

THE NEW TIMES

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

Vol. 44, No. 2

FEBRUARY 1979

POLITICAL ZIONISM AND THE MIDDLE EAST TIME BOMB

When the new State of Israel was established by terrorism in 1948, C. H. Douglas made the prophetic observation that the long-term effect would be to bring the Jewish Question into a public debate, which could ultimately prove disastrous to long-term Zionist strategy. This open debate is now moving to the stage where even desperate attempts to apply censorship are proving impossible. The widespread showing of the propaganda film "Holocaust" was an attempt to stem the anti-Zionist tide. But with the Iranian revolution opening the way for further disruptions of vital Arab oil supplies for the West, there is an increasing criticism of the pro-Israeli policies of Western Governments. President Jimmy Carter's phony Camp David peace gimmick is exploding in his face.

As predicted by a number of American and other Western strategists, including some anti-Zionist Jews like the distinguished American expert on the Middle East, Dr. Alfred Lilienthal, the establishment of the Zionist State of Israel was like the introduction of a poisoned thorn into the strategically sensitive Moslem world. It adversely affected the West's relationships with 500 million Moslems. It opened the way for Soviet penetration into the Middle East and for the eventual control of the vital Middle East oil. But, as Douglas pointed out, there was much more to the establishment of Israel than a "home for the Jews." It was designed to set in motion events, which would prepare the peoples of the world psychologically for the acceptance of policies leading towards the establishment of the World State. Israel is but a pawn in a much wider strategy.

SHORTSIGHTED SOUTH AFRICAN POLICY

Through uncritical support for Israel, the United States finds itself, along with other non-Communist nations, including Japan, in a situation bringing them into increasing conflict with the Moslem world. One of the most shortsighted policies adopted by South Africa was to align itself with Israel, one view being that this might help ease the internal campaign against South Africa. South Africa has obtained most of its oil from Iran, as has Israel. The new Iranian leaders have already made it clear that both South Africa and Israel may have to look elsewhere for their oil. Their situation is not going to be viewed very sympathetically by the anti-Israeli Arab States.

The grandstanding by President Carter at the Camp David talks merely obscured a reality, which no gimmicks can remove. That reality is that no genuine stability is possible in the East until the Zionist State of Israel agrees

to proper justice for the Palestinians who have been dispossessed of their homeland by the Zionist invaders. But the same night, September 19, that President Carter was addressing an enthusiastic Congress in Washington, on the Camp David "success," Israeli leader Begin was telling Israelis on television that the phrase "legitimate rights of the Palestinian people," which he had formally accepted at the Camp David talks, "has no meaning." Begin cynically said that he accepted the phrase to please President Carter and Sadat and "because it does not change reality. We accepted — and everyone has his own interpretation." Begin also claimed that he had agreed to suspend Zionist settlements on the West Bank for three months, not five years as claimed by President Carter. Subsequent Israeli activities on the West Bank have demonstrated just how arrogant the Zionist leaders are.

According to well-informed American observers, the Carter Administration achieved the phony Camp David accord by obtaining Saudi Arabian backing for this by a promise to pay more for Saudi Arabian oil, the Saudi Government in turn agreeing to use part of the increased oil revenue to assist both Egypt and Jordan. But vital to the accord was the alleged agreement concerning the Palestinians. Israel has made it quite clear that there is to be no justice for the Palestinians and that Zionist settlements on the West Bank of the Jordan will continue. The U.S.A. is not only committed now to higher oil prices, but to building military airbases at strategic points to guarantee Israel's "security." This is the type of project, which paved the way for the disastrous American involvement in Vietnam. In the case of Vietnam, the Zionists in the U.S.A. were against the American involvement and did everything to make it impossible for the American military forces to adopt other than

a "no-win" policy. But they are backing increased American intervention in the deteriorating Middle East situation, which is like a time bomb ticking towards a major explosion, with the whole Moslem world being progressively driven into the arms of the Soviet. This appears to be part of the Big Idea.

ZIONIST POWER MUST BE CHALLENGED

The essence of the current Middle East situation is that the only hope for the West to regain lost ground with the Moslem world, is to adopt a firm policy towards Israel, insisting that unless it helps remove the poisoned thorn by agreeing to genuine justice and independence

for the Palestinians no further financial, economic or military aid will be provided.

