

THE SOCIAL CREDITOR

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol.61 No.4

JULY–AUGUST, 1982

Programme for the Third World War

By C.H. DOUGLAS

THIS TREATISE, HERE CONTINUED, WHICH FIRST APPEARED SERIALLY IN THESE PAGES BETWEEN APRIL AND AUGUST, 1943, AND LATER IN BOOKLET FORM WILL NOT BE FAMILIAR TO MANY OF OUR PRESENT READERS. FOR OTHERS A RE-READING SHOULD PROVE ENLIGHTENING.

XIV

Let us try to draw the threads of the long story (a story which, to be understood, must be considered over periods involving thousands of years) into a tapestry.

A Chosen People is a collectivity bound together by a myth, and the less intelligent the individual the more likely he is to be the slave of a myth. The Jews, for instance, are not in the main intelligent. No body of individuals which was intelligent would have repeated its mistakes as the Jews have repeated, and are repeating theirs. An in-bred race is peculiarly susceptible to hypnotism, *i.e.*, domination by a myth.

The relation of an individual to a myth is important, and is well illustrated by Hans Andersen's charming little fable of the King who had no clothes on. The conventions and laws which grow up round, and buttress, a myth may persist, in the manner in which the sanctions of the money myth persist, but they are in mortal danger when a child sees through them, and says so. "Nothing is so dangerous as initiative."

If we substitute the word "ruling" for "chosen," and realise that various peoples, including our own, have presented a facade of being the "ruling" race for just so long as they have been the passive tools of the money power, it is not difficult to see that, once the myth gets out of hand, wars and yet more wars are inevitable. After draining and pillaging one country after another, the international money power, the wandering Jew, has in the past left bemused or subsidised historians to explain that, like the rise and fall of the Roman Empire (almost completely a monetary phenomenon due to "silver inflation"), all nations have their day, and that prosperity is bad for them. Several children have seen through this story, with the result that old contestants for the limelight are unwilling to retire into the wings and a virtuous poverty. We have only to compare the remark of General Ludendorff, which I have quoted elsewhere, that "The majority of the English do not realise that, having done their duty by the inner Jewish circle, they have now got to disappear as a world Power" (*—The Coming War*, 1931) with that of Mr. Winston Churchill, which has been so coldly received in America, "I did not become His Majesty's First Minister to preside over the dissolution of the British Empire," to see that the meek acceptance of the decrees of fate is somewhat marred by the realisation that fate is a lady of easy virtue, always to be found and acquired where the pickings are good.

There is a technique well known to politicians, lawyers and jugglers which consists in emphasising the unimportant while you slip in the essential. It is much in evidence just now. If you can get up a furious debate as to whether income tax shall be 10/- or 15/- after the war, you stand a fair chance of drowning the small, but rapidly increasing, number of people who say that taxation is robbery. If you can become really excited about whether the unit of world currency shall be called a bancor or a unitas (United States) or a shekel, you will be less likely to enquire whether the creation of the means of payment out of nothing has been so striking a success when administered more or less locally that the immense urgency of removing this myth incarnate to a point in space where its administrators will be even more shrouded in mystery, and immune from the consequences of financing Hitler's successor, is sufficiently demonstrated, except to the Chosen. And you may, once again, be driven to wonder why it is that, if an individual finds that a device does not work satisfactorily, he modifies it before extending its use, but if a Government finds a device is demonstrably defective, it connives at its enthronement as a world principle.

Precisely at this point the contribution of the province of Alberta to world history and genuine progress can be seen. Mr. Aberhart's Government has demonstrated, by forcing the nominees of the Money Power to disallow his legislation, that "economic determinism" is a mechanism of political intention. The Money Power does not, and never did wish to improve the money system—its consequences in war, sabotage and social friction are exactly what is desired. This, I think, exactly defines the task which society must face and solve, or perish. *First*, to attack and defeat the Money Power; *then* consider the reorganisation of the money system.

