

THE NEW TIMES

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

Vol. 43, No. 10

OCTOBER 1978

THE ROOT OF THE RHODESIAN TRAGEDY

By Eric D. Butler

It is clear now that only something in the nature of a miracle can ensure the future of Rhodesia as a stable, civilised country. The Smith Government's decision to make military service compulsory for all blacks, as it has been for all whites, appears to be a logical one in view of the agreement that ultimately political power should pass into the hands of the black majority. This decision, together with the increasing aggressiveness of Rhodesian forces against terrorists based in Zambia and Mozambique, could ease the terrorist pressure. But the real war against Rhodesia has not been conducted by the murderous terrorists. The Rhodesians are extremely unlikely to be defeated militarily, but by political and psychological warfare. The root cause of the Rhodesian tragedy goes back to the failure of the Smith Government to grasp the nettle of financial policy at the beginning.

The one man in the first Rhodesian Front Government, led by the late Winston Field, who had a realistic understanding of the importance of financial credit creation, was Lord Graham. He was responsible for bringing to Rhodesia from England a man with long experience concerning the subject of credit creation and control. He suggested to the Field Government that, based upon Rhodesia's vast resources, it was practical for them to make financial credit available for the development of those resources without debt. That man told me in London just after his visit that the Cabinet Minister least receptive to what he was saying was the Minister for Finance. His name was Ian Smith. By nature Ian Smith is basically a cautious, but tenacious type of man. A University Commerce Degree is not generally the type of achievement, which helps with an understanding of the realities of the finance-economic system.

During the heady days of 1966, when Rhodesians were packing halls during a four-week tour I conducted, I warned time and time again that unless Rhodesians took financial independence as well as political independence, their long-term security could not be assured. On subsequent visits to Rhodesia I re-emphasised this point. While it is true that there were some modifications of internal financial policies to develop and diversify the internal economy, almost immediately following the declaration of UDI the Smith Government was demonstrating a lack of understanding of finance-economic realities by making it clear that some type of international recognition was necessary in order that foreign capital could be invested in the country. Ian Smith had the same type of blind spot concerning finance, which has afflicted other political leaders whose excellent sentiments have been crushed by finance-economic realities. The political vote without genuine financial and economic independence is a dangerous illusion of power. Consider the plight of the people of Eire. Political independence tended to obscure the reality

that the Irish were still living under a financial dictatorship. And now the Irish are sharing with the once-hated English the increasing domination of the Common Market bureaucracy!

When Sir Robert Menzies retired from Australian politics I wrote an article on what I considered to be the tragedy of Menzies. An extremely able man in some areas, although a weak administrator, Sir Robert's instincts were basically sound. But he founded a Liberal Party, which from the beginning retreated from its own stated objectives. The basic cause of the progressive rot was a lack of understanding of finance-economic realities, or an unwillingness to attempt to come to grips with them. Prime Minister Fraser has what is almost an obsession about reviving the depressed Australian economy by the encouragement of foreign capital. Foreign loans and foreign investments mean a surrender of sovereignty. Pawning the nation to international financiers is a form of treachery. And yet Malcolm Fraser can no more be described as a conscious traitor than can Ian Smith. History is full of many examples of men of good intentions being used to serve the purposes of those able to exercise power through the manipulation of credit creation.

As even Benjamin Franklin admitted, the basic cause of the revolt by the American colonies against the British Government was the manner in which the colonies were issuing their own money. The American colonies were relatively prosperous compared with the British. If im-

DINNER ISSUE IN NOVEMBER

We had hoped that the October issue of "The New Times" would cover the Annual Dinner and associated activities. But the time factor made this impossible. Therefore the November issue will now be the Annual Dinner edition.

mediately after UDI, the Smith Government had started to break with debt-finance, and operated a realistic internal financial policy, it could have provided a situation in which large-scale European immigration would have taken place. Subsequent history could have been quite different. But after the bold act of declaring political independence, strict orthodoxy prevailed in so many spheres, the Rhodesians even adopting the metric madness. The British roots of Rhodesia were denied by refusing to include the Union Jack in the new Rhodesian flag.

Step by step Ian Smith was forced into a position of negative defence. He had to eat many of his own words and it was sad to see a man of such dogged courage left open to the charge of being a conscious traitor to the whites of Rhodesia. Unfortunately some of his critics have no more grasp of finance-economic realities than he has.

There are those who say that it is too late to be reviewing the past and what might have been done. I readily agree that the immediate and pressing problem for the Smith Government is to ensure that Rhodesia survives. But only by looking at the lessons of the past, and learning from mistakes, can it be seen what has to be done in the future. A miracle is still possible in Rhodesia. Generally overlooked is that fact that the white electors have yet to agree at a Referendum to change the present Constitution. If there is a belated white revolt, then the situation could change dramatically, with no offensives being taken. But as was the case after UDI, any new breathing space not devoted to grasping the financial nettle, can only but delay the inevitable end. And the lesson of Rhodesia is one which what is left of the Western world must face. Survival is impossible in the long term unless the treacherous policy of centralised debt-finance is broken.

