

"All that is necessary
for the triumph of
evil is that good
men do nothing . . ."
— EDMUND BURKE



THE NEW TIMES SURVEY

THE AUSTRALIAN

LEAGUE OF RIGHTS

Vol. 20 No. 2

Registered Australia Post - Publication PP343214 / 00016

February 2019

CONTENTS

The Mills of God Grind Slowly – But ... By Betty Luks	1
A + B - Mending a Mortgaged World (extract) by Jeremy Lee	6

THE MILLS OF GOD GRIND SLOWLY – BUT ... By Betty Luks

There is in the English-speaking world a saying: "The mills of God grind slowly but they grind exceedingly small". I believe the person who first coined that saying had the Universal Moral Law in mind. That Law is stated thus: **"The universal moral law (or natural law of humanity) is discoverable like any other law of nature, by experience. It cannot be promulgated, it can only be ascertained, because it is not a question of opinion but of fact. When it has been ascertained, a moral code can be drawn up to direct human behaviour and prevent men, as far as possible, from doing violence to their own nature."**

To which could be added the observation concerning the Law of Matter: "No code is necessary to control the behaviour of matter... matter obeys the law of its being in perfect freedom."

And to which could be added what the Christian Church once taught about the relationship of the faithful Individual to God: "In whose service is perfect freedom".

The faithful individual in his service to God, seeks to obey the Law of his own Being.

What is Social Credit?

Geoffrey Dobbs once explained that "even after ten years one lady correspondent could get no further than that it is "something frightfully involved about the control of money. Couldn't Geoffrey sum up the gist of it in a single sentence please?" He responded, yes he could – even in just two words: 'Practical Christianity'. But would that satisfy? No, it wouldn't because the word Christianity can now mean almost anything including the religion of Marxism. It was Douglas who challenged his readers with the statement: "Christianity is either something inherent in the very warp and woof of the Universe, or it is just a set of interesting opinions". "To those who adapt the Faith to fit their politics or their economics, it is clearly the latter," wrote Dobbs.

Religion and Social Credit

The word 'religion' in Latin meant 'bind back' (re-ligare). Thus we would define the English word 'religion' as that fundamental belief about the nature of things which determines and directs a man's life and behaviour - his life policy so to speak. Too often in modern times it is the ideology whether Left, Right or Centre of this or that Party which is the man's actual 'religion'. As regular readers would know, 'social credit' is the name of something which exists in all societies but which never had a name before. 'Credit' is another word for 'faith' or 'confidence', which binds any society together – **the mutual trust or belief in each other, without which fear is substituted for trust as the 'cement' of society.** In earlier Social Credit material the words 'social credit' were often defined as 'faithful dealing'.

Philosophy

Developing further the statement that Social Credit is a Policy of a Philosophy, Douglas dealt with the term Philosophy: **"It is something based on what you profoundly believe – what at any rate, I profoundly believe, and hope you will – to be a portion of Reality.** It is probably a very small portion, but we have glimpsed a portion of reality and that conception of reality is a philosophy, and the action that we take based upon that conception is a policy, and that policy is Social Credit... in many cases, it is no use arguing with many people about the techniques of Social Credit, because they don't agree with your philosophy..." – *The Policy of a Philosophy*, 1937.

Eric Butler could 'see' what these earlier 'social crediters' were getting at when he titled one of his booklets *Releasing Reality*. The social credit yields fruit from the practice of Christian teaching in a community or society – it is one of its most recognisable 'fruits'. As Geoffrey wrote: "Christianity is something real with vital practical consequences, and by no means a mere set of opinions which are optional for those to whom they happen to appeal."

(continued next page)

(continued from previous page)

L.D. Byrne's "Nature of Social Credit" will provide us with further evidence of how the policy of Social Credit is firmly rooted in a philosophy of Realism:

"It (Social Credit) is the credo or belief inherent in society that its individual members in association can get what they want ... what makes the individuals within the group enter into willing associations with each other is the belief that their efforts are being directed to secure the objective they desire."

Hopefully, we can now see that all our policies must be bound back to Reality. If our policies are not bound firmly to Reality, we can expect nothing but increasing disintegration of our civilization. Social Credit is concerned with the voluntary association of individuals to achieve the objectives they desire. If the individual is not obtaining from any association the objectives he desires, he must be free to leave; he must be free to contract out. The philosophy which conceives of all power as external to the individual results in compulsion of the individual. Under totalitarianism he is not free to contract out from undesirable associations.

