

THE NEW TIMES

"Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free"

Volume 28, No. 8

May 4, 1962

EDITORIAL

THE MONEY POWER'S WAR AGAINST THE BRITISH COMMONWEALTH

There can no longer be any doubt concerning the source of the major pressure upon the British Government to join the European Common Market. A press report from London states, "It is becoming known here that the Kennedy administration is impatient with Britain's cautious approach. Mr. Kennedy wants Britain to go into the Market quickly and believes she is dragging her feet." In his press interview last week after returning from abroad, Mr. John McEwen, Australian Minister for Trade, accused the United States of trying to influence negotiations between Britain and the Common Market countries to the disadvantage of Australia and other Commonwealth countries.

Former Australian Prime Minister, Viscount Bruce, has added his contribution to the Common Market debate by warning. "Watch America like hell." Unfortunately, however, the growing resentment against "American" influence obscures the fact that the American people and their vast productive system are but pawns being used by a comparatively small group of international financiers who have over a long period of time pursued a consistent policy of centralising power on a world scale.

As a result of steps taken during the Second World War various international organisations were set up which enabled those at the top of the international financial system to exercise greater power than ever before. Selective financing, much of it directed towards promoting State Monopoly and subversive activities, has hastened the concentration of economic power on a world scale. In his last major work *The Brief For The Prosecution*, Major C. H. Douglas examined the political events between 1918 and 1939, which led to the Second World War, an event obviously desired in order to expand the plan for World Power.

Douglas's examination led directly to a group of International Zionist Jews, who supported the New Deal in the U.S.A. through their tool, Roosevelt, Political and Economic Planning in Britain, and various other movements, all of which sought to destroy the foundations of genuine economic democracy, private ownership, free enterprise, and the profit system which gave many individuals a degree of economic freedom through dividends. Because the British Empire was a major barrier to World Dominion, it had to be destroyed. The pressure to sign the Treaty of Rome is but a continuation of other policies directed against the British world since the First World War.

The German-Jewish groups in the U.S.A. opposed America's entry into the First World War until the revolution in Russia had permitted the Germans to concentrate all their forces on the Western Front. One of the prices of the dollar loans to a desperate Britain was undoubtedly the acceptance of the Zionist demand concerning Palestine, even though this meant a betrayal of the Arabs, a betrayal for which the whole non-Communist world is

still paying. It was the Zionist financiers who insisted that Britain play its role in getting the Second World War started, and who at the end of that war suddenly terminated Lease-Lend in order to force the British to accept the Bretton Woods financial agreements.

Time and time again during the second world war President Roosevelt, backed by the Zionist-Jewish Money Power, and warmly regarded by the Communists, made it clear that he was an enemy of the British Empire, and particularly of the system of trade preferences which ensured that the British world had a degree of economic cohesion and independence. Already the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (G.A.T.T.) has been used to seriously affect the pattern of trading between British Commonwealth countries. For example, G.A.T.T. was used to deprive Britain of her big cotton market in Pakistan, which is now supplied mainly by Japan and Italy. At the 1952 Commonwealth Economic Conference held in London the question of British countries modifying existing preferences to their mutual advantage founded on the fact that the British Government in particular was controlled by G.A.T.T.'s rule concerning non-discrimination and was not prepared to revolt. If Britain joins the European Common Market, all existing preferences to other Commonwealth countries will be abolished, and Britain must impose tariff barriers.

Unless they drastically modify their internal financial and economic policies, Australia and New Zealand must either suffer domestic chaos and a revolutionary situation, or accept the advice of those urging greater exports to Communist countries. It is significant that the Australian Communist Party, which is but an instrument of the International Communist conspiracy, is so convinced that "American" pressure is going to force Britain to accept the Treaty of Rome that it has launched a special nationwide campaign on the Common Market issue. The superficial observer will uncritically accept this campaign as further evidence that the Communists are opposed to the European Common Market, and that the Common Market is therefore a genuine barrier against the expansion

Continued on page 4

A BRITISH HOUSEWIFE ON THE EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET

Writing in the February issue of "Housewives Today", a journal which supports the policy of the British Housewives' League, Elizabeth Dobbs points out that British consumers, whose living standards will be seriously affected if Britain joins the European Common Market, have not had their views considered at all. She clearly shows that Britain can successfully avoid the Common Market economic trap by a more realistic domestic financial policy.

