

CHRISTMAS ISSUE

THE NEW TIMES

Registered at the G.P.O., Melbourne, for transmission by Post as a Newspaper.

£2 per annum post-free.

Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne.

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

Vol. 30. No. 21

December 1964

EDITORIAL

REFLECTIONS UPON FUNDAMENTALS

Even in the midst of battle it is essential from time to time to consider ultimate objectives being sought and the fundamental principles underlying those objectives. The Christmas Season is one where we feel that we can with great profit go back to the very root of the issue, which we are so vitally concerned about. The issue concerns individual freedom. But although freedom is the most important thing, which is at stake in the world today, only a minority understands the true nature of freedom.

The cause of freedom is at the very heart of the struggle against the international conspiracy known as International Communism. The Doctrine of Free Will is a basic feature of Christianity, and yet many professing Christians do not appear to be concerned with the decline in freedom. Many even lend their support to policies, which are progressively driving the individual towards the Servile State. Some Christians go so far as to see virtues in the Godless tyranny of Communism. It is clear that there is both confusion and lack of understanding about this question.

One of the most deadly manifestations of a decline in the belief of individual freedom as a reality is the observation, often made by those who pride themselves on their "progressive thinking", that there is an "inevitable trend" towards more and more centralisation in all fields of human endeavour; that life has become so complex that progressive specialisation is essential; and that individuals cannot therefore have the type of freedom they once had. In order to clinch this line of argument, if it can be called that, it is also observed that freedom in the past meant that many only had the freedom to starve, while today the standards of living are so much higher. The false inference is that material abundance is only necessary by restricting individual freedom. Because Soviet Russia is now producing more washing machines, television sets and motorcars than previously, this allegedly demonstrates that there is some merit in central planning at the expense of individual freedom.

But are freedom and material abundance incompatibles? The short answer is that only freedom results in the creativeness of the individual being permitted full development and full play. While it is possible to mask some of the inefficiency of a Socialist industrial system, it is much more difficult to mask the inefficiency of a Socialist agricultural system. No matter where it has been tried, Socialist principles applied to farming invariably end in disaster. It would appear that those who by nature like living and working with the soil have a deeper instinct for freedom, and therefore resent any interference with their freedom to handle their soil in their own way. Farmers the world over have proved stubborn opponents of collectivisation of farming.

It is often overlooked that the Soviet Union would have collapsed internally a long time ago if it had not been for the periodic economic blood transfusions given by the free-enterprise nations. Finance has been the means of administering these transfusions. Which indicates that the controllers of financial policies are supporters of progressive collectivism. If, as we believe, finance is one of the main instruments being used to erect a World Slave State, then those responsible for financial policy are working towards exploiting the material results of freedom in the non-Communist world to ensure that the Communist world does not collapse before the non-Communist world has been deprived of the freedom it still possesses. The defeat of Communism requires, therefore, that the remaining arena of freedom left

When a civilization has reached the stage where little, mediocre men are casting big shadows, it is certain that its sun is low in the west and quickly setting.

in the world be zealously defended as the base from which the arena of freedom can be progressively expanded.

Real freedom is not some type of free-for-all, as often sneeringly observed by its opponents. It does not mean anarchy. Freedom is only possible when there is proper authority, a rule of law, which provides the individual with the maximum of freedom, which does not interfere with the freedom of other individuals. The challenge of Communism, which is basically a challenge to freedom of choice by the individual, cannot be met by policies of "moderate" Socialism, which also deprive the individual of freedom of choice. In fact it is the steady concentration of power in the non-Communist world, and the growth of bureaucracy, which is not only limiting the individual's freedom of choice, but it also sapping his will to be concerned about freedom. If sufficient people in the non-Communist world are so undermined by this creeping loss of freedom that they feel that the important thing in life is to obtain the creature comforts, then they may well ask why should they take any risks by opposing Communism.

Continued on Page 3

GEMS FROM C. H. DOUGLAS

During the Christmas Season the thinking dedicated Christian ponders on the miracle of the Incarnation and what it has meant to man. The author of the ideas which gave rise to the birth of this journal, C. H. Douglas, gave the world a greater understanding of reality, and enunciated a policy, Social Credit, which was designed to make real the philosophy underlying Christianity. Douglas said, "the crisis through which we are passing is a war against practical Christianity". Douglas was beyond doubt one of the greatest minds this century has produced. As he made clear in his work, his thinking was fashioned and influenced by that stream of history, which had its source with the birth of Christianity. We therefore feel that it is appropriate that in our Christmas issue each year we should take some time to ponder on some of the gems of wisdom which Douglas gave the world.

