As it is every Australia Day, the Anglo-Saxon-Celtic descendants of modern Australia have to bare the brunt of being accused of being the descendants of ‘the invaders’ and ‘the oppressors’ who came to this island-continent 200 years ago and have oppressed the Aboriginal inhabitants ever since. I decided to do my own investigation of the origins of Australia’s “first inhabitants” by looking for a better understanding of the ‘values’ of the Ancient Sumerians – after all, they are recognised as having developed the first civilisation, and ‘civilised’ peoples would have ‘values’ they were expected to live up to. I also came across a number of interesting past-events that are worth considering in relation to the claims that the ancestors of present-day Aboriginals were the first occupiers of this island-continent.

But first some background history of **L.A. Waddell**, the author of the first historical claims:

“Lieutenant Colonel Laurence Austine Waddell,[1] CB, CIE, F.L.S., L.L.D, M.Ch., I.M.S. RAI, F.R.A.S (1854–1938) was a British explorer, Professor of Tibetan, Professor of Chemistry and Pathology, Indian Army surgeon,[2] collector in Tibet, and amateur archaeologist. Waddell also studied Sumerian and Sanskrit; he made various translations of seals and other inscriptions. His reputation as an Assyriologist gained little to no academic recognition and his books on the history of civilization have caused controversy….”

Lieutenant Colonel Waddell claimed that in time the Sumerian civilisers set up a colony in the Ganges Valley:

“In India… we find this ruling and sea-faring clan of the Panch (Phoenician…ed) Aryans, at the end of the 8th century B.C. and beginning of the 7th century B.C., as the ruling Aryan race in the Ganges Valley in association with their kindred Aryan clan of the Kurus of Kur or Syria-Asia Minor as the Kuru-Panchala rulers of India.

“These conjoint Aryan clans had at that date freshly migrated from Northern Syria and Asia Minor for the colonization of the Ganges Valley, and had suddenly introduced there a fully fledged civilization of the late Sumerian and Asia Minor Hittite type, which formed the so-called “Indian Civilization” of the Ganges Valley, extending to the Deccan and Ceylon, with which the historical period opens in Eastern India, and which civilization has continued in India with little alteration down to the present day….

“We find that in 680 B.C. a powerful trading colony of sea-merchants under Hindu leaders established themselves on the coast of China, in the Gulf of Kia-tchou with trade relations as far as Shantung. They named their station on the south side of that gulf Lang-ga, after the Indian name Lanka for Ceylon...

“This Indian sea-trade with China or Cathay necessarily entailed a chain of ports of call along the Malay peninsula and Indo-Chinese archipelago. And it is generally admitted that Aryan-India was the civilizer of that peninsula and archipelago, from Burma through Malaya and Siam to Cambodia, with the great outlying islands of Sumatra, Java, Borneo (in part) and the Philippines in the Indo-Chinese archipelago, lands which with their islands are appropriately called Indo-nesia – “Further India.”…”

Waddell does claim the trade reached Celebes, the former name for the Indonesian island of Salewesi.

**Source:** “Egyptian Civilization: Its Sumerian Origin & Real Chronology” originally published 1930.

**Now to Rodney Liddell’s “Cape York the Savage Frontier”**

In his very informative book on the early pioneering history of northern Queensland, Rodney Liddell tells us that while researching the history of Cape York and the “Origins of Man” it soon became apparent that the original Australians were not the people we now refer to as aboriginals.

The evidence he claims clearly points out that the original Australians were Papuans who came down from New Guinea when both countries were joined by a natural land-bridge estimated to have been 100 miles wide. This land mass was believed to have been separated by the rising seas around 6500-8000 years ago. (continued on next page)
The original Tasmanians as well were identified as being of the Papuan race. In the 1930s Kathleen Haddon (Rishbeth) daughter of recognised anthropologist Alfred Cort Haddon, published “Artists in Strings” explaining: “Long headed, broad nosed people of ‘Pre-Dravidian’ stock, they are connected with the ‘Veddh’ and certain jungle tribes of South India, rather than the neighbouring Papuans and Melanesians. These ‘Pre-Dravidians’ appear to have displaced an earlier, woolly haired people, who had come into Australia via New Guinea and who survived until recent times only in Tasmania”.

