

THE NEW TIMES

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

Vol. 33, No. 3

MARCH 1967

THE "CREDIT MONOPOLY" AND THE "EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY"

MAJOR STEP TOWARDS THE WORLD POLICE STATE

The attempts by Mr. Harold Wilson's Socialist Government to gain entry to the European Economic Community, generally but misleadingly described as the European Common Market, has once again focussed attention upon a proposed step of the greatest importance, not only to the members of the Crown British Commonwealth, but to a Western civilization fighting for its survival. The real purpose of those who created the European Economic Community is rarely publicized. This example of centralization is but one more aspect of the drive towards the World Police State.

In the following extensive extracts from a letter to a Conservative British Member of Parliament, our English correspondent, Mr. T. V. Holmes, examines in depth the real implications of the European Economic Community. The matter is of such importance that we do not apologize for the large amount of space we are devoting to this examination.

In the 1840s Disraeli wrote that the "Funding System," "has made debt a national habit, it has made credit the ruling power . . . Sidonia was lord and master of the money market of the world and master of everything else. Monarchs and ministers of all countries were guided by his suggestion . . . Can anything be more absurd than that a nation should apply to an individual to maintain its credit and its existence as an empire?"

In 1920: Major C. H. Douglas wrote: "What is commonly called credit by the banker is administered by him primarily for the purpose of private profit whereas it is most definitely communal property. In its essence it is the estimated value of the only real capital, including plant, etc., of a society to do work. The banking system has been allowed to become the administrator of this credit and its financial derivatives with the result that the creative energy of mankind has been subjected to fetters which have no relation whatever to the real demands of existence, and the allocation of tax has been placed in unsuitable hands." *'Economic Democracy.'*

In 1930, Pope Pius XI asserted that private bankers exercised "immense power and despotic domination . . . because they hold and control money, also govern credit and determine its allotment, for that reason supplying, so to speak, the life-blood to the entire economic body, and grasping in their hands, as it were, the very soul of production, so that no one can breathe against their will." *'Quadragesimo Anno.'* Today these same "private bankers" hold the CREDIT of the nations to ransom. They hold a CREDIT MONOPOLY over the economic,

and thereby over the political and cultural life of the world which they administer by a virtually impregnable world-centralized "banking system." By their power of creating "bank credit" which passes for "money," "out of nothing," they have been able to load the nations of the world with vast sums of UNPAYABLE DEBT. They have literally "gained the whole world," *economically*, and now only wait to "gain" it *politically and culturally*, in order to become "de jure" as well as "de facto" the rulers of the world. To that end was World War II started and fought; to that end were both UNO and EEC created.

NOW ORDER IN ASIA?

President Johnson, says Vincent Ryder, *Daily Telegraph* staff correspondent, set out for Manila in order to "be-

ALEX J. AMOS

We record with regret the recent passing of another pioneer supporter of "The New Times," Mr. Alex J. Amos. A colourful and forceful character, Mr. Amos threw himself enthusiastically behind the launching of "The New Times" and was actively associated with the many campaigns it's sponsored. Mr. Amos was extremely generous with both his time and his money in serving the cause in which he believed. There would be no "New Times" today if there had not been dedicated pioneers like Mr. Amos.

stow another blessing on the new 'emerging Asia' . . . in a tour intended to dramatize his grand design for a new, independent Asia emerging from nationalism and devoting itself to a co-operative effort at improving the life of its peoples. **It is a long considered and deeply felt policy.**" (My emphasis.) In Wellington, N.Z., the President said: "We say to the leaders of North Vietnam that a new Asia is emerging. Your people should be part of it, proud, independent, peaceful, the beneficiaries of a social and scientific revolution that is regenerating the life of man. What can be lost by joining your brothers in South-East Asia in a different kind of war, a war for human dignity, health and enlightenment, for your children and generations of children to come? America pledges herself to serve in that war, for its duration." It was tragic that "the war of terror and bloodshed must be fought before Asia can be fully free to wage the other war against hunger and disease." But for responsible men of conscience there was no acceptable alternative to resisting aggression. "It is simply to halt the war North Vietnam is waging and supporting against her neighbour. When we succeed, and we shall succeed, we shall begin a nobler war against man's ancient enemies, hunger, ignorance, and disease, everywhere in South-East Asia, including North Vietnam, if its government so desires." (*Daily Telegraph*, October 20, 1966.)