"Wheresoever the Carcase is..."

By C. H. DOUGLAS

The following essay was originally published in three parts in "The Social Crediter" in March and April, 1941. Apart from the manner in which Douglas sheds light on the history and ideas which have produced the present world, the essay is prophetic with its warning that unless the forces which produced Hitler were defeated, along with Nazi Germany, they would continue with their assault upon Civilisation. The present plight of the world testifies to the fact that those evil forces were not defeated, that the final battle against them remains to be won.

Now that Mr. John Winant, millionaire assisted by Mr. Benjamin Cohen, has come from the International Labour Office at Geneva, as Ambassador and instructor to Mr. Ernest Bevin on the Labour Policy of Great Britain, Mr. Averill Harriman, multi-millionaire, has come to take charge of our Finance. Mr. Wendell Wilkie has taken our temperature, and Mr. Harry Hopkins, late of the Federal Loan and Mortgage Board, remains as bailiff's man, and all of these are enthusiastically welcomed by the Socialist Party, it is perhaps of some interest to find an answer to the riddle—"When is a rich man not a rich man?" (for the purposes of Socialism).

The first answer can be obtained by inspection, as our Math's Master used to say. It is when his riches are the result of monetary manipulation, and particularly, the result of bond flotation and sale. Each and every one of our, probably long-term, guests is in the orbit of the Kuhn, (i.e. Cohen), Loeb Finance Group. Not one of them is a manufacturer, or an agriculturalist, but all of them are here primarily to fix the conditions under which both manufacturing and agriculture are, they hope, to be carried on for the next five hundred years. And all of them are in enthusiastic agreement with the Socialists in the main tenets of Socialism. These are:

- (1) A Preamble that sets out the many glaring defects of the present Economic and Social Systems. (No mention or criticism of Finance permitted.) Obviously this gets a majority vote at once.
- (2) "Labour creates all wealth." Wealth is the object of life, especially if not used but exported. Therefore *Present* labour has a right to all wealth so long as it exports it. Anyone who has the enjoyment of wealth without labour is a parasite. (From this postulate is derived the curious inversion that anyone paid by the State is *ipso facto* not a parasite.)
- (3) The holding of property, particularly land or buildings, by an individual is robbery of the Public

and is likely to lead to the use of property for pleasure. The holding of property by *any* organisation is better, and the larger the organisation and the more secure it is from criticism by individuals, the better it is. The State, which is immune from Prosecution by Legal Process, is better still, at the moment, but a World State, which would be Omnipotent, would be best of all.

- (4) Everything can be reduced to a Book of Regulations. For this reason, a Civil Servant in Whitehall, or Washington, or Geneva, can farm land in Ross and Cromarty, or Cheshire, or Alberta much better than the farmer who lives on the land. Or if he can't, it doesn't matter much, does it? Nobody knows the Civil Servant's name, he'll never see the farmer or the farm, and anyway, both the farmer and the Civil Servant will be dead soon.
- (5) The main objective, therefore, is to take everything from the individual, vest it in an untouchable organisation, the larger the better, and thus change the choice of minor tyrannies, which are vulnerable, into an overriding single tyranny, which is invulnerable. Taxation is the primary tool by which to attain this desirable end, but restrictive Law, and in particular Licence Law, is a valuable auxiliary. But Law is the Agency both of taxation and Licensing.

When you have done this, you can put everyone on the wage and salary list, and invent a job for them, even if it's only filling in Forms to show how many people are filling in Forms. Then you will have solved the unemployment problem, which is the curse of Capitalism—if you don't know enough to recognise it as the coming of the Age of Leisure. And if people don't like filling in Forms, well, "He that will not work, neither shall he eat".

Now, there is every justification for the acceptance of Socialism of this character by a very large majority of the

population at this time, for reasons which a little later I propose to recapitulate briefly. It is a remarkable tribute to the sound instincts of the Anglo-Saxon public that the majority is not larger, and that it is far from solidly convinced.

But before dealing with the grounds for the views somewhat reluctantly held by this majority, let us for a few moments consider their millionaire friends, for instance, Mr. Winant, Mr. Averill Harriman, or even President Roosevelt, not forgetting Mr. Benjamin Cohen, *et al.*, in the background. Why are they so anxious to vest all property in the State, at any rate in England, and to tax the private property owner out of existence?

