

THE NEW TIMES

Registered at the G.P.O., Melbourne, for transmission by post as a newspaper

\$6.00 per annum post-free. Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne.

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

Vol. 41, No. 1

JANUARY 1976

THE DISCIPLINE OF TRUTH

By Eric D. Butler

There has been considerable worldwide comment on the massive Australian and New Zealand vote against Socialist Administrations late last year, with much speculation on whether this means a lead towards the election of more anti-Socialist, conservative governments in other parts of the English-speaking world. The truth is that the New Zealand and Australian votes were a protest AGAINST two Socialist Governments. They certainly were not FOR any genuine alternative policies. New Zealanders would not have voted for the Muldoon Government if informed before the elections that Prime Minister Muldoon intended to impose a series of harsh financial measures, resulting in an immediate increase in the cost of living.

As yet the Fraser-Anthony Administration has not indicated that it has one financial step in mind, which would reduce financial costs and start to reverse inflation. A number of steps, starting with the reduction of Sales Tax, could have been taken immediately upon election. Financial costs can be reduced just as quickly as they can be increased. The Muldoon Government has demonstrated that inflation can be dramatically increased overnight. Inflation inevitably intensifies the process of centralising power. Irrespective of the stated intentions of politicians, who may in some cases be quite sincere in their protestation that they are strongly anti-Socialist, genuine decentralisation is impossible without decentralising financial control. Finance is a technique for centralising power. Progressive centralisation in all spheres is inevitable -- it is a mathematical certainty — under debt and taxation policies directed towards maintaining "full employment." The march towards Communism may be temporarily slowed down, but it cannot be reversed under current financial policies.

Generally speaking, a comparatively short period is all that is necessary to prove the falsity of pre-election statements and policies by politicians. Truth is, of course, eternal. Over fifty years ago C. H. Douglas wrote his book, *Social Credit* (first edition 1924) and made specific predictions concerning the fate of Civilisation if Finance-Economic policies of centralisation were persisted with. Douglas wrote, "There will probably come well within the lives of the present generation, a period at which the blind forces of destruction will appear to be in the ascendant.... There is, at the moment, no party, group, or individual possessing at once the power, the knowledge, and the will, which would transmute the growing social unrest and unrest (now chiefly marshalled under the crudities of Socialism and Communism) into a constructive

effort for the regeneration of Society. This being the case, we are merely witnesses to a succession of rear-guard actions on the part of the so-called Conservative elements in Society, elements which themselves seem incapable, or undesirous of genuine initiative; a process which can only result, like all rear-guard actions, in a successive, if not successful, retreat on the part of the forces attacked."

Douglas went on to predict that unless man could master the mighty economic and social machine he had created, the end result must be the collapse of Civilisation into yet another Dark Age. The true test of Science is accurate predictions. Unfortunately Douglas's predictions have been consistently proved correct by events. The course of events is not going to be changed by policy speeches or by high-sounding moral denunciations of

BASIC FUND SLOWS

Following a magnificent burst before the Federal Elections, when the Basic Fund was taken to approximately \$25,000, there has, perhaps understandably, been a marked slowing of support. And yet the need was never greater. The League's nationwide election campaign amazed many observers. It was certainly the biggest single step forward yet taken by the League. But it cost thousands of dollars. This means that the League's Basic Fund of \$40,000 must be exceeded to ensure that the League keeps pace with the deepening crisis.

Northern N.S.W. and Queensland contributions to Mr. Jeremy Lee, Kingstown, via Armidale, N.S.W. AH others to The League of Rights, Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne 3001.

effects. The Fraser-Anthony Government cannot escape the discipline of Truth and at best must, as Douglas predicted, attempt to fight rear-guard actions in the face of the increasing momentum of centralisation which finance-economic policies generate. Inflation must continue. All efforts to modify, still less reverse inflation, are doomed to produce greater social dislocation under present financial policies.