It was the same "grand design," the same "long considered and deeply felt policy," which prompted Anthony Eden, in September, 1939, to declare in a BBC talk to America: "Our new civilization must be built through a world at war. But our new civilization will be built just the same." That "new civilization" which was to be the product of a "war of terror and bloodshed," is supposed to have been realized in the "European Economic Community" which reflects an "inter-dependent Europe emerging from nationalism and devoting itself to co-operative effort." World War II had reduced the nations of Europe to such a state of ruin and despair that they were prepared to accept any "new civilization" on any "terms" provided that it provided "aid and assistance." The "aid" came in the form of the Marshall Plan; the "terms" in the form of the Treaty of Rome. The strategy is that described by a witness who when asked to account for the "great economic depression" of the 1930s replied: "They wanted to create a condition of despair so that they could emerge as rulers of us all."

THE STATE OF BRITAIN IN 1945

The nations of Europe at the end of World War II were in a state of utter despair. But not so Great Britain. Far from being down and out, she terminated the war in a state of political, economic and moral victory. Her industries and agriculture were equipped and streamlined for production as never before. She had defeated Hitler's "grand design" to establish a "world sovereignty" and had thereby established, so she thought, the right of the small European nations, and more especially Poland, to enjoy their regained "national sovereignty"

and live their own life without let or hindrance. She had herself successfully defended and preserved the British Constitution, parliamentary sovereignty and the English common law, all tried and trusted bastions of "individual freedom." She had known 800 years and more of uninterrupted independence and home rule. She had given of her sweat, blood, toil and tears in overflowing measure that "home rule" and "self-determination" should be respected everywhere on Earth. She considered herself the equal in status to the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. Was it conceivable that she would allow herself to be "traded in" to complete a continental "business merger" under a European authority carrying out the dictates of a "world authority," the "credit monopoly," for a mess of "European markets" without which she was not to be allowed to live "economically," i.e., not to be allowed to consume that which she might produce?

But those were the days before the significance of the Teheran and Yalta treaties and their *political* betrayal, as later the overnight cancellation of "Lend-Lease" and its *financial* betrayal, had fully dawned upon the British mind. Those were the days before the British mind had fully grasped the fact that the weight and "bondage" of FALSE DEBT, the product of FALSE CREDIT, incurred in six years of "total war," would have to be borne in perpetuity as an "industrial cost" and "tax on income." Peregrine Worsthorne in the *Sunday Telegraph* tells Mr. Heath to "concentrate on no-nonsense practicality" and declares "the truth emerging—which is quite simply that neither great party has any convincing new ideas about how to manage a modern industrial economy, and is increasingly at a loss to know what to do." But no party and no government can "manage" a "modern industrial economy" *without* constant bank credit "pump priming," and such bank credit is only granted *on terms*. It is not "new ideas about how to manage a modern industrial economy" which are needed, but "new ideas" as to the purpose of industry itself, which ought to be the "truth emerging" from our present lunacies. No party or nation is intended to be able to "manage" a modern industrial economy to any good purpose, but only to the Credit Monopoly's "messianic" purpose. How "manage" an economy which is geared almost exclusively to the creation of "*political power*" over the nations, and only incidentally to the production and consumption of wanted goods and services? Archangels could not "manage" it. Perhaps devils could! Perhaps only those in league with devils would want to! "Last week the ailing pound required another dose of credit," the pound having experienced "its most severe assault from speculators." (*Time*, 23/9/1966.) Does the pound avoirdupois ever "ail" or demand medicinal "doses"? Do "speculators" mount "assaults" against it? Yet what is the pound if not a "unit of measurement"—a "measure" of goods produced and goods consumed? And who are these "speculators" who "assault" the pound, if not the agents of the same "Credit Monopoly"? But change the policy and the philosophy

BOOK NOW FOR ANNUAL DINNER

Those supporters who intend to attend this year's annual dinner, to be held in Melbourne on Friday, September 8, are requested to make their bookings as early as possible. In view of the overcrowding at last year's dinner, a policy has been adopted of giving "hard core" supporters first priority. The donation this year is \$4.00 per person and should be paid with the booking.

of the economy, set it to the production and consumption of real wealth of goods and services "to the glory of God and the relief of man's estate," and a child could "manage" it. But who expects the power-drunk "Credit Monopoly" to admit that "systems are made for man, and not men for systems, and the interest of man which is self-development, is above all systems, whether theological, political or economic?" *Economic Democracy*, C. H. Douglas.