Belief, Action and Fruit

To see the world in a grain of sand, and to see heaven in a wild flower, hold infinity in the palm of your hands, and eternity in an hour."

"If the doors of perception were cleansed everything would appear to man as it is, infinite. - William Blake

Look Not At What it Does, But How It Does It

Iain McGilchrist observes: "each hemisphere of the brain attends to the world in a different way – and the ways are consistent." Having briefly outlined how I understand the concepts of 'social credit', I want to introduce the work of Iain McGilchrist, and his book *"The Master and his Emissary"*. The Unique Role of Attention - Drawing on a broad spectrum of neurological knowledge and research that reaches back many decades, years, even centuries, Iain McGilchrist explains why it is important we understand how the Left and Right Hemispheres of our brains work. I will endeavour to highlight the links between this author and the early social crediters' work as recorded in *The Social Crediter*.

McGilchrist in *The Master and his Emissary* tells us:

"The unique role of attention has also been recognised in the new digital technologies of the modern "attention economy", in which the human gaze is increasingly being monetised and mined as a resource, again pointing to its central position in the landscape of the twenty-first century. As content producers compete to capture our attention and emotional engagement, "this battle for attention" creates what tech ethicist Tristan Harris has called a 'race to the bottom of the brain stem'".

But if you look, not at what the brain does, as if it were just a machine, but at how – in the sense of 'in what manner' it does it, as if it were part of a living person, some very important differences start to emerge, and a picture begins to take shape that tells us some astonishing things about ourselves and our world.

The primacy of the right hemisphere

"You might say: OK, here are two different ways of conceiving the world: but how do you know that they are not equally valid? I say that they are both very important - both, in fact, essential for our ability to lead civilised lives - but not equally valid. And there are many reasons for this.

In the first place, it is interesting that, in the late nineteenth and the twentieth centuries, both mathematics and physics (for example, Cantor, Boltzmann, Godel, Bohr) and philosophy (I am here thinking particularly of the American pragmatists, Dewey and James, and the European phenomenologists, Husserl, Heidegger, Scheler, Merleau and the later Wittgenstein), though starting absolutely from the premise of the left hemisphere that sequential analysis will lead us to the truth, have ended up with results that approximate far more closely – and in fact confirm the validity of – the right hemisphere's way of understanding the world, not that of the left. That is in itself a remarkable fact, since generally speaking the preconceptions with which you start will determine where you end. But there are other indications.

Broad vigilant attention must come before we can focus on one part of the field.

We see the whole before we see the parts, rather than putting the whole together from the parts.

We experience everything at first with the R/H, not with the L/H.

We desperately need both the Left (L/H) and Right (R/H) hemispheres in order to reason properly and to use our imagination creatively. In reality, the R/H sees more, is more in touch with reality and is more intellectually sophisticated; incidentally there is more evidence that those of highest intelligence may rely more on the R/H.

The L/H does not so much understand things as process them; it is the R/H that is the basis for understanding.

The L/H is better than R/H at manipulating both figures and words, but less good than R/H at understanding their meaning in any sense – information becomes more important than knowledge, than wisdom.

L/H: Its 'rationality' allows it to do this; it is in fact a mechanism through which this power can be gained. Careful analysis of the relationship between speech and gesture shows that **both thought and its expression actually originate in the right hemisphere**, not in the left.

(continued next page)

(continued from previous page) Re-presentation necessarily relies on earlier “presencing”. And even the mode of functioning of the nervous system itself is more right-hemisphere-congruent than left-hemisphere-congruent.

What the left hemisphere offers is, then, a valuable but intermediate process, one of “unpacking” what is there and handing it back to the right hemisphere, where it can once again be integrated into the experiential whole, much as the painstaking fragmentation and analysis of a sonata in practice is reintegrated by the pianist in performance at a level where he or she must no longer be aware of it.

That, at any rate, is how the two should work together: the emissary reporting back to the master, who alone can see the broader picture. But the self-consistent rationalism of the left hemisphere has convinced it that it does not need to concern itself with what the right hemisphere knows: it believes it has the whole story itself.