The future of the West now depends upon a complete rejection of Zionist policies. This means a challenge to that Zionist power exercised through the creation of international credit. It means a challenge to the vast, sophisticated political Zionist propaganda machine. There is, fortunately, evidence, that this challenge is at long last developing. 1979 could see some most important unrehearsed developments in the battle for the world. It is important that Christian patriots everywhere should be ready and equipped to take advantage of them.

The Situation and the Outlook

By C. H. DOUGLAS

As one of our contributions towards commemorating the centenary year of the birth of C. H. Douglas, we will throughout the year be re-publishing a selection of his lesser-known writings and addresses not only for the benefit of our many newer readers but also so that older readers may refresh their minds with the works of a genius whose views have stood the test of time.

The following was originally published in "The Social Creditor" in 1946 and some of the references to individuals and events relate to the immediate post-Second World War period. But subsequent events have confirmed Douglas's — unheeded, unfortunately — warnings:

(I)

The termination of large-scale military activities on the Continent of Europe—the pivotal theatre, to which the others were subsidiary and on which their destiny depended—is now sufficiently a matter of history for it to be possible to estimate their relationship to an ultimate objective, and to see also the pursuit of that objective "by other means". Any attempt to do this intelligently must proceed from one of two hypotheses; either the world was, and is, in the grip of blind fate, "written in the pyramids", *etc.*, or it is exhibiting the results of a policy derived from thinking man, in which case mundane fate, while conditioned to some extent by previous action and persistent deduction, is susceptible of "repentance" (thinking again or against) and compensatory action. It is on the latter hypothesis that the comments, which follow, are based, and if it is fallacious, it is obvious that neither they, nor perhaps any others, have any consequence. No policy, no cure.

It is necessary, in my opinion, to bear in mind that a policy *must* derive from a philosophy; and for this reason, and with some reluctance because I am well aware of the antagonisms which are aroused, I feel it would not be honest to omit the expression of an opinion which has been crystallising, so far as I am concerned, for some years. The more conventional form in which the idea to which I refer is phrased is that we are engaged in a battle for Christianity, and that is true. But it is surprising in how many ways, practically, realistically, factually, it is true. And one of these ways is almost unnoticed, except in its derivations—the emphasis placed by the Roman Catholic Church on the family, and the steady unrelenting effort to destroy the very idea of family and to substitute the State, by the Communists and Socialists, who, with the World Financial Group, are the real body of Anti-Christ. Please observe that what most people mean by family nowadays is a unit *contemporaneously* composed of parents and children. It has no extension in time; the flash of consciousness we call the present is all that is allowed to this idea of "family"; and therefore it has no stability, because it lacks a dimension.

Now it is this very idea of impermanence and scorn of

tradition which can be seen to be the key-note of the New Order which Mr. Anthony Eden, for instance, was so well informed as to prophesy almost before the first shot was fired in 1939. Life now is to have no stable principles; property is yours just so long as an institution does not want it; you are no judge of what is best for you, and what you want does not matter. Everything is to be conditioned by "the common good". The group is supreme over the individual; the flower exists for the benefit of the field.

This lack of stability is closely connected with a curious inversion. *Demon est deus inversus*. We mouth Social Security and live in a prison on the edge of a volcano. We decry privilege in favour of "the common good", double our Cabinet Ministers' salaries, and institute and maintain priorities in every one of the decreasing facilities of a dying civilisation. We cannot build houses, so we steal them. We cannot play the game, so we change the rules. In the face of the greatest crops in history we ration bread. We export immense quantities of goods we need ourselves to *e.g.*, France, and refuse to take payment in wines, having raised the price of Algerian claret from about two pence a litre, its cost of production, to about fourteen shillings, its "Government" price. We talk about the necessity to avoid inflation, and we negotiate immense and irrational wage increases unrelated to any intelligible wage policy and prevent the goods to which they relate from reaching the wage market; and, having with the support of fifty years' propaganda against profits obtained control of the national resources, we install a Chancellor of the Exchequer who disposes of the National Credit to our disadvantage, and cuts off the National dividend at its source—a rate of interest on the national capital account—while arranging that the real wealth produced goes abroad to be credited to the national capital account of our active enemies.

These matters are not episodic; they are all connected with an intelligible philosophy. And the raw material of that philosophy is the common man—the amorphous group, the tool of that terrible Power which fights relentlessly for our destruction. It is very necessary not to confuse

"the common man" with any economic class, perhaps more necessary in these days than ever before, although its characteristic does not change. "Crucify Him. Release unto us Barabbas. Now, Barabbas was a robber."