THE DESTRUCTION OF BRITAIN

However that may be, Great Britain's days of "victory rejoicings" are over. It is time for her to "grow up" and learn the "facts of life" in a world given over to the "Power Game." And in that "game" she is the "down and out," a "bankrupt" beyond possibility of redemption, bereft of empire and no longer viable, economically or politically, except by the grace and favour of the Credit Monopoly whose policy she must carry out and whose philosophy of the "good life" she must accept. By the laws of "orthodox finance" she is no longer CREDIT WORTHY. She is eaten up with DEBT. She who "saved the world" by her effort and example, herself she cannot save. She who fought two world wars for the "rights of small nations" and especially for the "right of self-determination" must abandon all thought of independence or self-determination for herself.

Great Britain stands in the path of the "grand design" and is a hindrance to an "interdependent" Europe, "emerging from nationalism." She must submit to the facts of bankruptcy and accept the orders of the European authority. She must "get into Europe" and quick about it. She must forget her one-time Great Power and Great Empire and adapt herself to her fallen fortune. And the European Economic Community is to act as her "receiver" and "goaler-protector."

Preparations are in train to facilitate the handing over. An "Industrial Reconstruction Corporation" has been set up "to stimulate and assist industrial concentration, rationalization and development." It matters not that the Corporation could be "a means of favouring those businesses which play ball with the government" or that "some of the schemes supported will fit into a large pattern of regional bribery. When staffed according to the fashionable trend by politically minded civil servants, the I.R.C. could play its part in persuading firms, which contribute

to anti-socialist causes by the discretionary use of its ample powers of compulsory purchase." *Daily Telegraph leader*, I.R.C. Ironies, 19/10/1966.

Properly considered, in the light of natural law, it is the CREDIT of the Credit Monopoly and its World Banking System, which is "ailing," and not the CREDIT of Great Britain. The REAL CREDIT of Great Britain, her capacity to produce and deliver wanted goods and services, has never been greater, as "World War III," if it should occur, would quickly demonstrate. That which is truly "ailing" is the policy and the philosophy of the Credit Monopoly which makes use of war, credit squeeze, taxation, unemployment, misery and despair as MEANS in the PURSUIT of its political objective—the "World State."

"TWO GREAT POWERS"

Great Britain must enter E.E.C. The writing is on the wall. As President Johnson told Foreign Minister Gromyko, "We are the two great powers in the world, and I think all the other nations look to us to keep the peace of the world." "That is the truth of the present world situation . . . These have been the years of the 'de-escalation' of the Anglo-American 'special relationship' . . . The world pattern began changing to such an extent that the relationship began to look special only to the extent that the relationship between an old family retainer and his masters is special . . . For the Common Market to be enlarged by Britain and other countries joining is the indispensable first step that must be taken, and taken now. That having been done, the rest will follow as day follows night, President de Gaulle notwithstanding." (*Instead of a "Special" Relationship*, Michael Hilton, *Daily Telegraph*, 1/10/1966.)

Edward Heath, leader of the "Conservative Party," accepts, apparently, the role of "old family retainer" as Great Britain's "special relationship" with the U.S.A. He takes Mr. Wilson and his party followers to task for not understanding this "new relationship." "They must recognize that there are some things to which there can

KEEP FIT WITH ORGANIC HEALTH PRODUCTS

Modern denatured foods are not sufficient to maintain complete health. Deficiencies can best be overcome with organic vitamins and minerals taken regularly. Health can be protected by the expenditure of only a small financial outlay per week.

Dietary Health Products can meet your basic requirements. Price lists available upon request. Support for Dietary Health Products is financial support for the work activities endorsed by this journal.

Dietary Health Products, 273 Little Collins Street, Melbourne. Telephone: 639749.

be no negotiations and others which have got to be accepted. That includes the Treaty of Rome, the common tariff, the agricultural policy and the institutions. There will have to be a transitional arrangement negotiated for the changeover of a great country like ourselves to a member of the Community. But it is no use any longer for Mr. George Brown and his friends to be asking for special privileges in E.E.C. It is true that the Six gave these to themselves. But they were the founder members. Rightly or wrongly, their view now is that the period is over and the privileges are no longer to be extended." Even within the Community we are to be treated as "second-class citizens."