All these things, and many more, have convinced me that one of the fundamentals of genuine Christianity is that the only true focus of power is the individual, which is simply a matter-of-fact method of affirming the Immanence of God over the Monotheistic Jehovah. The conscious man is not born to be ruled, neither is he born to rule over other people. Jesus said so, and the Jews crucified Him. They could do no other.

I believe we shall be taking the most generally accurate view of history for at least the past two thousand years if we view it as a conscious attempt on the one side, and an unconscious reaction on the other side, to and from the separation of the individual and his natural attributes, and to vest

them in organisations controlled by power maniacs. If you prefer to say that it is a struggle to separate man from God, to replace the immanence of God (*i.e.*, power over events) by the Omnipotent Jehovah (*i.e.*, subservience to events), I shall not quarrel with your choice of words, although it is the practical use you can make of them which matters.

I have spent some of my life on, or beyond, the fringes of "civilisation," where men carried guns, and used them without hesitation. The social atmosphere of those districts was much better than that of policed areas. It is not in the wilds that the scum of the earth rises; it is in the towns.

The denial of the right of the individual to carry arms is a fundamental infringement of liberty. Just as the boot-legger was the most enthusiastic supporter of prohibition, the gangster, both national and international, is a convinced adherent of disarmament by law. He knows what to do about the law, and what every policeman wants. And when, the smaller gangsters having disarmed the individual, the larger gangsters disarm the smaller gangsters, then, of course, the gangsters who are left will be transformed into ministering angels, and their international police will spend all their time helping international nursemaids to cross the international traffic. Anyone can see that.

XV

Through the courtesy of a correspondent, I have received an extract from an article by Mr. Harold Laski which was published in *The New Statesman* of June 5, 1943.

So far as my mental digestion will permit, I endeavour to read the views of people with whom I disagree. But my position in regard to the weekly journal in question is that of the deaf old lady whose nephew wished to introduce his friend Schnozzlewitt to her. After many efforts, with and without her trumpet, the old lady said sadly, "It's no good, Johnny; I'm getting deafer every day. It just sounds like Schnozzlewitt to me."

I gather that the article is entitled "1848 and Ourselves" and the extract I have received is as follows:—

"... The main issue the Left has to decide is when it will co-ordinate its forces for the victory that is its historic right. It can build forthwith a full understanding with the leaders of the Soviet Union and its people; in that event it gives to the revolution a creative power against which the forces of reaction will hurl themselves in vain. Or it can wait to make its treaty of friendship until the gangsters of Berlin, Rome and Tokyo are finally overwhelmed. In that event the Left accepts the risk of losing the favourable moment and giving its enemies the chance of consolidating their strength anew. ... If in the light of an experience so massive" (that is, from the 1848 revolutions, the reasons for the failure of which Laski had explained) "our leaders do not act while there is still time, we can be sure only of two things; there will be a third world war in our own generation, and the Left will find new leaders more apt to its opportunity. ... This is the one moment in time when Man the Rebel could become Man the Creator. To let that moment pass unused is a betrayal that will never be forgiven by posterity."

For the reason I have indicated, I am unable to state what further pearls of wisdom Professor Laski has embodied on this occasion, but both the title and the quotation are perhaps worth attention, not so much as news, but as exhibits.

Until recently, most Jews have repudiated any historic

continuity in revolution, and any specific relationship between Jews, as such, and the French, German, and Russian Revolutions. Professor Laski appears to have discarded this attitude. "The Left" has an "historic right" to "victory." "It" can do thus and such, "concluding arrangements with Foreign Powers," and the result will be this and that. We have the familiar suggestion of an intangible collectivity which will have its way "in war, or under threat of war."

To understand how it is possible for a Professor of Political Economy in an English University to write in the style of a Hyde Park ranter, it is, I think, necessary to realise his background and its implications.

Professor Laski is a Manchester Jew, I should imagine of the third generation, although of this I am not sure. Three generations would take us back to the revolutions of 1848 to which he refers, and it is probable that the arrival in this country of his progenitors was not unconnected with the failure he laments.