In 1909 Haddon published “The Races of Man” and exposed the invasion of Australia by the aborigines [Pre-Dravidians]. She states: “Australia was originally inhabited by Papuans or Negritos, who wandered on foot to the extreme south of the continent. When Bass Strait was formed, those who were cut off from the mainland formed the ancestors of the Tasmanians. Later a Pre-Dravidian race migrated into Australia and overran the continent and absorbed the sparse aboriginal population. The latter being driven off, “exterminated”, or even partially assimilated, but the formation of Bass Strait prevented the entry of the Australians (Pre-Dravidians) into Tasmania.”

Rodney Liddell quotes another source of this very different ‘history’ to what we are constantly fed. Professor A. P. Elkin, of the University of Sydney. (http://sydney.edu.au/arms/archives/elkinbio.shtml) Elkin, Liddell writes, “He also claimed that the aborigines were the early aborigines of South India and classified all the Pre-Dravidians as “Australoids”. In his book “The Australian Aborigines” Elkin states: “Was there a preceding race in Australia, namely the Tasmanians? The latter were a Negroid group related to the Melanesians and Papuans.

If the Tasmanians were living in parts of Australia at the time the aborigines commenced their invasion, they must have been either conquered and absorbed, or extinguished. It is also possible that the Tasmanians were already in their island home as well as on the mainland at the time of the Australoid invasion.”

Wikipedia’s Pre-History of Australia has this to say: Archaeological evidence indicates human habitation at the upper Swan River, Western Australia by about 40,000 years ago. [14] Tasmania, which was connected to the continent by a land bridge, was inhabited at least 30,000 years ago. [15][16] Others have claimed that some sites are up to 60,000 years old, but these claims are not universally accepted. [17] Palynological evidence from South Eastern Australia suggests an increase in fire activity dating from around 120,000 years ago. This has been interpreted as representing human activity, but the dating of the evidence has been strongly challenged. [18] Charles Dortch has identified chert and calcrete flake stone tools, found at Rottnest Island in Western Australia, as possibly dating to at least 50,000 years ago. [19][20] This seems to tie in accurately with U/Th and 14C results of a flint tool found embedded in Tamala limestone (Aminozone C) [21] as well as both mtDNA and Y chromosome studies on the genetic distance of Australian Aboriginal genomes from African and other Eurasian ones.

The sharing of animal and plant species between Australia-New Guinea and nearby Indonesian islands is another consequence of the early land bridges, which closed when sea levels rose with the end of the last glacial period. The sea level stabilised to near its present levels about 6000 years ago, flooding the land bridge between Australia and New Guinea.[citation needed]

It is unknown how many populations settled in Australia prior to European colonisation. Both “trihybrid” and single-origin hypotheses have received extensive discussion. [22] Keith Windshuttle, known for his belief that Aboriginal pre-history has become politicised, argues that the assumption of a single origin is tied into ethnic solidarity, and multiple entry was suppressed because it could be used to justify white seizure of Aboriginal lands. [23]

Human genomic differences are being studied to find possible answers, but there is still insufficient evidence to distinguish a “wave invasion model” from a “single settlement”. Some Y chromosomal studies indicate a recent influx of Y chromosomes from the Indian subcontinent. A 2012 paper by Alan J. Redd et al. on this topic notes that the indicated influx period corresponds to the timing of various other changes, specifically mentioning “The divergence times reported here correspond with a series of changes in the Australian anthropological record between 5,000 years ago and 3,000 years ago, including the introduction of the dingo; the spread of the Australian Small Tool tradition; the appearance of plant-processing technologies, especially complex detoxification of cycads; and the expansion of the Pama-Nyungan language over seven-eighths of Australia.”