Great Britain must enter E.E.C. Otherwise the whole level of business confidence may collapse because of the pressure on profits, the increasing menace of the unemployed, and the drying up of capital expenditure on new plant and buildings. That is the reason why "the whole issue of Britain's entry into the Common Market, which seemed so remote, has suddenly come alive again . . . one has the impression that there is no such thing as free will and we are all of us puppets dangling at the end of strings . . . it is beginning to be apparent once again that short of becoming the 51st State of the American Union, joining the Common Market seems the only way of imparting a radically different direction to our economic affairs . . . the prospect of access on equal terms to a vast European market will appeal as strongly to the Government as it already does to British business." (*Into Europe—When?* Patrick Hutber, *Sunday Telegraph*, 23/10/1966.)

To act as "whipper-in" among the young, a new organization called PEST (Pressure for Economic and Social Toryism) has been formed with branches in all the universities. PEST demands that Great Britain must take an active part in any plan, which seeks to develop a supra-national political structure for Europe. "We must get beyond the limited confines of national sovereignty. A more far-sighted approach, laying the foundation of genuine supra-national institutions is needed." (*Europe Looking Outward* leaflet, quoted in *Daily Telegraph*, October 11, 1966.)

THE GRAND DESIGN

PEST voices a "grand design" of considerable antiquity. It recalls the famous speech by Professor Arnold Toynbee at Copenhagen in June, 1931, when he said: ". . . we are engaged in a deliberate and sustained concentrated effort to impose limitations upon the sovereignty and independence of the fifty or sixty local sovereign independent states . . . it is just because we are attacking the principle of local sovereignty that we keep on protesting our loyalty to it so loudly. The harder we press our attack upon the idol, the more pains we take to keep its priests and devotees in a fool's paradise . . . We are at present working, discreetly but with all our might, to wrest this mysterious political force called sovereignty out of the clutches of the local national states of our world . . . The dragon of local sovereignty can still use

its teeth and claws when it is brought to bay. Nevertheless, I believe that the monster is doomed to perish by our sword. The fifty or sixty local states of the world will no doubt survive as administrative conveniences . . ." 4th Ann. Conf. of the Institutions for the Scientific Study of International Relations.

A recent *Daily Telegraph* leader states: "Today's Gallup poll shows that 90 percent of our top people want us to get into Europe, and that 91 percent of Europe's top people want to have us." And who dares to question the wisdom and good faith of the "top people" of the world? Rumours proliferate that Mr. Wilson will be the man who, however ironically and whether intentionally or because he feels he has no choice, will eventually lead us into Europe. These are straws in the wind. Mr. Wilson has openly declared his intention of joining the Common Market, though only "in due course" and "if we get the right terms." His Cabinet, too, has become far less rabidly anti-European, through changes partly of mind and partly of membership. Responsibility for our affairs at this juncture must be an education in itself. The difficulties which once humbled our proud island Tories now mount and rage round Mr. Wilson; if he is wise enough he will learn, as they have already learnt, the vanity of seeking to pursue, in isolation or in vague association with a dwindling and partly hostile Commonwealth, our own economic salvation at home or a pseudo-independent foreign policy abroad. Yet this lesson was easier for the Tories to learn. Whatever reservations some of them may have had on traditionally insular or imperial lines, there can have been little that was in itself repugnant to them in the spirit or letter of the Rome Treaty. This Treaty seeks to organize and run Europe much as they would wish—were it "politically" possible—to organize and run this country. To Mr. Wilson, however, it must represent not merely something vaguely strange and foreign, but the denial, implied or explicit, of almost everything he and his party have preached for a generation. It is called a market and is one. Its progenitor is not Marx nor yet Wesley but perhaps if anyone Adam Smith. It is supported by socialists, indeed, but by European socialists, not our sort." (*Fair Wind for Europe*, D. T. leader, 24/10/1966.) And European socialists are known to be proverbially REVOLUTIONARY and COMMUNIST.

THE MYTH OF "VAST MARKETS"

And what is the attraction of E.E.C. in economic peace and satisfaction? Patrick Hutber says "the prospect of access on equal terms to a vast European market will appeal as strongly to the Government as it already does to British business." But what constitutes a "vast" market? The U.S.A. in the 1930s had a "vast" market stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific oceans, and experienced the "vastest" economic depression of any nation in the world. Will E.E.C. provide a "market" of prosperous buyers for consumer goods, or just a place

for Credit Monopoly hand-outs and the devil take the hand most?.

