

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 66 No. 6

NOVEMBER — DECEMBER, 1987

CALLING IT CONSPIRACY

History reveals a pattern of revolution

There is nothing unusual about either secret societies or the lust for world dominion; both are as old as recorded history. Most secret societies have been political in nature; almost all were corrupt. This is not surprising, for secrecy means there is something to hide; otherwise there would be no need for it. Those seeking the destruction of properly constituted authority naturally gravitate toward secrecy.

To give an idea of the hundreds of societies that have existed over the centuries, the following are typical of those with outstanding political power and longevity; some lasted over a thousand years and are said to be still in existence: the Assassins of Persia, the Thugs and Stranglers of India, the Knights Templars of the Crusades, the Castrators of Russia, the Carbonari of Italy, the Avengers of Sicily, the Death League of Germany, the Holy Garduna of Spain, the Order of the Decided of Italy, the Holy Vehn of Westphalia, the Triad Society of China, the Illuminated Ones of Afghanistan, the Bavarian Illuminati, and the Freemasons of Europe.

Although differing widely in nationality, place, and time, these orders were strikingly similar in training, structure, and objective. Playing upon man's desire for power and wealth, love of mystery and sense of being select, the orders' mentors somehow discovered the use of certain procedures to condition other men's minds; the same procedures we now call "brainwashing". Their structure of circles within circles — with only those closest to the centre having knowledge of the order's true purposes — ensured impenetrable secrecy; their objective was personal power. A cardinal feature, of course, was that members lived an open life of virtue, a secret one of destruction.

The first society that concerns us is the Order of Freemasonry. It is thought that the term "freemason" originally meant English workers in stone who operated independently of the trade guilds during the 17th Century. It is not surprising that they got together in their own groups and in 1717 formed the first Grand Lodge of Masonry in London, with which the official history of Freemasonry begins. By 1720 a Lodge had sprung up in Paris, in 1727 one in Spain, one in Germany in 1730, until in short order Freemasonry established itself in almost every European country. This continental Freemasonry, however, differed from the English in that it was from the start subversive. In the Paris lodge, especially, the original ideas quickly underwent radical change and became atheistic and revolutionary, seeking the destruction of church and state. This was a natural development from the "Enlightenment" ideas already rampant in France, and it was also natural that Masonic secrecy should be seen as the perfect cover for their propagation. So virulent and threatening did Freemasonry become throughout the continent that in 1735 it was proscribed in Holland, in 1736 in Berne, in 1737 in France, and in 1738 Pope Clement XII issued his famous Bull of Excommunication, forbidding Catholics to belong to the

organisation. These proscriptions, however, were ineffective, and Freemasonry continued behind the scenes to lay the groundwork for the French Revolution.

Meanwhile, in 1748 Adam Weishaupt was born in Bavaria and from early childhood was indoctrinated with cynicism, atheism, and rebellion against every authority. He graduated from Ingolstadt University in 1768 and became a professor there; his brilliant sarcasm quickly made him a popular speaker with the students, to whom he preached his doctrines of anarchy, atheism, and vicious anti-clericalism. His most hated enemies were the Jesuits, precisely because they were the only ones sufficiently learned, astute, and organised to oppose his revolutionary ideas. At this time in France, too, the Jesuits were the only ones capable of checking the subversion of the Freemasons; it became imperative that the Society of Jesus be destroyed. Accordingly, using the principle of reversal, the Jesuits were accused by a conspiracy involving d'Alembert, Voltaire, and other Freemasons of being themselves the secret force behind the secret societies. This calumny was believed (it must be remembered that no one knew the identity of the Masons), and in 1773 the Pope ordered the Jesuits disbanded, thus removing the only force capable of resisting the conspirators.

In this way it happened that the post of professor of canon law at Ingolstadt University, always held by a Jesuit, became vacant; it was given to Adam Weishaupt. He could not have wished for a more congenial base for implementing the plan that apparently had been in his mind for some time. Accordingly, in 1776, at the age of 28, he founded the Order of the Bavarian Illuminati.

By 1778, Weishaupt, a man of extraordinary organisational ability, had founded 10 lodges in Bavaria with over 1,000 members composed of faculty, students, young nobles, and public officials. Now ready to implement his larger plan of international subversion, he conceived the idea of seizing control of continental Freemasonry and illuminating it into total subordination to the Order. With lodges established everywhere, Masonry could be used as the perfect "front".

The Nature of the Illuminati

It is instructive for present day sceptics to examine the training, structure, objectives and success of the Illuminati. It is possible to do so because many papers have been preserved and a remarkable book, *Proofs of a Conspiracy*, was written by a distinguished Scottish professor, John Robison, an English Mason who travelled widely on the continent in the latter half of the 18th century, had access to what was going on behind the scenes and in 1798 published his monumental exposé of the Illuminist plot to establish a New World Order ruled by a self-appointed elite. Beginning with France, this was to be accomplished by overturning all religion, every national government, and the established institutions of society. All civil, religious, and

(Continued on page 2)

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: One year £3; airmail £3.50; Australasia \$6.

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

—Editorial: 21 Hawkhead Crescent, Edinburgh, EH16 6LR.