Rationality: L/H does not understand how the uniqueness of things – especially of contexts, means that general rules can only ever be highly approximate, and often are plain wrong. Because of its need to ‘collapse things’ to a certainty, false distinction and dichotomies thrive, with an emphasis on “Either/Or”, rather than “Both/And”.

Matter became a mere resource to be exploited, and human mental processes are divorced from the body which shapes them, with the consequence that things become more abstract and more reified, more merely material.

Left Hemisphere has three great advantages:

First, it has control of the voice and the means of argument: the three Ls - language, logic and linearity - are all ultimately under left-hemisphere control. It is like being the Berlusconi of the brain: a political heavyweight who has control of the media. Of course we tend to listen more to what it has to say.

Second, the self-consistent world of pure theory and ideas is like a hall of mirrors: all attempts to escape are deflected back within. The main paths that might have led us to something beyond – the intuitive wisdom embodied in tradition, the experience of the natural world, arts, the body and religion – are all emptied of force by the abstracting, rationalising, ironising impact, of the world of self-consistent re-presentations that is yielded by the left hemisphere. The living presence is no longer accessible.

And third, there is a tendency for positive feedback to come into play; instead of redressing the balance, we just get more of the same.

Which brings me to reason we cannot just view this of academic interest.

For I believe the world in which we live has come increasingly to reflect the view of the left hemisphere alone.

So for humans the need to have both ways of understanding the world, and yet keeping them apart, is paramount.

And it turns out that in humans the corpus callosum, the band of tissue that connects the hemispheres, while it does both connect and inhibit, is more involved with the process of inhibition, with keeping things separate.

And the bump at the front on the right in humans is associated with a whole array of ‘functions’ that distinguish us from other animals and relate to our capacity for empathy: in intimate connection with the right hemispheres as a whole, it plays a significant part in imagination, creativity, the capacity for religious awe, music, dance, poetry, art, love of nature, a moral sense, a sense of humour and the ability to change our minds.

The ways in which hemisphere differences affect what each hemisphere “does” are profound...

History of Ideas in the West

It is believed the battle between the hemispheres (which is only a battle from the left hemisphere’s point of view) explains the history of ideas in the West and explains the predicament we find our selves in today.

The brain has to attend to the world in two completely different ways, and in so doing to bring two different worlds into being.

In the one, that of the right hemisphere, we experience the live, complex, embodied world of individual, always unique, beings, forever in flux, a net of interdependencies, forming and reforming wholes, a world with which we are deeply connected.

In the other, that of the left hemisphere, we “experience” our experience in a special way: a “re-presented” version of it, containing now static, separable, bounded, but essentially fragmented entities, grouped into classes on which predictions can be based. This kind of attention isolates, fixes and makes each thing explicit by bringing it under the spotlight of attention. In doing so it renders things inert, mechanical, lifeless. But it also enables us for the first time to know, and consequently to learn and to make things. This gives us power.

These two aspects of the world are not symmetrically opposed. They are not equivalent, for example, to the “subjective” and “objective” points of view, concepts that are themselves a product of, and already reflect, one particular way of being in the world — which, in fact, importantly, already reflect a “view” of the world, such as only the left hemisphere can take.

Not Different Ways of Thinking - But of Being

At its simplest, a world where there is “between-ness”, and one where there is not. *(continued next page)*

(continued from previous page) These are not different ways of thinking about the world: there are different ways of being. And their difference is not symmetrical, but fundamentally asymmetrical.

The Other, Between-ness

We say we know someone in the sense that we have experience of him or her, so that we have a 'feel' for who he or she is, as an individual distinct from others. This kind of knowledge permits a sense of the uniqueness of the other. It is also 'my' knowledge.

If another person were to ask 'what is she like?' you begin by trying to describe her in a few words ('quick-tempered', 'lively', by qualifying phrases such as 'quite', 'a bit', 'very' and so on), but you'd be frustrated by the feeling that these general terms didn't really help get it across. You might resort to retelling instances of things she'd said or done. You get out a photograph - we learn a lot from faces. But if the questioning continued you'd have to say: 'Look, you'll just have to meet her — I'll introduce you'.

