

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 51. No. 2.

SATURDAY, APRIL 17, 1971

1s. 3d. Fortnightly.

The Great Betrayal

By C. H. DOUGLAS

WE CONTINUE THE SURVEY WHICH ORIGINALLY APPEARED IN THESE PAGES IN 1948. EVENTS SINCE THEN, AND PARTICULARLY THOSE CURRENT, ADD EMPHASIS TO DOUGLAS'S SYNTHESIS:

(III)

There is really no room for doubt as to the nature and origin of the attack on the British Empire. It is fundamentally a cultural attack intended to eliminate or at least minimise the conception of human "quality" by substituting "equality"; and a recognition of this fact is the only key to a situation which is otherwise a mass of unrelated contradictions. It is an international attack, utilising national forces.

Attempts to define a culture are always unsatisfactory and inadequate, and the explanation of this can, I think, be found in its nature, which is four dimensional—it has an extension in Time, or it is not a culture. The ruling culture of the British Empire, and the feature which distinguishes it from many other contemporaries is tradition, *i.e.*, it is a true, not a spurious culture; and it is tradition more than any other factor, which the sponsors of dialectical materialism, Socialism, Marxism, and Communism attack. There is little doubt that behind all of these is a Power which is completely aware of the reality of extension in Time, and of the immense dangers to which humanity is exposed by "a break with tradition". It is perhaps unnecessary to add that an extension in Time is only *one dimension*, but it is a *fundamental of quality*. ("My Word shall not pass away.")

Perhaps as elementary an introduction to this subject, in the political sense, as any other, is afforded by Spain under General Franco.

Times being what they are, it may be necessary to insist that I have neither intention nor desire to apologise for General Franco, if he requires apology. What I do see quite clearly is that, with his associates, he defeated a primary attempt of Judaeo-Freemasonry, the Power which is using tradition to destroy tradition; that he stands as a protagonist, and a not unsuccessful protagonist, of the opposition to Judaeo-Masonic-Communism; that the culture of the British Empire, and its traditional basis, was a primary obstacle to the Masonic World Plan; and that, whether we like it or not, our natural ally in the present struggle is "Franco-Spain". And perhaps one of the greatest services rendered by the Canadian Royal Commission on Espionage was to uncover the existence of *e.g.*, *Englishmen*, "who placed loyalty to a (un-named) world Power above that which they owed to their own country"—a situation with which General Franco had to, and did, deal.

On April 17, 1948, the Washington (U.S.A.) *Times-Herald* published in a leader, portions of a correspondence which apparently passed between Sir Samuel Hoare, now Lord Templewood, then British Ambassador to Spain, and General Franco. So far as I am aware, this correspondence has not been published here. It may be noticed in passing that Lord Templewood belongs to a Quaker-Whig banking family, and that he was in Moscow at the time of the fall of the Czar.

On February 21, 1943, General Franco wrote to Sir Samuel Hoare:

"Our alarm at Russian advances is common not only to neutral nations, but also to all those people in Europe who have not yet lost their sensibilities and their realisation of the peril.

"Communism is an enormous menace to the whole world and now it is sustained by the victorious armies of a great country, all those not blind must wake up.

"If the war's course continues unaltered it is evident that the Russian army will penetrate deeply into German territory. If this comes to pass, would it not be of the greatest danger for the Continent and for England, a sovietized Germany which would furnish Russia her secrets and war constructions, her engineers and specialists, giving that country the opportunity of building a huge empire extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific coasts?

"We think the situation extremely serious and we appeal to the British people's good sense to consider the matter; for if Russia occupies Germany nothing and nobody will stop her.

"If Germany did not exist, we Europeans would have to invent it, and it is ridiculous to think she could be replaced by a confederation of Lithuanians, Poles, Czechs and Rumanians, who would rapidly convert to a confederation of Soviet states."

The test of science is prophecy.