While it is true that there is, in spite of half a century of Social Credit educational activity, appalling ignorance and confusion concerning the truth about the finance-economic system, much of this ignorance and confusion results from the persistent endeavours of those who do understand how the system can be used to centralise all power on a world scale. The informed Marxist, as distinct from the shock troops who only know how to form a picket line as ordered, understand the role of finance as an instrument of power. There has been an unholy alliance between International Finance and International Communism, now clear to see by all not afraid to face the Truth. Such is the power of this alliance that when a Solzhenitsyn cries out that the Soviet slave Empire is only sustained by the economic blood transfusions financed from the West, Rockefeller international messenger boy Henry Kissinger takes steps to downgrade the great Russian hero. Solzhenitsyn is charged with being a threat to world peace! His real threat is to the evil and suicidal policy of sustaining the Communists, including Red China, with greater economic blood transfusions. Large numbers of "anti-Communists" dutifully join in the chant, "But we must export to the Communists because this is good for our economies."

CIVILISATION LIES BLEEDING

By D. Watts

During the recent Federal election campaign a number of newspaper employees went on strike because, they alleged, the papers were, in their news coverage, biased against the Labor Party. The accusation may or may not have been true but, so far as I know, newspaper employees have never been seized with a passion for truth and fair-play when the bias has been in the opposite direction.

The impression is that though the monopoly of propaganda enjoyed by leftists during World War II and for some time after has been broken down to some extent, for the most part the socio-political doctrine that has been mainly and persistently propagated has had from a decided to an extreme leftist bias. Consequently those who became politically aware during and since the Second World War would naturally think that the leftist slant must be the true line, so that an impartial and upright presentation of facts and opinions would seem to them to be biased.

The World War II victory of the Allies was seen as a triumph for a leftist type of democracy. The earnest

As Prime Minister Fraser's statements indicate that he also supports the "export or perish" theory, it is not surprising, perhaps, that he has expressed the desire to visit Red China at the first opportunity. Japanese businessmen, who presumably would also describe themselves as anti-Socialists, have also been courting Red China. The Communists regard all economic associations with the non-Communist world as a major means of establishing the coming Communist World Order. If Mr. Fraser genuinely believes that he should visit Peking to "understand" the Red Chinese, might I point out that large numbers of Western politicians have visited the Soviet Union over fifty years. Whatever "understanding" they have obtained has had no discernible impact on the steady expansion of the international power and influence of the international Communist movements backed by the Soviet.

AUSTRALIA AND N.Z. CAN LEAD

Australia and New Zealand are as well equipped in every possible way as any other Western nations to turn the tide against the programme of centralising power. But this requires the decentralising of financial power, starting with a genuine anti-inflation programme. The Fraser-Anthony programme is doomed to failure because it ignores basic causes. The optimists and wishful thinkers will resent being told this. But the supporters of the League of Rights are now sufficient to enunciate the truth sufficiently loudly to produce a reaction. And as the reality of the situation impresses itself upon an increasing number of disillusioned anti-Socialists, they will be prepared to listen as never before. Truth can only be defied at an increasing unpleasant cost to those who seek to remove themselves from its discipline. Eventually Truth must be obeyed or there is Death.

idealists and enthusiastic revolutionaries of the time thought that they had the world in their hands and could mould it into a shape designed by themselves. They were confident that Democracy produced by Equality and producing Freedom would spread over a world smiled upon by Peace. Now, after thirty years, it is time to take an all-over look at that part of the world in which leftists have had it nearly all their own way. Look at its hate and violence, its bleeding spots and unhealed sores, its unjust equalities and idealistic tyrannies, and contrast that with what was intended and expected. Surely it is necessary to re-assess the values of the ideologies, which have so greatly influenced the shaping of impotent or mistaken domestic and foreign policies.

One development, which is not short of being calamitous, has been the separation between political and cultural action. The idea is that democratic government produces individual freedom but that government is the enemy of freedom. An extremely important fact, which is ignored by most leftist ideologists, needs to be here restated. Ungoverned freedom is lawlessness, but there is no freedom in lawlessness. That is not a paradox. It is an example of the Hegelian discovery that a thing can become its own opposite. Individual freedom is not absence of government, but transference of organisational, or State, government to the individuals. The extent to which government can be safely transferred from the State to the individuals depends upon the power and will of the individuals to govern their own behaviour. State and individual governments meet in social manners, customs and moral standards. There is a unity between political advancement and the stage of cultural development expressed in the social and moral codes.