It's also 'my' knowledge, not just in the sense that I can't pass it on to you, but in the sense that it's got something of me in it. What I know about her comes from the fact that it was I who encountered her. Another person might allow other aspects of her to come forward and might know her as someone rather different... We would expect a consensus of those who knew her to emerge. This is the kind of knowledge we think of first when talking about the living...

It's the way we naturally approach knowledge of a living being; it's to do with individuals, and permits a sense of uniqueness it's 'mine', personal, not something I can just hand on to someone else unchanged and it is not fixed or certain. It's not easily captured in words; the whole is not captured by trying to list the parts ('quick-tempered', 'lively', etc); it has at least something to do with the embodied person (the photograph); it resists general terms; it has to be experienced; and the knowledge depends on between-ness (an encounter).

These are all, in fact, aspects of the world 'according to' the right hemisphere.

This kind of knowledge derives from a coming together of one being or thing as a whole with another. But there is another kind of knowledge, a knowledge that comes from putting things together from bits. It is the knowledge of what we call facts. This is not usually well applied to knowing people...

It is the only kind permitted by science (though some of the very best scientists have used subterfuge to get away with the other kind). Its virtue is its certainty - it's fixed. It doesn't change from person to person or moment to moment. Context is therefore irrelevant. But it doesn't give a good idea of the whole, just of a partial reconstruction of aspects of the whole. This knowledge has its uses. Its great strength is that its findings

are repeatable. Its qualities are the inverse of those previously outlined, and they are associated with the left hemisphere: an affinity with the non-living; with 'pieces' of information; general, impersonal, fixed, certain and disengaged.

Both kinds of knowledge can be brought to bear on the same object, of course. My knowledge of you can be informed by knowing your age, height and place of birth, but that is not in itself at all what I mean by knowing you. These ways of knowing are so different that in many languages other than English they are referred to by different words: the first by, for example, Latin *cognoscere*, French *connaître*, German *kennen*; the second by Latin *sapere*, French *savoir*, German *wissen* — and so on.

What I want to suggest is that, just as *wissen* could sometimes be applied to people and living things, *kennen* can be applied to a lot more than our acquaintances. This kind of knowing may help us to understand, rather than simply to amass information about, a host of things in the world, animate and inanimate. In fact there is clear evidence that we used to do this in the past, but have lost the habit or perhaps even the ability...

I believe the essential difference between the right hemisphere and the left hemisphere is that the right hemisphere pays attention to the Other: to whatever it is that exists apart from ourselves, with which it sees itself in profound relation. It is deeply attracted to, and given life by, the relationship, the betweenness, that exists with this Other. - end 'The Master and his Emissary' extract

AND NOW TO SOCIAL CREDIT

Philosophy is the field of gestation of ideas, the compost from which *policy* (action taken towards a recognised objective) may spring. A sense in which beginning (policy) and end (results) are one; for the end must be 'seen' before objective can be stabilised. The bridge between the unseen and the seen is the means, joining metaphysics to physics, the *idea* to concrete objectivity.

Douglas set out to prove inductively the practical effectiveness of his belief and as Tudor Jones wrote, his writing will continue to baffle all those who persist in tackling the problem from the wrong end — the deductive end. He warned that the "Conscious cultivation of this mental attitude i.e., the loss of balance, produced by the exclusively physical application of the Bacon formula, in conjunction with the prevailing ignorance of the **vital necessity for a counterbalancing metaphysical application.**

Metaphysics: *used in the wide sense of other than physics; the working of the mind; thought; ideas; belief.*

A perfect mechanism for control? (continued next page)

(continued from previous page) By means of a controlled Press, Broadcasting, and other devices of a similar nature, something that you call 'public opinion' (because it is the only opinion which is articulate), you have a perfect mechanism for a continuous dictatorship, and moreover, it is the form of dictatorship which is fundamentally desired by the collectivist mentality — a dictatorship which has power without responsibility.

"There is, however, another explanation almost equally obvious, and probably equally true, and that is that local sovereignty, particularly as it extends to finance, is a barrier to the supremacy of international finance. A financier once remarked that it was the mental inability of the person to shake himself free from the dominance of finance resided in the fact that he was **incapable of distinguishing between numbers and things.**

Douglas thought: I should be inclined to go further than that, and say that the mentality, which is attracted by the Internationalist idea, is incapable of distinguishing between numbers, things, and individuals - (*L/H ed*). It is a type of mentality, which is fostered and ultimately becomes inseparable from people who deal with nothing but figures, and is, in my opinion, the reason why the banker in particular is fundamentally unsuited for the position of re-organiser of the world. No banker, as such, has any knowledge of large undertakings, he thinks he has, because he deals with large figures, and he mistakes the dealing with large figures as being equivalent to dealing with large numbers of things and people..."