"Now it is my own belief . . . that there is running through the nature of the Universe something that we call a 'canon'. It is the thing, which is referred to in the Gospel of St. John as the 'logos', the 'word' . . . The engineer and the artist refer to it when they say that they have got something 'right'. Other people mean the same thing when they talk about absolute truth, or reality. Genuine success only accompanies a consistent attempt to discover and to conform to this canon in no matter what sphere our activities may lie. For instance, I have no doubt whatever that there is one single test which can be applied to any financial scheme which is put before you for consideration, and that is, whether it represents reality, just as we know that the fundamental falsity of the present financial system is that it distorts and perverts reality . . . I am confident . . . that just as departure from the canon has produced the appalling condition of the world at the present time, so the existence of a growing body of people who are aware of the situation, and singly devoted to bringing back understanding into relation with reality constitute not only the great, but the only certainty that eventually a world system founded upon lies will give way to one which is founded upon truth."

—*The Pursuit Of Truth*, 1933.

"We say, with adequate foundation, that Social Credit is applied Christianity, and it is therefore especially necessary to be able to give an intelligent answer to an enquiry for a definition of Christianity in everyday life. It must be remembered that while it is no longer, England was once a Christian country, and during that period there was evolved a system of Law, known as Common or Natural Law, which was definitely Christian in intention, and surprisingly so in achievement. It was wholly distinct from Roman Law and entirely opposed to the Legislation by Departments which are struggling to kill it.

"It is in this body of Law that the most tangible structure to which Social Crediters can refer is enshrined, and it is important that Social Credit technicians should have a clear understanding, not of the details, but of the principles which are involved—principles which underlie the whole theory of private property and its corollary—the corporate nature of the family from generation to generation, which have been filched by their simulacra, the limited company and State Capitalism.

"Socialism, Communism, and Atheism are all of a piece, as are Christianity, private, decentralised property,

and respect for family tradition as part of respect for the individual. There is no compromise possible—either there is no Christ, or Socialism and Communism are of the Devil. The essence of them, without exception, is that the group giveth, and the group taketh away; blessed be the name of the group. Anyone with experience of life knows that the group giveth; yes, in exchange for the soul."

—In *The Social Crediter* of November 10, 1945.

"The set of ideas which became the movement known as Social Credit began with an examination of the problem of the relationship of the individual to the group, and the financial proposals which emerged were consciously, and in all their development, designed to free the individual from group domination. It is evident that the essential nature of the problem, not merely has not changed, but has become more sharply defined.

"It was early in the elaboration of the ideas, recognised that the group is essentially atavistic; it is something from which the individual has emerged, and his return to it is in the nature of spiritual death. Without, in this place, elaborating the connection between the anti-religious aspects of Communism, the soullessness of mass production, and the incompatibility of cartelism and Trade Unionism with peace, it may be emphasised that there is a connection between all of them, and it is epitomised in that amazing reply: 'Render unto Caesar that which is Caesar's and unto God that which is God's.' Caesar is, of course, functionalism, and if functionalism can be made paramount, if the Will can be paralysed by the Arm, if the Good which I Will I do not can be made uniform by the omnipotence of the atavistic Group over the emergent individual, then indeed the Devil is triumphant."

—In *The Social Crediter*, November 1, 1947.

"In the sense that I am going to use it . . . the word religion has to do with a conception of reality. It is the binding back either of action, or of policy—particularly of policy in the sense that I was using the word policy—to reality. In so far as its means to bind back, to bring into close relation again, and in that sense I am going to use it, religion is any sort of doctrine which is based on an attempt to relate action to some conception of reality. It does not necessarily mean, for instance, that your conception of reality is a correct one, but it does mean that you are postulating that there is something which we refer to as real, and you are basing your policy upon that reality . . .

"Social Credit is the policy of a 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."

—*The Policy of a Philosophy*, 1937.

* * *

"As I conceive it, Social Credit covers and comprehends a great deal more than the money problem. Important as that is, primarily because it is a question of priority. Social Credit fundamentally involves a conception, I feel a true conception—of the relationships between individuals and their association in countries and nations, between individuals and their association in groups."

—*The Approach To Reality*, 1936.

* * * * *

"'Reason', as I understand it is nearly synonymous with logic, of which mathematics is a special example. It is a pure mechanism, and as such, is deterministic. You put into the mechanism practically anything you please, and you get out something, which was inherent in what you put in, but nothing further. If I say that $(a + b)^2 = a^2 + 2ab + b^2$, I can apply that very useful piece of information to a number of concrete problems, but they must, on each occasion, concern similar objects. It is no use saying that the square of a apples plus b oranges gives you some information about bananas. It does not.