Although previously linked to the pariah dogs of India, recent testing of the mitochondrial DNA of dingos shows a closer connection to the dogs of Eastern Asia and North America, suggesting an introduction as a result of the Austronesian expansion from Southern China to Timor over the last 5000 years. [24] The recent finding of kangaroo ticks on the pariah dogs of Thailand further suggests that this genetic expansion may have been a two-way process. [25]

Source: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Prehistory_of_Australia

(continued on next page)
Now if we Australians were living in a time of peace and security and felt that even with our diverse backgrounds we could reach out to one another and find common ground and friendship upon which to build a stronger nation, there wouldn’t need to be an article on the falsifying of the history of the earlier people of this land. But we don’t live in peace and security. There is conflict and angst wherever one looks – and the false history is a part of the problem. Why? you may ask.

(former communist) Geoff McDonald in his books “Red Over Black” and “The Evidence”, exposed the Marxist/Leninist strategy to fragment this nation and its people for ulterior motives. Geoff listed his material of the Communist’s plans in “The Evidence” in 1984, insisting he was presenting “Revealing Extracts on Aboriginal “Land Rights” from Official Communist Documents.” A foreword was written by Bruce Ruxton, O.B.E. President of RSL, Victoria; Len Turner, President of RSL, Western Australia and Sir Colin Hines, President of RSL, New South Wales:

“Communist strategy and tactics as outlined by Mr. Geoff McDonald is not unknown in the military colleges of western countries. The journal Coronet, Vol. 29 No. 3 (January, 1951) quotes from the Stalin archives in the National War College in Washington DC.”

Geoff records, Joseph Stalin wrote:

“How will we bring the masses of a nation into the communist programme? We have fashioned a number of organisations without which we could not wage war on capitalism: trade unions, co-operatives, workshop committees, labour parties, women’s associations, a labour press, educational leagues, youth societies. As often as not, these are non-party organisations and only a certain proportion of them are linked with the party. But under special conditions, every one of these organisations is necessary; for, lacking them, it is impossible to consolidate the class positions of the workers in the various spheres of the struggle. There is a veritable ant heap of independent organisations, commissions, and committees comprising millions of non-party members. Who decides upon the direction these organisations take? Where is the central unit of organisation that wields sufficient authority to keep them within prescribed lines in order to achieve unity of command and to avoid confusion? The central unit is the Communist Party!”

In quoting original Australian Communist sources to substantiate his warnings, Mr. McDonald deals specifically with land rights and related movements. He makes clear how Stalin’s theory on the ‘National and the colonial question’ is applied in Australia. The above quotation from Stalin bears out how Communists operate all over the world in their fields of political action.

This volume illustrates how techniques are being used in manipulating the land rights movement and such parallel campaigns where the name of conservation is used to sabotage mining and industrial development.

Of importance to the author’s documentation is how Communists write openly to explain to their followers designs to exploit the name of aboriginals and conservation issues. Yet at the same time they cry ‘McCarthyism’ or ‘racism’ to cover their activities when they are exposed to the public. The RSL has experienced the same smear over the many years that members have called upon their fellow Australians to be conscious of Communist threats to the security of this country…”

Communism, The Occult and Metaphysics

The following notes are taken from a 2014 interview of Professor Jordan Peterson.

“In order to grasp the root of such hatred and gratuitous violence as depicted in books such as Alexander Solzhenitsyn’s “The Gulag Archipelago”, Canadian Professor of Psychology Jordan B. Peterson insists there had to be a metaphysical element. Solzhenitsyn saw there was a connection of Individual deceit with the pathologies of the State and the religious ideas associated with good and evil. And, only religious language was deep enough to get to the root of it all.

But, as Peterson reminded his listeners, Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche, the German philosopher saw that the conflict between religious thinking, Christian thinking in particular, and Enlightenment thinking, was going to wipe out at least the ability of Christian thinking to believe the metaphysical assumptions at the base of Christian thought.

In 1860 Nietzsche predicted the wars of the 20th century, costing many millions of lives, were linked in some way to communist ideas and the ‘will to power’. Peterson observed Empirical Science ‘had kicked the slats’ out of how people thought about Religion and even their mental picture of God the Father.

I am reminded of Eric D. Butler’s 1959 paper presented to the Anglican Synod, Melbourne, “The Real Communist Challenge to Christianity”. Eric could see that Christians in that day simply couldn’t grasp the danger of the Communist attack on the West. It was not a military attack but a psycho-political attack that has intensified since then.