... this is the idea which is at the root of the International idea, where it is held sincerely. It is that you can obtain an elaborate series of statistics regarding the populations of the world and put a committee down at Geneva, or elsewhere, to legislate for them on the basis of statistics... The danger to the world of this idea is instant and practical. *CH Douglas, The International Idea - 1932*

IT DOESN'T KNOW WHAT IT DOESN'T KNOW!

Bacon's Inductive Method: It made possible greater boldness in the advance of certain of the sciences. He rightly insisted that preconceived attitudes, based only on established practises, must be tested against reality and if found wanting then changed or superseded.

This brings us to the heart of the social, economic, political and scientific problems of modern mankind.

Dr. Thomas Robertson had read Douglas and had grasped the importance of the disruptive influences of the two systems of education. Like Bacon, Robertson sought the primary causes of the unhealthy Body Social, looking past the symptoms to grasp the facts about the primary causes. He set out to examine the Body Social's institutions, the social mechanisms, using the Hellenistic-Deductive Method which emphasised, as observed by Douglas in "Social Credit", "any observed defects" in the social organisation are defects in the characters of

the persons composing the society. "Wars occur because people are wicked, poverty because people are idle, crime because they are immoral." Robertson likened the Body Social to a boy who displayed the symptoms of gluttony, laziness and a penchant for 'sweeties'. On examining the boy in more detail by the Inductive-Baconian Method, and ascertaining the facts, found the causes for his gluttony, laziness and craving for sweets, were to be found in his diabetic condition.

The Social Mechanisms: After examining the real objectives of the social mechanisms, including the Church, he insisted it must also re-examine its attitude to the boy, to the Body Social.

In the *Social Crediter*, Sept. 19, 1953 *The Mastery of the Event*, **Tudor Jones wrote:**

"My mind goes back to a day three years ago, Douglas stopped the car at a northern end of the famous avenue of trees leading out of Aberfeldy. (Scotland) He looked across to the river and town beyond it in silence, then said very slowly and gravely: "You know TJ I think the time is approaching when we shall have to challenge this monstrous and fantastic overgrowth of industrial expansion — fundamentally ... I can see nothing particularly sinful about a small dynamo, but this thing we've got ... it isn't a joke, it is Satanic..."

"... Insensibly, the minds of such people turn to numbers. It ceases to be the quality of the idea, the importance and significance of the idea communicated, which matters most. What matters most is how often you can communicate an acceptable idea to a different person... that is nonsense. The world doesn't work like that. How it works is an entirely different matter, by pursuing that path, you drop steadily to lower and lower levels of consciousness to touch broader and broader fields of ineffectual conviction. So that what is said more closely matches what the reader expects to be said, because his mind already contains it. 'We descend to meet'!"

AND WHAT OF JORDAN PETERSON'S PYRAMIDAL STRUCTURES?

"*Pyramidal organisation is a structure designed to concentrate power, and success in such an organisation sooner or later becomes a question of the subordination of all other considerations to its attainment and retention.*" *C.H. Douglas, The Pyramid of Power, 1919.*

We can thus see that where there is compulsion of individuals, compelling them to do things they do not want to do, we get a different type of organisation from the type we have been studying. This type of organisation can be shown diagrammatically as a pyramid. In this type of organisation a few people at the apex of the pyramid have all power and authority. There are various strata in the pyramid, all comprised of groups of people who are controlled by the stratum above.

(continued next page)

(continued from previous page) At the base of the pyramid we have the great majority of the people, and their only chance of furthering themselves in this type of organisation is by intrigue and corruption. Every stratum in the pyramid must maintain its position by controlling all those below it and by making itself subservient to those above. In such organisation the worst in human beings is developed, not the best.

Clifford Douglas wrote of the pyramidal structures long before Jordan B. Peterson came on to the world internet scene, and Douglas saw clearer and further than does Peterson.