"The whole validity of the Christian Church rests upon the acceptance of certain premises. Those premises are not provable by reason, or they would not be premises. But they are provable or disprovable by experience, and to my mind, quite a surprising number of the Christian premises will stand that test.

"Given that attitude, and the proper and reliable historical background, an immense power could be built up as an instrument of higher legislative criticism."

—*The Realistic Position of The Church of England*

* * *

"Everything of which we have any knowledge is relative. The fact that the Dark Forces seem in the ascendant is a proof that they are temporarily in the ascendant over something else. You cannot know light without shade, you cannot know what anything is if you don't know what it is not . . .

"It is just as certain as anything can be in this uncertain world, that Christianity is not a Plan, it is a Philosophy which we have hardly begun to grasp. As such, it must have a Policy. That policy was and is rejected by the Jews, consequently it cannot be a Jewish Policy. That is to say, Jewish Policy is what Christianity is not. What is Jewish Policy? That is much easier to answer, because the present state of the world is the result of it. The short answer is Tower Politics—The Servile State'. The philosophy from which it proceeds is that of non-immanent Sovereignty."

—*Whose Service Is Perfect Freedom*

THE MOB

"Fifty thousand people gathered in a single place can do fewer things together than twenty-five groups of two thousand. Their chief function is limited to *being* there and saying Hurrah! or Heil! at the right moment. That is why dictators love crowds and seek to provide bigger arenas and auditoriums for them. The bigger the crowd, the emptier the function."

—Lewish Mumford in *The Culture of Cities*.

It is clear to us that there is a much deeper significance in the statement beginning "When two or three are gathered together in My Name . . ." than most people realise. The League of Rights is finding, with its grass-roots organisation, that groups of six or less are the most effective.

LORD ACTON'S WISDOM

Whatever formula we adopt we shall do well to bear in mind the truths which Lord Acton, one-time Lord Chief Justice of England, never ceased to proclaim:

"That man does not live by bread alone; that the State was made for man, not man for the State; that every citizen counts; that minorities should have their place in the sun; that liberty is not a mere political contrivance, but a spiritual principle; that ordered liberty is the highest prize of civilised society; that men and women, like flowers, need light and air to have their chance and produce their best; that since all power tends to corrupt, the only way to prevent its abuse is to cut it up into little bits."

—Extract from an article on Lord Acton by G. P. Gooch.

LET US SOLVE THAT CHRISTMAS GIFT PROBLEM

Books of permanent value and *New Times* subscriptions make a different kind of Christmas present. *New Times* subscriptions as Christmas gifts are at special rates: £1 for one subscription; 30/- for two subscriptions; £2 for three subscriptions; and 11/-per subscription for four or more.

Reflections Continued from PAGE 1

If, as the Christian is taught, God gave man free will because He wished him to make free choices, and to accept personal responsibility for the choices made, then freedom is God's purpose for man. Loyalty to God therefore requires a determined defence of freedom as the most basic issue for the dedicated Christian. Those who really believe in free will, free choices, must reject as part of the materialist delirium all suggestions about "inevitable trends". Nothing is inevitable for those who accept the teaching that Christ came that men might know the truth, and that this truth would make them free. Clearly then real freedom stems from an acceptance of the truth, which Christ revealed to man. Armed with this truth, dedicated Christians can spearhead the campaign to defeat the anti-Christ, irrespective of the label under which he operates. Let us all ponder on the fact that every retreat from freedom is a retreat from Christianity; an expansion of freedom requires a more practical Christianity in the critical days ahead.

BRITISH COMMONWEALTH COULD LAY FOUNDATIONS FOR A NEW CIVILIZATION

As Christmas time approaches, the thoughts of most turn to family reunions. This is therefore a most appropriate time for members of the British family of nations to contemplate what the British Commonwealth has given to the past and, much more important, what it could give to the future. This is the issue which Mr. D. J. Killen, M.P., took up in his Paper at the 1964 League of Rights Seminar. We have much pleasure in presenting the second part of this Paper as excellent Christmas fare for our readers around the British Commonwealth:

In the fifteen years that followed the end of the Second War, the British Commonwealth did not centre much activity on its own structure. The world, it was true, was passing perceptibly towards the billowing turbulence of Messianic Communism, and the lash of that storm was to be made so much the worse by a complete misunderstanding of its ferocity. The old order of colonialism gave way to an insistent and viable nationalism. Power gathered in new combinations. But jealousy, suspicion and hatred continued largely to regulate the proceedings of a world that called itself civilised. Of course the world was tired of war—or so many leaders declared; yet somehow violence hung on to its infatuated followers.