Now, Manchester has a very important place in English, and indeed world, history. At the beginning of the nineteenth century it was the focus of probably the largest body of rich and for this reason powerful Jews not merely in Great Britain, but anywhere outside Holland and Germany. It was also, whether by coincidence or not, the focus both of the industrial revolution, the factory or Gentile Ghetto, and of labour rioting, of which Peterloo is the best remembered incident. While its slums, as Mr. Austin Hopkinson has pointed out, were perhaps the worst in the country, its better suburbs, such as Cheetham Hill and the nearby fringe of Cheshire, were dominated by mansions amongst the owners of which it was difficult to find an English name, and easier to be understood in German or Yiddish than in the local tongue. Contemporaneously, the "Manchester School" (Free Trade, Ricardian Economics, the Iron Law of Wages, *etc.*) dominated English politics, and Sir Robert Peel, himself a manufacturer, on the one hand sponsored the repeal of the Corn Laws, thus inaugurating the decay of British agriculture, and on the other introduced for the first time in these islands, the police system.

In 1844 the Bank Charter Act centralised credit in the Bank of "England" (even at that date it is impossible to identify the ownership of it) and based credit on gold, the main holders of gold being, of course, the Rothschilds, with their bullion brokers, the Samuels. The similarity between the strategy of the Bank Charter Act of 1844 in relation to the wave of revolution in 1848, and the Bank Notes and Currency Act of 1928 in relation to the "economic blizzard" of 1929, is too obvious to require more than mention.

Meanwhile, the physical aspect of the Manchester district, from the slopes of Lyme on the South, on which the fallow deer had grazed for a thousand years, to "proud Preston" fifty miles North, was transformed from a region of outstanding beauty and agricultural fertility to a desolation of black coal refuse, foetid streams, and ugly, endless rows of gloomy tenements, miscalled cottages. No war ever devastated a smiling countryside so thoroughly and for so long as the textile industries and their ancillary trades devastated south Lancashire. The spinning jenny and the power loom are the original mould of mass production (production with the soul taken out of it) and for some reason which is difficult to explain, the Jew has always been attracted to the finance of mass production, especially of clothes and clothing materials.

The internal effect of this was to drive the agricultural

population into the towns, to shift the political balance of power to the manufacturer-exporter (thus elevating the Bill of Exchange to the position of a major political weapon) and to re-orientate completely the economic policy of the country from autarky to mercantilism. Most of the great fortunes amassed in Manchester in the nineteenth century, apart from purely financial manipulation, were "made" in dark little offices employing half a dozen clerks at starvation wages, by German and other Jews who never even saw the materials, other than as "samples," in which they were dealing, and whose function was to separate the maker and the user.

Against this state of affairs there was, in essence, only one defence—the Tory Party.

Under a facade of what is now called Tory democracy, men such as Lord George Bentinck paved the way to the long leadership of Benjamin Disraeli. It is sufficient to say that the Tory Party not only failed to secure a revival of agriculture but succeeded in establishing itself firmly in the minds of the general public as the party of reaction, high taxes, dear food, and war.

It would take us too far from Professor Laski to trace the influence of "Manchester" on the amazing Crimean War against Imperial Russia—the beginning of the attack which terminated in the murders of the Bolshevik Revolution—, on the American Civil War and its relation to Egypt, and on every major feature of nineteenth century policy. England became the head office of every plotter in Europe—and "Manchester" provided a great deal of the funds they required. The point I am concerned to make at this time is simply this—that probably at no time in history has a body of immigrants come into an established country and obtained so much power and so effectively dispossessed the natives, as did the Jews in England between the time of William of Orange and the emergence of Joseph Chamberlain as a tariff reformer. In that situation, "Manchester" was central. And it is profoundly important to enquire why there appears to be something which leads Professor Laski to fear that the "victory which is its historic right" is being filched from what we will agree with him to call "the Left."

Before passing to this, we may note the fact that Manchester's leading newspaper probably had a larger circulation amongst the "Left" in every country, and particularly in the United States, than any similar periodical, and that the sedulously-propagated idea that "What Manchester thinks to-day, the world will think to-morrow" was taken with surprising seriousness by its admirers.