Why, for instance, was it freely stated in Washington in 1920 that a certain notorious witness was given £10,000 from New York to advocate the nationalisation of the coal industry; that the Railways, although ostensibly Company owned, are since 1920 entirely divorced from the control of their Shareholders; that Mr. Montagu Norman "welcomes" nationalisation; that the London School of Economics, founded by the Fabian Society but mainly endowed by Sir Ernest Cassel, is practically a manufactory for Bureaucratic Socialists with international financial doctrines; and much other evidence to the same effect?

However reluctantly, I feel that we must abandon any explanation of these phenomena, which assumes, for instance, that Messrs. Winant, Harriman, and Hopkins (assisted by Mr. Benjamin Cohen) have come over here to commit financial suicide, or to sell all they have, and give to the poor. I feel almost certain that the "New Order" in Europe, and Great Britain in particular, like the Socialist Paradise in Russia, while it may impoverish and enslave millions, and destroy the culture and achievements of many centuries, will still leave Messrs. Harriman, Kuhn, Loeb, *et al.*, assisted by Mr. Benjamin Cohen, in a situation which they regard with complacency. That is, of course, if nothing goes wrong.

We have therefore to approach Socialism, in order to appreciate it as a policy, from a somewhat unfamiliar angle. What is it that is concealed in a doctrine whose first postulate is a protest against economic inequality, which makes it so attractive to a special group of international millionaires who are the outstanding beneficiaries and primary cause of the inequalities attacked?

Obviously, the answer to this most important question will be found, not in what Socialists have said, but in what Socialism has done. And the first step to understanding what Socialism has done, is to be clear in regard to what Socialism has *not* done, such as invent and develop railways, roads and bridges, motor cars, dynamos and aeroplanes. The activities of Socialists have been almost exclusively in the field of Law (assisted by Mr. Benjamin Cohen, *et al.*), and the situation in which we find ourselves is only to be understood by considering the Socialist legal trend against a background of scientific advance for which Socialism can take no credit whatever, but for the use of which it is responsible to the extent that its legislation has affected such use.

(II)

It is, I think, important to keep in mind this fact that Socialism is simply a system of Legalism, because it is not a British product, and all Legal Systems must be based on some particular conception of Society and must aim at realising or perpetuating that conception. Socialism is "German", in the same sense that the Rothschilds (Redshields) are "German", or that the Reformation was "Ger-

man", or that Kuhn, Loeb, or the Warburgs are "American". It is, and has been always, primarily a theory for export, and in the country of its nativity, has been, and is, kept severely in its place, which is to crush independence. The hey-day of "German" Socialism was in the day of Bismarck, who said of it "We march separately, but we fight together".

The downfall of Russia in 1917 was consummated by the introduction, in a special train from Germany, of Lenin and Trotsky. Freemasonry, financial and moral corruption, and Socialism, accompanied by a horde of petty bureaucrats, have brought about the downfall of France: and the strong tendency of the better elements of French society, in all classes, to Anglophobism is the result of the widespread conviction that the British Government is now merely the tool of the same Dark Forces.

The situation we have to consider, therefore, is simply this. Two quite distinct influences have been at work for at least two hundred years. On the one hand, we have had the material progress of the industrial arts, which, as most people know, has been easily sufficient, considered by itself, to raise every member of the British public, by the use of power, to a position of economic independence, while at the same time reducing the necessity for economic labour to a small fraction of that available. Almost contemporaneously with this, we have witnessed a systematic expansion of Legalism, of which Socialism is an increasing part, which ignores and in fact systematically attacks and distorts this situation. And the nett result is insecurity, more labour-hours, poverty, and war.

While it is probable that a majority of those who are interested understand how this situation has been brought about, it may be desirable to recall that the *physical* causes have been: Export of production, either unpaid for, inadequately paid for, or paid for in raw material only useful in the production of further material for export. The objective of this has been exchange manipulation. Grossly unbalanced production—too many machines, too few comforts. Sabotage: Artificial trade booms and slumps, with the breakup of plant and organisation.

Large-scale "Rackets" such as the Grid Electricity Scheme, which was an imitation of, and inspired from the same source as the Utilities racket in the U.S. Hundreds of millions of pounds worth of magnificent machinery and plant was consciously and unnecessarily broken up in connection with this scheme alone. All of these were rendered possible

DOUGLAS CENTENARY

In our July issue we observed that 1979 marks the centenary of the birth of the founder of the Social Credit Movement, whose ideas resulted in the establishment of "The New Times" in May 1935. A special Douglas Centenary issue of "The New Times" is planned for July of next year. The issue will be probably 32 pages with a cover and readers, who feel they have something to contribute, are invited to participate. Next year's "New Times" Dinner will be known as "The Douglas Memorial Dinner" and will be an historic event of considerable significance. A big display of historical material is planned. Bookings for the Dinner will be accepted early in 1979. It would be appreciated if contributions to the Centenary issue of "The New Times" are forwarded as early as possible.

by subtle propaganda which treated money as wealth, and only employment paid for by money as being the production of wealth.