Freedom and justice can never be advanced by mere pretence. To be persuaded that all is right when freedom and justice are trampled upon is to cultivate neither honour nor safety.

The strange feature of the Commonwealth association in the period to which I now refer is that it was not used in any sense whatsoever to meet the challenges of Communism and materialism, the problems of helping new nations, of giving aid to the hungry, of succoring the depressed, of encouraging the enslaved—in none of these things and more was there a united Commonwealth effort. For a host of reasons that was a pity. I do not dwell on the great error, which in my view the neglect represented. The world desperately sought leadership. The Commonwealth could, I believe, have given that leadership.

Meanwhile there was plenty of activity elsewhere. All sorts of organisations, agreements, schemes and institutions were set up—exhausting almost every available arrangement of the letters of the alphabet to describe them. I do not denigrate this activity. A lot of it was very worthwhile. What, however, I do say is this: if the Governments and peoples of the Commonwealth had devoted one percent of the time and effort to the Commonwealth as was given in other directions, then the Commonwealth of Nations would be vastly different and stronger today.

A Shift Away From The Commonwealth

If there were any doubt that the Commonwealth had been dreadfully neglected then those doubts were dissolved when, in 1961, Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom made application to join the European Economic Community. The application showed exactly how policy making in the United Kingdom had moved away from any really earnest consideration about the Commonwealth.

I have no wish to exhume the Common Market controversy, and I do not do so as such. Nevertheless, there are some comments about that great struggle which I feel obliged to make, if for no other reason than to acknow-

ledge the existence in certain high places of a desire to still get Great Britain into the European Community. To that extent then, I speak not merely in retrospect but in a sense proleptically.

First of all there was the argument which ran approximately along these lines: "Oh it's inevitable, old chap, that Britain join Europe—there's simply no other alternative." That argument was usually put over in a manner that was a mixture of smugness and affectation. If an inquiry was put to the user of the argument: "Have you read the Treaty of Rome?"—the reply was invariably a supercilious: "Oh, that is not really necessary."

I pause here to say that what I found to be one of the most bewildering and irritating aspects of the Common Market issue was the appalling ignorance in surprising places about the most elementary matters. Time and time again, when I could bring myself to look at economic factors, I would ask: "Well now, can you give me an account of what you consider to be the economic advantages of E.E.C. membership—that is, for Great Britain?" As a question it was not calculated to get much information. Here then, in a material sense, was the sheer recklessness of the undertaking. Nobody had the vaguest idea of what economic benefits, if any, may have flowed to Great Britain by becoming a member of the European Economic Community. This was bad enough, but when that recklessness was transferred to a consideration of the questions of traditions and institutions, and the historic links between Great Britain and her Commonwealth, the recklessness took on a cruel and bitter look.

To contemplate with a cynical disconcert the future of an estate passing from Alfred and Pym, and Burke and Livingston—somehow or other that struck me as a most wanton gesture.

If you believe that what I have said is a mild piece of sentimental hyperbole, let me cite this hitherto unrecorded fact. In the course of a discussion in London with a British Minister I asked him, assuming Great Britain's application to join the E.E.C. was accepted, what procedure would be used to bring the Treaty of Rome into the Municipal Law of England. His reply was that the House of Commons and the British Parliament would not be required to approve of the Treaty. He did not appear to be very impressed when it was pointed out to him that in England a Treaty could not affect private rights save, with the approval of Parliament. I am not impressed when I reflect that the Minister concerned was one of the senior Cabinet Ministers involved in the negotiations.

A Realistic Warning

In striking contrast to the ministerial ignorance I have just instanced was the frank warning given by the Master

of the Rolls, Lord Denning. Referring to the consequences of British entry into Europe His Lordship wrote:

"Our Constitutional law must be rewritten so as to show that the sovereignty of these islands is not ours alone, but shared with others. Large parts of our Statute and common law must over the years be adjusted."

It would not seem inappropriate for me to confirm that during a discussion Lord Denning told me that on the question of how to make the Treaty of Rome part of the Municipal Law of England he saw nothing but difficulty. And writing subsequently he observed:

"The last word on the Treaty will rest, not with our courts, not even with the House of Lords, but with the Court of Justice at Luxembourg."