XVI

The statement made in many quarters that one nation after another comes into the grip of, and is used by, the Jews reasonably provokes the comment:—"Well, if the Jews are so superhumanly clever that no one seems able to stand against them, there is nothing to be done about it. They win." This is, no doubt, what Professor Laski means when he states that "the Left" has "an historic right" to victory. It may also be noticed that a claim is implicit in this either that "the Left" is invariably right, or alternatively, it doesn't matter whether "it" is right or not.

There are several issues involved in this aspect of the matter. The first is "How has it been done?" The answer to this enquiry is "Simply, and in the last resort, solely, by

(Continued on page 4)

The United Nations

A WARNING

"The United Nations is in serious trouble. The American people have finally begun to recognize the world organization for what it is — a pro-Communist force designed to enslave us in World Government — rather than the peacekeeping entity its advocates have claimed it to be

"Time is always on the side of truth. Today the UN is increasingly regarded not as a sacred cow, but rather as a *troika* composed of a white elephant, a Trojan horse, and a Judas goat.

"*White elephants* were the rare albino pachyderms that traditionally belonged to Siamese kings, who would then present them to courtiers they didn't like. Since white elephants were not allowed to work, could not be disposed of without offending the king, and had enormous appetites, they would eventually reduce the courtier to ruin. The United Nations, a 'gift' to our country from its founders, has had roughly the same destructive impact. The decline of our national honor, influence, and independence since 1945 has resulted, in large part, from the manner in which our foreign policy (and much of our domestic policy), have been moulded to meet United Nations specifications.

"The *Trojan horse* was presented as an offering of peace and good will to the people of Troy; in fact it was loaded with Athenian warriors bent on Troy's destruction. The main difference between the Trojan horse and the UN is that the Trojans didn't know that the horse contained their enemies; the UN, on the other hand, was wheeled into New York City with the full knowledge of our leaders that the key posts were controlled by Communists and other anti-Americans, and that diplomatic immunity would give our enemies a protected base for their operations within our borders

"*Judas goats* are animals trained to lead other animals peacefully to slaughter. Their job is to keep the victims deluded about their actual situation until it is too late to do anything about it. Similarly, propagandists for the UN have consistently misled the American people regarding the true nature of the world body. They imply that it is carrying us along the road to peace when, as we shall see, it is taking us down the garden path toward a Marxist-orientated World Government. Such deception has become so salient a feature of the United Nations operation that it is doubtful the organization could survive without it. In fact, it is largely because Americans are finally catching on to the subterfuge that the UN is in such hot water today"

— From Foreword to *The United Nations Conspiracy* by Robert W. Lee (Western Islands, Boston and Los Angeles, 1981)

The Under-Secretary for Political and Security Council affairs of the United Nations organization, it was agreed, should always be nominated by the USSR. All except one holder of this office have been Soviet nationals. The responsibilities of this official are:

Control of all military and police functions of the United Nations 'peace-keeping' forces.
Supervision of all disarmament moves on the part of member nations.

Control of all atomic energy ultimately entrusted to the United Nations for peaceful and 'other' purposes.

To allow the United Nations Organization to have a say in the future of the Falkland Islands would be utter betrayal.

PROGRAMME FOR THE THIRD WORLD WAR

(Continued from page 3)

control of the credit system." The God of this World is Money, and his Chosen People are the Jews.

Every effort has been made to present the Jew as primarily a usurer. I doubt whether the Jew was ever primarily a usurer. He has been in possession of a technique of credit-money creation for thousands of years, and his power has come not so much from charging interest as from creating new claims and appropriating them. This technique probably came *via* Egypt from Chaldea. There is, I believe, in existence somewhere a baked Chaldean tile which has inscribed on it an almost perfect prototype of the modern Bill of Exchange—the basic document of international finance.

Once understood, and it is not really very difficult to understand, only quite moderate intelligence is necessary to operate the credit system. And, operated with attention to a few easily formulated rules, banking automatically comes into control of everything necessary for its own defence, including control of information. Just so long as it is not widely understood.