Majority "rule" with a secret ballot is the organising mechanism of "the common man", the vehicle of the subconscious, the animal man. "Father, forgive them, they are *unconscious* of what they do." Intellect is not concerned.

(II)

In order to disembarass oneself of the confusion involved in the use of words such as Fascism, Communism, Socialism and the like, and to avoid the elementary fallacy of supposing that our troubles began with the present so-called Labour Government, and can be ended by merely replacing it by a so-called Conservative administration, there is no better discipline than to turn back to the Mond-Turner Conference, and to observe its absorption in P.E.P.

The Mond-Turner Conference consisted of six of the most powerful industrialist employers in Great Britain, dominated by the international Zionist Jew, Sir Alfred Moritz Mond and his able coadjutor, and co-racialist, Sir Hugo Hirst (Hirsch). Mond had belonged to both main political Parties; so had some of the others. The six so-called Labour members of the Conference included Right and Left Wing Trades Unionists, Socialists and a Communist.

It would be difficult to get together a body of men less "political" in the Parliamentary sense. They were not there to discuss policy; they were there to make a given policy work. That policy was the World Empire of Big Business. "The high purpose of the Conference could not be more amply illustrated than by the fact that the first agreed resolution *published to the world* [my italics] was a Joint Memorandum on the Gold Reserve and its relations with industry.

"It is merely necessary for me to point out that the issue of that Memorandum to the Chancellor of the Exchequer had a definite result in the policy which he pursued."—Sir A. M. Mond, at Harvard University, 1928.

His Master's Voice, in fact.

It is necessary not to lose sight of the undiscussed question of policy; but, before dealing with it, the sequence of events following the Mond-Turner Conference should be noted. The Conference was in 1926. The Bank of England centralised currency in 1928; the financial crash and the world depression began in 1929; P.E.P. and the U.S. New Deal became dominant in 1932. Selected nominees of Big Business trained at the London School of Economics were installed in key positions in Australia and Ottawa. Mr. Coldwell, an Englishman, with a strong dislike for England, had the extraordinary fortune to meet Mr. Nash of New Zealand at Regina when he was so successfully founding the Canadian Socialist Party, and discovered that their views were identical. Dr. Arnold Toynbee announced that "we" are working with all our might to undermine the sovereignty of our respective nations. "Hitler" undermined them by force, and at the outbreak of war a carefully prepared but unsuccessful propaganda was launched for "Union Now with Britain" [sic]. "Union" was, of course, carelessly disguised absorption of the British Empire by the United States.

Two main features of this period can be discerned without much difficulty: The pressure to organise larger and larger units was accompanied by bigger and worse disasters. This pressure is the outcome of what, at one end of the industrial scale, is called Socialism, at the other end, Rationalisation. Both mean Monopoly under the guise of Collectivism, and both mean de-Nationalisation—an economic not a political organisation. And the second feature is that the British Empire is an insurmountable obstacle as

such, and must be disintegrated before it can be replaced by economic world control. It may be recalled that William Randolph Hearst made just such a statement in an unguarded moment many years ago.

The outcome of the last catastrophe, the Second World War, is a fresh drive towards both these objectives from the same origins. And the two ends of the scale are, one unconsciously and the other consciously, working towards both objectives at the same time. That is what is coming to be called the Financier-Socialist Plot.

At this point, the divergence between a political and a business Empire becomes easier to discern. British Statesmen of the pre-twentieth-century type were constantly accused of hypocrisy. Without examining the grounds for this charge too closely, the mere fact that it was made is instructive. Hypocrisy has been well and truly defined as the tribute vice pays to virtue. British tradition, therefore, either had, or pretended to have, a policy. What was it? Certainly not, traditionally, "business". Napoleon's gibe that we are a nation of shopkeepers was meant to be, and was accepted as, offensive at the time it was made. Nowadays we are not such successful shopkeepers, but regard shop keeping as our highest aim.

Many books have been written on this subject, but a trivial phrase is perhaps as illuminating as any of them. In even remote parts of South America, thousands of people, many of whom have no idea whether England is a continent, a country, or a planet, and may never have seen an Englishman, assure each other of their sincerity by saying *Palabra de Ingles*—"On the word of an Englishman". Notice the suggestion of stability, of continuity, and the contrast with the predatory methods of "Enabling Legislation", the Managerial State, and other current fashions which accompany our decadence.

The point is not so much—although, of course, that is important—that a political Empire has a certain set of principles. It is that those principles should be stable. Out of this, as it were by a side wind, came success and power. The conception is closely allied to "quality".