Now listen to the sapience of the Quaker-Banker-Whig. He wrote:

"You say the greatest European danger is communism and that a Russian victory would mean the triumph of communism in European countries that would bring the destruction of European civilization and of Christian culture.

"Our point of view is, on the contrary, entirely different . . .

"The feasible situation at the end of the war will be thus: French, English and American armies will occupy the European continent. These armies will be supplied with the

best war weapons and would include fresh, first order troops, not wasted and tired as those of Russia's armies.

"I dare to bear prophecy that, at the moment, THE GREATEST MILITARY POWER IN EUROPE WILL WITHOUT DOUBT BE THAT OF GREAT BRITAIN . . . Consequently, British influence will be the greatest ever seen in Europe since the time of Napoleon's downfall.

"This influence will be supported by an enormous military power . . . with it we shall maintain full influence in all Europe and will help her reconstruction.

"So I accept no fear of afterwar Russian danger for Europe. Nor can I accept the idea that Russia will, at the end of the war, follow an anti-European policy of her own."

(IV)

Perhaps it is desirable, at this stage, to bring again into prominence the practical importance of recognising the world's ills as the result of a long-term policy. A skilful propaganda to the contrary has been linked with anti-Christianity. Reference to the subject has been made before, but, *e.g.*, the course of events in Alberta demonstrates that it will bear constant recall.

The first point on which to be clear is that if we are *not* faced with a long-term policy, our position is quite hopeless. If every step in the industrial arts merely confronts us with more devastating wars, more restrictions and controls, and, except in the United States, a lower standard of life, mankind is so hopelessly perverse that his only tolerable future lies in early annihilation, more especially in view of our decreasing (average) intelligence. But if we are facing a Satanic policy, our position, although very serious, is not necessarily irremediable. But we must first face the facts. No policy, no cure. Clear policy, clear problem. A problem clearly stated is half solved. The second aspect of this situation is equally indisputable. Policies *in vacuo* are a contradiction in terms. Policies embody strategies; you do not fight a strategy, you fight the human beings who are carrying out that strategy. "It's the system we're fighting not men" is one of those half-truths which are of the greatest assistance to the Enemy Generals.

Akin to this is the "anti-anti" or "anti-negative" propaganda. Without attaching too much importance to the fact that a double negative is a positive (*i.e.*, an anti-anti Jew or Russian is, by definition, a pro-Jew or Russian, not a neutral) it is fairly obvious that the main use of this technique is to stampe the innocent into disclosing their position, thus being put on the defensive. The best defence is attack. Do you propose to allow your enemy a monopoly of it?

This raises the question of (a) The inimical objective; (b) The Enemy troops.

For clarity and brevity it would be difficult to improve on St. Matthew 4:8-9: "And the devil taketh him up into an exceedingly high mountain, and sheweth him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them; And saith unto him: All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down, and worship me." This is an offer of World Dominion, on condition of the acceptance of collectivism—the worship of the group idea.

In these days we are fortunate in one thing, if in no more. We can actually see and read in our daily paper that the devil's offer has been accepted, and two attempts, the

League of Nations, and U.N.O. have been set up. By their fruits, ye shall know them.

Now as to the troops. As Mr. Jaques so clearly brought out in his speech, much, and probably the most important part of the organisation of the World State is financial and industrial—the control of credit and raw materials.

While it is difficult to deny the existence of such organisations as the International Chemical Trust, the World Bank and International Monetary Fund and similar world cartels, because they are visible to the eye and mentioned in the newspapers, their relation to the world state is not so visible and not so easily exposed. But if we grasp the fact that the essence of Communism, which is the politics of the World State, is centralised vesting of the planet in an organisation expropriating and cutting across all local and personal sovereignty, we cannot be much in error if we identify internationalists, open or concealed, with treason to the individual and his race and country. In an earlier part of the speech by Mr. Jaques to which reference has been made, he remarked, "The hon. Member for Macleod said, if I remember correctly, that there are just two kinds of people in the Civil Liberties Association (a Canadian "Red Front"), traitors and stooges, the dupes". *Caeteris paribus*, it appears to me to be true that any organisation which is working to transfer sovereignty from those who are associated under a national constitution, to those who have secretly concocted an international constitution by the misuse of national resources, whether those persons are working inside or outside the country, are enemies of, and traitors to, believers in the national conception. Their motives may be diverse and obscure; but when you see an enemy soldier, obviously working for your destruction, you do not investigate his motives, you shoot.