The *political* cause was the determination to maintain the monopoly of credit and to buttress that monopoly by Law. The most vital result of this was that purchasing-power was, and is, inadequate to buy the goods produced at the prices at which the price system requires that they should be sold, so that a majority of production has to be given away to an enemy, while the purchasing power involved in its production is used to make up the deficit in respect of the remainder. At the same time, the controlled Press hypnotises the public to demand universal employment. Of course, nothing could be more favourable to the temporary re-establishment of this system than the present holocaust of sabotage and free gifts to the enemy if the world is still foolish enough to agree.

We are now perhaps in a "somewhat better position to proceed with our examination of the apparently contradictory attractions of Socialism, *if we realise that it is simply more Law, an extension of exactly the process which has stultified the progress of the industrial arts. There is no more prospect of producing a tolerable state of Society by passing more Laws, and imposing more sanctions, than there is of repairing a motor car suffering from a choked carburetor by devising a fresh tax upon it.* The world is suffering from a fantastic and unnecessary book of Regulations, every additional one of which, while apparently beneficial at the moment, exacerbates the disease.

There are thus two aspects of Socialism, attracting very different supporters. There is the aspect which attracts Messrs. Winant, Harriman, and their like, with Mr. Benjamin Cohen, the Incarnation of Law, joyously assisting. These people see in Socialism, quite correctly, a line of thought which can only lead to the concentration of power in their hands, power they are determined to maintain and extend, just as Stalin and Hitler have power which the Czar and the Kaiser never had. The aspect which attracts the rank and file of Socialists is in the main something much more subtle, I think.

Passing over the fairly obvious influence of the revenge complex on the part of the under-privileged (who have for the most part been kept in that position by the millionaire "Socialists" in order to be used as a disintegrating force) and the attraction offered by petty bureaucracy to lovers of power without responsibility, I believe that one definite delusion accounts for more Socialists than any other single cause. It is the delusion of the supremacy of the intellect, with the derivative that an order is the same thing as its execution.

Now, anyone with reasonably wide experience of life and affairs knows that the intellect has very definite limits. "The Professor" is recognised as a legitimate butt for mild humour, not so much on account of his knowledge, as for the lack of any ability to use it in his daily life.

We recognise that what is lacking is something we call judgment, or (very misdescriptively) "common" sense, and that this faculty, so rare that when it *is* combined with intellect it can almost command its own price, is an ability to check constantly and almost automatically, theory and ideas, against experience. It is exactly the lack of this faculty, which is conspicuous in Socialist circles, which by common consent draw their support largely from the influence of well-meaning elementary schoolteachers. The modern State-controlled school is the perfect model of bureaucracy designed primarily for control by the Government rather than for any genuinely educational objective.

There is no standard of output, except *Si monumentum requiris, circumspice*. Once again, it is evidence of the magnificent material of the British people that a large and increasing proportion of these teachers are revolting against this tendency. But a good deal of harm has been done.

Now to this type of mind, the fact that you can multiply x by itself five times, for instance, and the result is called x^5 is not merely proof of a fifth dimension, it is ground for a political world of five dimensions. Or to put the matter another way, "the Government" can order golf-club secretaries to grow asparagus in bunkers. Therefore asparagus will grow in bunkers. This confusion between Aristotelian and Baconian thinking is one of the most valuable tools of arch intrigue.

At this point, it may be desirable to dispel the idea, if it exists, that international financiers spend their time hatching out, e.g. Socialism.

To paraphrase a well known example from the theory of Chance and Probability, if ten monkeys tapped ten typewriters long enough, they would be bound, eventually, to write Karl Marx's *Das Kapital*, as well as everything else, even if they didn't understand it. But that would not mean that it would be broadcast weekly with variations by the B.B.C., commented upon by the "Woof", sponsored by the *Daily Poursuivant* modified for use in schools and Churches by the London School of Economics, and hailed on the outbreak of war as the Blue Print of the New Order. It is control of *distribution* upon which international financiers rely to stultify *production*, either of goods or of ideas.

What happens is that a comprehensive watch is kept on proposals of every kind and from every source, which have the smallest bearing on major issues. As an instance of the rapidity and efficiency with which this intelligence service acts, I might perhaps cite the fact that in less than three weeks from the publication of what might be called the first article on the relation between Finance, Centralisation and World Hegemony, which appeared in the *English Review* in 1918, an important member of the Rothschild family had sounded an alarm in appropriate quarters about it. If a proposal is dangerous to financial and high political interests, the press is closed to it. On the other hand if it is an attack on any interest *other* than these, and particularly if it is buttressed by "moral" argument, it is subterraneously assisted, since the destruction of these interests does not mean that they cease to exist—it merely means that they are transferred to international Finance. It is hardly too much to say, at this time, that if a policy of social reform is not attacked in the Press, or refused reasonable publicity it is certain to contain, hidden in it, a conspiracy against