"*Community in Disarray*," *Time*, 28/10/1966, after stating that the very reason for the European Coal and Steel Community's very existence is to solve coal and steel problems for Western Europe as a whole, continues: "Yet the Community's Italian president, Dino del Bo, who reportedly has threatened to resign, says that 'since June we have watched a development of replacing a community plan with dangerous and unacceptable national plans.' The French Government has threatened to give its own steel industry a competitive edge by granting it a \$600 million, low-interest, modernization loan and by buying more cheap American coal. Germany says it may help its over-stocked and over-priced coal industry with a straight subsidy. The Italians and the Dutch are happily selling steel from their new, competitive seaside plants wherever they can . . . Faced with the problem of dealing with over-production rather than with under-production, the Coal-Steel Community's High Authority in July proposed as a first step what amounted to a coal subsidy to be paid to Germany by the other five members. This would enable German coal to compete with U.S. coal, which sells for \$4 a ton less in Europe. But the French vetoed the plan on the grounds that they did not want to subsidize the German coal industry and that they did not want to give the High Authority any more 'supra-national' power. Then the threats of separate national solutions started . . . Said one Coal-Steel official: 'The Community is just going to crumble if the nations do go their separate ways and seek national solutions, but in two years the problem will only be worse when the national solutions haven't worked. The experiences of the 1930s prove that Europe is too small to try to export your problems to your neighbours.' The French seem unconvinced. 'Sacrifices imposed on a country by an authority other than its own is unacceptable,' said the French Foreign Minister last week in Paris, adding that France's experience with the Coal-Steel organization had been 'lamentable.' Concluded Couve de Murville: 'Nothing has taken place in Luxembourg except coal crises.' That sounded ominous for the Community's future."

And that is the 'mess of pottage' for which we are asked to exchange our 'birthright'! And then there is the question of Price Levels. Even the BBC has to feature the daily arrival of shoppers from Belgium and northern France who come for the day to buy goods that would cost at least 25% more money in their shops. Entry into the 'Common Market' would cause our prices to rise that 25%.

WILL TRUTH PREVAIL?

'Magna est veritas et praevalabit,' says the old sage. Perhaps TRUTH will prevail *in the long run*. But in the short run it seems more probable that LIES will prevail, and that the colossal power-momentum, which LIES have built up as to the nature of CREDIT will drive us into

the 'Common Market'. But so long as Constitutional sovereignty, freedom and independence remain a 'will to live' and a determination to oppose Heath's 'death-wish' must also remain. It is impossible to believe that your Motion is without political consequence or that your supporters do not realize that once we have signed the Treaty of Rome, the Crown's right to issue money will have gone. And not only Money. The right to determine the Budget, Taxation, the Common Law, Internal Policy, Foreign Policy and the Defence of the Realm itself will also have gone. 'No taxation without representation' will become a meaningless tag. How long the Crown can continue to act as a figurehead under such conditions is anybody's guess.

The 'Monday Club' gave the British people a heartening renewal of confidence in its destiny when it came out for British rights in Rhodesia against the rights of UNO and its unidentified Sponsors for 'World Rights'. And if the Club can make such a stand for Rhodesia's constitutional independence, why not for Great Britain's constitutional independence? For what sort of 'independence' will Rhodesia or Great Britain enjoy if the former is driven by economic and political sanctions into the arms of a Southern African 'Common Market' under the aegis of South Africa, itself a bastion of Credit Monopoly through its gold mine inheritance, and the latter is driven by similar sanctions into the arms of Europe's 'Common Market'? The Club can feel no delight at the role Heath is playing in our 'Great Betrayal' and must wish to redeem its Party's honour. It must wish to give the utmost publicity to the identity of the Powers and Policies which are driving us 'into Europe' before a complete silence is imposed upon Party, Press and Public Assembly.

As Disraeli might have said today, the 'Funding System' "has made Debt a Social poison, it has made the usurpers of our Credit the ruling power . . . Can anything be more absurd than that a nation should apply to an individual, or to a bank controlled by the individual, in order to maintain its Real Credit and its Social Stability as a distinctive and effective nation?" Or as Jung did say, "not your thinking, but your being, is distinctiveness. Therefore not after difference, as you think it, must you strive; but after YOUR OWN BEING." Therein lies the essence of CREDIT and the justification for the ORGANIC BRITISH CONSTITUTION. And our business is, as Douglas said, "to free it from the weeds which are choking it, and to restore its power and effectiveness . . . to be successful, Constitutionalism must be organic; it must have a relation to the nature of the Universe." *Realistic Constitutionalism*, 1947. 'Majority rule' and the 'one man one vote' are not essential ingredients in our constitution. E.E.C. is an 'organization', and again to quote Douglas, "All organization is what used to be called magic, and a good deal of it is black magic—the manipulation of metaphysical forces for questionable materialistic purposes."