THE AMERICAN EXAMPLE

The United States of America presents us with an outstanding example of what happens when, while mistaking cultural lawlessness for cultural freedom, a people relies too much on a particular form of political government to create a civilised way of life. It is of special interest to this country because at present Australians are more than inclined to accept their cultural values from America.

Consider the significance of the following *Sydney Morning Herald* headlines to news items concerning civil conditions in the U.S.A. 1. SURVIVAL IN SCHOOLS (advice to teachers on how to protect themselves and their students from violence, perhaps death). 2. REPORT FROM HIT CITY. Jeremy Campbell Visits the Murder Capital City of the World (the murder city is Detroit). 3. Equality Costs Liberty. CRIME BY U.S.A. WOMEN ON THE UPSURGE (rate of murder, armed robbery, assaults and burglaries by women increasing proportionately faster than that for men). 4. U.S. POWERLESS TO STEM MURDER TOLL. 5. STICKING IT OUT IN THE SHADOW OF MUGGERS (from Washington). 6. THEY JUST WANTED TO KILL (from Chicago, referring to young murderers). 7. EVERY 17 SECONDS SOMEONE BUYS A HANDGUN. A Shooting Gallery called America. 8. THE CLIMATE OF ASSASSINATION (from New York). 9. AUSTRALIAN ENVOY ON U.S. CRIME. Attackers Get Little More Than a Slap on the Wrist (from Washington).

Those headlines, of course, give a far from complete picture of American society, but they suggest that crime has become a large part of that picture. In a community, areas of lawlessness cannot be isolated. Their evil is bound to seep into the whole of society; and that is what it is doing. In a recently held Gallup Poll 45 percent of Americans said that they are afraid to walk

in their own neighbourhood at night. A study at the Massachusetts Institution of Technology indicated that an urban American boy born in 1974 is more likely to die by murder than an American World War II soldier was to die in combat. U.S. crime, including rape, assault, robbery and burglary rose 17 percent over 1973 and the rate has increased since. Increase in crime has been even more rapid in suburbs and rural areas. Though over 10 million crimes were reported to the police in 1974, and even more were expected in 1975, a survey shows that more than two out of three serious crimes are never reported. Counting crimes reported and unreported, it is calculated that 70 murders, rapes, assaults and thefts are committed every minute. *Young people* commit most crimes. 45 percent of serious crimes were committed by youths less than eighteen years old.

A former general counsel to a presidential crime commission said, "Crime does pay . . . the odds are 99 to 1 that you could commit a serious crime and not go to jail for it." In New York City the criminal has an even better chance of escaping jail. Of 97,000 arrests for serious crimes in a recent year, the trials of only 900 reached a verdict. In many cases there is "plea bargaining". The criminal agrees to plead guilty to a reduced charge usually carrying a suspended sentence. At the most, the reduced charge as, for instance from murder to manslaughter carries a comparatively light sentence. What Americans call a "revolving door system" is followed even in the case of men with long criminal records. In some American districts of cities, as already in Australian cities, a policeman struggling to arrest a violent offender receives no assistance from bystanders enjoying the show and may even be hindered by people coming to the assistance of the criminal.

GOVERNMENT REFLECTS THE QUALITY OF PEOPLE

Lawlessness has spread over the lands where people have been persuaded to put their trust in the power of a political ideological form to generate and preserve advanced social conditions. Political terrorism is social lawlessness in evil flower. Admittedly, there are several economic and social and political developments that have played a part in injuring social order, but it does seem that all the psychiatry and criminology and sociology and

Mr. NORMAN EMMOTT

We deeply regret recording the recent death of West Australian "New Times" stalwart, Mr. Norman Emmott who over much of his lifetime gave liberally of his substance and time to our cause. We extend our deepest sympathy to all members of the Emmott family. Their departed brother has made his contribution to the history of freedom.

educational theory that has flowed from the fount of research should have revealed ways of countering adverse emergencies and trends so that the crime rate would at least have been kept to stable percentage.

It was idiotic to suppose that any form of government can function satisfactorily without the support of a moral people. By teaching that it can, what leftists have made of democracy takes its place in the long procession of human follies. A political form takes on the quality and character of the people and, in reciprocal action, controls the general behaviour of the people, at least to some extent. However, it is not the only factor in the creation of social order. To treat it as though it were is to load it with more responsibility than it can bear. Part of the over-estimating of the power of a political form came from admiration of America's action in wrenching its political independence from Britain and the progress, which until recently, it afterwards made. The unconsidered belief was that if other colonies gained independence they, like America, would make rapid advance in all ways.