"PEOPLE'S CAPITALISM"

By Or. James S. Albus

Reviewed by Dr. Geoffrey Dobbs in the July, 1978 issue of "The New Times," this book by a distinguished American engineer makes a vital contribution to the debate concerning how is "full employment" going to be maintained in an era of rapidly expanding technology. Dr. Albus writes of the necessity of "an income-distribution system based upon something other than employment." An American Professor of Public and Environmental Affairs comments as follows on the book, "This could be one of the great seminal ideas which comes along only once in a century."

the plain man. The torrent of abuse, misrepresentation, downright lying and calumny, which has been directed against Social Credit, more particularly in Canada and Australia, is probably the highest compliment to its potential effectiveness which could be offered by the world's mischief makers.

(III)

It is clear, I think, that it is exactly in the realm to which Socialism has contributed nothing, the realm of individual initiative, invention, and scientific discovery, that we have made our progress towards a leisure civilisation, security, and culture. And exactly in the realm in which Socialism operates exclusively, that of Law and the infringement upon the liberty of the individual, that the major and increasing frictions of Society occur, and the stultification of Science is accomplished. It is not the concern of Science to deal with Distribution. And with regard to Finance, which is the mechanism of Distribution, Socialists and the Financier have always been of like mind.

In this, we approach the answer to our original question—why does Socialism receive support from International Finance and specifically German-American-Jew Finance? That answer is that Law places the sanctions of the State behind the collection of taxes. Socialism, with its slavish adulation of the State, aims continually at the transfer of Property to the State. This property then becomes available as security for State Loans created by the Financiers out of paper credits—i.e., the monetisation of the collective credit of the community concerned. The Bondholders are exactly what their title would imply—they are the slaveholders of the "New Order"*. Just enough of the Bonds are distributed to the Public to obscure the real nature of the transaction and to create a vested interest in the protection of the Financier.

Now, up to this point, it should be clear that there is really no room for discussion. There is not a single Socialist measure, which has not involved increased taxation—taxation which is unnecessary but which increases the power of the Financier. At the date at which these words are written, the expenditure of the British Government has reached the colossal figure of £14,000,000 per *day*. No one in their senses believes that this sum is being raised, either by taxation or "saving". It is, as to its major part, a bookkeeping device to transfer Public Credit to Financiers. When the war has gone on long enough to ensure that the necessary

***"Slavery will be abolished by the War. This we and our European friends are in favour of. For slavery is but the owning of Labour, and involves the care of the slave. The same result can be obtained by controlling the money." Circular issued to Bankers in the United States at the end of the American Civil War.**

ANSWERING THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

There is no better introduction to opening people's eyes to the pro-Communist bias of the World Council of Churches than Bernard Smith's booklet, "The Crooked Conscience." In order to facilitate the widest possible distribution of this booklet amongst Christians, the League is offering 12 copies for \$1 posted. Adequate supplies of this booklet are available for a nation-wide distribution campaign, which could ensure that unsuspecting Christians do not provide any further funds for the WCC.

"THE HOAX OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY"

By Dr. A. R. Butz

The most detailed and scholarly examination to date of the myth of the six million Jews allegedly gassed during the Second World War. This is the work, which professional historians should have undertaken. But they have feared for their careers if they examined one of the biggest hoaxes in history. They have not even felt it safe to review objectively the Butz work, the most valuable source work yet produced on a subject of such explosive significance.

arrangements have been made under the plea of military necessity ("Only in time of war, or under threat of war, will the British Government engage in long range Planning", as Mr. Israel Sieff's P.E.P. journal remarked) the maximum amount of taxes, although not all that are "due" as interest on these paper loans, can be extracted from the individual, so that he can never become his own master. Since inability to pay all will be admitted, the interest will be scaled down. The genuine subscriber, as distinct from the creators of large credits, will thus in effect lose his money. And it should be remembered that these colossal credits are based on destruction not construction.

Such a situation requires the elimination of autonomous States. One centralised Police Force ("As easy as ABC") will provide the Sanction for the Tax Collector. Herr Hitler is eliminating European States, the United States is eliminating the British Empire, Japan proclaims a "New Order" in Asia, and, through National Socialism, the New Deal, Communism, or funeral Reithism, Utopia arrives with the day on which Hitler (if you live in England) Churchill (if you live in Germany) or Mussolini, are "beaten". Stalin Roosevelt, Taxes and Banks will accompany Mr. Benjamin Cohen, *et al.*, into the Dawn of the New Day.

Perhaps.