Douglas wrote: “This demand to subordinate individuality to the need of some external organisation, the exaltation of the State into an authority from which there is no appeal (as if the State had a concrete existence apart from those who operate its functions), the exploitation of “public opinion” manipulated by a Press owned and controlled from the apex of power are all features of a centralising policy commended to the individual by a claim that the interest of the community is thereby advanced and its results in Germany have been nothing less than appalling.

A + B - MENDING A MORTGAGED WORLD **Jeremy Lee's paper to the Inverell Forum March 2009 - extract**

I started preparing this address on the day of the inauguration of America's 44th President, Barack Hussein Obama. Anyone who listened to the opening and closing prayers, or the incoming President's speech to the nation must have been impressed by the fervent hopes for a new beginning and an era of peace. Only a few, however, understood that the ceremony took place on a battleground; not so much between nations - Iraq or Afghanistan; Georgia or Gaza; the Congo or Zimbabwe; but between two spiritual proposals for the future of this planet - God or Mammon. Our Lord told us a long time ago that none of us could serve two Masters. That truth is the essence of a crisis now engulfing the world, driving us towards a catastrophe which threatens to dispossess and enslave us all.

The key instrument in the hands of Mammon – the Money Power - is debt. Scripture warns us, “The borrower is the servant of the lender”. Amschel Rothschild, founder of the Rothschild banking dynasty, put it another way: “Permit me to pass the money of a nation and I care not who makes its laws.”

Who creates-as distinct from lends-Australia's money?

There's so much evidence to answer this question that it is past any argument. The Australian Constitution, in Section 51, is clear that the responsibility belongs to the Federal Government and States – via their own State banking powers - in this country. Not the International Monetary Fund. Nor the World Bank or the Bank of International Settlements.

“While the individual is efficient in his own interest, and consequently well fitted to survive, may and will possess characteristics which completely unfit him for positions of power in the community. The necessity for a clear recognition of the differences between the application of the principle to the attainment of a single objective and its fundamental unsuitability in dealing with complex issues is quite vital... I should be inclined to go further and say that the mentality, which is attracted by the Internationalist idea, is incapable of distinguishing between numbers, things, and individuals. It is a type of mentality, which is fostered and ultimately becomes inseparable from people who deal with nothing but figures, and is, in my opinion, the reason why the banker in particular is fundamentally unsuited for the position of re-organiser of the world.”

We have merely skimmed the surface of what McGilchrist and Douglas Social Credit appear to share – though to my knowledge he has never heard of Social Credit. The seed Clifford Hugh Douglas planted for future generations did not have a name before – it was just taken for granted – that is, the Social Credit of any and all communities. Are you tending to that seed? ***

To emphasise the point, in 1937 ~ in the middle of the great Depression ~ the Federal government set up a Royal Commission into Finance and Banking. In his summary, the Chairman, Sir Mellis Napier said: “... That the Commonwealth Bank (i.e. at time a government-owned peoples' bank) can make money available to governments or to others on such terms as it chooses even by way of a loan without interest or even without requiring interest or repayment of principal...”

But, like every economy in the world, Australia has now transferred its constitutional power to create its own money into private hands. And the same private hands have indebted Australians, and hold mastery over the people and their governments. To quote a former A.L.P. Federal Treasurer, one-time deputy Prime Minister Dr Jim Cairns, in his book “Oil in Troubled Waters”

“... I want first to explain how money is obtained or supplied in a capitalist economy. Banks certainly create credit or, more exactly, they create money. Creation of money by banks is a simple process... The banks, therefore, can create deposits by lending to customers... within very wide limits, the trading banks decide how much or little to lend and who to lend it to... Not only have the banks power to create money within wide limits, but they do so. As well as determining the total volume of money, the banks decide also to whom they will lend. It is obvious they will prefer rich and powerful people and the companies associated with them; (continued next page)

(continued from previous page) they will prefer ‘old customers’, and they will not be too keen to lend to poorer people, to ‘battlers’, or to persons or even companies who may be competitive with their associates. The power to create money and to decide who should get it is a vast and significant social and economic power and for this reason, the Labor movement has always believed it should not be a privately owned power but be exercised solely by a public or peoples’ bank...”

That, for all its sins, was the old Labor Party in Australia – the party of Andrew Fisher and King O’Malley, of John Curtin and Ben Chifley; of national sovereignty and Australian ownership and mateship.