There are myriads of organisations which are working to destroy nationality (*not* Stateship) ranging from the highly "respectable" Royal Institute of International Affairs openly financed by cartels (Chatham House, whose secretary, Dr. Toynbee, said "we are working secretly, but with all our might, to undermine the sovereignty of our respective nations") to the hundreds of Communist shop-stewards in industry working like musk-rats to cripple and disrupt local control. And, it should be remembered—there is a lucrative career in it.

The "Canadian" Broadcasting Corporation is notoriously "Red", and the genealogy of its parent organisation, the "B".B.C., as well as its peculiar form of extra-national management and its link with the patent monopoly of the Marconi network, can best be viewed as the functionalised monopoly of information. The London School of Economics has linked internationalists (frequently, but not always, Jews) in key positions in Canada, Australia, and New Zealand.

So far as the population of these islands is concerned, the triumphs of the traitors has produced swift and spectacular results. Mr. Attlee's Administration claims that there are more persons gainfully employed (*i.e.*, being paid paper money) than ever before. Not only that, but they are (so it is said) more efficiently directed, using more power and better machines and methods than would have been deemed possible in the time.

To which I should myself comment that not ten *per cent*

of the population is really better off, by which I mean has more control over its material and spiritual destiny, than it had fifty years ago, and this includes the New Kommissary, and ninety *per cent* are not merely worse off, but their prospects are infinitely worse. That is where they have been brought by "traitors and stooges", in an era of unparalleled advancement in the industrial arts, directly and solely due to individual initiative.

If that were all, it would be serious enough. But the basic wealth of a nation is in its intangibles. It is faith which moves mountains, and the decline of faith is perhaps the most noticeable change in the general population. No-one believes in anything or anyone, any more. Let us eat, drink, and be merry in the Black Market, for tomorrow one more big racket will be put over on us. So far from the consumer being always right, he no longer has any rights, he merely has a few coupons. He doesn't give his orders to the shopkeeper, he gets what the "Co-operative" decides to let him have, of any quality or none, and if he doesn't like it, he mustn't throw it away—it's an "offence".

And if any explanation is required or given; it's the export drive. He is told to save, and his savings are taken off him by Government-stimulated rising prices, taxation, and down-right confiscation. He "buys" a house, and pays ten times what his grandfather did for the same house, and finds he hasn't bought it; it can be, and is, "requisitioned" at the instance of any obscure alien in a selected bureau. Until it is, and sometimes after, he pays in rates and taxes more than the original rent, for the privilege of "owning" it. If he murmurs, one of his conquerors tells him that "we" don't intend an Englishman's home to be his castle. In fact, "we" will see that it isn't. Why not emigrate? "We've plenty to replace you, and we are replacing you—you've served your turn".

(V)

"The intellectuals of the *goyim* will puff themselves up with their knowledges, and without any logical verification of them, will put into effect all the information available from science, which our *agentur* specialists have cunningly pieced together for the purpose of educating their minds in the direction we want. Do not suppose for a moment that these statements are empty words: think carefully of the successes we arranged for Darwinism, Marxism, Nietzscheism. To us Jews, at any rate, it should be plain to see what a disintegrating importance these directives have had upon the minds of the *goyim*."

"The intensification of armaments, the increase of police forces—are all essential for the completion of the aforementioned plans. What we have to get at is that there should be in all the States of the world, besides ourselves, only the masses of the proletariat, a few millionaires devoted to our interests, police and soldiers."—*Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, II. ii and iii, VII. i.