I have already suggested that an illusion has been systematically and consciously fostered both by the corrupt Press, and by political propaganda covertly paid for by international financiers, that the world's populations must maintain themselves by persistent and increasing "work" and competition for export markets; that this illusion can only be maintained by every kind of waste, and that the periodical wars which are a necessary agency of this waste are used to rivet fresh bonds, in every sense of the word, on the deluded public. But there are certain other aspects of the matter, which are both significant, and curious. One of these is the success with which Old Testament "religion" is used to recommend Socialist doctrines, in much the same way that Cromwell's illiterate and half-crazed bible-thumpers prepared the way for the victory of the City of London Whigs, and their shadowy Continental backers, the re-admission of the Jews to England, the foundation of the Bank "of England", the loss of the American Colonies by taxation, and the black era of child-labour and unbridled industrialism which characterised the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. No one who has any familiarity with the subject can fail to recognise the revival of the same technique, modernised, in the Dispatches from Our Own Correspondent on Mount Sinai which are broadcast by the "British" Broadcasting Corporation before the more secular

news which follows at 8 o'clock. The frenetic adjurations to "sacrifice", i.e. to pay more taxation ("which with proper psychological preparation can be greatly increased"), which were a feature of Lord Stamp (of the Bank "of England")'s pre-war speeches, also bore the same suggestion that we hearken unto the Chosen Messenger of the Lord—invariably bringing bad news.

I am quite willing to accept any alternative explanation, which fits the facts. But I find it difficult to understand the traitorous mismanagement of the affairs of this country for the last twenty years, in the face of the warning of 1914-1918, to go no further back, and the rewards and honour which have fallen to those who have been responsible, on any other assumption than that the situation in which we find ourselves today was consciously designed by much cleverer men than any of the well-known political shop-window ornaments who did their bidding. And further, that the arrangements to sell the British Empire required an organisation much older than twenty years, and included the sale, at one and the same time, of exactly those conceptions of individual liberty which, with some justice, we consider flourish best in these islands.

While, therefore, I have no doubt that Pan-Germanism, at

the moment represented by Hitler, is the immediate enemy, and, as the result of the skilful planning of the real Enemy can only be crushed and must be crushed, as the outcome of a long and devastating war, I am equally confident that victory over Germany is only valuable if it is accompanied by victory over those who at one and the same time helped Germany to re-arm, and prevented Great Britain from re-arming until re-arming inevitably meant a long war. I mean that mysterious international Power which at one end of the scale crosses all frontiers, dictates every Budget, and imposes the policy which maintains its own strength, and at the other, uses its Socialist dupes to fortify those sanctions of the State which render revolt impossible.

The solution of the problem is not a light matter, and is more difficult with every day's delay. For my own part I am convinced that, having in view the devastation which these men have let loose for their own ends, no action is too drastic which renders them and their Organisations incapable of further harm.

Once they are out of the way, with their powers of Bribery and Blackmail, there is plenty of goodwill and ability in the world to guide "the forces of nature to the service and well being of Man".

THE WORLD PLOTTERS AT WORK

C. H. Douglas warned that the power lusts striving to establish the World Monopoly State had realised that they required more than an international credit monopoly; that this had to be buttressed with an international monopoly of the basic resources of the world, including food, and, ultimately a type of World Police Force.

The programme for creating the World Monopoly State first emerged into the open with the establishment of the League of Nations after the First World War, followed by the creation of Central Banks in as many nations as possible, these in turn linked to The Bank of International Settlements. But it took the Second World War and the developments, which followed that conflict, particularly the rapid expansion of Communism, to make real progress towards establishing the World State. Dr. Henry Kissinger had broadly sketched the major features of what was proposed while American Secretary of State. He was emphatic that international control of basic resources, such as oil and food was essential.

Now this programme has started to emerge in much more concrete form under the label of the "New International Economic Order." In his explosive book, *"Upon that Mountain,"* Mr. Jeremy Lee has traced the major steps already taken to establish the World Monopoly State. But those steps are being intensified now with an increasing number of international conferences all designed to hasten along the Big Idea. Representatives of International Finance have been meeting in Washington, where Robert McNamara of the World Bank insisted that the developed nations must make greater efforts to help the underdeveloped nations.

One of the key features of the "New International Economic Order" is called the Common Fund. The original concept of the Common Fund was that it should

be used to ensure price stability for commodity prices, many of the commodities coming from the underdeveloped nations. But that clearly was only a type of bait for the far-reaching proposal, which now emerges as one designed to provide the underdeveloped nations with funds for purposes far beyond the stabilisation of commodity prices. The Common Fund clearly is now proposed as an instrument for transferring resources from what are called the "have" - the wealthy — nations, to the "have not" nations. The next conference concerning the "New International Economic Order" is to take place in Geneva in November, where the subject of the Common Fund will be discussed. Press reports state that the main grain-exporting nations - - the U.S., Canada, Australia and Argentina have met in the State of Washington to co-ordinate their strategy for the Geneva Conference.