The next argument (and it's the last one to which I will refer) used with respect to urging British membership of the E.E.C. was that it would make a useful contribution for defence purposes. The fact that Mr. Macmillan told the Commons, contemporaneously with Britain's application to join the E.E.C. that it was "not a Defence Alliance or a Foreign Policy Community . . ." did not seem to make much impact on those who used the argument that Britain was needed in Europe for defence reasons.

I cannot in honesty, looking back on those hectic days, disguise the misery that gripped me. It was not merely the disagreement with friends that disturbed me. Neither was it disagreement on the basic question. What roused me was the deceit and the falsehood—the cynical dismissal of what I felt to be a whole heritage—the scornful, contemptuous failure to give simple language its ordinary meaning—and when it seemed almost certain that Great Britain would go in, the vulgar exploitation by some people of that circumstance. These were the things that not only roused me, but also made a lasting impression on my mind.

At the time I wrote:

"The Empire knew its enemy in 1939. His ambitions were clear and well understood. Nobody doubted that he wanted to break up the association of British peoples and take from them the right to run their affairs. That he failed is now a proud part of our history. In countless thousands of homes throughout the world linger memories of those who shared in writing that history. There is no complaining in those homes. The memories are fading. The tears have run down into the current of time . . . Now the British family is challenged again. In a very real sense the demands of the family are identical with those made in 1939. One thing is different. The enemy is within, not without. And instead of Panzer divisions, "U" boats and bombers striking at the very foundations of British institutions, there is confusion, a lack of will to act as a family, and the crazy idea to commit Great Britain to a European Community."

And then came that tremendous moment when the whole move to extinguish British Sovereignty and with it,

in my opinion, the Commonwealth was turned. This was a time of truth. For now there had to be found an alternative.

Slowly, consciously and deliberately, the British people came to put together the facts of a situation quite without parallel in the long history of the race. That there had been gross deception was beyond contest. But the question now was—well, where do we go from here? With the country once again murmuring the lines of Henley:

**"I am the master of my fate;
I am the captain of my soul,"**

it turned to face the Commonwealth—a Commonwealth that had been terribly neglected, and this after nearly fifteen years. It would be erroneous to say that attention had not been given to the problems of any one Commonwealth country.

A Period of Futility

That is not my thesis and I do not seek to sustain it. What I contend is this: we had allowed the Commonwealth as an institution to drift into almost a meaningless, indistinguishable form. In world affairs it did not mean very much. In national affairs it meant even less.

Prime Ministers' Conferences were held but, somehow or other, they never seemed to be gripped of the drama represented by the changes occurring within the Commonwealth. Mr. Macmillan, as Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, visited a number of Commonwealth countries. Wherever he went he spoke pleasantly and affably. He did not always speak realistically. At Montreal in 1957 Commonwealth Economic Consultative Council was established. It has had little influence. Perhaps it never was meant to have influence. Beyond this there was no really concerted Commonwealth effort. Oh yes, Commonwealth Days were observed. Some of the speakers at the rallies were quite impressive; some of them later became better known for their advocacy of "let's get Britain into Europe." It became "non-U" to have respect for tradition; a harsh sophistication pushed in to replace the quiet idealism of God, Queen and Country; in politics, flattery and insincerity were preferred to frankness and honesty.

Meanwhile throughout the world the adherents to Marxism-Leninism were unremitting in their efforts. Their zeal had already brought them rich rewards. That they should seek to exacerbate the difficulties associated with emerging nationalism was understandable; that we failed to challenge them was unforgivable. Throughout the African continent massive forces stirred—some intent on giving intelligible expression to the ambition for self-government; others fired by brutal superstition and sheer lawlessness.

"World Opinion"

World opinion, we were solemnly reminded, dictated that all colonial countries should be given immediate self-government. Nobody ever explained how this "world opinion" was formed, but it was there nevertheless. The fact that the same world opinion did not seek to condemn bestiality and witchcraft in some of the new nations was puzzling, but we were left to wonder. Subversion and

murder and rape and thuggery became commonplace in nations where once there was, at least, order. For those who reacted against this violence there was the twentieth century explanation that this was a natural sociological manifestation associated with coming to nationhood.

In seeking to give the Modern Commonwealth a new meaning in the world, and I am convinced it needs a new meaning, I believe it is essential that there is a recognition of the fact that Commonwealth countries have now got very little in common. No organisation or association can survive for long unless its members do have common ideals and a common purpose. I do not dogmatise, but I am unable to see why it is that some people believe that the Commonwealth could be an exception. Mythology and illusion are all right in their respective fields. I suggest that they have no place in the real business of re-building the Commonwealth.