Now whether we seek 'Social Money', issued by the State, or 'Social Credit', issued by the Integral Account, we shall both agree with Ezra Pound that the "State by creating riches should thereby get into debt? This is infamy, this is Geryon!" And I think we shall further agree that the State, by getting into false debt, should thereby be led away into a 'European Captivity' is the greatest infamy. It is nothing less than a denial that any LAW exists on Earth and an assertion that POWER alone rules.

TOWARDS GREATER CENTRALIZATION

Vincent Ryder's final report from Seoul, South Korea, on President Johnson's "mixture of royal progress and exercise in political management" so well sets out the Credit Monopoly's 'Grand Design' to 'rule the world' under national camouflage that passages must be recorded:

"By the use of forces in Vietnam and persuasion elsewhere the Americans have gone a long way towards convincing influential men in and out of power in Asian capitals that Communism is not the wave of the future. In response, the influential men in Washington are finding it hard to resist the tempting thought that the ensuing political readjustments being made in Asia represent a tide of opinion that is leading rapidly to a concert of peaceful nations embracing two-thirds of the human race.

"The outlines of his grand design are simple. American power will be used to block Chinese expansion. When a balance of power has been struck, and accepted on both sides, no single nation will dominate the Asian and Pacific region.

"The U.S. will not attempt to de-Communist the countries that are already Communist, at least not by force, and will tolerate any political regime provided it is not imposed directly from outside, whether it becomes Communist, Fascist or Democratic.

"Within this framework the U.S. expects to see the present trend towards regional groupings expand. It will not set up any new military alliances.

"Eventually, it hopes, China and North Vietnam will join in co-operative schemes of development with other Asian countries, with the U.S., Europe and Russia serving as contributors but not as paymasters.

"In this 'Pax Asiatica' American know-how will be used to satisfy Mr. Johnson's ambitions to spread 'the Great Society' from America to Asia, to feed, clothe, house and educate the multitudes . . .

"With the ardour of the converted he now insists that when America treats with the world it must no longer put Europe at the top table and Asia below the salt, that America has a mission to tackle the squalor and hunger in Asia. Can he now persuade the mass of Americans to share his views?" (*Daily Telegraph*, 2/11/1966.)

And in pursuit of that 'world mission', *Britannia delenda est!*

'Mr. Wilson's Passport to Europe,' Walter Farr, *Daily Telegraph*, 8/11/1966, also demands notice: "Since the Brussels breakdown four years ago, it has been a *foregone conclusion* among the Six that sooner or later, whatever the governing party in Britain, a new application was *inevitable* . . . The Brussels institutions must now be the permanent framework for a Market covering most of Western Europe . . . *Economic reality* at home and on the Continent are *forcing Mr. Wilson to accept this* after bitterly attacking them in Opposition . . . the Six feel that British entry is *the only way to end the present stagnation* in many key sections of the *Market's development* . . . *only by widening the Market can real progress be made on European* . . . *political union* . . . Mr. Thomson, the Minister responsible for European Affairs, says Britain accepts the basic rules of membership and does not question the institutions or the Treaty of Rome . . . he says *the British consumer would have to pay not only for the full cost of producer support at the higher prices in the Market, but also for the cost of bringing the prices of imported foods up to the higher levels required to protect the internal markets* . . ." (My emphasis.)

Why is the Constitutional issue never raised? 'No taxation without the consent of Parliament' was the reason for the House of Commons existence. TAXATION can take two forms (a) INCREASED PRICES, and (b) DECREASED INCOME. The INCREASED SHOP PRICES, which will inevitably result from joining the Common Market, will constitute a very considerable 'income tax' *additional* to the 'income tax' levied by H.M. Government. And it is an ADDITIONAL INCOME TAX, which the Brussels authorities can increase, *without the consent of Parliament*, whenever they consider that 'producer support' and 'internal community markets' demand it.