Many people find it difficult to comprehend that the old Labor movement was gradually captured after World War II by a totally different idea – international Marxism. The new Labor used the same words, but had never had a blister on their hands. They weren’t ‘workers’, or patriots, but international academics. They followed Marx’s belief that the Debt System would finally destroy Capitalism and deliver the Marxists a global slave state. Karl Marx put it this way in his book *Das Capital* in 1867:

(Quote) “...Owners of capital will stimulate the working class to buy more and more of expensive goods, houses and technology, pushing them to take more and more expensive credits, until their debt becomes unbearable. The unpaid debt will lead to bankruptcy of banks, which will have to be nationalized, and the State will have to take the road which will eventually lead to Communism...”
(unquote)

By 1983 when the Hon. Bob Hawke became Prime Minister with Paul Keating as his Treasurer, the old A.L.P. had been subverted by the programme of gradualism from the Fabians and the Socialist International, who were one arm of the Money Power.

Treasurer Keating, despite earlier promises, allowed 13 foreign banks to hang out their shingles on Australian soil. The magazine *Euromoney* awarded him title of “Treasurer of the Year”.

The Commonwealth Bank, hitherto an icon known as the “Peoples’ Bank”, and founded by the Labor Party before World War I, was sold to the private banking monopoly. Incidentally, it is instructive to consider how modern Treasurers, whether Labor or Liberal, are rewarded by the Banks. Paul Keating is currently chairman of Lazard Carnegie Wylie, a subsidiary of the international bank Lazard Freres; while Peter Costello is an advisor to the International Monetary Fund.

“Deregulation”, so passionately argued by John Howard, Treasurer in the previous Fraser Liberal Government, was allowed full sway by Hawke and Keating. Australia increasingly became “internationalized”. It progressively wrecked its own
New Times Survey

farming and manufacturing industries, corporatized its resources, allowed foreign ownership of its vast minerals and mining, and lived on foreign debt. It excused this by calling it “free trade”. The largest single shareholder in each of the ‘big four’ allegedly Australian banks was, and is, Chase Nominees from America.

By the time John Howard became Prime Minister in 1996, the rout was almost complete. The biggest international gathering of financiers ever held in Australia met in Sydney within three months of the election, and, under the chairmanship of John Corzene, C.E.O. of Goldman Sachs and now a United States Senator, instructed the new PM on acceptable policies if he wanted his programme ‘bankrolled’. Howard hastened to comply! This distasteful episode was fully reported in the *Australian Financial Review*.

Mammon, the international money power, was rampant and supreme throughout the industrial world, with its sights set on the New World Order, or Global Government. From Bob Hawke onwards our governments have been “globalist” – without ever asking the people at elections. Howard himself once said of Globalism that it was ‘inevitable’. There was nothing else. While he continued to deliver the plums of office, his party idolized him. But when reality caught up he couldn’t even retain his own seat in Parliament!

The new Rudd Government, with Treasurer Wayne Swan running the economy is the same horse with a different jockey. The whole game is to bail the banks – the perpetrators - out of their own mess – at the expense of the victims, the people. Australia is destined to sink into disaster unless it regains sovereign control over its own money system. There is no reason why it should not do so.

Australia has been described by the World Bank as “the richest per capita nation in the world”. Yet we have one of the largest per capita foreign debts on record. Both Labor and Coalition parties campaigned on this while in Opposition. In fact, when Treasurer Costello was seeking office in 1996 he drove a “debt bus” round Victoria highlighting the Foreign Debt. But during his term in office he conveniently forgot all about it and the Foreign Debt more than tripled!

Neither major party makes any attempt to deal with our Foreign Debt when in office. The same debt conditions, with variations, prevail worldwide. The banks, which own the world’s money, control governments and elected politicians. Ordinary people starve in the midst of plenty, or work with their spouses to pay lifelong mortgages, which are now passed to their children. Australian housing debt levels are actually worse per capita than those in the U.S.A.

But absolute power corrupts absolutely! Wall Street and its global fraternity wallow in self-indulgence, taking their bloated bonuses and profits while communities and families collapse around them. (continued next page)

(continued from previous page) Their luxury limousines and corporate jets pass by the homeless and the jobless on their way to the latest party, the snow-fields or their yachts. No political parties in office dare breath against their will!