At the time Eric noted:

“… The motives behind Communism are as old as man, and the real problem confronting the Christian Church is the same problem it has faced ever since the famous statement concerning Caesar and God was given social significance by outstanding Church leaders as they attempted to exercise Authority to curb Power.

(continued on next page)
It is impossible to develop this matter here, but I draw attention to it because I believe that the Christian Church alone can provide the type of leadership so desperately needed today, as we stand face to face with a challenge from Caesar which surpasses anything previously witnessed in human history.

The only thing new about Communism is the techniques it possesses for enslaving both bodies and minds. I refer not only to mechanical technological developments, but to the numerous forms of what has come to be known as brainwashing. While subversion and the various forms of sabotage are a major part of the disruptive programme of the Communists, the main, decisive work is done openly in the attack on the mind…"

Ideas have People – Not People have Ideas
Some further Jordan Peterson snippets to finish off: “Here’s a way of thinking about religion. You can reduce your way of thinking to Darwinian principles and destroy it that way.

THE ACHILLES HEEL OF THE CONSERVATIVE MOVEMENT by Eric D. Butler
continued from last month’s NTS…….

DOUGLAS' FINDINGS
Major C.H. Douglas was an eminent British engineer with a wide experience in implementing a number of big projects in various parts of the world. He was called in by the British Government during the First World War as a costing expert to solve problems in the aircraft industry. His approach was one of the true scientist, objectively examining, but without any pre-conceived political theories.

Having satisfied himself that modern industry was not distributing sufficient purchasing power over any given period, to meet total prices created over the same period, and that this deficiency - which must become progressively greater with every technological advance and the displacement of human labour in production - could only be masked under present financial rules by progressively expanding new credits for excessive capital work, export drives, and instalment buying.

Douglas placed his discoveries and suggestions before a number of prominent people. He was completely detached, his approach being that common sense men would be interested in being shown a major defect in the finance-economic system, in the same way that engineers are interested in learning about defects in machines so that they can be corrected. But he discovered that, in spite of the fact that his views were widely and intelligently discussed, with many prominent men endorsing them, it was clear that there was powerful opposition to any serious modification of financial policy.

Or you can expand your way of thinking so that it encompasses the genuine phenomena of Religion, but it is also the problem of why people won’t read Jung. First, he’s very difficult, second, he is terrifying. It was asked: Why is he terrifying? Peterson answers: Because no one thinks like he thought. His grasp of the development of ideas stretched over ten thousand years. He puts the Enlightenment thinkers to shame. But if you start grappling with the thought that ideas have people and not the other way round, that forces you to re-evaluate your entire thinking on the Nature of Being.

Another thing Jung asks is: Which ideas have you and where are they suggesting that you go? That’s like the Greek god idea, we’re play-things of the gods. These are like metamemes”.

Again, the devil took Him to a very high mountain and showed Him all the kingdoms of the world and their glory. “All this I will give You”, he said, “if You will fall down and worship me”…. Matthew 4. ***
The true conservative knows how important is the past. As the young French-Canadian mystic, Simone Weil, so beautifully expressed it in “The Need For Roots”: “We possess no other living sap, than the treasures stored up from the past and digested, assimilated and created afresh by us.”

A genuinely conservative approach to life requires humility, to accept the fact that man is not self-sufficient. It is surprising how many conservatives will accept this truth concerning some subjects, but reject it in the field of economics. Far too many conservatives create the impression that their concept of “rugged individualism” is a type of free-for-all where the self-made man succeeds and the weak go to the wall. The truth is that no man is self-sufficient today in the field of economic endeavour. Even those pioneering on some of the world’s remaining frontiers are making use of machinery and technical assistance which comes from co-operative industrial societies, themselves the heirs to a thousand years of amassed industrial arts.

The creative conservative of the Twentieth Century must take a new look at economics if he is to meet the Socialist challenge. Some proper humility is a pre-requisite.