Now the *direct* aim of an Empire of Business is power, and the ultimate *material* power is that over Life and Death—War. But the intermediate device is Fashion—Instability, Change. *Palabra de Ingles*, if it has any place at all in it, is a business device helpful towards increased exports. Use it on your letter headings. Learn from Marx and Lenin the uses of lying. In fact, learn from anybody or anything except the makers of your own history and from that history itself.

Consider then Karl Marx (Mordecai): "The mode of production in material life determines the general character of the social, political and spiritual processes of life" (*Critique of Political Economy*). If that means anything at all—I am not sure that it does—it means that our desperate social, political and spiritual processes derive from "the mode of production".

I don't think "the mode of production" was even remotely understood by Marx. What he meant was the business system. And I should say myself that it is the political and spiritual processes, which are evidenced *by* the business system. Hence the projected World Empire of Big Business and the increasing desperation of our plight.

(III)

A dispassionate consideration of such events as the Mond-Turner Conference (not to mention the deliberations of less known bodies) ought to convince anyone that the Materialistic Conception of History, which Marx popularised, but did not originate, is, like so many other theories and ideas which are current, an inversion of the truth. Mond, and

possibly others with him, was perfectly conscious of what he was aiming at, and was animated by a *conscious* hatred of the traditional English way of life, which represented an unconscious subordination of the "employment" and production systems to spiritual and social needs. It was the remnant of Christian Europe. Given that conviction, it is not difficult to see that mass production, majority democracy, collective bargaining and collectivism, one world government (intended to be ruled by Zionists) and World War and World Annihilation are all of a piece. They are the inescapable results of a choice—conscious in a small minority, unconscious and essentially passive in "the Common Man".

It has often been observed that there has been a steady degradation in the attractiveness of life in England, and perhaps to a less extent in Scotland, as the statistical wealth of the nation has increased. Since (a) the population has increased—rather mysteriously—and (b) the rate of production per man-hour has been accelerated by a factor of at least one hundred and probably more, it is indisputable that something must be happening which is ignored. There are many factors of this character. The first is that most of our production has little value in adding to the pleasure of life. The second is that a startling amount of our exports are a complete loss, from which we get no return. A third is that we get less return each year per unit of export, so that the amount of labour paid per unit of *import* tends to remain constant, or to increase irrespective of the productivity of that unit. At the present time, as a result of labour agitation reinforced by the failure of this policy to raise living standards, actual output tends to drop.

That is the system, and its apotheosis is, "full employment" for unspecified ends. Now, in fairness to many people whose education and daily work renders it nearly impossible that they should comprehend the insanity of this policy, it has to be admitted that war is its justification. If we are to contemplate more world wars, competitive armaments, not absolute standards of military strength, are inescapable. Put quite shortly, the world is doomed, and at no distant date, if this is the only conceivable policy by which to deal with the threat of war on a modern scale.

But there are at least two policies, which can be applied to the situation. One of these is being publicised by every means, which modern methods can suggest. It is the policy of the omnipotent World State. And the second is hardly mentioned and still more infrequently understood. It is the policy of the Free Individual.

It is difficult to pick up any newspaper at this time without reading a suggestion of the growing risk of war, accompanied by the remark, "Of course, nobody wants war". Well, if nobody wants war, from whom do wars proceed? The answer is: From the Common Man, manipulated by his Greatest Enemy, the Power Maniac. Without the common man, the Power Maniac is helpless.

There is really no room for argument about this matter. Not a day passes without some action being taken to make the individual more impotent and to transfer his individual initiative—his personal power—to the mass. The Trades Union, the Co-operative "Movement" (Co-operation between High Finance and the "Labour" Party to monopolise and cartelise distribution), the Producing Cartels, the various infringements on real property, and, most deadly perhaps of all, the combination of calculated inflation, taxation and "coupon" restrictions are all steps to Russian serfdom.

Perhaps the greatest disservice to struggling humanity, which the past hundred years has witnessed, has been fostered by those "money reformers" who have supported the "nationalisation" of the Bank of England. It is simply appalling in its implications that men, well educated in

the everyday sense, should be so unconscious of the very roots of the democracy for which they profess such admiration that they cannot or will not grasp two elemental propositions. The first is that genuine control of genuine finance was the core of a genuine Parliamentary system, not its electoral devices, and that this involved getting the money from Parliament not from a Ways and Means Account, and that "nationalisation" of the Bank of England has now made it quite unnecessary to bring financial questions into the House of Commons at all. So evident has this become that the proposal to vote thousands of millions of pounds merely empties the House.