A British housewife exploring Europe immediately notices that prices are much higher than at home. In a restaurant a single dish costs as much as a whole meal in a comparable place in Great Britain. It will probably be better cooked and on a holiday we eagerly pay for the respect and imagination so miserably rare in institutional meals in this country. But love and care are thrown in because that is the way the true cook works. They are not fundamentally what makes it so expensive. Meals are more expensive because ingredients are dearer. A stroll through the street market makes this clear; and the recent efforts to reduce the price of beef in France, for instance, illustrate it.

All over the continent the first essentials for living cost more, but because they are presented strangely and interestingly, and because "Culture" has done its best to convince us that continental habits are altogether so much better than our own, we don't notice how much dearer everything is. The Common Market is busily levelling things up. We should consider this before we join it.

The root problem is that agricultural countries outside Europe grow so much more food, so much more easily than Europe does, that it can be imported far cheaper than it can be grown at home. Yet agriculture at home is usually better in quality, and must continue. How to protect home produce? The Common Market and Great Britain use diametrically opposed techniques.

TWO OPPOSING METHODS

The Common Market protects its farmers with tariffs and quotas on agricultural produce entering it. Farmers then charge up to this artificially heightened price for homegrown produce. The consumers pay for their wheat the low world price *plus the duty*.

In Great Britain we allow free entry of goods — either preferentially from the Commonwealth, or from all countries — and protect our farmers by subsidies. The farmer sells at the low world price. The difference between this and an economic price for him is made up by subsidies. The consumers only pay the low price.

Subsidies are paid out of taxation, but even so they are as all can see more effective in keeping down prices.

The French argue that it would be fiscally impracticable for them to adopt a subsidy policy even if they wanted to. That is for them to decide. But if we join the Common Market we shall almost certainly be required to substitute direct protection for our own more successful device of subsidies. This will mean rising prices for housewives.

WHY DO WE EXPORT?

However, any advantage to be gained by joining the Common Market is supposed to be in the field of Exports. Here the scope is large.

Everyone knows that we have to sell abroad enough of

our goods in the right places to be able to buy in the tremendous amounts of food and raw materials we need. Until recently we plodded along happily, selling manufactured goods to the Commonwealth (by and large) and getting from them our daily bread and butter, cheese, "fruit and meat. Denmark joined in with butter and cheese, and for luxuries and French cuisine we went to the continent. This was a decent reasonable procedure, with the added advantage that it left the Commonwealth nearly independent of the political blocs East and West.

But there is another less well-recognised role of exports, which bears closely on our everyday lives. It can best be discovered by considering what factories are *for*, and what people think they are for, which is not necessarily the same thing.

People who use and buy (for example) cars think a car-factory is simply there to make cars. On the other hand, those who work in them think their important function is to give employment for which wages are paid. In fact the factory has dual functions: on the one hand it is there to make cars; on the other, to give employment. But for 60 or more years engineers have been doing their level best to invent ways of making cars, and everything else, with less work, fewer man-hours of employment, less specialised skills. They have succeeded beyond their wildest dreams. With modern developments in automation the actual production of wealth has become enormous and the potential capacity for production even greater, and all for a very small expenditure of human work. However, when automation does the work, men lose the means-of-living that employment produces. (Machines don't get wages or spend money). So that the less human work is needed to make a product, the less means people have of buying it. Every improvement in technique of manufacture increases this disparity.

Various mechanisms have grown up to try to bridge this gap. Exporting is one of them. Others are excess bureaucracy, advertising, rocketry and in the last resort, war (the ultimate of exporting — by force).

Within this scheme of things exporting is understandably the most popular. If we can make more things than we want, and if we can sell them abroad, the work done in making the export-things gives employment, wages for which pay for goods-not-exported. So, paradoxically, the more we manage to export, the more we can get for ourselves at home. This is why the urge to export is so frantic. And this is why the lure of the Common Market is so strong.

THE DILEMMA

At the moment Western Europe is one of the two fastest growing markets in the world. The other is the United States. Imports to both more than doubled between 1954 and 1960. Our traditional markets in Canada and the

sterling area only grew by less than half in this time, and British exports to these parts increased by 12 percent, only. Our share of the total markets there fell from 58 percent to 44 percent. Australia and South Africa imported more from America on the removal of discrimination against the dollar. India imported industrial plant from Germany. Our exports of textiles fell by 20 percent, though exports by the rest of the world increased by 41 per cent.