—In Australia (Editorial, Subscriptions, Business and Books): Tidal Publications, 11 Robertson Road, North Curl Curl, N.S.W. 2099.

THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Personnel—Chairman: C. R. Preston, Meadow Cottages, Burndell Road, Yapton, Arundel, West Sussex, BN18 0HP, U.K. General Deputy Chairman: Dr Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, 2 Park Village East, London, NW1 7PX. Deputy Chairman, Australasia: H. A. Scouler, 11 Robertson Road, North Curl Curl, N.S.W. 2099.

social authority (“the tyranny of princes, nobles, and priests”) would be destroyed. In its place a “heaven on earth” would be created for all mankind. As Weishaupt put it:

The human race, without distinction of nation, race, or condition, will become one good and happy family. Our aim is to unite men from all nations and all religions, into One Universal Order, and this for the good of all mankind.

As with all collectivist movements, Illuminism must be seen as nothing more than a vast “con” game making cynical use of the impossible dream of an earthly utopia. This vision has been held out to mankind since the beginning of time and exerts an irresistible attraction on gullible minds. Pious declamations of brotherhood and love, benevolence and universal good were all stock in trade for the Illuminati. Adherents were seduced by exalted notions of creating nothing short of a new human race, naturally good, free from the “corruption” of legitimate authority. That Weishaupt himself was totally cynical is revealed in his personal letters as quoted by Robison:

I cannot but laugh when I think of the ready reception all this has met from the grave and learned divines. . . .

Weishaupt, as the supreme head of the Order, revealed how he directed it but remained unknown:

My circumstances necessitate that I should remain hidden from most of the members as long as I live. I am obliged to do everything through five or six persons. I have two immediately below me into whom I breathe my whole spirit, and each of these two has again two others, and so on. In this way I can set a thousand men in motion and on fire in the simplest manner . . . and impart orders and operate on politics. [Nesta Webster quoting Weishaupt in *Secret Societies and Subversive Movements*.]

Thus it is seen that total obedience to unknown superiors was a fundamental law of the Order. A ruthless technique was employed for obtaining this; today we call it sensitivity training. Great emphasis was put upon *self-revelation*. The novice was forced to reveal the most private and intimate things about himself; often these were compromising and were later used for blackmail and subtle terror. He was also

required to criticise fellow novices and endure criticism himself.

Bit by bit the novice became more deeply involved and committed to the Order. After being carefully prepared he was allowed to rise from the “pious frauds” (Weishaupt’s description) of the lower degrees. In his book, *Conspiracy Against God and Man*, Reverend Clarence Kelly explains the process:

Weishaupt sought out and enlisted potential members through his agents. The most successful and promising were drawn in and up to smaller and increasingly more powerful circles. This process, which involved moving through many degrees over a considerable period of time, was designed in such a way that there took place a gradual Illumination of the candidate. For example, in the outer circles atheism-pantheism and anarchism were not openly acknowledged to be the true doctrines of the Order. But with Illumination, not only were these secrets revealed but the candidate was increasingly conditioned to embrace them, so that eventually he would be able to acknowledge openly to himself that the destruction of organised religion and the ruthless control of all the governments of the world were the real goals of the Order, all the verbiage to the contrary notwithstanding.

If the member felt misgivings, he was reassured by the distinguished men who had taken over the direction of his life. When the full implication of the total revolutionary intent of the Order was finally understood, he was too deeply compromised to be able to turn back. Besides, why turn back when riches and power lay just ahead?

The French Revolution

We can but skim the surface of the incredible role of Illuminated Masonry in bringing about the horrendous crimes of the French Revolution; the instructive point is that it had the power to do so. The two classic works on the subject, written at the time of the Revolution but with the authors unknown to each other, came to the same conclusions concerning the criminal machinations of the society.

One of these books, by Professor John Robison of the University of Edinburgh, we have already mentioned. The other, the outstanding *Memoirs Illustrating the History of Jacobinism*, by the French Abbé Barruel, was widely translated and caused a great sensation in 1798. As Lord Acton put it in his *Essay on the French Revolution*:

The appalling thing is not the tumult but the design. Through all the fire and smoke we perceive the evidence of calculating organisation. The managers remain studiously concealed and masked, but there is no doubt about their presence from the first.

Taking the lead in the subversion of France were the lodges called Grand Orient. In 1789 there were over 1,000 such lodges, comprising a vast, intensely secret revolutionary network. There were lodges in 282 towns, 16 in Lyons alone, and 80 in Paris. Members were carefully instructed in the following techniques of infiltration and control formulated by Weishaupt:

The great strength of our Order lies in its concealment; let it never appear in any place in its own name, but always covered by another name, and another occupation.

There must not be a single purpose that may betray our aims against religion and the state. One must speak sometimes one way and sometimes another, so that, with respect to our true way of thinking, we may be impenetrable.

We must win the common people in every corner. This will be obtained chiefly by means of the schools.

We must bring our opinions into fashion by every art — spread them among the people by young writers. We must preach the warmest concern for humanity (human rights), and make people indifferent to all other relations.

We must acquire the direction of education, of church management, of the professional chair, and of the pulpit.