It is at this point then that the force of Burke's aphorism - "What shadows we are and what shadows we pursue" becomes clear. In terms of the Commonwealth that was a family, its members capable of disagreeing with each other but in trouble capable of standing together, the Commonwealth is but a shadow. And to go on imagining that something of its former strength can be regained without hard thinking and hard work, is to pursue the most fleeting of shadows.

Making A New Start

Where then can we start? It is easy enough to state the problem; it is a different matter finding the solution. We must be realistic. There is no point in propounding ideas, which are not practicable. This is not to mean that we should shun ideas, which have never been tried. What I submit is that we should look at every idea and ask: "Well, how far can I go with this?"

I believe that there is ample precedent for the Commonwealth to lay down some general principles, which all members should seek to observe and to acknowledge. This may be an unwelcome notion to those people who have held firm to the view that there was no need to have the Commonwealth relation set out in chapter and verse.

What I propose is not what would be, in effect, a Constitution for the Commonwealth. What I envisage is a declaration of Commonwealth willingness to support certain principles and, if need be, certain institutions. Opinion against such a proposal should not harden too quickly. After all, the Statute of Westminster put into rather fixed terms a relationship, which at the time called for very little definition.

Today there is, I submit, a powerful case for stating in a general way some of the things that Commonwealth countries can reasonably be expected to support.

I do not propose to cover the field, so to speak. All I can do is to address myself to some of the matters that seem to me to be of importance.

There is, I feel, a clear need to state in most unambiguous language that the Queen is still the Head of the Commonwealth, and is to many Commonwealth countries the constitutional monarch. Recently a visitor to this country, a

Mr. Mboya from Kenya said that the leadership of the Commonwealth should rotate from one Commonwealth country to another. I have no wish to offend Mr. Mboya but it deserves to be said, and nobody as yet has said it, that such an idea is a rank absurdity. The monarchical system is too entrenched in our system, i.e., the Australian system, for it to be lightly abandoned in the cause of what purports to be progressive thinking. I do not labour the point, other than to say that Mr. Mboya's suggestion lends handsome support for us to restate, one way or another, the things we stand for. Some Commonwealth countries are republics, and I can respect their attitude. Nevertheless, they accept the Queen as Head of the Commonwealth. If it seems some countries in the Commonwealth cannot accept the Queen as Head of it, then one may suggest without rancour that they would be better off out of the Commonwealth. Next I refer to the need for Commonwealth countries to affirm the principle of non-interference in each other's domestic affairs. This is of tremendous importance. It is incredibly easy to pass judgment on events from afar. To condemn is all too human a habit. To search for the facts and to get the truth—this requires discipline, and we are not always responsive to its requirements.

Past And Future

Time and fate have seen the peoples of the Commonwealth involved in great struggles. The significance of many of those struggles has, no doubt, been dimmed. Even so, the world is better off for their having been waged. Justice has more point to it because of what happened at Runnymede; humanity is more real because Shaftesbury and Owen challenged inhumanity; our social conscience is more enlightened because Wilberforce and Elizabeth Fry strove to make it so; the idea of Parliament is firmer because of Hampden and Fox; courage has more character to it because of Edith Cavell; tolerance is better practised because of Daniel O'Connell and John Wesley; understanding

THE MONARCH'S ROLE IN PARLIAMENT

Fifty years of trial and failure of that notion of the Greek "democracies" should be sufficient. Another fifty years of worship and obedience to strange Gods and the Magna Charta may just as well never have been written.

It is not suggested that governments in British countries should revert back to the form at the time of James II, but any strengthening of the monarch's role in Parliament will have a stabilizing effect in the social and political life of the British people.

The Crown is the repository of a treasure which has grown organically and is the very soul and secret of British existence; destroy it and an epoch in human history will have come to an end; preserve it and the Commonwealth will assume a new meaning.

—Karl Moeller at 1964 League of Rights Seminar.

and the family were given a fresh importance because a man named George became King of England in 1937.

No—to look back on the past is not to dwell in the past. Our lives are concerned with the future. But to face this future and to build in it an existence that offers hope and contentment and dignity calls for both resolution and spirit. It should never be imagined that the great qualities of creation never need replenishing. Today we are asked—the world is asked—to lay the foundation for a genuine peace and a society destitute of animosity, jealousy and ignorance. It is my fervent hope that in responding to that summons, no mantle and no shadow will pass between the peoples of the Commonwealth and their sense of history.

THE POLITICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF CURRENCY DEPRECIATION

"What," Professor Hayek asks, "would be the present value in various countries of the accumulated savings of a person who for a period of forty-five years, from 1913 to 1958, had put aside every year the equivalent in money of the same value and invested it at a fixed rate of interest of 4 percent?" (F. A. Hayek. *The Constitution of Liberty*, p. 329.)