Great Britain is not alone in this fix. All industrial countries share it. All of them *must* export more than the minimum needed to pay for their imports or they will not be able to circulate among their own people even a modest share of the things produced. If the Common Market puts us inside their trade barriers, it also lets them inside ours. In the Commonwealth market, with a lead, close connections and still some preferences, we have lost no less than 14 percent of the available trade in 10 years.

Do we really think that we shall gain markets in Europe's home ground, competing with France, Germany and Italy in their own backyards when they specialise in the same type of thing? European wages are lower, their hours are longer, less time is lost in strikes and they cannot in any case send us the vast quantities of elementary foods we need to sustain us. This is fundamental.

Take cars as an instance. For the last seven years there has been a steady decline of Britain's share of the world's motor markets. We held 40 percent of the world car exports in 1954, but had only 25 percent in 1960. In the Common Market countries our share dropped from 21 percent to 11 percent in the same time. In the United States it fell from 70 percent to 28 percent by 1960, and in the first five months of 1961 right down to 5 percent. Meanwhile German exports there rose from 46 percent to 81 per cent. Currently the number of foreign cars on our own roads increases steadily; in 1960 ten percent of all cars here were foreign. *As soon as we go into the Common Market British protection against French, German and Italian cars will be cut by half. Eventually it will be removed altogether.* Possibly we may sell some more British cars on the continent: we are certain to lose substantial markets here. And so with most other things too.

This is partly, but only partly, because British industrialists lack thought and imagination in pursuing markets. They do not picture at all clearly what the consumer needs and wants. Where is the British cheap, handy, weatherproof car built to need no garage, organised for the non-expert owner to keep in order? We import Volkswagens as we have imported scooters from the continent, jet-aircraft from the United States, and have watched the Japanese supply the world with transistor radio sets. We might have developed all these, but we didn't.

All this is quite true: but it is also true that no amount of angry or sorrowful words can restore a wilting enterprise and imagination. Even fierce competition with keen foreign manufacturers cannot do so: any more than it could cause our workers to stop striking, or put in a longer day for less money. Both attitudes are symptomatic of a deeper frustration.

FRUSTRATION

We sometimes hear it said that people ought to work longer hours for less money, and that strikes should be made illegal. If this were done, it is added, we could compete with the "Continent".

We put it on record, for all to read, that we believe strikes to be symptoms of a deep frustration based on the unconscious knowledge that the work people do is often pointless, unnecessary, often better done by machines and frequently petty or even harmful in its purpose; and that all the same, the makings of plenty-for-all lie around us. How can we urge people to work longer hours while this is so? Of course, similar conditions affect everyone. How many businessmen are driven into illness by endless worry, endless work and endless form filling, much of it unnecessary?

The "Continent" lags behind us. In the last resort their workers know nothing but compliance or revolution. Our strikers, with all their tragic mistakes, know more than they do.

We have seen that even if exports could supply the remedy (which they can't, apart from the fact that scrambles for export markets lead directly to war) the Common Market would be most unlikely to provide the desired markets, and that joining it would probably lose us at least some of those we already have. We have seen that cost of living would certainly rise unless the Continent could be persuaded to use our mode of subsidising agriculture, which again is unlikely. On the evidence, then, the pressure for us to join the Common Market is not economic, though economics have been dolled up to look like a reason.

POLITICAL PRESSURE

The source of the pressure is political. The policies of both the United States and the U.S.S.R. are to make Europe into a buffer state between them. It would suit both for Great Britain to detach herself from the remains of the Commonwealth and become wholly dependent on Europe. It would also suit the powers behind the great conglomerations of European industry. Yet Britain has probably been most use to Europe as a guerilla force operating independently on her outskirts.

The Common Market is an economic trap, inadequately baited, to catch Britain and deprive her of the very freedom of action that twenty years ago, and twenty years before that, was Europe's salvation. We should keep right out of it.

There is no reason at all why we should not negotiate special trade relations with Europe, without surrendering sovereignty, and without becoming wholly dependent on her. This, the United States of America propose to do.

At the same time we should by-pass the whole miserable series of mechanisms for stopping the gap between work-necessary-to-production and employment-necessary-for-

Continued on page 4

THE EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET

Continued from page 3

earning-a-wage. We should tackle the fundamental dilemma itself. That is, that as manpower is progressively displaced by machine-power, with a consequent increase in productivity, access to the wealth produced is progressively extinguished, because access is only through employment.