Could our Prefect fill the judicial positions of a state with our worthy members, he does all that man can do for the Order. It is better than to gain the Prince himself.

In like manner we must obtain influence in the military academics (this may be of mighty consequence), the printing houses, booksellers, shops, cathedral chapters, and in short in all offices which have any effect either in forming or in managing or in directing the mind of man.

We must take care that our writers be well puffed, and that the Reviewers do not depreciate them; therefore we must endeavour by every means to gain over the Reviewers and Journalists.

If a writer publishes anything that attracts notice, and is in itself just, but does not accord with our plan, we must endeavour to win him over, or decry him. [Rev. Clarence Kelley quoting Weishaupt in *Conspiracy Against God and Man*.]

The role of the infamous Philippe, Duc d'Orleans, a man of royal blood who longed to replace his cousin, Louis XVI, on the throne of France, now comes into focus. Illuminated by Mirabeau, he was the Grand Master of the Grand Orient Lodge of Paris and the chief financial "angel" of the Revolution. Mirabeau, Professor Robison tells us, "led him by his wicked ambition, and the expectation of obtaining that crown which they (the Freemasons) intended to break in pieces, that they might get the use of his immense fortune". After his great wealth was exhausted, in true Illuminati fashion he was guillotined in 1793.

Other prominent actors — Condorcet, Rochefoucauld, Babeuf, Marat, Robespierre — were office holders in the Grand Orient lodges; indeed, the famous Jacobin Club was simply one of these lodges. Mirabeau also initiated the illustrious Talleyrand, later one of the most odious traitors of the Church and excommunicated by the Pope. Thus the

tentacles of the conspirators penetrated everywhere; into Parliament, the army, the monasteries, schools, and the court itself. This web was controlled by an intricate organisation. The hundreds of lodges were each responsible to one of 38 directors, who reported to one of eight superintendents, who were directed by three agents, who took orders directly from Spartacus (Weishaupt's Illuminated name). Corresponding Committees were formed so that plans were transmitted throughout the nation. This explains, Robison tells us,

how the revolution took place almost in a moment in every part of France. Those duly initiated were ready everywhere at a call. The rapidity with which one opinion was declared in every corner, and that opinion as quickly changed, and the change announced everywhere, and the perfect conformity of the principles, and sameness of language, can hardly be explained in any other way.

With the slaughter of over a million victims of "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity", France was rendered prostrate, debased and perverted, her cathedrals desecrated and worship suppressed, many of her Catholic hierarchy openly professing atheism, her Constitution destroyed, her social fabric in tatters. The conspirators had set out to uproot and sweep away all religious faith and morals and break the bonds of civil authority. They were eminently successful.

There are many lessons in this extraordinary attempt to annihilate the past and re-create society in a New World Order. Called one of the most astonishing events in history, the French Revolution laid low the most powerful, prosperous, and advanced nation in Europe by treason and betrayal from within. Far from being a "spontaneous uprising" of the "oppressed masses", as the history books have it, a profoundly subversive group of power-mad men was able to work its will through the mechanisms of infiltration, disinformation, and control of key positions. As Alexis de Tocqueville says in *The Old Regime and the French Revolution*, revolutionary ideas "were put in the peasants' heads before they had thought of them themselves". Here is the ghastly example of how overweening ambition coupled with the most loathsome kind of mind conditioning can gradually suck men into committing monstrous acts at which they would have initially blanched. Criminal conspiracies can exist, have existed, and have been highly successful. Why should it be strange that one exists today?

— Jane H. Ingraham.

(Extracted from *The New American*, 17th August, 1987.)

TIME FOR A PUBLIC SECTOR CREDIT REQUIREMENT

November sees the publication of the Chancellor's Autumn Statement which details overall public (i.e. Government) expenditure for the next financial year. The planning totals for each year are always set for three years ahead, that for 1988/89 having been already set at £154.2 billions, and that for 1989/90 at £161.5 billions.

Prior to publication of the Autumn Statement, the Chief Secretary of the Treasury, with one or two senior ministers, presides over discussions with ministers in charge of the spending departments to determine their individual budgets — the "Star Chamber" procedure, so-called because of the grilling which ministers are said to undergo in defence of

their claims for appropriations. Since each department cherishes hopes of extra funds for programmes they regard as essential, inter-departmental conflicts not unnaturally develop over the allocation of the pre-determined total.

Where the money goes

The adjacent table summarises the growth in expenditure for the main spending departments between 1975 and 1985, the latest year for which complete figures have been published. Also shown for comparison over the same period are the totals for Public Sector Debt and Debt Interest, the Public Sector Borrowing Requirement, and Money Stock

MAIN FACTORS IN PUBLIC SECTOR SPENDING

Departmental budgets:	1975	1980	1985	(£ billions)
Education	7.0	10.6	16.7	
National Health Service	4.1	9.2	16.3	
Social Security	7.2	19.9	39.9	
Housing	4.5	6.1	4.4	
Defence	4.2	9.2	17.1	
DEBT INTEREST	4.1	10.8	17.5	
PUBLIC SECTOR BORROWING REQUIREMENT	7.9	10.0	10.2	
PUBLIC SECTOR DEBT	45.9	93.8	166.9	
MONEY STOCK (M3)	39.5	73.9	147.7	

Sources: Annual Abstract of Statistics, 1987 edition.
C.S.O. "Blue Book", 1987.

