credit was designed for free Society; but we have the Welfare State. And until men, and their institutions, disengage themselves from the

less: it is the inevitable result of the religious sentiment degenerating into politics. It is in fact of the essence of religion that it can be taught by all and lived by all; every man is *a priori* 'capable of God,' none is excluded from the divine banquet. But now that the State has absorbed God, none is excluded from the political banquet! This caricature of a reply to the *universal* appeal of God is the basic cause of the appearance and survival of *universal* suffrage."

The Prince of this World

THE COMMENTS IN OUR EDITORIAL FOR AUGUST 4, 1962, REPRINTED HERE, ARE UNMISTAKABLY THOSE OF THE LATE DR. TUDOR JONES.

A Correspondent writes:

"On a number of occasions in his addresses and writings Douglas describes the conspiracy which threatens to subjugate the world as 'diabolical'. His use of this adjective is no accident.

"In the Protocols of Zion (III. 9) we read: 'When the hour strikes for our Sovereign Lord of all the World to be crowned, it is these same hands which will sweep away everything that might be a hindrance thereto.' It is therefore not without significance that Jesus Christ refers to the Lord or Prince of this World as the Devil, 'and in me he hath not anything.' (St. John XIV, 30).

"The authors of the Protocols also make it quite clear that their arch-enemy is the Papacy (XV. 3 and XVII. 3 and 4). In this connection it is interesting to quote from a private letter which Douglas wrote on 21st September 1946 and which has not previously been published: 'While I am not formally a member of the Church of Rome, I am coming to believe that it more clearly represents a Christian social order than any other. . . . Also for a long time I have felt that there is no organisation of which I have knowledge which has the experience and the influence to deal with the terrific and worsening world in which we find ourselves other than the Catholic Church. . . . The derivations of Social Credit ideas are largely inductive, but as always happens when inductive processes begin to form a pattern, one looks for a frame. I hope and believe that that frame has proved to be Christianity.'

"At the risk of labouring the point, it is also worth re-quoting from the last page of *The Elements of Social Credit* the remark once made to Douglas by a priest of one of the great Orders of the Church: 'You know, WE know that what men call the Sins of the world are not of much greater consequence than the pimples on a man's face. But behind all that there is a diabolical wickedness which will take you all your time, and us all our time to surmount.'

"If, as all the evidence strongly suggests, it is the Lord of this world and his servants whom we are fighting, then it is reasonable to suppose that our practical efforts to expose the devilment of which the world is a victim may be furthered by resorting to the 'Sword of the Spirit'. In other words we might with advantage try the additional weapon of private prayer. There is ample inductive evidence to indicate that the Lord of this World has an intense dislike and fear of it.

"This advice is offered entirely in the spirit that Douglas himself would have offered it. No-one need accept the advice: anyone is free to contract out. But no-one will lose anything by trying it. The simpler and more, fervent the prayer is, the more effective it will be."

Yes. It will be noticed that the sentences quoted by our correspondent from Douglas's letter of 1946 were, as always with Douglas, very carefully phrased. While four different substantives are used—'Church of Rome', 'Catholic Church', 'organisation', 'Christianity'—these are very far from being synonymous, and thus justify the attribution to them of functions not only different in themselves but capable of dissociation. Another point which should not pass unnoticed is the date of Douglas's letter. During the second World War, the pronouncements emanating from the Vatican, discretionary or *ex cathedra*, did indeed "deal with the terrific and worsening world in which we find ourselves."

Now, sixteen years after Douglas wrote his letter, that world is more capable of inspiring terror than it was even then, and is still 'worsening' almost hourly. It is a matter of opinion whether, in face of this predicament, the Church acts steadfastly more effectively or less effectually than it did. Its difficulty is evident—almost palpable—Caesar! God? Caesar? Which is which? What things are Caesar's? What things are God's? At every step which Caesar takes to claim Authority (which is a thing neither distributable nor destructible) the Church, embarrassed perhaps by an ambiguity latent in its own claims, seems to retreat instead of advancing. It was not the present Pope but, we believe, the last who complained that much that he said, and much that was important, either fell on deaf ears or was obliterated by other voices audible to his flock and thus never fell anywhere at all. A great and adored teacher of the writer of this note once told him: "It is useless to speak of advancing Truth in the abstract: what you need to do is to uncover Truth in the here and now, as it comes to your experience." Let the Sword of the Spirit be tempered and sharpened and made ". . . bright, broad, and trenchant; yea, and seven spans from hilt to point, O Lord!"*

The Individual and the Community

"If the exaggerated forms of exploitation which are now observed amongst us are studied with care, it will be seen that, almost without exception, they spring from community-given monopoly or privilege.