It is time to insist that nominal employment can no longer form the exclusive title to wealth. Engineering has made it impracticable. Every person should be entitled to a share of this increasing wealth unconditionally, an increment to his freedom irrespective of earnings or employment.

The British workman recognises the situation subconsciously in a pattern of life that takes in its stride on-and-off unemployment pay, and on-and-off strike pay sickness benefit and public assistance. This is the root of his willingness to strike for what seem quite trivial reasons, a willingness that is often made use of, for instance, by the Communists, for the furtherance of their own policies. Still, with his customary realism he is well on the mark in recognising as correct that his living need not come *only* through employment.

It is suggested that as a nation we should consolidate this attitude.

Let an amount of new credit carefully based on and tied to the increased productivity calculated over a fixed period be shared out between the inhabitants of these islands - the wages of the machine, if we think of it that way. This credit must not be raised by taxation. Part of it should go direct to the consumer, and without conditions (unlike for instance, unemployment pay which demands you be unemployed, or sickness benefit, for which you have to be sick); and part used to keep down prices by the proved method of subsidy.

Measures such as these would let us buy as much of our own product as we wanted, without being forced to engage in supernumerary exporting or bureaucracy or war. Dare we add that here, too, is the means of reconciliation between warring political parties?

At this time in the history of the world, with the atom bomb looming over our shoulders, this could be precisely the saving atonement. It could begin the dissolution of the monopoly of power, which has dictated for so long the terms of living—and the terms of dying—to us all.

A REMINDER ON STUDY COURSE

Melbourne readers are again advised that the 1962 Social Credit Training Course will start on Thursday, May 24, at the office of *The New Times*. Those desirous of doing this course should submit their names immediately. The course may also be done by correspondence.

PAGE 4

Printed by W. A. J. Barr (Printers) Pty. Ltd., 434-430 George Street, Fitzroy, N.6.

THE MONEY POWER'S WAR

Continued from page 1

of Communism. But the Communists are not in fact opposing Britain joining the Common Market; they are eagerly exploiting the situation to advance their own strategy.

The Communists propose the following policies "to offset crisis": Recognition of Communist China, "orientation of trade orders to the Socialist countries," and acceptance of the Soviet Union's offer to supply cheaper petrol in exchange for Australian primary production. These policies, which will gain considerable support throughout Australia and New Zealand, if Britain joins the Common Market, would increasingly tie Australia and New Zealand to the Communist bloc and enable the Communists to exert increasing pressure. It is possible, of course, that Australia and New Zealand could be offered "salvation" from Communist alliances by joining a Common Market already hinted at by President John Kennedy. But whatever development took place, it would be towards the further concentration of power as part of the drive for World Dominion.

The group exercising power through the worldwide monopoly of credit undoubtedly believes that in the final analysis it will rule the world. Such a world would have to be run on Communist principles or there would be revolt. The people of the British world can play a decisive role in defeating the threat of world tyranny by rejecting the Common Market trap and taking steps to modify domestic financial and economic policies which are undermining the free society. Such steps would be bitterly contested by the Money Power and its agents, but sooner or later the essence of the real struggle concerning the future of mankind must be forced into the open. The countdown for the final battle has already started.

A "SPANNER IN THE WORKS"?

Up until Wednesday, March 28, the majority of the Trafalgar (Victoria) Apex Club favoured the promotion of fluoridation in Trafalgar as a service project. But one member suggested that the anti-fluoridation case be heard. On March 28 Dr. Hickey, spokesman for the Dental Association, discussed the question with Mr. Eric Butler, National Director of the League of Rights.

The only comment necessary is provided by the following extract from the Apex Club's report to members:

The discussion on fluoridation was most interesting. It was unfortunate that the speaker against it was so much more accomplished a speaker than the one in favour. Apparently some members were later, at best, less strongly in favour of the project than they had been. The club fluoridation committee, at an informal meeting afterwards, was almost unanimous that there was little hope of persuading Trafalgar to try fluoridation.

The New Times is published by New Times Ltd., Third Floor, Pressgrave Building, 273 Little Collins Street, Melbourne. Subscription: £2 per annum post-free.

THE NEW TIMES