If there is one claim made by Socialists more confidently than that their *credo* is that of the "common good", it is that they are the torch-bearers of progress, and the champions of "science" against reaction—a word used to dispose comprehensively of any views not held by the London School of Economics. It is significant, therefore, that what is perhaps the most operative principle in the workings of natural forces on this plant—entropy—is never mentioned by them, and

is perhaps a conception which their minds dare not entertain, in view of its implications.

The rigid definition of entropy is "the quantity of heat in a closed system, divided by its *absolute* temperature" and this implies that it is a numerical expression which increases as energy loses availability, because, energy is only available for useful work where there is a fall of potential (a waterfall is the most obvious example). Consequently, if we are to introduce the analogy of physics into Socialism (and there is no intrinsic *social* science worthy of the name) we derive two ideas from entropy: (1) that, of the total amount of energy (initiative) in the world, it is only that which is above the average, is not standardised, which can be expected to produce results. (2) To the extent that Socialism tends to produce social equality, it increases social entropy. It is in fact the technique of social death.

So far as I am aware, there is no instance of an individual who has accomplished anything which is not routine, while retaining abiding belief in equality as a social principle. There are numbers of instances (Karl Marx or Mordecai is one) of schemers and revolutionaries who have used "equality" as a catchword with which to demoralise their enemies; but practically all of them, including Marx, have left on record their contempt for their dupes.

There is therefore an analogy if nothing more, between the principle of entropy in thermo-dynamics and the social forces (for want of a better term) tending to reduce humanity to a dead level in which nothing can be done—there is no difference of potential. If that state is attained, it would not be fanciful to characterise it as one in which social entropy was a maximum.

It is desirable to recognise that we are familiar with a certain type of repetition-analogy in what we call physical forces. The octave in musical sounds repeats from the lowest audible bass to the highest audible treble, and there is an octave in the light scale, the spectrum. While we have no proof, of the rigid nature which can be measured by instruments, as in the case of temperature-entropy, that a social dead-level exhibits the same kind of relation to a highly diversified civilisation that a stagnant pond does to Niagara Falls, there is much to suggest that it may be so.

Fortunately, the Socialist habit of giving to words a meaning which does not correspond to anything realisable, while it has a disruptive effect of serious importance, ensures its own exposure. "Equality" in action always raises the question of hierarchy in function. No one in possession of average intelligence supposes that one man could be at once a cricketer equal to Bradman, an engineer equal to Brunel, a mathematical physicist of the order of Eddington, and a General such as Lord Wavell. This being obvious, on what function do you equate him? And when you have decided on the inequality of his functional excellence, how do you deal with the inescapable hierarchy of function? Does anyone suppose that, on the one hand, only one man could build the Tower Bridge, or on the other, every engineer would be equally successful?

As Mr. Christopher Hollis, M.P., remarks in another connection, "Simply to say that we must get rid of privilege is to mistake a phrase for a solution" (a common socialist procedure). "Few of the valuable achievements of life are the achievements of a single generation; if this principle

were advanced as a principle of biology rather than of politics, it would be hailed as a progressive principle. But whether biological or political, whether progressive or reactionary, it is at any rate, a true principle".

If we realise that the outstanding necessity of our times and our culture is to minimise social entropy, to raise available individual potential (and not merely economic potential); and at the same time we observe that immensely influential agencies have financed propaganda and organisation on every plane of society directly and skilfully designed to produce the degradation (in the exact sense of the word) to which the British people are being subjected, only one conclusion is possible in regard to that situation. Every person involved is at the best a dupe of a national enemy; or otherwise is a traitor, and should be dealt with according to his merits.

(VI)

One of the reasons frequently and reasonably advanced against what is called the world plot theory is that it postulates a degree both of organisation and discipline which is out of all proportion to anything with which we are familiar on the necessary scale.