However, the world plotters have problems. While the Carter Administration, the tool of the International Financiers, has embraced the principles of the "New International Economic Order," it has to live with political realities dominated by finance-economics. The inflation rate is rising again in the United States and President Carter is committed to trying to reverse the upward rate. American producers are demanding protection policies. Increased prices for imported commodities can only increase inflation. It will be instructive to watch the American representatives at the Geneva Conference trying to placate the underdeveloped nations while at the same time not committing the U.S.A. to policies, which could produce a major domestic electoral backlash.

Irrespective of how many international conferences the world plotters and their dupes hold, every policy designed to centralise power results in reaction. The programme for the "New International Economic Order" is

creating reactions which could lead to political developments unforeseen by the plotters. Never has there been a better opportunity for exposing the power groups behind the drive towards the World Monopoly State. Patriots in all countries can now more readily draw attention

to what is being planned. As the major features of the "New International Economic Order" emerge from the shadows into the light of day, increasing numbers of people can see the nature of the threat to their future.

CIVILISATION AND THE INDIVIDUAL

Take two men, one of whom follows the life of making existence one long strain for money, and finally dying in ignorance of everything but the price of land in Chicago, Buenos Aires, London, Paris, and Timbuctoo: on the other hand, take one who, when he comes to die will not even be mentioned by the newspapers, whose name no bank director ever saw on the back of a note, who knew nothing about the price of land except at the corner grocery, but who enjoyed fifty years of sport, of gardening, of fishing, and of outdoor happiness.

Which of these two men got the most out of life? Does the knowledge of the price of land, or an obituary notice in the newspapers, atone for the loss of all sport?

Does the man who makes a fortune accomplish so much for the world that his own happiness or ease should not be allowed to weigh in the balance?

Civilisation tends to the importance of the individual.

The middle ages saw thousands compelled to labour for one lord and master; today each man is considered as entitled to some share of the good things in the world, and even women and children are coming forward.

In some distant future each man will consider that the day is made for him, and that he who fails to enjoy himself - that is, to use the gifts of nature rationally - is a fool.

Civilisation should mean emancipation from drudgery, and unquestionably man will some day cease to labour in the present meaning of the word.

When machinery attains to such perfection that the ground is ploughed, the seed is sown, the crops are tended, watered, gathered without the work of man; when power, light, heat are so cheap as to be free as air to everyone, actual labour to provide food, raiment and shelter need be but slight.

At present we put a fictitious value upon labour as a moral exercise apart from results.

One hundred years ago our Puritan ancestors doomed here and hereafter the man who held to any but the most dreary and dreadful beliefs; sunlight, moral as well as physical, to them partook more or less of the nature of sin.

Today we are in danger of erring similarly with regard to work.

One fetish is taking the place of another. I deny that the man who prefers his lobster boat to a banker's desk, who would rather know about the habits of the clam than the price of land in Chicago or New York, is in danger of deterioration, or that his example is vicious. — Extracts from "Liberty and a Living," by Philip G. Hubert. Jnr. (Putnam 1904).

PROBLEMS OF THE PERMISSIVE SOCIETY

The following extract from the James Simpson Oration on Medicine Versus Nature given to the Royal College of Surgeons of Edinburgh, March 1976, by one of the most distinguished Professors of Gynecology and Obstetrics in Britain, Professor Jeffcoate, is a recent reference drawing attention to some of the problems of the permissive society.

Journal of the Royal College of Surgeons of Edinburgh Vol. 21 No. 5, September 1976:

"Gynecologists, whilst appreciating the various motives which can lead women to accept sexual intercourse in irregular circumstances, have long been concerned about the harm to individuals and to families which commonly results, harm about which their daily practice provides first-hand information. But, fearful of being accused of presuming to dictate moral standards and of being puritans out of touch with the outlook of the young, they have hesitated to air their qualms publicly. If the present trends are to be arrested and reversed the time has come for gynecologists to break their silence and to take every opportunity to inform the public that the adverse consequences of

sexual adventures, which were strong deterrents to immorality in the past, remain real and serious. If it is right for physicians to warn of the dangers of smoking and of over-indulgence in food and alcohol, it is right for gynecologists to warn of the health risks attending permissive and perverted sexual behaviour.

The mental trauma, often long lasting, of illicit relationships cannot be discounted but the physical hazards are more easily defined. These include venereal diseases, which, contrary to lay ideas, are not always diagnosed and treated in time to prevent permanent injury, and which are inevitably acquired if a boy or girl takes several partners. They also include unwanted pregnancies and illegitimate babies, termination of pregnancy which is never without danger; the late effects of venereal and postabortal infections such as menstrual disorders and sterility from tubal occlusion; and recurrent abortion, premature labours and other mishaps in subsequent planned child-bearing. Moreover, it should now be emphasised that carcinoma of the cervix arising later in life is to be regarded as a form of venereal disease, the only clearly

established cause of this being frequent intercourse with a variety of partners, especially if commenced in adolescence when the cervical epithelium is relatively unstable and receptive to foreign nucleic acids provided by sperma-

tozoa and possibly by the sexually transmitted herpes virus (Type 2). Moreover, modern non-barrier methods of contraception make cervical cancer, like other venereal diseases, more likely to be acquired."

