

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 34. 26.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 5, 1957.

6d. Fortnightly.

Social Credit and Suez

I.

There has probably never been a world crisis about which opinion, both professional and public, has been so confused. Such a state of affairs strongly suggests either that there are insufficient facts on which to base a judgment; or that the facts, or some of them, are not what they appear to be. But what is unquestionably true is that in all the 'explanations' of the crisis which we have seen put forward in every type of journal, from the more responsible to the merely cranky, some of the available facts have been left out of account. And it is thanks to the late C. H. Douglas's mastery of those facts, and his patient elucidation of them, that Social Credit can contribute to a fuller understanding of the crisis.

Douglas pointed out that the series of crises which have afflicted mankind particularly in this century, despite the progress in the industrial arts, with its promise of life more abundant for all, is due either to the hopeless perversity of mankind, or is the outcome of a long-term policy. If the former, annihilation not only awaits us, but is to be preferred. If the latter, and if we can identify the policy, and those responsible for it, *and can deal with them*, we have a chance of survival and of a life more abundant.

What do we mean by a long-term policy? We mean action taken over a long period of years to bring about a certain state of affairs, postulated in advance. For example, some years after the rise of Hitler, it became evident that he was following a policy of making Germany supreme in Europe, and, as it later transpired, supreme in the world. Once this policy was appreciated and understood, it became evident that Hitler's policy must be actively opposed, or we would become slaves to Germany. But what was not so evident in, say, 1939, but has become clear since, is that Hitler took over an already existing policy. The world supremacy of Germany was the continuous policy of the Great German General Staff. It received a set-back in 1918, through the defeat of German arms; but the Great German General Staff retained its effective identity, in mufti, and carried on its long-term policy "by other means," as Clausewitz put it. Once the long-term continuity of this policy is grasped, the appearance of Hitler on the scene takes on a different significance. The 1939 war was not *primarily* due to Hitler, whatever he contributed to its timing and direction. There would have been someone; and, in retrospect, it appears probable that Hitler lost the military war which the Great German General Staff had decided on, and would probably have won had they not been interfered with by Hitler.

There are quite clear geographical reasons which explain why Germany, in the course of history, developed an aggressive policy. They are well expounded in Professor Derwent Whittlesey's *German Strategy of World Conquest*. This policy originally was a natural reaction to environment. But at least by the time of Frederick the Great it had become a conscious and deliberate policy of conquest, and the German State was just as deliberately organised with that end in view. Every aspect of life was subordinated to the policy of German conquest; and the military phases of that policy were, in Clausewitz's words, only "the continuation of policy by other means."

That, then, is a long-term policy: a project pursued over the course of many generations.

II.

Revolutionary Communism is another long-term policy. Marxian Communism as a definite movement dates from the Communist Manifesto; but its roots go back much further. While the German policy is primarily one of conquest, the Marxian policy is primarily one of subversion, based on the systematic exploitation of grievances, and the undermining of traditional government. By far the best account of Communist objectives and techniques is contained in Stalin's *Problems of Leninism*; and what is particularly germane to the present crisis is the technique of encouraging nationalist movements and promoting "anti-colonialism," with the objective of weakening the Great Powers, and of producing unsettled conditions. Like Frederick the Great, Stalin regarded diplomacy as nothing but a method of tricking his adversary; sincere diplomacy, he wrote, is no more possible than dry water, or wooden iron. This thoroughly perverted point of view permeates the whole of Communist theory. Communism has a single, clear, objective: a world Socialist State, policed by the Red Army and the secret police. Although this objective is quite clearly displayed in, for example, *Problems of Leninism*, Russian "diplomacy" has been remarkably successful in concealing it, just as Hitler's diplomacy concealed the reality of objectives laid down in *Mein Kampf*. The result, at present, is that Russia appears on the world stage as an aggressive Power, holding over mankind the threat of a third, "atomic," war.

This threat of war is an essential ingredient of Communist strategy. It places the burden of armament on Russia's 'adversaries' and so, in part, depresses the standard of living, makes traditional government more onerous, and increases the possibility of panics and disorders.

(Continued on page 3.)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:**
One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.
Offices—*Business and Editorial:* 11, GARFIELD STREET, BELFAST.
Telephone: Belfast 27810.

*Note: The above rates cover subscription to *Voice*, appearing fortnightly in alternate weeks with *The Social Crediter*.

From Week to Week

O, to be in England, now that petrol's dear.