According to Hayek, the saver in Switzerland would have retained some seventy percent. In the United States and Canada he would have retained approximately fifty-eight percent. In the British Commonwealth he would have kept fifty percent, and in Germany thirty-seven percent, and in France and Italy between eleven and twelve per cent.

Considering such staggering losses on the part of the thrifty and provident people, the growing clamour for government aid and assistance can hardly be surprising. The inflation losses strengthen the demand for social security, aged health care, and government controls over prices and rents. They foster federal aid and subsidies, and otherwise provide the chief arguments for an extension of government power.

Long-term employment contracts inflict inflationary losses on millions of professional people. Within a few years of employment they may lose some ten percent or more of their income through monetary depreciation. Their relative economic and social position in society declines with the decline of real income and wealth. This effect is all the more significant as it hurts especially that class of people that is most influential ideologically. There cannot be any doubt that teachers, ministers, priests and rabbis significantly shape and direct the moral, political and economic trends of the future. As fixed income receivers they are especially victimised by inflation.

—*American Opinion*, June 1964, p. 73.

The moral implications of inflation were dealt with by the Rev. Norman Hill, speaking at the 1960 Melbourne Anglican Synod, when he said that inflation, whether "controlled" or "uncontrolled" "is a form of subtle theft . . . Right order in society is impossible while official theft is condoned."

The full text of Mr. Hill's address, republished in booklet form, is available from The Heritage Bookshop. Single copy, 11d. Post-free. 12 copies, 5/- post-free.

POLYOLOGIST'S PROGRESS A Rhymed Guide to Contemporary Opinioneering (Dedicated to all young Australians about to enter universities, heaven help them!)

The budding polyologist (a toney word for know-all)
Seeking honour as the latest things in sages
Must tell the world he's found the way whereby it can out-grow all

The accumulated wisdom of the ages.

The quickest way to qualify for academic fame
(And the Sunday paper syndicated cheques)

Is to make an ostentatiously uncompromising claim
To "an honest, fearless attitude to Sex."

Help the Avant-Garde Morality to liberate the race
From the drab, conformist shibboleths of yore!
(Here's an easy one to start with: do a "survey" on the case

For the f-rn-c-t-r, s-d-m-te and wh -----).

You may satirise timidities like "faithfulness" in marriage,
For they're hardly worth a *serious* rebuff.

Oh . . . call 'em narrow-minded—and of course you can disparage

Monogamy as kindergarten stuff.

"God and Queen and Country" talk has had its little day.

We've substituted "Better Red than Dead"

And none dare call us Yellow, for it's we who have the say
On whom to smear and whom to boost ahead.

These vital matters settled, let's go on to make it clear
That a lot of other things need putting right.

Enlightened modern thought must be unsparingly severe
With ev'ry old wives' fallacy in sight.

Is water really wet, for instance? Who says fire burns?
Dirt is clean. "Confronting" isn't war.

The world awaits the happy day when ev'ry schoolboy learns

That *subtracting* Two from Two produces Four.

Any case for any virtue, any blame for vice or crime
We'll explain away, discount, dispute, debunk;

If you will not hark to Reason (as expounded in our Rhyme)

We'll stage a demonstration—and you're sunk!

On, thus, to New Horizons, to the Frontier Next-but-One
Of Tomorrowland and Glories Yet Un-Been,

When the Culture of the Public Root of Minus Twenty-One
Will contraceive, at last, the Ultra-Gene!

One proverb stays unaltered: we shall reap as we have sown,

So the Evolution Theory let's re-shape—

For it can't be very long before the Obvious is known:

That we're all descending TO, not FROM, the Ape.

—S. O. Watt.

* * * *

HOLIDAY ARRANGEMENTS

The offices of New Times Ltd. and The Heritage Bookshop will close on Christmas Eve and re-open on Monday, January 18. All those requiring vitamin supplies should make certain to place their orders before the holidays. Only urgent matters will be attended to over the holiday period.

DOUGLAS and the 'JEWISH QUESTION'

When C. H. Douglas first made his discoveries concerning the grave defects in the modern finance-economic system, defects which he warned would, unless corrected, lead to disaster for Civilization, he felt that the obvious line of action was to bring the nature of the defects to responsible people, and that this would lead naturally to corrective action being taken. But Douglas later discovered that there were powerful international groups which were prepared to go to any lengths to prevent the implementation of policies which would halt the progressive concentration of all power. He once recalled how a representative of one of the international financial groups based in New York was most interested in what Douglas was going to do about the discoveries he had made.