It would be possible to answer this objection on its own ground, because there are several aspects of religion, secret societies and commerce which are not too greatly disproportionate to such a task. But, in fact, it is highly probable that the proof does not lie along those lines, and that permeation and perversion, the product of education, observation, and patronage, is the technique mainly effective. A little elaboration of this theme may be useful.

If you want to catch mice, you don't specialise in canaries, you keep a cat. If long observation has convinced you that success in politics or industry is impossible unless a certain hierarchy of function is preserved, and you wish to destroy a rival, you don't, at least at first, order him to consult his office boy before making a major decision—you stimulate the formation of Trades' Unions, permeate the schools, take great care that words such as policy, administration and ownership are mixed up so that they can mean anything or nothing, and secure executives in the Trades' Unions who are both ambitious and technically ignorant. In fact, you hypnotise everyone into agreement that the office boy knows it all. If you can ensure that Trades' Union policy is based on the assumption that the object of life is full employment you have an almost omnipotent monopoly ready made. The leisure class is, you say, living on the worker, and consumption being a mere by-product of production, the consumer should be given less and less and the production process absorb more and more. You will almost automatically develop a state of affairs which requires supermen to run it. Then abolish all principles of law, morals or politics on some theory such as the divine right of majorities and the omnipotence of Parliament, and you may be confident that your Materialist State, which requires supermen to run it, will elect for that purpose demagogues ignorant of the elements of the problem with which they are required to deal. Quite naturally, they fail, and still more "sacrifices" are suggested. Quite a small organisation of conscious, trained traitors can bring about this situation. It takes time, and "wars or the threat of wars", but it can be done. It has been done in the British Isles, and the evidences of it are indisputable.

The defence against it is to expose the strategy, minimise the demand for labour, maximalise the availability of consumption goods, and break up every monopoly whether of goods or labour.

These policies are only possible inside the framework of a Constitution which has an organic relation to reality. For instance, if it is once established, as it is being established, that the primary object of the Constitution is to demolish the rights of the individual ("Parliament is supreme—it could, in its wisdom, decree that all blue-eyed babies be destroyed at birth") and so centralise them that they can be transferred out of the country and the nation, which is the exact opposite of the Constitution envisaged and re-inforced by Magna Carta, the measures I have just suggested lose all meaning. They would be the last method by which to establish the centralised world, which is neither organic nor realistic. It is mechanistic, static, and abstract. There seems to be small doubt that its primary agency has been, and still is, the Financial System which has been increasingly a conscious and lying aberration of a magnificent instrument for good. By its agency, Constitutions, Governments and Peoples have been corrupted. "Ye are of your Father, the devil. He was a liar from the beginning."

The plight of the British is not a consequence of the war, neither, in the true sense, does it originate in the so-called Labour Party. All the ingredients of defeat can be found, active and conscious, in the Baldwin-P.E.P. reign of the Armistice period. Their shop window is redressed—that is all.

(Concluded)

THE MONOPOLY OF CREDIT

By C. H. DOUGLAS

The standard literary instrument for the correct information of the public concerning the technical aspects of Social Credit.

70p (14/-)

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LTD., 245 CANN HALL ROAD,
LONDON E.11

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 45/-, Six months 22/6.

Offices—

Business: 245 Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone, London, E.11. Tel. 01-534 7395; Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1. Tel. 01-387 3893

IN AUSTRALIA—

Business: Box 2318V, G.P.O., Melbourne, Victoria 3001
Editorial: Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001 (Editorial Head Office)

THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Personnel—Chairman: Dr. B. W. Monahan, 4 Torres Street, Red Hill, Canberra, Australia 2603. Deputy Chairman: British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1. Telephone: 01-387 3893. Liaison Officer for Canada: Monsieur Louis Even, Maison Saint-Michel, Rougement, P.Q. General Deputy Chairman and Secretary: H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001.

Circular Press Limited, Colwyn Bay.