COMMON MARKET STAGNATES

Meanwhile the much-vaulted Market already suffers from "stagnation in many key sections of its development." A Belgian 'agent de change' writes that today, 'c'est lac crise—en plein'. The so-called 'Market' can only be kept alive by constant 'development', supposedly justifying constant Bank credit 'injections'. Otherwise the Market stagnates. This must be the "economic reality" facing Mr. Wilson and forcing his hand, as well it might. Nevertheless it remains a solely *Bank imposed 'reality'*, and in no way a nature imposed 'reality'. Any Market, even the despised British market, can 'flourish' under such conditions—the conditions of PERPETUAL BANK-CREDIT INJECTION, PERPETUAL INDEBTMENT, and PERPETUAL PRICE INFLATION. But what then is the purpose of the present 'Credit Squeeze'? It is just another bank imposed "economic reality"—supposed to 'save the Pound'. But why 'save the Pound' if it is a "foregone conclusion" that the Pound is to be thrown to the Brussels wolves and a steep rise in Sterling Prices is thereby a "foregone conclusion"?

"OPIATE OF THE PEOPLE?" NO, COMRADES — AN ALLY

ROGER GARAUDY and DER SPIEGEL

Prof. Garaudy is the chief ideologist for the French Communist party. This is from his interview with one of West Germany's most influential magazines, published weekly in Hamburg.

The following dialogue will be of interest to our readers, especially those of an earlier generation. Thirty or forty years ago it was generally accepted in the church that the Communist conspiracy with destruction of individuality in all its forms as a prime target, saw religion as its greatest enemy. It was recognized by the Communists that belief in a divine creator outside the control of man but the source of his strength, inspiration and progress was their greatest hurdle to achieving a society based upon the precept that all men are equal. The first tactics employed by the Communists in dealing with the church and Christians were crude. The slaughter of millions or their incarceration into slave labour camps, on political charges—the charge never was that they were Christians—stiffened the resistance in the West. The tactics then became those, which are classical to Communist technique, infiltration and perversion. Today the church has many apologists for Communism and the clear line of delineation is obscured to the point that many Christians cannot tell the difference between what are two uncompromising and opposing faiths.

SPIEGEL: Professor, you are a philosopher and a Communist. As a member of the central committee of the French Communist party you have pleaded for an approach between Communists and Christians. It is possible to be Communist and Christian at the same time?

GARAUDY: Nothing in the statutes of our party prevents a Christian from becoming a member of the Communist party. Yet this is not the important point. The point doesn't concern being Communist and Christian at the same time. The point is to find out where Communists and Christians can take the same position.

SPIEGEL: This co-operation comes rather suddenly.

GARAUDY: No, not philosophically. We are now experiencing the end of the 35-year domination by existentialism that is by Sartre. The subjectivity by this philosophy is now being replaced by the so-called structuralism, which is of the opinion that history is only an interplay of structures. This is a history without the human being, simply directed by reactions.

SPIEGEL: And against this reaction you as a Communist want an alliance with Christianity?

GARAUDY: Yes, confronted by this situation Christians and Communists have to act together. Politically this phenomenon is not new. Beginning in 1936 Maurice Thorez, the deceased secretary-general of our party, in his policies tried for co-operation with Catholics. So we haven't just started to recognize that Christianity has contributed tremendously to human history.

SPIEGEL: For a Communist, though, Karl Marx's contribution is supposed to be much more important, and he said: "Religion is the opiate of the people." Many of your comrades will stick to that and may not even consider co-operation with Christians.

GARAUDY: Marx did not want this famous sentence to become dogma. Nothing is more remote from Marx's thinking than dogma. He only voiced an historical experience, which is undisputed; during his time the church, in the Holy Alliance, made itself the accomplice of reaction. And today it is not much different. Everywhere the church has favoured fascism and reaction and

still does so. It concluded the concordats with Mussolini and Hitler.

SPIEGEL: Even the Soviet Union concluded a treaty with Hitler.

GARAUDY: I am surprised that you compare these. If the relations of two states are regulated, that is a political agreement. But if the church concludes a concordat, that is a spiritual position. There is no connection.

SPIEGEL: We do not agree. You explain the church has become the accomplice of reaction. And with such an evil accomplice communism wants to conclude a pact? We know an explanation for this puzzle. Communism no longer is a revolutionary—but a reactionary power. We dare to state that the Soviet Union, concerning art, literature and education, is the most conservative country in Europe.

GARAUDY: I must quickly correct that. At present there are two Picasso exhibitions in Moscow. The writings of Kafka have been published. That's why I think that you cannot talk of a general conservatism in the Soviet Union. But let's return to the church. We as Communists don't demand that the church give its blessing to Communism nor that it condemn capitalism.

SPIEGEL: This is exactly why we doubt there will be many common interests between Communists and Christians.