(M3). Except for the rise in Social Security costs, *the rate of growth of Debt Interest exceeds that of all other factors.* This reflects the rise in Public Sector Debt (which includes the National Debt) from £46 billions in 1975 to £167 billions in 1985.

Yet while other heads of expenditure are so rigorously scrutinised, the burden of Debt Interest appears never to be questioned, although it is glaringly obvious that the need to make provision for it must impinge heavily to the disadvantage of departmental budgets. At £17.5 billions (1985), *servicing Public Sector Debt cost the taxpayer more than Education, more than the National Health Service, and more than Defence, and syphoned off £1 from every £3 raised from taxes on income.* At the same time, each of these essential services are seriously underfunded. Schools are starved of necessary books and equipment, nurses are leaving the Health Service because of poor pay, and the Defence forces are overstretched to meet commitments and training requirements.

Then there are the further problems of regenerating the inner cities, of building urgently-needed houses for the homeless, and supporting the growing army of people below the official "poverty line". On the other side, the Chancellor feeds expectations of more tax cuts. So no wonder the pressure for economies in spending mounts. Already, the new Social Services minister, Mr John Moore, is envisaging saving some £4 billion. Meanwhile, Mrs Thatcher insists that the Government has no money but what it gets from taxes. But why is Debt Interest apparently so sacrosanct?

It is only when the sources of Public Debt are examined that the full absurdity and stupidity of the system comes clearly to light. Part of the Debt stems from genuine savings by individuals through their purchase of Government securities, either individually or through their pension funds and insurance companies. Money thus saved and lent to the Government does nothing to increase the total stock of money in the country (represented by M3 in official tables).

Where the debt is generated

But the great bulk of government borrowings comes not from such genuine savings, but from new money created expressly for the purpose by banking institutions. Thus the total stock of money is thereby increased. While not all new money is lent to the Government, the correlation between rising Public Debt and the growth in M3 over 10 years is clearly shown in the table. The crux of the matter is that the

creation of bank credits for loans to the Government costs the banks nothing but the bookkeeping involved in it, but repayment of such loans by the Government must be made at their face value. The matter is put beyond doubt by some authoritative quotations.

"Banks lend by creating credit. It is a mistake to suppose that bank credit is created to any important extent by the payment of money into the banks." *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, vol. 3, "Banking and Credit".

"Suppose for example that in a given week the government require £10,000,000 over and above the receipts from taxation and loans from the public. They apply for an advance from the Bank of England, which *by a book entry* places the amount required to Public Deposits in the same way as any other banker credits the account of a customer when he grants him temporary accommodation." Cunliffe Committee on Currency and Foreign Exchanges, 1918.

"It is sometimes said that the Government 'spend new money into existence', but before it can spend it, it has to be created. It is created by the banks by the simple process of taking up Treasury Bills or bonds, and crediting the Government account for the corresponding amount." *The Times*, 30th September, 1942.

"It is misleading to describe the banks' services in financing Government expenditure out of newly-created credit money as 'lending'. The word should not have been used in this connection as it creates a false picture of what really happens. As a result we have allowed private institutions to usurp the right to issue our money and to make very handsome profits thereby." [Economic Research Council's Research Report No. 9, "Government Debt and Credit Creation", 1981.*] Referring to this Report, a writer in *The Times* of 25th February, 1983, commented, "What happens here is that the banks are allowed to treat this newly-created credit as lending to the Government rather than money that has to be paid for. The result is that the state is not only deprived of the revenue it should derive from such credit creation; it is also obliged to pay the going rate of interest on the sums involved for ever and ever. Those sums, it should be emphasised, are far from small. The report calculated that, all told, the state has been deprived of some £30,000m. since 1945 as a result of allowing itself to be saddled with this absurdity.

"The obvious solution is to restore to the Government its historic privilege of issuing all forms of money, including credit. It should never have been surrendered."

It should be noted from the table that payments of Debt Interest have overtaken the Public Sector Borrowing Requirement (PSBR), which in 1985 was £10.2 billions. It is currently around £4 billions. Since 1980, it is obvious that all Government borrowing has been absorbed solely in paying interest on earlier loans, not on redeeming them, so the Government has been getting ever further into debt — the classic case of financial subjugation to money lenders.

The Just Alternative

When one considers all the urgent public needs which are crying out to be met while "unemployed" manpower and idle productive capacity remain unused "for lack of money", it is high time that this pernicious and self-perpetuating system of financing public expenditure be

*Price £1, from Economic Research Council, 1 Old Burlington Street, London, W1X 2AX.
(Continued on page 5, column 1)

A WORD TO THE SECRETARIES OF STATE

You, Minister, have no doubt been engaged recently in the annual round of talks with the Chief Secretary of the Treasury to determine your Department's appropriation of funds for 1988/89. You will have been faced with the standard arguments as to why your budget, and those for other departments, must be kept within strict bounds. Essentially, these are to restrain inflation, to avoid overheating the economy, and to keep within the pre-planned total for 1988/89 of £154.2 billion, a limit fixed with the laudable aim of steadily reducing the proportion of the National Income absorbed by Government spending.