It ought to be elementary, but it is not, that if no considerable number of individuals, as *individuals*, can be found to say they want war, then the way to prevent war is to prevent those individuals from being coerced or deceived, by desire for money or State action, into a war which only a tiny minority *do* want, because of its indispensability to a Power World Organisation. The present Administration is going further and faster than any previous Administration along the course in which Mr. Churchill's Administration concurred, and against which the so-called Conservative Opposition is making no real protest—the transfer of power and initiative from the individual to the institutions controlled by International Finance. And no Power on earth can avert the consequences, failing a reversal of the policy and the discredit of its Philosophy. Those consequences are war and the death of civilisation.

(IV)

The situation, then, is that the philosophy of Hegel and Marx, to use the names to which it is generally attached; a philosophy which appears to be fundamentally Jewish with a modifying strain of Prussianism, is now temporarily triumphant in a policy of State Socialism directed under cover of a bureaucracy by a small group of international money kings, perhaps not entirely Jewish at the moment, but intending to become so. Control of propaganda in all its forms has imposed a false mental picture on the group mind which facilitates the acceptance of such patent absurdities as "full employment" in a power-production economy, centralised direction in a universal literacy, and, in fact, general stultification in the name of "the common good".

No refinements on this policy hold any prospect of salvation. It is fundamentally false and vicious, and events are the outcome of it. The greater dominance it acquires, the more events must follow the pattern of its philosophy. We are therefore driven to consider how it can be arrested, what can be substituted for it, and how that substitution can be accomplished.

To say that Social Credit is the only policy which offers any hope to a distracted world would savour of quackery unless accompanied by a definition which is not delimited by a plan, financial or otherwise. The very essence of a plan is that it is static, not organic; and the very essence of the necessity under which we labour is that we have to recognise that life is organic, not static. The conception of Social Credit which first has to be established, so that the error of a static conception shall not stultify *tactical* plans, is that we must aim at liberating reality; and to liberate anything you must first be able to recognise it. A good deal of the so-called philanthropic sentiment in the world is not reality, and has no relation to reality. Who are the prime beneficiaries of U.N.R.R.A. and the "Save Europe Now" rackets? Before touching upon immediate necessities two simple propositions require enunciation. The first is that no one has ever been able to conceive of a stick with one end, still less to make one. When someone says (and there is a steady propaganda to induce people to say) that a policy is negative, they are

talking the same kind of nonsense as those who say that what is wanted is a positive policy. No one has yet found a way to travel nearer to Carlisle without getting further from Crewe, if you start from Crewe.

And the second proposition is that a Government is inherently and inevitably restrictive and therefore that the amount of Government, which a community can stand without collapsing, is definitely limited, and if Governments are competitive, the most governed community will collapse first. And therefore, the first policy to be applied to over-Government, *i.e.*, Socialism, is and must be, a negative policy—a retreat from Government; less Government.

This characteristic of Government is inherent, but is little understood. Government is of necessity hierarchical and cannot stimulate or even tolerate independent, responsible action. Anyone who has contact with Government officials knows the impossibility of getting a genuine decision out of any of them. At the best, what you get is the assurance of a precedent.

In its place (quite a minor place) and with strict limitations, this state of affairs is necessary and useful. But not when elevated to a scheme of life. Governments are not proper mechanisms to which to entrust policy. The result never varies; the world becomes progressively less pleasant to live in. As at present organised, there is no essential difference involved in "Big Business".

I am coming to believe that an extra-mundane code of principles is in the nature of reality. Given that, individual responsibility for the interpretation of the code follows logically. And the first consequence of this, which leaps to the eye, is that the miscalled democratic system, as generally understood, even if it had any genuine existence, is a dangerous mistake. It postulates Group Responsibility. In the mundane sense, there is no such thing. Groups are

psychic constructions, probably sub-human; and the current endeavour to *e.g.*, identify every individual who happens to have a German passport with "Germany" is voodooism, and proceeds from a source in which the identity of the individual with the group is an atavistic survival.

Individual responsibility inescapably implies inequality, and inequality inescapably implies that an individual *can* (not, with the aid of Miss Ellen Wilkinson, necessarily does, at the present time) know his own business best.