GARAUDY: The church and the Christians are not the same. Today the church is still mostly reactionary. Yet more and more Christians reject this policy. They not only want co-operation with Communists, but also a more progressive church policy. The hierarchy has to go along with this movement.

SPIEGEL: Even if this were so, how would you expect this co-operation to work in practice? If France were governed by a socialist-Communist majority, what would happen then? Could the citizens assemble freely, could they freely set up organizations, maintain independent newspapers in which they could print their uncensored opinions? Would there be religious freedom without any restrictions?

GARAUDY: This would be so. There would indeed be total freedom. In France we have about 10 million people who more or less are influenced by Catholicism. A few million are influenced by the Communist party. Therefore, whether anyone likes it or not, it is impossible to build a stable future for France without or against the Catholics just as well as against or without the Communists.

SPIEGEL: So Communists suddenly are for pluralism?

GARAUDY: We recognize the pluralism of the political parties.

SPIEGEL: If a Communist told you: "Marxism has proven itself for a century. There is no reason to seek a common ground with Christians," what would you reply?

GARAUDY: There are Communists who argue like that. Yet there will be fewer and fewer. The party officially recognizes my theses.

SPIEGEL: Is there a Western reform movement inside communism for which you are a representative?

GARAUDY: For about 10 years there have been innovations in the Communist parties, and especially in the parties of France, Italy and Spain. I am part of it, and I wouldn't say that I work in isolation in this movement.

TWO IMPORTANT BOOKLETS

Every student of Communism and every Christian Actionist should read these books.

BY E. D. BUTLER
"Dialectics"

"Dialectical materialism enables the Communist to murder, lie, betray, to claim that which was black yesterday is white today. But the Communist does not believe that he is murdering or lying or being treacherous. So long as he is advancing Communism he is in fact acting morally because to the Communist the only morality is that which advances Communism."

Price 4/5 posted

THE EQUALITY DOGMA LEADS TO COMMUNISM

By D. Watts

In this brilliant essay the author exposes the equality dogma as one of the most dangerous of the twentieth-century myths, and one, which is paving the way for International Communism. This essay is a closely reasoned reply to the claim that "all men are equal" and a demonstration of the truth that the organisation of human beings into masses destroys the individual.

Order from The Heritage Bookshop, Box 1052J, G.P. O., Melbourne. Price 2/-, post-free.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

The following letter by D. Watts was printed in the "Sydney Morning Herald" recently. In the welter of comment on juvenile delinquency abroad today, which is mostly superficial reflecting little understanding of fundamental causes; this letter throws a clear light showing where delinquency starts.

SIR. —In his article on juvenile delinquency Professor Maddison says that evidence strongly suggests that the amount of violent crime has been remarkably stable in recent years. If that be so, a significant thing is that, in spite of all the research done by psychologists, psychiatrists and educationalists, and all the practical efforts of social workers, such crime has not decreased. That seems to indicate that either the approach and methods have not been quite right, or there are influences at work to nullify what is being done to solve the problem.

It is being discovered that, much more than economic conditions, the psychological environment influences behaviour. A person does not need to read or to watch TV to be affected by it. Our present society being organized as it is, the influence of the social psychological environment is likely, in many cases, to swamp that of the domestic environment; and the social psychological environment is created by the intellectuals.

Who wrote and praised all the morally ugly novels and plays and persuaded parents and youngsters and many of those appointed to uphold law and order that moral ugliness is amusing or exciting or excusable? Intellectuals. Who taught young people that in being lawless they are being gloriously youthful? Who flattered them into believing that they are wiser than those with more knowledge and experience? Who led them to believe that anyone attempting to maintain some discipline among them was an unsympathetic wet blanket who did not understand how frustrated it made them feel not to be allowed to do as they like? Who taught that when wrong is done, anyone but the wrongdoer should be blamed? Intellectuals — not all intellectuals but delinquent intellectuals who would never listen to anything they did not want to hear nor look at anything they did not want to see.

Perhaps psychologists should pay more attention than they do to intellectual delinquency; for there is an inevitable relation between that and social delinquency.

FREEDOM WEARS A CROWN, by John Farthing.

This is beyond doubt the most significant constitutional work produced within the British Commonwealth for a long time. A Canadian lecturer in political science, the late John Farthing left behind him a brilliant exposition of the case for the Crown as an institution essential for the free society. Easily read, this book should be given to every young student starting to study political science. And it is a work, which can be taken down time and time again to refresh an understanding of the great traditions of the British world. One of the really great books of our times. Price 35/-.