"They do not spring from the relation between individual and individual or from the institution of private property itself. They spring from the relation between the individual and the community. Those relations would be multiplied, not diminished, in a socialistic democracy.

"The Socialistic democracy assumes, and must assume for the success of its programme, a condition of individual perfection which the whole of history denies."

—Nicholas Murray Butler, 1907.

* William Morris: *Rapunzel*

Mechanisation of Work

The following letter appeared in the *Berwickshire and Berwick Advertiser*, March 1, 1984.

Sir, - The September 1982 single-topic issue of *Scientific-American* is devoted to the Mechanisation of Work, and under the heading 'Towards a Workless Economy' are listed innovations which have progressively displaced human labour as the principal factor of economic production; the steam engine; the steam turbine; the internal combustion engine; and now self-regulating machines and the computer and communications technologies which are displacing the human nervous system not only from production processes, but from service occupations as well.

Close attention to comment in the media confirms that the implications of these developments have yet to impinge upon thought and action in conventional political, financial and business circles, where, due to a flaw in universal cost accounting practice, the main preoccupation is the senseless and intensifying competitive struggle for home and export markets. Douglas R. Hofstadter, of the Department of Computer Sciences, Indiana University, a columnist in *Scientific-American*, quotes a passage from Dean E. Wooldridge's *Mechanical Man: The Physical Basis of Intelligent Life*, abbreviated below, which reveals the nature of this problem: "When the time comes for egg laying, the wasp *Sphex* builds a burrow and seeks a cricket which she stings to paralyse but not kill. She drags the cricket into the burrow, lays eggs alongside, closes the burrow, then flies away never to return. The eggs hatch, and the wasp grubs feed off the paralysed - wasp equivalent of deep frozen - cricket. Such an elaborately organised and seemingly purposeful routine conveys a convincing flavour of logic and thoughtfulness, until details are examined. For example, the wasp's routine is to bring the paralysed cricket to the threshold of the burrow, go inside to see that all is well, emerge, then drag the cricket in. If someone moves the cricket a few inches away while the wasp is inside, it will, on emerging, bring the cricket back to the threshold, but not inside, before repeating its prior inspection, which, in one experiment, it did forty times."

Hofstadter concedes that one might conclude that it was the experimenter, rather than the wasp, that was stuck-in-a-rut, but, humour aside, interprets this as a shocking revelation of the mechanical underpinning in a living creature of what looks like reflective behaviour. He dubs this thinking-in-a-rut of the wasp "sphexishness", and its opposite "antisphexishness". Consciousness he defines as the possession of antisphexishness to the highest possible degree. Our conscious mind should have the capacity to reflect upon itself and criticise its own performance. With this conclusion we agree. Of course, one requires leisure for such reflection, but creative leisure is the supreme benefit promised by the release of mental and physical energies from stultifying routine processes. To date that promise is frustrated, unfulfilled, mainly because governments - whether totalitarian or supposedly democratic - have, ignoring the aforementioned flaw in cost accounting practice, increasingly involved themselves in an activity foredoomed to failure, namely, 'managing' the economy! Attempting to sort out in the short term the resulting dislocation distracts attention from glorious long term potentialities. Hence the absurdities and contradictions with which parliamentarians - especially cabinet ministers - are beset.