Americans, themselves, are quite justifiably pleased with themselves for having thrown off the colonial yoke and become independent. From what one can learn, they seem to overlook completely the conditions, which justified their action. They were a civilised people who had inherited a well-developed culture from the countries from which the original European settlers had migrated and so were quite capable of governing themselves in a civilised manner and therefore had a right to do so.

Ignoring the cultural conditions, which made self-government for them a right, they have looked on self-government as a right in itself, irrespective of cultural standards and civilised values. The mental rupture between political thought and cultural discovery is disastrously apparent in that ideologically determined behaviour. Even before there were psychologists people knew that infants must be trained to become rather more self-dependent children, and that children must be taught and trained to become efficient adults. Research by psychologists had revealed that very often the mental age of a person does not correspond to his physical age. Since communities are groups of individual persons, there is, in a general way, a parallel between personal and community development. A primitive community cannot, in one step, become a politically mature and culturally adult society. The journey to political independence should have been a gradual one and, most important, political education should have gone hand-in-hand with mental and moral education. Egalitarians rejected that advice with doctrinal indignation. It was, they declared, an influence of inequality, which was an affront to the newly liberated.

BACKWARD PEOPLE REQUIRE GUIDANCE

When, in the backward countries, political independence did not produce democratic government, the ideologists remained, on the whole, impudently silent about the bar-

barous nature of government in those nations. They whittled down the conception of democracy to de-colonisation, atrocious or not, and presented that as being absolutely right to the international world and in the U.N. General Assembly. A probability, which is nearly a certainty, is never considered. It is that backward peoples might advance in political understanding and improve their cultural quality far more quickly under the control and guidance of a civilised nation recognising its own material and moral responsibilities and the needs and natural rights of dependent ethnic groups than ever they can when left to struggle out of barbarism by their own efforts.

The advantage enjoyed by a backward people of being under the protection and training of more advanced governors is exemplified by the superior conditions of Negroes under Rhodesian and South African rule. That statement is, of course, a flouting of the present conventional propaganda slant. The slant is preserved by putting anything out of line with it on a kind of journalistic Index Expurgatorious. I select the following illustration of that because it happens to be the latest I have come across. A *Sydney Morning Herald* journalist produces a feature titled *The Inside Column*. In it he recently wrote that the sanctions against Rhodesia must be biting as its Information Centre had posted to his office some printed matter to which no stamp had been affixed. It was a small joke and worth a passing smile. Perhaps the Rhodesian Centre would have been wiser to have treated the paragraph as such instead of angrily (as was the impression given by the columnist), when sending the stamp, requesting the return of the envelope. The columnist informed his readers that, with the envelope, he had returned the propaganda material.

It was appropriate enough for him to mention that he had sent the material back to the Rhodesian Centre of Information; but it is of interest to know why he had dispatched it in the first place. Depending upon how it strikes the reader, it may seem that the publicly announced return of the printed matter may have been intended as an insult to the Rhodesian Centre or as an assurance that he, the columnist, had not touched pitch and so remained ideologically undefiled. To me, it brought to mind an anecdote related many, many years ago in the old *Bulletin*. A newsagent in a small country town told of how he dealt tactfully with tardy payers. He would, for instance, have delivered to a dyed-in-the-wool conservative the Labor paper or to a tough fellow about town, a publication about baby-care and dressmaking instead of one giving sporting news and so on. The customer would storm into the shop to complain and would usually depart after having settled his account. However, the best reaction, he said, was that of Bidy Murphy who arrived boiling with indignation and holding an earnest Protestant periodical at arm's length in a pair of tongs. "And in the holy season of Lent, too!" she said.

THE NEW TIMES—JANUARY 1976

By itself, the return of papers sent by the Rhodesian Information was a trivial incident. It is not a trivial thing, however, that the "tongs" treatment of unwanted information or unwelcome argument should have become, among many intellectuals, a common practice, and that after all the expensive education they received and the fine talk about rationality and tolerance and justice and hearing both sides of a case before coming to a conclusion etc. The practice is an inexcusable betrayal of all the men of the past who made sacrifices, sometimes terrible ones, for the freedom, which is the gift of truth.