The U.S.A. *appears* to be playing foreign policy on the village idiot theory. Basing our information on the report of the London *Times's* Correspondent, we have the following:

(1) "It is not so long ago that Mr. Dulles was giving the real reason for the withdrawal of the Aswan offer the belief that Colonel Nasser had become the tool of the Kremlin."

(2) The current belief is that Colonel Nasser is essentially anti-Communist. If given American aid, he "will strive to fill the vacuum left by the decline of British influence."

(3) President Eisenhower is now playing a major part in the direction of American foreign policy.

(4) President Eisenhower gives every appearance of holding himself *incommunicado* at the moment.

(5) "The President said . . . he would like to take a holiday as soon as circumstances permitted it. . . ."

From all this it is difficult to tell whether American foreign policy emanates from Mr. Dulles in bed in hospital, from Mr. Eisenhower, or from the Alsop brothers.

But we do not believe the village idiot theory, the fact of President Eisenhower notwithstanding. As Stalin put it, "good words are a mask for bad deeds" (*Problems of Leninism*); or Professor Toynbee—"What we deny with our lips we are doing with our hands." As Mr. Eisenhower is evidently the lips, it is not surprising that he feels in need of a holiday.

What the hands are doing is engineering an oil famine for Europe, and, more particularly for Great Britain. Our economic system having been completely subordinated to full employment, an oil famine means real famine. So now you see why we have exported the British, and imported the -??? ("The British are too stupid to make a revolution; therefore someone else must make it for them"—Karl Marx).

A power which is fore-sighted enough and powerful enough to control educational programmes to condition the young to grow up to be 'common' men is quite astute enough to condition—or brain-wash—the uncommon products of the native traditional system. Consult *The Times*.

WHOM THE GODS WISH TO DESTROY:
Kerensky; Mr. Gaitskell. (This list is anything from exhaustive.)

"The United States Committee, for the United Nations, has circulated across the American Continent a U.N.O. map for use on United Nations Day.

"Believe it or not, Britain isn't on the map at all. Where you might expect it to be there is just pale blue ocean."—John Gordon, *Sunday Express*, November 25, 1956.

Mr. Gordon treats this as a joke. We consider it of the gravest significance. Readers may remember the issue of British stamps in 1947, bearing Masonic symbols, as does the Great Seal of the U.S.

If ever the true history of our times comes to be written, an essential strand in the fantastic tale will be that of the subtle and successful attack on the Social Credit movement, with the tragic consequences we see.

Messrs. Owen & Co., of New Zealand couldn't learn from Major Douglas; they can't even learn from experience. Having brought further ignominy on the Movement, Mr. Owen says "We intend to go on." A traitor can be shot. But it has been said that even God is helpless before a fool.

Douglas and the British Tradition

Because of more urgent matters, Mr. Browning's essay will be concluded at a later date.

Social Credit Secretariat

In view of the gravity of the situation, *The Social Crediter* is resuming weekly publication. For this and other reasons, large funds are urgently required. British, and other European donations should be sent to the Secretary, Social Credit Secretariat, C/o Messrs. K.R.P. Publications, Ltd., Lincoln Chambers, 11, Garfield Street, Belfast, Northern Ireland.

Extra copies of *T.S.C.* will be printed, and will be available to subscribers on application for use in extending the influence of the journal.

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

"Whose Service is Perfect Freedom".....	5/-
The Brief for the Prosecution	8/6
Social Credit	3/6
The Big Idea	2/6
Programme for the Third World War	2/-
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-

(*Terms for quantities to bona fide
Social Crediters on application.)

FROM K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,

11, GARFIELD STREET, BELFAST, N. IRELAND.

(Please allow for postage when remitting.)

Russia's Ultimate Aims

The developing situation calls for the re-publication of our Editorial for February 10, 1945:

The Comte de St. Aulaire, from whose remarkable book, *Geneva versus Peace* we quoted recently, remarks "The League of Nations was conceived in Berlin. . . . We learn this fact from Von Bulow . . . it is at Berlin that the ring is completed, after traversing Washington, Paris, London, Budapest and Petrograd. The mutual affinities of its ancestry, plutocracy, revolution, Freemasonry and Pan-Germanism, are so close that it may be wondered if there is not, beneath them all, another identity."

In this, the gravest crisis of the world's history, it is essential to realise that the stakes which are being played for are so high that the players on one side, at least, care no more for the immolation of the peoples of a continent than for the death of a sparrow.