TO THE POINT

The managing director of Australia's biggest sugar cane grower, the Bundaberg Sugar Co. Ltd., Mr. Roy Deicke, has recently joined the ranks of those criticising the trading policies of the European Economic Community. Mr. Deicke said that the EEC could not continue to ignore international commodity agreements to the detriment of countries like Australia, which respected them. The EEC is now a big exporter of sugar. Until the EEC can be brought into the New International Economic Order, it will continue to do what it is doing now. Under the NIEO sugar is one of the commodities listed for international control. Like other Australian primary industries, the sugar industry failed to make any significant contribution to the Common Market battle in Britain. Its spokesmen are now complaining about what was certain to happen if Britain joined the EEC. They would be well advised to take a long, hard look at the implications of the New International Economic Order.

Australian Bureau of Statistics shows a staggering 220 percent increase in exports to Communist China from \$169 million to \$540 million in the 11 months to May 31. Prime Minister Fraser and his colleagues are pleased with Australian exports to Communist China. But only seven years ago Mr. Fraser and his Minister for Foreign Affairs, were directing Australia's involvement in the no-win Vietnam war, Mr. Fraser was Defence Minister and Mr. Peacock was Army Minister. In justifying Australia's involvement in the Vietnam War, Mr. Fraser and Mr. Peacock charged that the Vietnamese Communists were unmitigated scoundrels being manipulated by Peking. Australians were fighting in Vietnam to halt "the downward thrust of Chinese Communism." Now Mr. Fraser and Peacock welcome the opportunity to send economic aid, not only to the Chinese Communists, but also to Communist Vietnam. Vietnam Communist Deputy Foreign Minister, Mr. Phan Hien, visited Australia early in July at the invitation of Foreign Minister Peacock. Mr. Hien smilingly declined to comment on the situation of seven years ago. "A new page had been opened up for relations of friendship and co-operation between Australia and Vietnam." The war, with its Australian casualties, was unfortunate, but in the world of pragmatic power politics, the past is past. The old values are also of the past, as Ian Smith of Rhodesia has discovered. Sick British Socialist politicians claim that the sacrifices made by Ian Smith and his fellow Rhodesians 30 years ago, in standing with Britain when she stood in peril of destruction, are "no longer relevant." If the past is no longer relevant, then the future is at the mercy of the power-lusters of the world manipulating shallow-rootless politicians. The old British Empire was far from perfect, but it did foster a sense of loyalty and responsibility amongst many of its peoples.

* * * *

Speaking in Melbourne on September 4, Mr. Philip Klutznick, world Jewish Congress President, said that the United Nations had never reached the level expected of it, this being the result of never being granted the powers people thought it had. Mr. Klutznick is strongly pro-Un, having been U.S. representative to the U.N. Economic

and Social Council, and a member of the U.S. delegation to general assembly sessions. With a typical piece of Talmudic dialectics, Mr. Klutznick denied that Zionism was "racism." He said, "Any movement that seeks to free people is not racism." Palestinians driven from their homeland by Zionist aggression do not quite see Zionism as a liberating movement! Mr. Klutznick made the significant point that he did not think the Moscow Olympic Games should be boycotted. Mr. Isi Leibler, Australian Zionist leader, now linked in the travel business with Mr. Bob Hawke and the Australian Council of Trade Unions, takes a similar view. 160,000 Jews have been permitted to leave the Soviet Union during the last ten years and large numbers continue to leave, demonstrating that verbal blows between Zionist and Communist leaders tend to camouflage the fact that Zionism and Communism continue to run together in double-harness.

* * * *

An event of the greatest significance took place on August 12, when the Liberal-Democratic Government of Japan signed a Treaty of Perpetual Peace and Friendship with the Communist Government of Peking. The underlying factors behind this Treaty are the determination of the present Chinese Communist leaders to industrialise China as quickly as possible, and the urgent necessity for Japan, under conventional finance-economic policies, to find new outlets for its growing flood of production. A combination of Japan's industrial drive and China's vast natural resources must inject a new factor into international politics. Should Japan ever be taken over by Marxist Government, a Chinese-Japanese Marxist combination would have far reaching implications. There are influential voices in Japan demanding that Japan increase its defence expenditure. The answer to the latest example of centralisation is not to attempt to match it, but for the English-speaking peoples to take the necessary steps to implement policies of decentralisation and, in the process, to demonstrate to the victims of centralisations the road to true harmony between the peoples of the world.

NEW TIMES—OCTOBER 1978