The following are basic truths which must be accepted in evolving a policy which will enable the best of our civilisation to be preserved and developed along the lines of a genuinely conservative and co-operative society, one in which the creative initiative of every individual can find expression:

1. What might be described as man’s basic capital consists of vast natural resources, including the soil. Growth is impossible without sunshine, rain and fresh air. All this is a gift from God. It is not produced by man’s work. Labour does not produce all wealth as the Socialist and Communist claims.

2. The use of basic capital requires production capital. This has been developed at an ever-accelerating rate because each new generation is the heir to the accumulated knowledge of the past, which is part of man’s cultural heritage. Without this knowledge, man would still be subsisting at a primitive level without even knowing about the wheel. It is more correct to describe man as a discoverer than an inventor. The truth concerning what is termed the “mechanical advantage” was DISCOVERED, not created, by the man who first used a lever to lift a much greater weight than he could with only his own muscular energy. This and other truths are also a gift from God. The Indians watched the flow of water over the Niagara Falls for centuries, without realising that here was an enormous source of power which could be harnessed to serve the individual.

Present-day North Americans use this power, not because of greater physical ability than the Indians, but because they are heirs to knowledge passed on to them by previous generations. Semi-automatic machinery driven by solar energy, computers, machines making machines, with human labour as such now a minor factor, are the results of the cultural heritage.

3. Both morally, and realistically, the individual is entitled to a share in the benefits possible because of the application of the cultural heritage to basic capital. But although the cultural heritage, like basic capital, must be regarded as a community heritage, in order that this heritage is preserved, extended and in the most competent and responsible manner on behalf of the individual, private ownership is essential. In a free-enterprise society, private owners should be a group of producing aristocrats, proud of their responsibilities and the opportunity to develop their various skills, serving a democracy of consumers.

4. As the “money vote” and price system is the most flexible mechanism through which the individual can exercise effective control over how his heritage is to be developed, it is the legitimate function of Government to ensure that the volume of community purchasing power AUTOMATICALLY reflects economic realities. The proper level of water in a cattle drinking trough is automatically adjusted by a ball-valve and the amount of water consumed by the cattle. The actual mechanics necessary to place individuals in control of their own credit, is one for appropriate experts to create. No change in the ownership or administration of the private banks is necessary.

C.H. Douglas predicted in 1924 that unless control of the community’s credit were decentralised into the hands of it’s individual members, and the economic system re-oriented away from the direction in which it was being forced by those monopolising the control of financial credit, that there would come a time “well within the lives of the present generation” when “the blind forces of destruction will appear to be in the ascendant... There is, at the moment, no party, group, or individual possessing at once the power, the knowledge, and the will, which would transmute the growing social unrest and resentment (now chiefly marshalled under the crudities of Socialism and Communism) into a constructive effort for the regeneration of Society .... we are merely witnesses to a succession of rear-guard actions on the part of the so-called conservative elements of Society, elements which themselves seem incapable or undesirous of genuine initiative; a process which can only result, like all rear-guard actions, in a successive, if not successful retreat on the part of the forces attacked.
While this process is alone active, there seems to be no sound justification for optimism. “

**Social Credit**

A genuine counter-offensive by conservatives, demands a challenge to the policy of the credit monopoly. It was Abraham Lincoln who observed that “the power to regulate the currency and credit of a nation” is “the Government’s greatest creative opportunity.” A resurgent conservatism might well take the Lincoln statement as its fighting motto.

**CONSUMER CREDITS OR REVOLUTION?**

An article published in “THE NEW TIMES,” Vol 4, No 6, June 1979

All industrialised countries are now moving at an accelerating rate on a revolutionary road. Over recent years all industrialised societies have been experiencing high levels of inflation, compared with what was once regarded as acceptable, and growing industrial conflict as Governments and their “experts” attempt to discourage wage-earners from seeking higher wages to offset a decrease in purchasing power. Every type of control has been attempted, but the over-all result has been a progressive worsening of the general situation.

After a period during which the inflation rate was reduced fractionally by restrictive policies which caused large numbers of business bankruptcies and contributed to creating high unemployment, now the inflation rate is rising again in Australia, New Zealand, Canada, the U.S.A. and the United Kingdom.