They have no nationality, no morals, no scruples and no regrets. The League of Nations was conceived in Berlin, yes. But it was proposed and pressed by Wilson, the representative of men who had fought (well, a little anyway) to defeat the country in which it was conceived. It is not accidental that a film, and we know who controls the films, has appeared at this time which presents Wilson as a giant among statesmen, instead of, as he was, a second-rate school-master completely dominated by Schiff, Strauss, House, Baruch and Brandeis.

To a world not distracted by rocket-bombs and Ministries of Fuel and Power, it would be uniformly obvious that a manipulated clamour is being raised in favour of the scum of the underworld in each country as it is "liberated." This scum has obtained arms in large quantities under the pretext of resistance to the Germans during the occupation. How much resistance was actually offered, we may, or may not, learn at a future date. We may, or may not, also learn the principles on which the arms of the resistance movements were distributed. But we already have sufficient experience of what happened in Greece, Belgium, and parts of France (always backed by a prepared clamour from the "British" Socialist Party) to be assured that a massacre of the Right has been prepared. The text-book is available to anyone who supposes that we are alarmists. It is written by Stalin, and its title is *Problems of Leninism*. In a valuable commentary which should be read by everyone, ("What are Russia's Ultimate Aims?" Price fourpence, 9, Hazlewood Road, Glasgow), Mr. H. W. Henderson remarks "No one acquainted with Communist tactics in Germany before the advent to power of Hitler, can fail to be impressed with the fact that unity between the Communist and Socialist Parties could have kept the Nazis out. This was however rendered impossible by the actions of the Communist Party, acting under instructions from Moscow." Now, the Russian Revolution, and its spate of murder, was financed from New York with the assistance of Germany by some of the richest men in the world. And these same men are those who have persistently opposed effective monetary reform with the obvious intention of retaining an army of discontent for use against the Right. That is to say, there is a working coalition between the scum of the underworld and the richest men in the world to murder those from whom alone redemption for the underworld can come, in order

that any threat to the power of the financier may be removed. The underworld will be dealt with just as easily as Stalin deals with any opposition, when the underworld has done its job.

SOCIAL CREDIT AND SUEZ—(continued from page 1.)

Yet, as events have repeatedly demonstrated, aggressive war is not Russia's intention. The function of the Red Army is to 'support' insurrections and revolutionary governments, thus acting under a facade of legality, whatever the concrete results are. It is a deadly and successful technique.

To the extent that a threat of war is taken as real, a country threatened must prepare for a successful war, or accept defeat. Under modern conditions, successful war means the subordination of society to that end—that is to say, totalitarian organisation. While the threat persists, so must the organisation, irrespective of changes of government; a permanent bureaucracy, charged with building and maintaining organisation, must be installed. This again furthers the Communist objective, because in the event of revolution, or if by 'democratic' processes a Communist party, or party favourable to Russia, comes to power, the central controls to make power over the population permanent are there ready to be seized.

III.

While, of course, many members of the Great German General Staff are simply highly trained and competent military officers, while others are part of the State bureaucracy, the planning section consists of what amount for practical purposes to monomaniacs. Their task is to prepare plans for world conquest, in all eventualities and anywhere in the world.

This preoccupation with the theoretical problems of world conquest gradually led to theories of the relations of peoples, resources, and geographical areas. In 1916 a Swedish political scientist, Rudolph Kjellen, coined the word "geo-politics," and systematised the sort of conceptions the Germans were dealing with (see *German Strategy of World Conquest*). These systematic ideas were taken up by the German Karl Haushofer, who developed the subject and propagandised it. Largely through this, the German nation became consciously imbued with the ideas which the Great German General Staff had been secretly promoting for generations.

But long before this popularisation and systemation of the ideas of geo-politics, the practical importance of the Eurasian land mass had become evident to the Great German General Staff, and some, including Nietzsche, foresaw the union of Russia and Germany—either by the conquest of one by the other, or through common interest.

The British geographer, Halford J. Mackinder, wrote in 1919: "West Europe, both insular and peninsular, must necessarily be opposed to whatever Power attempts to organise the resources of East Europe and the Heartland . . . German *Kultur*, and all that it means in the way of organisation, would have made that German domination a chastisement of scorpions as compared with the whip of Russia." (Quoted by Whittlesey, op. cit. p.67.)