THE IMPORTANCE OF MORAL INSPIRATION

The more ideologically intransigent are supporters of a political creed, the more extreme, in an advanced society, will be the reaction against it. The recent Federal election in Australia showed that in a mild way. It would be an unhappy thing were a total ideological revulsion to result, as did the leftist reaction in the twenties and thirties of this century, in a rejection of all that has been good as well as all that has been bad in political and social action. A preliminary reassessment by intellectuals of the realism and practicality of some sacred ideological dogmas might prevent reform from degenerating into a worthless, riotous revolution. Perhaps Australia and New Zealand and a few other nations are in a better position than are more powerful nations to moderate reforming zeal - that is, if the Lords of the Media permit.

A first orderly step towards rational reform might be the recognition of the fact that *what is most civilised in our laws and political institutions and practices was of moral, not political inspiration.*

The ideology that did spring from pure economo-political ideas is Communism. The substitution of a political code of right and wrong for a moral one largely accounts for Communism's uncivilised features. The cynical attitude of communist governors towards moral principles when dealing with international affairs would certainly not be diminished by the Western people's policy of trying to oppose one ideology by another — communism by democracy - - for, subtracting moral values from democracy leaves that form the less neatly and exactly organised one. As to allowing that the conflict is between Communism and Capitalism: that gives many people the picture of ownership of wealth by the people as opposed to monopolies, cartels, trusts, great multinational corporations etc. presided over by a few powerful plutocrats. It would have been better to have shown the difference as being between common (State) ownership and individual private ownership (not private enterprise exclusively). Ownership by private persons can be regulated to be a condition of individual freedom and privacy in which perception of moral values most easily and readily develops.

The political form is the glove that is fitted to the economic hand. The glove that clothes an iron hand is inflexible while that over a flabby hand is flaccid and easily torn. Neither holds the jewel of civilisation. If there be any reverence for civilisation, the judging of right and wrong should be, not according to a nation's political ideology, but according to its stage and state of civilisation.

AUSTRALIAN POTENTIAL FOR FREEDOM

Australia, at least, is not yet so far advanced in multi-racial moral confusion that she cannot develop a generally acceptable, civilised moral code, which could be the base of a moral order in which there can be individual freedom. As a preliminary, we would need to get rid of some propaganda humbug. A good many apologists for moral disintegration can be just as unctuous as any holier-than-thou puritan, as witness their argument in favour of degrading entertainment: that people should be free to enjoy what they like. What some people revel in are spectacles of cruelty and violence. If, in this country, there were public exhibitions of hanging, drawing and quartering, there are those who would flock to enjoy them. Note how they gloat over the physical injuring in sport and scenes of horror on the T.V. or cinema screen. There should be, for the sake of the quality of society and of possible victims of a cultivated taste for cruelty, a limit to what people are free to enjoy.

A disingenuous argument often put forward is that if people do not like lewd and bestial books and shows, they are not compelled to read or view them. They are, however, compelled to live in a society being brought down by degrees to the moral level of those who, by nature morally backward or debased, are instructed by the ugly shows in how to do worse than they could have imagined by themselves.

It is constantly inferred in defence of immorality and brutality as subjects of entertainment that the only cultural choice that people have is between prudery and lasciviousness or between callousness and unrealism, and that people must be either dreary, ridiculous puritans or joyous, likeable Permissives. It is difficult to say whether the sanctimonious smugness of the dissolute and the lover of others' suffering or that of the self-righteous prig is the more repulsive. Fortunately, there are other choices and civilised virtue can be beautiful.

Political, social and cultural advancement is not from a restrictive morality to barbarous lawlessness, but from barbarism to civilisation. Further, while primitive evil is horrifying, sophisticated evil seems to have an added obscenity. That latter kind of evil is rotting civilisation and calling the rot freedom.

THE BACKGROUND OF SOCIALISM

By Bryan W. Monahan

(Originally published in "The Australian Social Crediter", June 1, 1946, and republished in "The Social Crediter", February 1975).