And, finally, when the loan packages accumulate into billions and trillions they gamble on such a scale that they are past accurate accounting and the banks themselves no longer trust each other. They demand that governments bail them out and charge their victims - you and I – for the cost of doing so. It is monstrous and must be changed.

But who is speaking out? No politician I am aware of dares say anything. Their parties are mortgaged to the banks; and the media, which survives by corporate ownership and advertising, toes the line in a manner which flies in the face of free speech.

As for the Church? Once it championed the poor and spoke resolutely against usury and exploitation. It stood for limited government. The only group Our Lord took physical action against were the money merchants who had turned His Father’s House into “a den of thieves”.

It was a Bishop who led the campaign for Magna Carta in Britain against the despotic King John.

Both Catholics and later Protestants opposed monopoly while defending private property. Christians advocated a just relationship between employers and workers and Magna Carta, 800 years ago, banished the money lenders from the country. But by the time the Bank of England was founded in 1694, the Churches gradually became mute, finally joining the queue for loans.

In 1960 the Congregationalist Union of Scotland, after an exhaustive hearing on finance and banking, issued a report which gained some attention. Included in its findings were the following: “We believe that the virtual monopoly of credit enjoyed by the banking system is contrary to all reason and justice....”

After taking evidence from bankers, economists and industrialists, it published a comprehensive report which is still available. It should be mandatory reading in all Churches.

Pope Benedict the Fourteenth wrote a valuable Encyclical on the nature of fair and unfair contracts and the evils of compounding interest. Indeed, the Old Testament contained much on the forgiveness of debt and the idea of a Jubilee; while Our Lord Himself went further in the Lord’s Prayer, urging us to pray, “Forgive Us Our Debts, as we forgive our Debtors.”

In 1931, as the Great Depression reached full intensity, Pope Pius XI issued his Encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno*, in which he stated that those who controlled credit had become so powerful that: “none dare breathe against their will” – preventing a just relationship between employers and labour in the economy, and a just price for goods and services.

On October 15, 1991, Pope John Paul II was reported in the global media in these terms: “The Pope hit out yesterday at the kind of financial austerity plans imposed on debt-ridden nations by foreign lending institutions such as the International Monetary Fund.

“One must state firmly, so that the whole world hears it, that a country’s foreign debt can never be paid at the expense of the hunger and poverty of its people,” he told a meeting of Brazil’s Bishops ...”

Yet our politicians quote these unscrupulous international financiers as though they were infallible!

In fact, on 2nd April, 2009 Finance Ministers and Central Bank Governors from the Group of Twenty (G 20) Industrial Nations gathered in London with the Managing Director of the IMF and the President of the World Bank, and Chairmen of the International Monetary and Financial Committees and Development Committees of the IMF and the World Bank to address the global financial crisis. What mandate have Prime Minister Rudd or Treasurer Wayne Swan been given to accept the decisions of such a group?

Both Treasurer Peter Costello and Treasurer Wayne Swan bathe in the waters of the latest IMF statistics as though they were, and are, Holy Writ!

Treasurer Paul Keating was feted as “International Treasurer of the Year” in the early 90s, even while thousands of Australian farmers were evicted off the land with interest rates between 20 and 30 per cent!

Since Pope John Paul’s condemnation – almost 20 years ago – both Catholic and Protestant churches have kept their silence while crisis has engulfed the world around them. Most pay usury on their church buildings without complaint, or charge interest on their investments. In the battle against Mammon the Churches are comfortably out of view on the sidelines! They watch with averted eyes the breakdown of families in their own congregations.

For as long as I can remember, in this fabulously well-endowed nation we have had an average ten per cent of the population living below the poverty line. It’s going to be much higher before long. Within forty kilometres of my home town of Toowoomba in Queensland there are over 70 different church congregations, meeting for services each week. Some provide social assistance to casualties in society. But they never speak out publicly against evil policies which render so many into insolvency.

Toowoomba – a city of churches – has one of the highest crime rates in Queensland. It’s more or less the same throughout the Western World. ***

**“Who Called the Cook a Bastard”
by Brig. C. Stanton Hicks - a personal account of a
one man campaign to improve the feeding of the
soldier - \$8.00 posted to anywhere in Australia
from PO Box 27 Happy Valley SA 5159**