But there is also a more compelling reason.

May I draw your attention to the fact that a major curb on all departmental budgets arises from the necessity, under present arrangements, for the Treasury to provide ever-increasing sums annually merely to service government debt? The adjacent table, extracted from official sources, demonstrates clearly that **the rate of growth of Debt Interest**

exceeds that of all spending departments except Social Security. Whereas in 1975, Debt Interest absorbed 4.85% of the National Income, by 1985 it required 6.64%. **At £17,526 million (in 1985) interest payments exceeded the entire departmental budgets for Education, for the National Health Service, and for Defence.** This reflects the growth in Public Sector Debt from £45,957 million in 1975 to £166,946 million in 1985.

But the true significance of these figures emerges only when the cardinal fact is grasped that the main source of government borrowings is not the savings of private investors but new money generated by the banks at virtually no cost to themselves. The quotations cited in the accompanying article clearly testify to this central truth. Hence also the rapid growth in money stock (M3) from £39,573 million in 1975 to £147,780 million in 1985. Furthermore, it will be obvious from the table that **Debt Interest alone now absorbs the entire Public Sector Borrowing Requirement**, so that the Government has already passed the point at which it has to continue to borrow money merely to pay the interest on previous loans. It is thereby getting ever more deeply into debt, as the figures demonstrate.

Continuation of this method of funding public spending must inevitably lead to ever-mounting debt and debt charges and consequently even tighter restrictions on departmental budgets. Hence postponement or cancellation of desirable departmental objectives, despite the facts that manpower and *matériel* to achieve them may be available, but rendered unusable solely for "lack of money".

What is the alternative?

The money at present advanced by the banks in exchange for their acquiring Government stock, at virtually no cost to themselves but at heavy cost to Government, represents drafts on the nation's Real Credit, that is, its ability to produce real wealth as goods and services to back the money so created. This money could and should be provided at no cost to Government (other than management charges), in other words, as a Public Sector Credit Requirement instead of a Public Sector Borrowing Requirement. Such a change would free billions of pounds annually, either for necessary Government expenditure or for reducing taxation, or of course for a combination of both.

These facts are incontestable and are well known to the Treasury. Are you prepared to use your authority and influence to effect such a change in government funding, to the benefit not only of your own Department's finances, but to the benefit of the British people as a whole?

Time for a Public Sector Credit Requirement

(Continued from page 4)

ended. To quote again from the Economic Research Council's Report, "As the banking system in creating this money is merely using the Nation's credit by liquifying it, the right of the banks to treat such created credits as a loan and to receive payment of interest thereon is unjustifiable. It is therefore submitted most strongly that they are not entitled to anything more than an agreed fee based on the extra work devolving upon them by the handling of these funds, in a manner similar to that in which the Bank of England is compensated for the management of the National Debt and the Fiduciary Issue."

That is the key to the situation.

The sole right to monetise the nation's Real Credit must be restored to the nation, not to the government of the day lest it be tempted to abuse it for party political purposes, but to a National Credit Authority as independent of government as the judiciary, which would be under compulsion by its constitution to relate credit creation to the realities of Gross Domestic Product and the National Income, thereby ensuring a stable currency without inflation.

Essential government spending could then be met from the Public Sector Credit Requirement, credits being advanced to the government of the day at no cost other than a management fee, and being based on the national capacity to produce the goods and services to validate such credits. Only then could a start be made on rolling back the Public Debt and the absurdly onerous burden of Debt Interest.

AN AGENCY OF CENTRALISATION

(Continued from the September-October number)

[This is the concluding part of "The Trilaterals under the Spotlight", translated by Gefforey A. Lawman from the original by Eric Branca, published in *Spectacle du Monde*. At this point the author is referring to the role of Jean Monnet, nicknamed "The Father of Europe", and his influence on post-war European politics. Editor, *The Social Crediter*.]

His friends were now occupying the highest posts of responsibility in the State. René Pleven, either as Minister for the Economy or for Defence or as Prime Minister, was

continuously in government from 1944 to 1954. Another, Pierre Pflimlin, held ministerial posts 15 times in the Fourth Republic, was fleetingly Prime Minister in 1958, and is now president of the European Assembly. And Felix Gaillard was Prime Minister in 1957. Together the four of them put the finishing touches to the Council of Europe, the European Coal and Steel Community and, in 1954, the still-born European Defence Community.

Jean Monnet was himself the first chairman of the Coal and Steel Community, assisted by Delouvrier and Berthoin.

Their goal was to construct an "integrated" Europe. In an attempt to link their own "totally rational" and material viewpoint with the need for reconciliation between nations so strongly felt in post-war Europe, Monnet and his American friends in the C.F.R. enlisted the help of such opinion-forming agencies as the Catholic Church then possessed, beginning with Pope Pius XII, who dreamed of a new "Strasbourg Oath"⁵ to be sworn by the German Konrad Adenauer, the Italian Alcide de Gasperi and the Frenchman Robert Schuman, the leading figures in western Christian Democracy.