On October 19, 1982 the Rt. Hon. Mrs Margaret Thatcher exhibited shocking prime ministerial examples of sphexishness in the House when pressed by the equally sphexish Leader of the Opposition on unemployment totals: "The best thing to get unemployment down, as the CBI said, is to be more competitive . . . there is no solution to unemployment without greater competitiveness . . . there is a deep world recession, and how we weather that recession will depend upon whether we stay competitive" as reported in *The Times* on October 20. But in the same issue Frances Williams, Economics Correspondent, quoting from the August Review of the National Institute of Economic and Social Research, drew attention to "the painful dilemma confronting governments in any attempt to improve performance, in that it was estimated that if Britain were to produce its economic output with a productivity performance equal to that of Germany, 7.5 million jobs would disappear tomorrow. If British workers produced the same output per head as their American counterparts, 9.5 million jobs would go." Which, however accurate the figures, emphasises a basic point which my associates have tried for sixty years - so far to no avail - to impress upon minds manacled by sphexishness; that the correct objective of an economic system is not to provide Full (wage-slavery) Employment, but to create - and make readily available to every individual - real wealth, with the minimum involvement of human labour!

Jack Hornsby

CHD Associates,
PO Box 4,
Duns,
Berwickshire.

The Jewish Technique of Subversion

In 1948 we published the following extract from a private letter written by a distinguished Arab leader. It is republished for the benefit of those who have not previously read it and as a reminder to those who have:-

"Logic is insufficient to predicate action. It is merely a method of combining pure assumption into a sequence of consequences and by its very nature it is incapable of supplying one with the assumption it uses, for human action requires the adoption of some premises before it can be effected. Therefore arbitrary conviction precedes the logical superstructure. The Catholics know this and that is the basic reason why the Jews hate them intensely and work incessantly for their downfall. The Protestants, on the other hand, are so hopelessly muddled by their inconsistent methods of trying to extract a moral code from logic that they have no strong conviction in any direction. For logic has nothing to do with morality—a criminal can be very logical.

"The Jews, aware of this, are enabled to discredit and corrupt all existing structures of religious, social and economic nature. They want this and effect it by exploiting every discontented group without shaking their own solidarity in the midst of anarchy, as happened in Russia. Small groups seek reforms of special interest and are divided into various sections; only the Jews are always agreed on what they want and that is control. Every one else wants to control for some purpose but they want merely control for its own sake, that is to say for *their* sake. This is the thing which appeared to the U.S. Jewry, composed mainly of

Russian Jewish immigration. Therefore they have become ardent purveyors of Communist philosophy, and hailed Marx as the Saviour of people everywhere.

"They themselves do not love Communism but rather use it, to serve their purpose. They would love any form of government enthusiastically if they were assured of control at the highest level.

"Every Jew was pro-British in the days when d'Israeli was Prime Minister but today they find the British are not so easy to control as they did the ignorant masses of Russia. This indicates their adherence to the principle of transvaluation, that is, striking at the most vulnerable point in human behaviour, that of sincerity, for instance: they pretend to champion the rights of Negroes, object to segregation and advocate mixed breeding, yet they seek a segregated and separate community in Palestine. They wait at being forced to live in a separate district of their own, and yet are rabid for the establishment of a ghetto-like state, where they can hoard without sharing the proceeds they extract from the people of the world. No day passes without presentation of some play, radio sketch or movie showing the "Great Jew," the "Suffering Jew," or the "Humane Jew" struggling for the betterment of all. Was virtue ever so loud? They affect concern over anti-Catholic prejudice, while spreading lies and prejudice against the very Church they fear because it is strong enough. In New York they purchased a monthly magazine, the *Protestant*, and they have financed it to malign and smear the Catholic Church. Currently they direct a smear campaign against all Muslims and Muslim nations everywhere for fear that Muslims will resist their infiltration. They cry out for freedom of speech in a voice so loud that it drowns out opposition and creates a steady foul wind, always blowing from one direction and never ceasing to permit an honest difference of opinion. That is why they love democracy next to Communism, because a democracy is a state without conviction, which can be pushed hither and thither, guided solely by the loudest voice. No wonder Europeans don't understand the American government; the Americans are not insane (and this may apply to the Canadians as well). They are merely unable to recognize the trouble into which they can be projected by this wailing minority voice, and the erratic and indecisive course followed by the democracies' government is a sign that the democracies have not been completely controlled.

"Democracy died with the industrial revolution and the dependence on centralized coal and steel deposits, and will not again be a feasible form of government until it is possible completely to decentralize industry, when each community will become self-sufficient. Communism insists upon freezing for ever the form of society to the age of steel and perpetuating a central control."