The latter part of 1975 saw electors in three English-speaking communities — British Columbia, New Zealand, and Australia — violently reacting electorally against declared Socialist Governments. There is every reason to believe that the former Governor of California, Mr. Ronald Reagan, will become the Republican President nomination for this year's American Presidential election, and win on a strong anti-Big Government policy. But this does not mean that the tide has now turned against collectivism. As shown by Dr. Monahan, Socialist policies can only be defeated by breaking the power of centralised finance. One of the first acts of the new National Government in New Zealand was to increase drastically the cost of living. There is no evidence that the Australian Fraser-Anthony Government proposes to challenge High Finance. It accepts one of the basic tenets of Socialism — the "managed economy."

Socialism is an omnibus term, which means different things to different advocates. Probably its best general definition, like that of Social Credit, is that it is the policy of a philosophy. In both cases, this definition excludes all particular technical applications; it excludes the means, and directs attention to the ends. Generically, Socialism belongs to the philosophic group of which monism and pantheism are formal expressions for special purposes; more narrowly, the 'political philosophy' is Collectivism - the idea that a given Society has a real corporate existence in relation to the individuals composing it, and that as such it possesses permanent functions which are relatively permanently identified with specific classes, so that members of the class become more or less exclusively exponents of a single function.

These abstract relationships do not explain why so many profess Socialism as a policy, and it is evident that only a small minority has any knowledge of the theoretical background. The practical motive with most, is probably "what they can get out of it" or think they will get out of it, and this in turn is conditioned by their present status.

To begin with what the theoretical Socialist regards as the basic - i.e. despite what he says, the *lowest* stratum of Society: the worker, or wage-earner, or proletarian. For the great majority of modern workers, the job has become routine and non-creative. It may or may not require a high degree of skill; but if it does, it is a specialised skill unrelated to anything else in life. The job, therefore, provides nothing in itself for the worker; it is a means to an end external to the job itself. The interest of such workers are outside their work; their perfectly natural motive is more "interest" and less "job", the concrete expression of which is higher wages and shorter hours. Now Capitalism does not explicitly offer this, although it could; it appears as the antithesis of what the worker regards as progress, because the worker is continually taught that there is only either Capitalism or Socialism, and that only the latter is identified with his interests.

The next lowest stratum consists of those who make a business of advocating the grievances of the workers - the lower-grade Socialist politicians. These do not feel

themselves to be freely interchangeable with those they represent. They are "leaders" whose position depends on having workers with grievances to "lead". The "class-war" is their bread and butter; it is also their taste of power. Now if Socialism abolished all grievances their position would go; they would relapse into the ranks of the workers. But Socialist theory assigns them a function; they personify the *junction* of labour in the collectivist system; they become the channel through which this function is coordinated with other functions. Socialism thus means for these stability, and stable power.

Next there is the intelligentsia, in which we may include both the genuine expert, and the intellectoid, or intelligent-seeming, type. The latter is a sort of sincere drone type. Its representative defies the intellect in effect; this is the Utopian, the blue-printer, who writes books on how the world should be re-planned, quite oblivious of the equal merits of the radically different and incompatible plans of his fellow intellectoids. The common denominator of the lot of them, however, is the "plan," which will construct everyman's Heaven out of this Earth.

The expert, on the other hand, knows perfectly well the practical consequences of collective planning. His outlook has been well described by Colin Brogan: "It is customary for politicians to talk as if all ignorance, disease, dirt, squalor, ignominy and poverty were the results of an evil and rapacious economic system. But the experts, amateur and professional, have other views. They think the poor must be firmly handled — for their own good, of course. They believe that large numbers will abuse the provisions of social security if they are given the opportunity.... When they come into action, there will be discontent -but the experts mean to be firm . . ." (*The Democrat at the Breakfast Table*).

Of course: Once the community is committed to a plan, departure from it is likely to be as disastrous as departure from the design of an engineering project. Sticking to the design has, however, a strong inherent appeal to the expert, especially if he is the author of the plan. Unlike the proletarian, his interest and his work coincide.

There is a silent alliance between the expert and the intellectoid. The latter, well exemplified by the Pink

journalists, builds beautiful word-pictures of a state which he calls Socialism. There is no denying the beauty of the picture, and quite naturally the workers vote for Socialism. The expert says nothing. He knows what Socialism is; and he knows that his business is to carry out orders. And when he is ordered to bring Socialism into being, he attends to his part of the business; it is not his business to correct any misconceptions, except in practice.