During this period the "European movement" gave rise to a strange alliance between religion and banking, which had a strong influence on French political imagination, despite the latter's leaning toward Gallicanism. In 1951 the "Osservatore Romano", organ of the Holy See, advised the French against voting for General De Gaulle's R.P.F. party as being "anti-European".

His fingers burned by the collapse of the E.D.C., a failure which ran counter to all his plans (as Rivarol once said, "States are mysterious vessels with their anchors in the sky"), Monnet decided in 1956 to concentrate on building up his own "network" in France, and founded the Action Committee for a United States of Europe one of whose first members, Jean-Jacques Servan-Schreiber, described it as an "international force for federalism". Raymond Barre, Mitterand and Lecanuet all joined the committee during the 60s. In 1974, the year in which the "European Council of heads of State and Prime Ministers of the European community" was created, the "Inspirer", now 86, decided to put his Action Committee into deep-freeze. The time was now once again favourable to "world-wide projects": the Trilateral Commission founded by his disciples had seen the light of day a year earlier.

Its architect, David Rockefeller, had drawn on a list of 2,000 names, choosing from them rather more than 300, the real cream of the world of business and politics, representing in themselves 60 per cent of the world's economic power . . . "and even a little more", coldly admitted M. Berthoin.

The main novelty of the Trilateral compared with its predecessors the C.F.R. and the Bilderberg group is that it is the first international pressure-group set up since the war to treat Japan on the same footing as the United States. The leading figures of Toyota, Sony and Mitsubishi sit alongside those of Ford, Exxon and Coca-Cola. European firms such as Fiat, Schneider and Thomson are represented by their chairmen.

The Trilateral's objective of influencing the decisions of the various governments is facilitated by the presence among its members of a large number of influential political personalities. A good example is that of Otto Wolf van Amerongen, chairman of the powerful West German Chamber of Trade and Industry. A member of a family of industrialists involved since 1918 in trade with eastern Europe, it is he who in 1982 and 1983 personally organised the campaign unleashed against President Reagan for the crime, as the Trilateral sees it, of having decreed sanctions against the Soviet Union.

Of its 320 members, all co-opted, 140 are American, 105 European and 75 Japanese. Twenty of the European are French. Among these are Michel Albert, former Commissioner for Planning under Raymond Barre and

today chairman of the A.G.F., Marcel Boiteux, Paul Delouvrier's successor as head of the nationalised E.D.F. electricity board (the Paris offices of the Trilateral were housed in the E.D.F. building until 1982), Jean-Claud Casanova, professor at the Paris Institute of Political Studies and staff adviser to Barre during the latter's term as Prime Minister, Jean Deflassieux, head of the nationalised Credit Lyonnais bank, Thierry de Montbrial, chairman of the French Institute of International Relations (I.F.R.I.), Alain Gomez, chairman and managing director of the Thomson electrical giant, Didier Pineau-Valenciennes, president of the Schneider group. And, of course, Raymond Barre himself, who as its most prominent French member took the chair at the Commission's Paris meeting in October 1985. He has been a member of the Trilateral continuously since its inception (except during his terms as Prime Minister under Giscard d'Estaing between September, 1976 and May, 1981, this being a house rule of the Trilateral). He began his political career as a member of M. Lecanuet's campaign committee during the presidential election campaign of 1965. He then moved to Brussels as European Commissioner for Economic Affairs until he was suddenly brought back to Paris in January 1976 as Minister for Overseas Trade, to become Prime Minister nine months later.⁴

An even more meteoric rise was that of Jimmy Carter, elected President of the United States in 1976 through the direct intervention of the Trilateral.

When, on 12th December, 1974, the former peanut-farmer, Governor of Georgia, announced that he was running for the presidency, his path had been smoothed for him by the discreet backroom offices of Mr Brzezinski, whom he had met two years earlier in London with Mr Rockefeller at a meeting of the "Round Table" (an "outer circle" of the "Pilgrims' Society").

"My active participation in the Commission since 1973 was a splendid experience for me", Mr Carter declared in January 1977, thus setting the tone for the term of office he had just entered on.

The new President immediately called on the Trilateral, and 30 of its members found their way into the highest ranks of the Carter administration within a few months. Other American Trilateral members chosen by Carter included Andrew Young, U.S. ambassador to the United Nations and spokesman for the black community, Michael Blumenthal, treasury minister, Harold Brown, minister of Defence, Walter Mondale, Carter's Vice-President (who later contested a presidential election against Reagan), and Paul Warnke, the principal American arms-reduction negotiator.

For four years the Trilateral imposed its mark on the most memorable decisions of the Carter administration. The abandonment of Taiwan, to the sole advantage of People's

⁵ A reference to the treaty concluded in 842 between two of Charlemagne's grandsons to regulate the succession. The parallel with the "Common Market" is inexact, in that, although the Germanic and "French" sections of the Empire swore eternal friendship, their oath, taken at the expense of a third brother, confirmed the splitting of a hitherto unitary regime into three separate kingdoms — France, Germany and Lotharingia. (Translator's Note.)

⁶ U.K. and Irish Members listed include: Hugh Coveney, T.D.; Terence Higgins, M.P.; Michael O'Kennedy, T.D.; David Owen, M.P.; Sir Julian Ridsdale, M.P.; Peter Shore, M.P.; Sir Peter Tapsell, M.P. Former Members in Public Service: Garret Fitzgerald, Gemma Hussey, Irish Minister for Education.