Judges of a Policy

"An Athenian citizen," said Pericles, "does not neglect the State because he takes care of his own household; and even those of us who are engaged in business have a very fair idea of politics. We regard a man who takes no interest in public affairs, not as a harmless, but as a useless character; and if few of us are originators, we are all sound judges of a policy."

—*Thucydides*, Jowett Translation.

A Book Review in 1962

Unless he is familiar with the sea and knows how to assess its powers and its mysteries, a man standing on a sea-shore is often quite unable to determine whether a tide is ebbing or flowing. With the catastrophic changes of the tremendous Present, no one can claim familiarity. The times are apocalyptic. Hundreds if not thousands of tons of 'print' vomit from the presses, purporting to deal with the ebb and flow of the tides of our history. What effect has this mass of printed matter on the minds of us all? Yes, all: Social Crediters admitted 'free of charge'! Much? Any? None?

One effect which it may be possible to identify is the prophylactic effect—or more correctly the immunisation effect. Exposures to small doses of the Truth establishes tolerance. Tolerance improves resistance. Truth is disarmed. The Englishman 'laughs it off'. In fact, of course, he has laughed it *on*, not *off*! The evil which Truth opposes is henceforth not banished but here to stay and be lived with.

These considerations occur to us after reading a book dedicated "To Guy Boas, Sir Jack Drummond and my Wife by all of whom I have been moulded." It is "affectionately" so dedicated—so we should think! To have been so moulded is something to write home about. The moulded is Magnus Pyke, and his book, published by John Murray at 18/- stg. net, is called *The Science Myth*. The wise counsellor who persuaded us to read it told us that "though popularly written it is important". It is. Well, does it banish or immunise? Honestly, we do not know. Dimly, we see signs,—"O Mighty Caesar", the spate of Orpingtons, the increasing uneasiness of even that preposterous sheet *The Times*, the comical antics of Her Majesty's 'Ministers'—of what? Reaction to inoculation? The 'healthy' reaction which promises 'immunity'? The 'venomous' bite of the Serpent of Truth? The mortal thrust of the Sword? No: we cannot say. Alas! But, read it, the book.

Greek to You?

"We are all in Bed together, but we can choose what we are going to do about it. Some may be a good fit: when Productivity says 'work', they work; when Consumption says 'buy', they buy; when The Radio says 'laugh' they laugh. These people do not want to be freed; once their stumps are healed they enjoy their sleep. Others may suffer themselves to be mutilated or compressed or deformed by the rattling busyness of the technological machinery.

"But for some, there may come the spirit of Theseus to give courage to resist. Theseus had as well the wit to see that Procrustes had a substantial treasure, which when distributed to the local inhabitants of the countryside could give them a better and more enjoyable life. No one of us may be a full-blown hero like Theseus, capable of killing the wicked Procrustes outright, but if we club together some of us may at least give him a fright and even wake up a few of the sleepers as well."

—Magnus Pyke, *The Science Myth*. John Murray, 1962.

"Wheresoever the Carcase Is..." (Continued from page 3)

holders of the "New Order."* Just enough of the Bonds are distributed to the Public to obscure the real nature of the transaction and to create a vested interest in the protection of the Financier.

Now, up to this point, it should be clear that there is really no room for discussion. There is not a single Socialist measure which has not involved increased taxation — taxation which is unnecessary but which increases the power of the Financier. At the date at which these words are written, the expenditure of the British Government has reached the colossal figure of £14,000,000 *per day*. No one in his senses believes that this sum is being raised, either by taxation or "saving." It is, as to its major part, a book-keeping device to transfer Public Credit to Financiers. When the war has gone on long enough to ensure that the necessary arrangements have been made under the plea of military necessity ("Only in time of war, or under threat of war, will the British Government engage in long range Planning," as Mr. Israel Sieff's P.E.P. journal remarked) the maximum amount of taxes, although not all that are "due" as interest on these paper loans, can be extracted from the individual, so that he can never become his own master. Since inability to pay all will be admitted, the interest will be scaled down. The genuine subscriber, as distinct from the creators of large credits, will thus in effect lose his money. And it should be remembered that these colossal credits are based on destruction not construction.