The stage has been set, for a new wave of industrial unrest, with the Marxists in key sectors of highly centralised economies, able to paralyse communities to the point where members of those communities are practically defenceless.

As we predicted, changes in the politicians in Australia and New Zealand in 1975 would do nothing to change the course of events unless a financial policy of escalating debt and high taxation was altered. Unless the new Governments of the United Kingdom and Canada alter financial policy, they are going to preside over the same type of depressing disasters which have been experienced over the past four years in New Zealand and Australia.

Britain’s first woman Prime Minister may be as determined as her supporters say she is, but unless she can take the necessary steps to reduce inflation by dealing with the basic cause of inflation, she is doomed to preside over even greater industrial unrest than that which undoubtedly played a part in the defeat of the Callaghan Labour Government.

Mrs Thatcher appears to have the same rigid orthodox approach to finance-economics as Prime Minister Fraser of Australia and Prime Minister Muldoon of New Zealand. Like Mr Fraser, Mr Muldoon has found that instead of reducing taxation he has to increase it. Displaying what can only be described as a type of invincible stupidity, in imposing recent savage taxation increases, which are inflating prices even further, Mr Muldoon argues that this will control inflation. It is difficult for people of common sense to understand that prices can be brought down by putting them up.

**THE BASIC PHILOSOPHICAL CLEAVAGE**

The basic cause of the disintegration of what is left of civilisation, is philosophic. The first essential for regeneration is an acceptance of the truth that the economic system exists to serve the individual; the true purpose of production is consumption; that the benefits of technology should be passed to the individual in the form of greater leisure time in which he can devote himself to self-development.

The policy of “full employment” is rooted in the anti-Christian philosophy that the individual exists to serve the economic system, and that any policy which enables the individual to obtain greater access to the abundance of the universe with less work as generally understood, should be rejected on the basis that “something for nothing” is bad for the individual. The philosophy underlying this viewpoint is that the individual cannot be trusted with freedom. The actual or potential abundance available for the individual is in fact “something for nothing.”

With the application of discovered truths to the abundance of the universe, the amount of human energy being applied to production, compared with other forms of energy, is but a decreasing fraction. The real credit of a society is its productive capacity. The major part of that real credit is “something for nothing”; it is a heritage which belongs by right to the individuals of society.

Financial credit, created by the banking system, must be seen either as a system to enable the individual to gain access to his heritage or as an instrument for controlling the individual by forcing him to operate the economic system in a manner which keeps him “fully employed”, even if he is employed on production which is exported - given - to the Communist dominated countries. The financial credits so readily made available to finance production for the Communists could just as easily be made available to the individual so that he could obtain greater access to his own inheritance. Present policies make it inevitable that every improvement in technology in the non-Communist world requires greater exports in an attempt to control the individual.
INEVITABLE RESULTS OF PRESENT POLICIES

If present finance-economic policies are persisted with, it is mathematically certain that inflation and high taxation must continue. The drive towards still greater centralisation with the consequent social disintegration, must accelerate. Programmes for creating the World State via Common Markets and New International Economic Orders are the logical result of a philosophy which regards the individual as but raw material to be manipulated by power-mongers.

The labels on Governments will make no difference to realities. But the growing impetus towards centralising power must result in a further breakup of Civilisation under the impact of revolution. The situation is exactly as Douglas predicted when the founder of Social Credit started writing at the end of the First World War.

The essence of the rapidly-deepening crisis is that either the individual is permitted to gain access to his heritage, as a right, which means in practice the use of consumer credits distributed direct to the individual, or there will be revolution resulting from policies which insist that financial credits, created as a debt, are only made available for still more production.

Looked at realistically, inflation should be seen as a measure of the unnecessary production in which the individual is forced to participate in relationship to that production which serves the individual’s genuine needs.

Although all governments pay lip service to the necessity of reducing deficit budgets, unless the new credits for these deficits are made available, the economies of the industrialised nations would suffer a major collapse. But as the new credits are written as a debt, and are used to finance still greater economic activity, they contribute towards sustaining high taxation and high inflation. They are like a drug.