China (visited by the Trilateral in 1979), the "writing-off" of the Shah of Iran, the conclusion of the Salt agreements, the transformation of white Rhodesia into a black-majority Zimbabwe, all these were inspired by what M. Barre recently described (in *Le Monde* of 31st May, 1985) as "organised wisdom on the international level".

The Trilateral's most recent objective (one which Georges Berthoin went to America last November to promote) is to persuade the U.S. Congress to sever diplomatic relations with the "racialist regime" in power in South Africa. "Nothing (Mr Brzezinski pontificated) would be more harmful than to set ourselves up as the last-ditch defenders of what remains of white supremacy in Africa. . . ." The recognised spokesman of this doctrine, Andrew Young, declared in April 1977 to the United Nations: "It is racialism which has always been my enemy, not Communism. Cuban intervention in Angola has helped in the restoration of order and stability."

Concurrently, relations with the east were developing along the lines worked out under President Gerald Ford by Helmut Sonnenfeldt, Kissinger's "Kremlinologist", closely connected with the West German pacifist parliamentarian Egon Bahr, a Social-democrat. In December, 1975 Mr Sonnenfeldt had addressed a meeting in London of American ambassadors to the European countries. There he had insisted on the necessity of the Soviet Union's retaining its hold over eastern Europe, so as to avoid "any risk of upsetting the balance" and to foster the consolidation of an "organic whole". Five months later the final agreement of the Helsinki Conference was signed.

By now the Trilateral enjoyed ample publicity in the United States (thanks in large part to President Reagan, whose denunciation of it had been a prominent feature of his presidential campaign), but it still maintained quite a low profile in western Europe. Its first mention in France came in 1975, with the publication of a report, co-signed by Michel Crozier, on "The governability of democracies". This text, drawn up on behalf of the Trilateral, outlined a project for a world-wide reform in communications by which governments "would have the right and the practical possibility of controlling information at source".

This programme, understandably, aroused misgivings across a wide spectrum of the Press, on the right and the left, and journalists began to take a closer interest in the exact role played by the Commission. It thus became clear that it was instrumental in organising the annual economic "summits" between the principal world industrial powers, and that the first of these, held at Rambouillet (just outside Paris) in November, 1975, had been worked out in advance down to the smallest detail by Raymond Barre, playing a key-role that has never since been denied.

Since he has been freed from ministerial duties, M. Barre has established even closer links with the Trilateral. Strengthened by the prestige he won by successfully negotiating the Siberian gas pipeline deal with the Soviets, he has not missed any important meeting of the Commission since 1981.

At Davos (Switzerland) in early 1984, at the annual international symposium of the Foundation for World Economy of which he had just been elected chairman for two years, the former Prime Minister had caused a shock-wave by a statement made to the newspaper *La Suisse*, in which he said: "The Iron Curtain no longer exists: eastern

Europe has been infected by our western life-style, and the agreement on American grain deliveries proves that the U.S.S.R. no longer wants war."

This declaration of belief he repeated word for word a year later at the next Davos Symposium. But this time he added a qualification designed to parry the "ignominious attacks" that had greeted his earlier remarks: "A responsible policy of openness to the east must coexist with the maintenance of Atlantic solidarity, which is necessary to our security."

But such a solidarity must not, in the view of M. Barre, be confused with "the old demons of anti-Sovietism", which he is only too ready to criticise in the person of M. Mitterand, since he considers that the latter's foreign policy "constitutes a step backward by comparison with the past".

On 3rd October, 1985, at a lunch given by the "Revue des Deux Mondes" on the very day when Mr Gorbachev arrived for an official visit to Paris, M. Barre declared: "France and the Soviet Union are two countries who are both interested in the maintenance of peace and who must develop their relations at governmental level." And then the former Prime Minister added: "It is a pity that such a visit (i.e. that of Mr Gorbachev) should be a novelty; it ought to be normal occurrence." He then went on to explain to his hosts the advisability of treating President Reagan's space defence project (the Strategic Defence Initiative) with some mistrust.

It was by setting such declarations of his long-term aims against, for example, the extreme coolness M. Barre showed when the Pershing missiles were being installed in Europe, that the historian Philippe Robrieux (an acknowledged expert on Communist affairs) was able to build up the material of his radio talk on "Europe 1" on 7th February last, during which he said: "The Russians want Raymond Barre as France's next President. The leaders of the Communist party, Georges Marchais and the Kremlin, hope that (present circumstances) will bring him to power, and that that will make possible the Finlandisation of the country." When asked to explain his words a few days later, Robrieux specified: "I have never accused anyone of being a Soviet mole. . . M. Barre has merely added his name to the long list of politicians who have made an incorrect analysis of the U.S.S.R. and its expansionism, and have taken decisions which have consequently proved disastrous."

— Eric Branca.

COMMUNIST OBJECTIVES

In the *Communist Manifesto*, Karl Marx listed 10 measures that would be required to socialise a country. He prefaced his list with this statement: "These measures will of course be different in different countries. Nevertheless, in the most advanced countries, the following will be pretty generally applicable."

1. Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.
2. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.
3. Abolition of all right of inheritance.
4. Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels.
5. Centralisation of credit in the hands of the State, by means of a national bank with State capital and an exclusive monopoly.
6. Centralisation of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the State.

7. Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the State, the bringing into cultivation of waste lands, and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan.
 8. Equal liability of all to labour. Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.
 9. Gradual abolition of the distinction between town and country by a more equitable distribution of population over the country.
 10. Free education for all children in public schools.
- (Extracted from *The New American*, 17th August, 1987.)

CHURCHILL ON CONSPIRACY

“From the days of Spartacus-Weishaupt (who founded the secret order of the Illuminati on 1st May, 1776) to those of Karl Marx, to those of Trotsky, (Russia), Bela Kun (Hungary), Rosa Luxembourg (Germany), and Emma Goldman (United States), this world wide conspiracy for the overthrow of civilisation and for the reconstitution of society on the basis of arrested development, of envious malevolence, and impossible equality, has been steadily growing. It played a definitely recognisable role in the tragedy of the French Revolution. It has been the main-spring of every subversive movement during the nineteenth century; and now at last this band of extraordinary personalities from the underworld of the great cities of Europe and America have gripped the Russian people by the hair of their heads, and have become practically the undisputed masters of that enormous empire.”

— Winston Churchill (1920).

(Extracted from *The New American*, 17th August, 1987.)

“SKULL AND BONES”

Recently there has become available in this country a series of short books by Antony C. Sutton, whose previous works included “National Suicide — Military Aid to the Soviet Union” and “Wall Street and the Rise of Hitler”. The titles of the first three volumes are “An Introduction to the Order”, “How the Order creates War and Revolution”, and “How the Order controls Education”. A fourth volume is called “The Secret Cult of the Order”.

What is The Order referred to? It is the product of a secret society at Yale University dating from 1833 called “Skull and Bones”. Each year since then (barring one) 15 of the students have been initiated after, apparently, having been specially chosen.

In the Preface to the first volume, the author writes “After 16 books and 25 years in basic research, I thought I had heard it all. The world was a confused mess, probably beyond understanding and certainly beyond salvation, and there was little I could do about it. Back in 1968, my “Western Technology and Soviet Economic Development” was published by the Hoover Institute at Stanford University. In three substantial volumes I detailed how the West had built the Soviet Union. However, the work generated a seemingly insoluble puzzle — **why** have we done this? **Why** did we build the Soviet Union while we also transferred technology to Hitler’s Germany? **Why** does Washington want to conceal these facts? **Why** have we

boosted Soviet military power? And simultaneously boosted our own?

In subsequent books, the Wall Street series, I added more questions — but no answers. I had more or less arrived at the conclusion that there was no rational answer that could be proven.

“Then a year or so ago I received an eight inch batch of documents — nothing less than the membership list of an American secret society. . . . This was no ordinary group. The names spelled Power with a capital P. As I probed each individual, a pattern emerged . . . and a formerly fuzzy world became crystal clear.

“The book you will read here is the first of a series. Each volume builds on the previous volume.

“These volumes explain **why** the West built the Soviets and Hitler, **why** we go to war, to lose; **why** Wall Street loves Marxists and Nazis; **why** the kids can’t read; **why** the Churches have become propaganda founts; **why** historical facts are suppressed; **why** politicians lie, and a hundred other whys.

“This series is infinitely more important than the original Western Technology series on technical transfers. If I have a *magnum opus*, this is it.”

(30th July, 1983, Phoenix, Arizona.)

These volumes deserve close study. They are available from Heron Books, P.O. Box 29, Sudbury, Suffolk, CO10 6EF.

THE CRASH OF '87

The collapse of the world’s stock markets over five days from 19th October caused large falls in share values ranging from 31% in Singapore, 29% in Australia and 22% in the U.K. to 10% in Germany and 5% in France. Such losses exceeded those of the Wall Street crash of 1929, with which commentators were comparing the situation. We reproduce some such comments extracted from *The Sunday Times*, 25th October, 1987.

“Wall Street Goes Mad.” — *New York Post* headline, 3 p.m. edition.

“It was genuine, historic, worldwide financial panic.” — Hugh Johnson, senior vice-president of First Albany Corp.

“It was the worst market I have ever seen . . . and as close to financial meltdown as I ever want to see.” — John Phelan, chairman of the New York Stock Exchange.

“Everyone is a little puzzled. There is nothing wrong with the economy.” — President Reagan.

“After the 1929 crash, the universal phrase was: ‘The economy is fundamentally sound.’ Expect to hear that out of Washington over the next few days.” — John Kenneth Galbraith, Harvard Professor.

“The economy is strong and fundamentally sound.” — President Reagan.

“Those who rush to assure us that the underlying situation is fundamentally sound are, like their forebears 58 years ago, deluding themselves and others. The underlying situation is structurally faulty.” — Brian Reading, *Sunday Times* writer and finally, Sam Walton, owner of a chain of discount stores and reputedly the richest man in America, took his £300m. loss on the chin. “It’s paper anyway,” he said. “It was paper when we started and it’s paper afterwards.”