These observations are not intended to be an introduction to the subject with which they deal, and I have therefore no doubt that anyone sufficiently interested to read them will be able to follow the connection with the general principles involved, of the following tactical implications:

(1) Rationing is economic ("household management") centralisation. It is diametrically opposed to Social Credit, and should be fought consistently and bitterly.

(2) Money (which comprises prices) should derive from the individual and be contributed, without coercion, to such state functions as are necessary (N.B., This is *not* a scheme). "Coupons" are simply a "Russian" trick.

(3) An individual has no more right, moral or pragmatic, to indiscriminate and unlimited voting power than he has to unlimited and indiscriminate purchasing power. Any one who is in favour of a secret-ballot franchise on an unrestricted agenda prefers to make his purchases at a thieves' receiver. What is not for sale, ought not to be buyable.

No one has ever produced the slightest evidence to support the "Gentle Jesus, meek and mild" conception of Christianity (except by quoting a mistranslation). It appears probable that Christianity has many aspects; the one immediately important is depicted in the adjuration "Ye generation of vipers" and in the scourging of the moneychangers from the Temple. A firing squad may be necessary.

SOCIAL CREDIT AND "THE JEWISH QUESTION"

By Eric D. Butler

The following is from one of the chapters of a book, "Releasing Reality," by Mr. Eric Butler, which has been written by the author as his contribution towards the commemoration of the Douglas Centenary year. "Releasing Reality" will be formally launched at this year's "New Times" Dinner in September.

In his examination of the problems afflicting Civilisation, and the philosophies of those imposing policies of centralising power, Douglas was forced to agree with what many other eminent students of human affairs had asserted: There was a "Jewish Problem" with its roots deep in history. Although Douglas's comments on the problem were in his usual objective style, the smear was spread that after becoming frustrated and disillusioned because his financial proposals were not more readily accepted, Douglas then "used the Jews as a scapegoat." Allegedly he became "paranoiac" about the question, but both Douglas's writings and those who knew him intimately attested to the fact that Douglas remained an integrated individual until the time of his death.

So far from seizing upon the "Jewish Problem" in his later years, Douglas had raised the question in 1924 in his book *Social Credit*. In the chapter, "Relation of The Group to The Individual," Douglas dealt with the danger to human personality by elevating the group over the individual, and then said: "No consideration of this subject would be complete without recognising the bearing upon it of what is known as the Jewish Question; a question rendered doubly difficult by the conspiracy of silence

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

who are on trial, and that the remedy, if one is required, is to break up the group activity."

Sixteen years later, in *'Whose Service is Perfect Freedom'* (1940), Douglas wrote: "If I have, for my own part, come to believe that there is a fundamental relationship between the troubles which afflict Europe and what is known as the Jewish Problem, I have formed the opinion with reluctance, and only after close consideration both of facts and of less tangible evidence."

There is a vast literature, extending over thousands of years, concerning the "Jewish Question," with some of the most important contributions coming from Jews like the distinguished Dr. Oscar Levy, who wrote that "The Question of the Jews and their influence on the world, past and present, cuts to the root of all things and should be discussed by every honest thinker." In his book, *The Jews*, (first edition 1922) the famous Catholic writer Hilaire Belloc wrote, "The Jewish problem is one to which no true parallel can be found, for the historical and social phenomenon which has produced it is unique. . . . It is a problem, which cannot be avoided, nor even lessened (as can some social problems), by a healing effect of time; for it is increasing before our eyes. It must be met and dealt with openly and now." In his classic work, *Antisemitism*, (first edition 1894) the Jewish scholar Bernard Lazare observed, "In as much as the enemies of the Jews belonged to diverse races, as they dwelled far apart from one another, so that they could not possibly judge alike of any subject, it must needs be that the general causes of anti-Semitism have always resided in Israel itself, and not in those who antagonised it."

Western Europe Civilisation was a partial incarnation of Christianity. Its culture was a reflection of Christian values. Jews quite logically reacted against that culture because it was completely alien to them. A Christian cannot begin to understand the real nature of the "Jewish Problem" until he understands that there is a basic cleavage between Christianity and Judaism. The Jewish writer, A. Memmi, wrote frankly as follows in his book, *Portrait Of A Jew* (1962) "Do Christians realise what the name of Jesus, their God, can mean to a Jew? For a Christian, even an atheist, it evokes, or at least has evoked at some time, a being infinitely good, who offers himself as The Good, who desires at least to carry on the torch of all bygone philosophies and all morals. For the Christian who is still a believer, Jesus epitomises and fulfils the better part of himself . . . To the Jew who still believes and professes his own religion, Christianity is the greatest theological and metaphysical usurpation in history; it is a spiritual scandal, a subversion and blasphemy. To all Jews, even if they are atheists, the name of Jesus is the symbol of a threat..."