Among the experts must be classed the Big Businessmen. Large monopolies require knowledge and specific skill and experience for their management; and their managers are indispensable. Socialism, both in theory and in practice, consists of a set of huge monopolies under the coordinating monopoly of the State, and those monopolies can be run only by those who know how -- those who run them at present. Consequently, as Major Douglas puts it, Socialism will install the Trust magnate in the bureaucrat's seat, with the added advantage that he will have no shareholders to concern him. The war — not to mention P.E.P. - - revealed the best of understandings between the socialist bureaucrat and Biggest Business. They both propose to eliminate the smaller - - the independent — business.

This aspect is easier to grasp from a consideration of profit. The enormous profits of Big Business are meaningless in terms of individual spending power; human capacity for personal consumption of the product of industry is very strictly limited. Big profits really mean *power*, and are used, through investment, to achieve and consolidate monopolies. Now the technical essence of Socialism is exactly the same thing; it is monopoly control of investment, to produce development in accordance with a monopoly plan.

Here indeed is the key to the whole situation. It is a fact of observation that industry moves ever in the direction of organisation into larger units. It is also known that the expressed policy of in particular, the Bank of England has been the encouragement of such organisation. Now industry is dependent on the continuous provision of fresh money, which takes the form of an expansion of bank credit, reflected by an increase in debt. The reason for this can be demonstrated mathematically: but here it is sufficient to draw attention to the fact, which can be confirmed by the observation that bank deposits, and total debt, show an absolute increase each year, and that this increase is most rapid when industry is most active, as especially during the war.

Clearly, the dependence of industry on the provision of bank credit - "accommodation" as it is called — places the banking system in a position to control the policy of industry. Thus financial policy could be directed either to promoting or to opposing monopoly development, simply by the preference shown in advancing the necessary credits. Or to put the matter another way, it is not really conceivable that monopoly development has occurred in the face of financial opposition.

But in just the same way, Governments are dependent on financial policy, because they too are dependent on "accommodation." And it can at once be observed that Governments equally for many years past have followed a monopoly policy, which takes the form of more and more Government "control," and an increasing sphere of Government activity. Just as industry squeezes out the small man, so Government squeezes out the voluntary and independent organization.

Thus we have one policy operating through both industry and Government, and the logical end of it, already nearly consummated, is the amalgamation of industry and Government, *and the identification of Finance with Government*. That is precisely what Socialism is: the concentration of all forms of power in one set of hands.

It is merely absurd to suppose that a Government of greengrocers, engine drivers, schoolmasters, journalists and Bloomsbury Pinks will form or ever have formed the *effective* Government. The administration of the huge complexity of ultimate monopoly will be possible only to highly trained experts, and those experts are, of course, those who are at present administering the system. They will form the General Staff of the bureaucracy, the directing brain: and having achieved and consolidated supreme power, it will obviously be merely a matter of expediency whether or not they retain the titular "elected" Government. If they do, it will be simply as a propaganda device, a sort of Public Relations Office, which is exactly what the Russian singlelist Parliament is.

In the meantime, the green-grocers, school-teachers *et al* who doubtless believe they initiate policy, are where they are simply because their ideas happen to be in accord with the policy which is going to be pursued anyway so that they form the best possible cover for the real point of origin of that policy. That is why our "Chif", the financial wizard, is affectionately known as "the voice", and our Bert Evatt, is the wonder-boy of UNO. The tune would soon change, as it did with Lang, if they proposed to depart from the current canons of finance.

It is of extreme importance to realise that it is not profit as such which the "Capitalist" prizes; it is power. Of

NATIONAL WEEKEND

The 1976 National Weekend will be from Friday, September 17th until Sunday 19th. The "New Times" Annual Dinner will be held on the Friday. Donations this year unfortunately will be \$7 a person, another result of inflation. But private hospitality can be arranged for country and interstate visitors. This year earlier bookings would be appreciated in order that private accommodation can be adequately organised.