But the fact of the matter is that there is now a fusion

of Eastern Europe, including 'Eastern' Germany, and 'Russia,' which controls the Heartland. And as 'Western' Germany is not much use at the moment to the Great German General Staff, it is all too probable that it has transferred its ambitions and abilities to Moscow. Hitler attacked Russia; but Stalin said "Hitlers come and Hitlers go; but the German people remain." If anyone thinks that Stalin's remark was meaningless, or mere propaganda; or that the Great German General Staff, with a continuity of hundreds of years, disappeared in the Nuremburg trials, he is in for an unpleasant surprise.

IV.

The technique of attaining world dominion whether by conquest or by subversion may be said to depend on two main principles—force, and make-believe. Force requires totalitarian organisation, and control of massive resources. Make-believe requires control of news and propaganda.

The information very much condensed in the preceding passages of this essay is widely and easily available. The real difficulty is that it is so much diluted by make-believe and opinion as to be lost to view. It is this that gives rise to what Douglas called "the episodic view of history." Events like the nationalisation of the Suez canal just happen, British and French reaction are just 'colonialism'; and the best that can be done is an improvised solution to avert World War III.

But are the events of the Suez canal crisis just episodes? Do they bear no relation to the long-term policies, on the one hand of German plans for world dominion through conquest, and on the other, of 'Russian' plans for world dominion through subversion? To answer this question, it is necessary to try to trace the continuity of these policies since the end of World War II.

We have not the full authenticated records of history to help us at this point; but there are numerous facts which can be related to the long-term policies under review.

First, as to what happened. "On May 8, 1945, when the war ended, Poland was in the grip of another alien dictator, and the balance of power was as dangerously distorted as it had been five years earlier, for Berlin, Prague, Vienna, as well as every capital in Eastern Europe, were again in the grip of a single power." (Chester Wilmot, *The Struggle for Europe*.)

Greece and Jugoslavia would have been included in this grip, but for the action of the British. And this action of the British was condemned by an obviously organised public opinion throughout the world, supported by the *London Times*.

Next, under the auspices of the (then) United Nations Organisation, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration was set up, with the ostensible objective of providing sustenance to devastated Europe, whose condition was aggravated by the fact that the main food producing areas of Europe were under Russian occupation. But Sir Frederick Morgan exposed the fact—and lost his position as a result—that the organisation of U.N.R.R.A. was being used as a cover for the exodus of Jews from Europe and Russia to Palestine.

During the war, America instituted Lend-Lease to the opponents of Germany—a device to circumvent Congress's prohibition of the supply of arms to belligerents except on a cash and carry basis—on which basis Great Britain had rapidly dissipated her own and her nationals' dollar resources. Quite naturally, Great Britain's enormous war effort made her dependent on Lend-Lease not only during the war, but for some time after, until industry could be re-converted to peace-time purposes. But long before such conversion could be made, Lend-Lease was suddenly, and without warning, terminated. This created a situation in which the negotiation of a dollar loan, on terms all details of which have not been revealed, was essential.

Following a campaign of terrorism, combined with virulent anti-British propaganda, in Palestine, the State of Israel was created and recognised by the U.N., following extraordinary behind-the-scenes manoeuvres.

For a period after the termination of hostilities in Europe, Russia remained our 'ally.' But then Mr. Churchill went to America, and at Fulton gave a speech which resounded throughout the world, in which he referred to the Iron Curtain across Europe, and after which Russia became world enemy No. 1. The Cold War, with all its atomic implications, began from that date.

We are back to the threat of war. As a direct consequence, we have the 'peace-loving' democracies being organised, individually and collectively, along the lines appropriate to war.

Despite the threat of war with Russia, the 'peace-loving' democracies do not constitute a solid front, as has become evident particularly since the Suez crisis.

It would, I think, be generally agreed that the only country able and, at least in appearance, likely to wage a world war, is Russia. It seems equally likely that America, or America and the British Empire, could make enough of a fight of it to deter Russia, if they were clear in their objective. To put it another way, a clear treaty between the U.S.A. and the British Empire that they would maintain sufficient forces to successfully oppose Russia; that they would oppose any military action anywhere; and that they would, when desired, assist in the settlement of disputes, would almost certainly suffice to maintain peace—more especially as the fundamental desire of the *peoples*, as opposed to Governments, of the earth is for peace. That is to say that if the U.S.A. and the British Empire acted as police forces, they would be more effective than the U.N. has proved to be.

(To be concluded.)

"Whose Service is Perfect Freedom"

by

C. H. Douglas.

Foreword by Tudor Jones.

5/- Post Free.

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