That the power of the Jew is primarily the power of the banker, is certain. That fact is both a complete answer to the defeatist, and a clear indication of the direction in which to look for the triumph of the Right. But it does not deal with certain other aspects of the problem.

If you say that a man is a European, there is a sense in which you are just using words. You do not describe an Austrian in a company of Englishmen by calling him a European. But in a camp of Hottentots the appellation conveys a distinct and realistic picture.

The Jew is, in this sense, an Oriental, and only Europeans who have had contact with the Oriental mind acquire sufficient wisdom to realise that they only very partially understand its workings, and that it works differently from the mind of any European. Consequently, to contend with it on its own ground is to court disaster.

To take a simple example, the average Englishman, with careful coaching and lengthy preparation, can secure a reasonable place in the Honours Examination in his chosen subject at one of our older Universities. While there is not lacking a body of respectable opinion to the effect that examinations prove little or nothing, it does seem to be the case that the average Honours Graduate is at least averagely successful in later life. But the Oriental, with one tenth the preparation, will leave him standing in almost any written examination which you can devise, and still be completely useless for any practical purpose. I personally knew an Indian who took a high place in *three* Triposes, and was only prevented from taking a fourth by the veto of the authorities. He was a pleasant but incompetent individual, and so far as I am aware has never done anything of the slightest consequence since he was restrained from rendering the Examination system ridiculous.

Such ideas as "fairness," "decency" and what we call the realistic Christian virtues, convey nothing to the Oriental *as such*. Perhaps I might with advantage observe at this juncture that many Orientals compare very favourably with many Europeans on every ground. That does not invalidate the main contention, which is that the Oriental has virtues of his own, but they are not in the main the same virtues as those of the European, and they do not contact them.

Again, for example, the "Liberal" ideas of the mid-

nineteenth century, such as "England, the asylum of the politically oppressed," appear to the Eastern mind as either an invitation to corruption, feebleness, or insanity, and as such to be exploited to the possible limit. The only sense in which any gratitude ought to be expected, or is given, is that of a lively sense of favours to come. If the relationship between Great Britain and India had no other value, and it has many, the fact that it has injected into the Indian consciousness, more particularly in the North-West, the idea of "character" (a completely alien idea to the East) and into a few British minds the fatuousness of forcing political systems on to peoples whose philosophies do not fit them, would have justified it.

Perhaps the cleavage in outlook between the East and West is most practically exemplified in the idea of "price" as simply the haggling of the market, or as Sir Marcus Samuel put it, "the price of an article is what it will fetch," on the one hand, and the struggles of the Mediaeval Church (the foundation of Europeanism) with the concept of the Just Price. Whether St. Thomas Aquinas achieved any stable mechanism for this doctrine, I do not know—probably not. But the philosophy of it is basic. There is no part of the Social Credit thesis which has roused such rancour as the demonstration that the Just, or what we now prefer to call the Compensated Price, is at the root of economic democracy.

Professor Laski knows quite well that the compensated price is now an integral part of British official policy, and he knows equally well that the money system is widely understood.

I think that it is in these facts that we can find the explanation of the rather urgent call for hurry. Things are not what they were. "Man, the Rebel" becomes the pet of the bullion-broker, and "Man, the Creator" the indispensable raw material of full employment at maintenance wages or slightly below. In fact, to quote Mr. Sieff, in a 1931 edition of *Freedom and Planning*, "The only rival [?] world political and economic system which puts forward a comparable claim is that of the Union of Soviet Republics." It may be noticed that none of the enthusiasts for Soviet Russia can be persuaded to go and live there.

(To be continued)

War and Peace

It should not be forgotten that having won two world wars Britain lost the peace in both cases. Having defeated Argentina in the Falkland Islands can she win the peace?

THE SOCIAL CREDITER FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

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

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

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

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

Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, 2 Park Village East, London NW1 7PX. Tel. 01-387 3893.

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

THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Personnel—Chairman: H. A. Scoular, 11 Robertson Road, North Curl Curl, N.S.W. 2099. Deputy Chairman, British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, 2 Park Village East, London NW1 7PX.