Douglas was not long in coming to realise that the issues he was concerned about would not be resolved at the purely intellectual level; that appropriate force would be necessary to defeat those determined to continue centralising power. In one of his addresses, Douglas said that he was no longer interested to know that millions of people in Britain supported his ideas. The important thing was what action were they prepared to take to give realistic expression to their faith. It was when Douglas evolved a militant political strategy to deal with the problem that large numbers of his alleged supporters deserted him. They shuddered at the thought of the type of action Douglas advocated. Some wanted to continue their intellectual pastime of merely discussing what they had learned from Douglas. This was safe. Others were lured away into the bog lands of orthodox party politics.

When Douglas started to make it clear that Civilization was threatened by an international conspiracy, and that finance was the main, but not exclusive instrument of wielding power, it was asserted by some that Douglas had become so frustrated by the lack of progress of his ideas, that he looked for a scapegoat and became, like many others, convinced that "the Jews" were responsible for the world's problems. This view is still put forward by some academic money reformers whose main preoccupation is to keep as far away from the real fighting line as possible. Their contention is that we are fighting false ideas, and that it is not the done thing to specifically name individuals and groups advancing those ideas. Douglas flatly opposed that view, and increasingly felt that the fullest possible exposure was necessary of all individuals and groups favouring the progressive centralisation of power on a world scale. He said that individuals must be made *personally* responsible for their policies.

So far from Douglas raising the "Jewish Question" from sheer frustration in the late thirties, the truth is that he had referred to it in very balanced terms in one of his earliest books, *Social Credit*. In the chapter dealing with the relationship of the individual to the group, Douglas wrote:

Jews And Collectivism

"No consideration of this subject (the relationship of the individual to the group) would be complete without recognising the bearing upon it of what is known as the Jewish

Question; a question rendered doubly difficult by the conspiracy of silence which surrounds it. At the moment it can only be pointed out that the theory of rewards and punishments is Mosaic in origin; that finance and law derive their main inspiration from the same source, and that countries such as pre-war Germany and post-war Russia, which exhibit the logical consequences of unchecked collectivism, have done so under the direct influence of Jewish leaders. Of the Jews themselves, it may be said that they exhibit the race-consciousness idea to an extent unapproached elsewhere, and it is fair to say that their success in many walks of life is primarily due to their adaption to an environment which has been moulded in conformity with their own ideal. That is as far as it seems useful to go, and there may be a great deal to be said on the other side. It has not yet, I think, been said in such a way as to dispose of the suggestion, which need not necessarily be an offensive suggestion, that the Jews are the protagonists of collectivism in all its forms, whether it is camouflaged under the name of Socialism, Fabianism, or 'big business', and that the opponents of collectivism must look to the Jews for an answer to the indictment of the theory itself. It should in any case be emphasised that it is the Jews as a group, and not as individuals, who are on trial, and that the remedy, if one is required, is to break up the group activity."

It is the breaking up of this group activity, which Jewish leaders have so consistently opposed. Policies are rooted in philosophies, and anyone who doubts the truth of the claim that Jews favour collectivist policies more than any other group, and are readily amenable to discipline as a group, might reflect on the significance of the tremendous Jewish vote against Goldwater at the recent American Presidential Elections. In spite of Goldwater's Jewish background, and his claim that he was proud of it, Jewish spokesmen in the U.S.A. have stated that the Jewish vote for Johnson was the largest ever recorded for a Presidential candidate. One Jewish spokesman claimed that well over 90 percent of Jews were against Goldwater.

A Bloc Anti-Goldwater Vote

The only logical conclusion to be drawn from this bloc anti-Goldwater vote, is that the policies advocated by Goldwater were anathema to Jewish leaders and the Jews as a group. This fact leaves no doubt that the Jews in the U.S.A. are violently opposed to the decentralisation of power, the limiting of the power of Governments, and, in spite of charges of "anti-Semitism" in Soviet Russia, reject any hard line policy against Communism. While Jews permit themselves to be used as a group to endorse policies which are driving the world towards the complete Slave State, the "Jewish Question" will continue to generate heat which, unfortunately, does not always produce real light. And the individual Jew is invariably the main sufferer. As Douglas said, the policies he advocated would solve the "Jewish Question" by removing the basic cause of the problem. But these policies are rooted in the philosophy, which the Jewish leaders, the Pharisees, of two thousand years ago rejected. It is unfortunate that Jewish leaders of today still reject this philosophy.