Not surprisingly, in the United States, where there is a large number of Jews and Jewish influence is strong, Jews have been leaders in a long campaign to keep all Christian activities, including the singing of Christmas carols, out of the public schools.

Douglas went to the core of the "Jewish Question" in

the following comment in *"Whose Service Is Perfect Freedom"*: "Everything of which we have knowledge is relative. The fact that the Dark Forces seem to be in the ascendant is a proof that they are temporarily in the ascendant over something else. You cannot have light without shade; you cannot know what anything is, if you don't know what it is not..."

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

As all policies are rooted in philosophies, it is not surprising to find that Jews have played a prominent role in collectivist and power activities subverting Christian societies. The distinguished Jewish author, Dr. Alfred Nossig, wrote in his *Intergrades Judentum*; "The modern Socialist movement is in great part the work of the Jews, who impress on it the mark of their brains . . . The present world socialism forms the first step of the accomplishment of Mosaism, the start of the realisation of the state of the world announced by our prophets . . . It is only a League of Nations penetrated with the Socialist spirit that will render possible for us the enjoyment of our international necessities, as well as our national ones."

In *The Social Crediter* of February 7 1948, Douglas elaborated on the relationship of Social Credit to the

BASIC FUND PASSES \$30,000

With the quickening of the national and international crisis, the awesome responsibilities thrust upon the League of Rights have been substantially increased. In spite of the massive campaign to destroy and denigrate the League, it has more than "held the line" and continues to provide the guidance and inspiration for which increasing numbers are looking.

After a most encouraging start, the League's Basic Fund of \$45,000 for 1978-79 has, over the past two months, lost momentum. It has, however, managed to pass \$30,000. But this result has been achieved by only a small minority of readers. The League has sent out an SOS to the great majority who has not yet contributed, urging them to get behind the Fund immediately and provide the balance of \$15,000. 1000 readers sending an average of only \$15 can quickly resolve the matter. Please get your contribution, small or large, away immediately. All Northern N.S.W. and Queensland contributions to Mr. Jeremy Lee, Kingstown, via Armidale, N.S.W. All others to Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne.

"Jewish Problem."

"We believe that there is a small number — loyal and valued members of our public — who, although, because their loyalty, they accept our views on certain aspects of the Jewish race, yet have an idea that these are an excrescence on 'Social Credit' and, they feel, might have been left unnoticed. We are not concerned with the reactions of the crypto-Communists and their accusations - 'anti-Semitism', 'racism', 'negative criticism' and other catchwords -- but we are ready at all times to explain to our friends what we recognise as a very excusable failure of comprehension.

Perhaps the simplest way in which to deal with this matter is to enunciate certain propositions:

1. Both Judaism and Social Credit are rooted in philosophies. Even in the case of non-orthodox Jews, race and philosophy are inseparable. Heine refers to Judaism as the portable Fatherland.
2. Social Credit is Christian, not primarily because it was designed to be Christian, but because it was painstakingly 'dis' (un) -covered reality. If Christianity is not real, it is nothing; it is not "true", it is Truth. 'Ye shall know the Truth, and the Truth shall make you free.'
3. Judaism is implacably anti-Christian, and it is, by definition, an Incarnate Lie. "Ye do the deeds of your father . . . he is a liar, and the father of it."
4. Both philosophies have a policy and these policies cannot live together. The Founder of Christianity was quite unequivocal on the question. 'I came not to bring peace, but a sword.' It is remarkable that many people who complain of the suppression of vital information by the press and Broadcasting Agencies, will resent the exposure of Jewish policy, even if the exposure is merely the publication of statements made by Jews themselves."

Douglas observed that the practical problem to be faced was militant, not intellectual. Mere conversion to an understanding of the credit swindle *of itself* leads nowhere. People must know who is preventing effective rectification and who benefits most from a continuation of present policies.

Douglas concluded: "For all these reasons and others, we conceive it to be our vocation to indicate, without prejudice but without favour, those whom we conceive to be the enemies of our culture and ideals; to unmask their aims. It does not make a cheerful story; many people would prefer to escape into Utopia, just as 'the workers' have been hypnotised into the Utopia which is spreading over Eastern Europe; but it is our conception of Reality at this time, and only from Reality can you proceed to Realisation."