A PROGRAMME FOR SURVIVAL

As the financial credit created for deficit budgets is written against a nation’s real credit, its production capacity, and that real credit belongs to the individuals of that nation, then obviously the financial credit also belongs to those individuals. A start could be quickly made to reverse present revolutionary developments by writing present budget deficits as credits for the cost of administration only, and distributing those credits by financing the reduction of the present retiring age to, for a start, 55 years. Offered a secure income for the remainder of his life, few individuals would reject the offer to retire from the production system at 55.

Instead of working to feed or industrialise the Communist nations, the individual might decide to make toys for his grandchildren, or help with community activities. He might take up painting, or just go fishing. But he would be enjoying what is his, and permitting younger people to enter the economic system, this sweeping away a number of growing social problems.

Part of the new credits could be used to lower prices of basic items in the economy with the use of a system of consumer discounts. A falling price level is a realistic reflection of the truth that the true cost of a unit of production is falling as a result of greater technology. A falling price level increases purchasing power, and makes inflation impossible. It also destroys all the basic causes of revolution. That is why Marxists are in the forefront of all opposition to the distribution of consumer credits. They understand that the distribution of financial credit direct to the individual spells the death-knell of their revolutionary hopes.

And their spiritual brothers, the international financiers, also understand that the use of consumer credits would end their grandiose dreams of New World Orders. The future of Civilisation depends upon whether individuals can unite to wrest control of their own credit, real and financial, away from those at present claiming it as their own. The battle is between the individual and an unholy alliance of Marxists and Financiers.

CONSTRUCTIVE RECOMMENDATIONS OF A BRITISH CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

The 1933 Report of the Economic Crisis Committee of the Southampton Chamber of Commerce, England, one of the largest and oldest Chambers in the world, made the following “constructive recommendations”:

1) Money supply should be governed by the real credit of a community as represented by its productive capacity. This appears to involve the abandonment of any arbitrary restriction on the quantity of money, and the limitation of internal money supply by such an instrument as the international gold standard.

2) In order to ensure that money performs its true function of operating as a means of exchange and distribution, it is desirable that it should cease to be traded as a commodity.

3) Money being merely a vehicle of credit of the community, and the power which the control of money carries with it being nothing less than the control of the entire economic life of the nation, it is desirable that the administration of financial policy should be vested in a national authority directly responsible to the Sovereign and his people.
4) As the existing mechanism for the distribution of incomes fails to provide the purchasing power necessary to distribute the products of industry or the money equivalent of imports, it is necessary that purchasing power and prices of available goods and services should be equated . . . . two alternatives are available:

(a) Either prices should be reduced to meet the purchasing power available without involving any loss to individuals, or

(b) Purchasing power must be increased to meet prices. Or both methods could be employed together.

NOTES ON THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

How many students of history have heard that the real cause of the American Revolution could have been the bankers of London rather than the taxes on tea? The book “Unrobing the Ghosts of Wall Street”, claims that some few years before the Revolution, the colonies were happy and prosperous. Benjamin Franklin, who was later one of the framers of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution explains it:

“Abundance reigned in the Colonies, and there was peace in all their borders. A more happy and prosperous population could not perhaps be found on the globe ... The people generally were highly moral and knowledge was extensively diffused.”

Franklin, during a visit to England, noted the poverty and want in rich Mother England. Asked to explain the prosperity in the Colonies, he is reported to have replied:

“It is because in the Colonies we issue our own money. And we issue enough to move all goods freely from the producers to the consumers; and as we create our own money, we control the purchasing power of money and have no interest to pay.”

The book claims that this situation was not acceptable to the international bankers, then operating out of England, and they caused a bill to be passed in the English Parliament, forbidding the Colonies to use their “scrip money” and compelling them to use gold and silver furnished to them by the ‘English’ bankers in a limited amount - and at high rates, no doubt. Thus, began the debt-money system in America.

Benjamin Franklin reportedly said that within a year after this action of the bankers, the streets of the Colonies were crowded with unemployed, and that it was the poverty resulting from this British financial interference in the Colonies’ economy, which provoked the Revolution. “This was the straw that broke the camel’s back,” he said. The colonies may have got England off their backs, but the international bankers were soon right back on.