All supporters urged to make a note of the above dates NOW.

course there is exploitation of the worker, and that exploitation is in the interest of power -- self-aggrandisement through the subordination of others. It is a purely arbitrary circumstance that for the time being, that subordination is achieved through money-power. The prime concern of the wielders of power is to make their position impregnable. Socialism represents, in theory, an impregnable power-system and its imposition on Society, through the deception of its intended victims, is exactly what one would expect.

Subordination of others means making those others do what you want them to do. Now if modern industry concentrated on the production of consumers' goods, it would rapidly bring about a condition where the requirements of the population were satisfied with a small and decreasing expenditure of human effort, which would be reflected in what, by present standards, would be ridiculously short working hours. What are the people going to do with all their spare time under these circumstances?

The answer of Socialism is that they are going to be put to work on "projects" which have no immediate relation to the standard of living. Working for an excess export trade; public works; maintenance of armed forces; war; altering the face of the globe by vast engineering projects — all these are of a piece. They are all means to sustaining "full employment," and they all figure in the Socialist planned economy. And they gratify the lust for power of the planner, and are carried through by the exploitation of the worker. They rob him of free time.

The genuine alternative to Socialism is thus a system, which grants to the worker the free time which modern industry makes possible. It can be seen at once that such an alternative receives no publicity whatever. Capitalism is criticised because it fails to provide "employment," and the only argument permitted is as to whether Capitalism can be modified as to provide "full employment," or whether Socialism, whose primary assumption is "full employment," is inevitable.

While perhaps the sort of detailed exposition of the necessary and objectionable consequences of Socialism that Professor Hayek makes* is necessary at some stage, in the alternative is simply whether individuals are to be allowed to be individuals, making their own decisions, and making what they can of their own lives, with the fruits of modern industry at their disposal in return for their own decreasing efforts, or whether they are to be compelled to live in accordance with an imposed pattern. There is a great incompatibility between the physical possibility, and the imposed ideal. Those who believe that "for their own good" men should be forced to work, will have to use force. Or else they will have to destroy the physical basis of possible leisure.

It is not the theory of Socialism that requires exposure. Socialism is the means by which those who impose on Society an arbitrary ideal propose to render their exalted

position impregnable. It is the plot of the Financier to enslave in perpetuity the worker. With the greatest cunning and treachery it makes use of the vague and abstract ideals of masses yearning for freedom and the fuller life to impose servitude on them. It is genuinely reactionary, for it reacts against that possibility of freedom. Criticism of the technique of Socialism will make little difference; what is required is a challenge to the power of its promoters, *and their exposure*. This can be done, through the local objective campaigns, details of which may be obtained through the various Social Credit affiliated groups.

THE PRESS AND RHODESIA

Before and since the Rhodesians made their historic declaration of complete independence, they have been subjected to blatant lies and misrepresentation by much of the world's press. Time and time again Rhodesia was on the point of collapse, or about to be engulfed by Black Africa. There have been dreadful stories of how White Rhodesians have allegedly maltreated Africans, but no references to the bestial and terrorist tactics being used by invading African guerrillas - - backed by the Communists — against simple Rhodesian tribal Africans. We have seen no report of the revolting incident when a tribesman, after refusing a terrorist gang food, was beaten, had both wrists broken, and then had his ears, lips and nose cut off. His wife was forced to roast the flesh on an open fire and to eat it.

Two recent examples of irresponsible reporting appeared in the *Sydney Morning Herald* on January 3 and 8. The first was a reprint from the *Johannesburg Sunday Times*; the "report" stating that 12,000 African "guerrillas" backed by Frelimo were poised to invade Rhodesia on January 10. In its second report the *Sydney Morning Herald* sought to forecast and spell out the doom of Rhodesia. But there has been no such invasion or doom. Terrorist activities have been relatively quiet. Rhodesia stands secure with constitutional talks taking place between Prime Minister Smith and African Nationalists. We look forward to the Fraser Government adopting a much more realistic and sympathetic attitude to Rhodesia than that of its predecessors.

"PROGRAMME FOR REVERSING INFLATION"

Every actionist should have this clearly presented practical programme for reversing inflation. Preferably he should have a number of copies to pass, or sell, to others. He should always have his own copy for reference. The Treasury "experts" were asked to refute this booklet by Mr. Eric Butler, but were unable to do more than smear it and make ridiculous statements.

*The Road to Serfdom.