Such a situation requires the elimination of autonomous States. One centralised Police Force ("as easy as A.B.C.") will provide the Sanction for the Tax Collector. Herr Hitler is eliminating European States, the United States is eliminating the British Empire, Japan proclaims a "New Order" in Asia, and, through National Socialism, the New Deal, Communism, or funeral Reithism, Utopia arrives with the day on which Hitler (if you live in England) Churchill (if you live in Germany) or Mussolini, are "beaten". Stalin, Roosevelt, Taxes and Banks will accompany Mr. Benjamin Cohen, *et al.*, into the Dawn of the New Day.

Perhaps.

I have already suggested that an illusion has been systematically and consciously fostered both by the corrupt Press, and by political propaganda covertly paid for by international financiers; that the world's populations must maintain themselves by persistent and increasing "work" and competition for export markets; that this illusion can only be maintained by every kind of waste, and that the periodical wars which are a necessary agency of this waste are used to rivet fresh bonds, in every sense of the word, on the deluded public. But there are certain other aspects of the matter which are both significant and curious. One of these is the success with which Old Testament "religion" is used to recommend Socialist doctrines, in much the same way that Cromwell's illiterate and half-crazed bible-thumpers prepared the way for the victory of the City of

London Whigs, and their shadowy Continental backers, the re-admission of the Jews to England, the foundation of the Bank "of England," the loss of the American Colonies by taxation, and the black era of child-labour and unbridled industrialism which characterised the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. No one who has any familiarity with the subject can fail to recognise the revival of the same technique, modernised, in the Dispatches from Our Own Correspondent on Mount Sinai which are broadcast by the "British" Broadcasting Corporation before the more secular news which follows at 8 o'clock. The frenetic adjurations to "sacrifice," i.e. to pay more taxation ("which with proper psychological preparation can be greatly increased") which were a feature of Lord Stamp (of the Bank "of England")'s pre-war speeches, also bore the same suggestion that we hearken unto the Chosen Messenger of the Lord — invariably bringing bad news.

I am quite willing to accept any alternative explanation which fits the facts. But I find it difficult to understand the traitorous mismanagement of the affairs of this country for the last twenty years, in the face of the warning of 1914-1918, to go no further back, and the rewards and honour which has fallen to those who have been responsible, on any other assumption than that the situation in which we find ourselves to-day was consciously designed by much cleverer men than any of the well-known political shop-window ornaments who did their bidding. And further, that the arrangements to sell the British Empire required an organisation much older than twenty years, and included the sale, at one and the same time, of exactly those conceptions of individual liberty which, with some justice, we consider flourish best in these islands.

While, therefore, I have no doubt that Pan-Germanism, at the moment represented by Hitler, is the immediate enemy, and, as the result of the skilful planning of the real Enemy can only be crushed and must be crushed, as the outcome of a long and devastating war, I am equally confident that victory over Germany is only valuable if it is accompanied by victory over those who at one and the same time helped Germany to re-arm, and prevented Great Britain from re-arming until re-arming inevitably meant a long war. I mean that mysterious international Power which at one end of the scale crosses all frontiers, dictates every Budget, and imposes the policy which maintains its own strength, and at the other, uses its Socialist dupes to fortify those sanctions of the State which render revolt impossible.

The solution of the problem is not a light matter, and is more difficult with every day's delay. For my own part I am convinced that, having in view the devastation which these men have let loose for their own ends, no action is too drastic which renders them and their Organisations, incapable of further harm.

Once they are out of the way, with their powers of Bribery and Blackmail, there is plenty of goodwill and ability in the world to guide "the forces of nature to the service and well-being of Man."

* "Slavery will be abolished by the War. This we and our European friends are in favour of. For slavery is but the owning of Labour, and involves the care of the slave. The same result can be obtained by controlling the money." Circular issued to Bankers in the United States at the end of the American Civil War.

EXTRA COPIES of *The Social Creditor* are available (while stocks last) at the following prices posted:

8 page issues: 3 for £1.50; 5 for £2.50; 10 for £4.00.

4 page issues: 3 for £1.00; 5 for £1.50; 10 for £2.50.