As the central feature of Social Credit policy is the principle of the individual receiving a dividend based upon the cultural heritage, it is not surprising that Jews have been to the forefront in attacks upon Social Credit. In a comment in *The Social Crediter* of March 13, 1948,

Douglas referred to a revealing quotation from a review of the work of the historian Wernher Sombart by Dr. Jacob Fromer in *Die Zukunft* of October 28, 1911. Fromer observed that "Nothing in the Jewish religion is done for nothing," commenting that it is "diametrically opposed to the Christian doctrine of unearned grace." The same opposition to the doctrine of unearned grace is expressed in the Communist view that the principle of inheritance should be abolished. As with other Jewish revolutionaries, who became atheists, Marx advocated policies rooted in the Judaic philosophy. Bernard Lazare, writing in *Antisemitism*, answered the objection that the Jewish revolutionary who turns atheists ceases practically to be a Jew. Lazare wrote:

"The objection may be raised that, in joining the ranks of revolution, the Jew as a rule, turns atheist, and ceases practically to be a Jew. This, however, is true only in the sense that the children of the Jewish radical lose themselves more easily in the surrounding population, and that as a result the Jewish revolutionist is more easily assimilated. But as a general thing, the Jew, even the extreme Jewish radical, can not help retaining his Jewish characteristics, and though he may have abandoned all religion and all faith, he has none the less received the impress of the national genius acting through hereditary and early training. This is especially true of those Jews who lived during the earlier half of the nineteenth century, and on whom Heinrich Heine and Karl Marx may serve as fitting examples.

"Heine, who in France was regarded as a German, and was reproached in Germany with being French, was before all things a Jew . . . The only philosophy that ever really attracted him was pantheism, a doctrine which seemed to come naturally to the Jewish philosopher who in speculating upon the unity of God by instinct transforms it into a unity of substance. His sensuousness, that sad and voluptuous sensuousness of the *Intermezzo*, is purely oriental, and has its source in the Song of Songs. The same is true of Marx. The descendant of a long line of rabbis and teachers he inherited the splendid powers of his ancestors. He had that clear Talmudic mind which does not falter at petty difficulties of fact. He was a Talmudist devoted to sociology and applying his native power of exegesis to the criticism of economic theory . . . Marx was not merely a logician, he was also a rebel, an agitator, an acrid controversialist, and he derived his gift for sarcasm and invective, as Heine did, from his Jewish ancestry."

"A PLOT TO DESTROY AUSTRALIA'S INDEPENDENCE"

By Jeremy Lee

This chilling work should ring the alarm bells right throughout Australia.

TO THE POINT

C. H. Douglas observed that nations, like individuals, could sometimes gain access to material wealth too quickly; that the results were disastrous when there was no adequate background and experience for handling the sudden wealth in a responsible manner. The genuine aristocracy of Christian Europe understood this truth and their children were brought up accordingly. Much of the cause of the Iranian revolution, one that will have far-reaching implications for the whole world, was the Shah's attempt to use the vast credits obtained from the nation's major natural resource, oil, to "modernise" his country in the most extravagant manner. This meant a massive attack upon the people's religious and cultural traditions. It is ironic that the Communist materialists should be able to exploit a situation where religious opposition to the Shah's materialism has resulted in a situation, which advances Soviet strategy in the Middle East.

Senator John Glenn of the United States has revealed after a recent visit to Communist China that the Chinese Communists desire to join The International Monetary Fund. Senator Glenn says that he was told of the Communist desire by Feng Tien-shun, manager of The Bank of China. Needless to say, there will be no opposition to the proposal from international financial groups, currently working to find ways of providing Communist China with the credits required for the growing economic blood transfusions flowing from Japan and the West. Romania, Vietnam, Yemen and Kampuchea (Cambodia) are present Communist members of the IMF.

* * *

A reader draws our attention to the fact (well known to us) that David Rockefeller's Chase Manhattan Bank is well established in Taiwan and has provided credits for some of Taiwan's biggest projects. The question is asked, "Is it not rather contradictory that Rockefeller, whom you have pointed out, has been bankrolling the Communists, should also be financing the anti-Communists?" As international financiers have the power to create credit against other people's assets, they stand to lose little even if their debts are repudiated. Even should Taiwan be "liberated" by the Chinese Communists, the Chase Manhattan would no doubt carry on business as usual. Although Mr. Rockefeller and his fellow international financiers have financed the Soviet Union, they are also keen to finance the build up of Communist China, which some naive observers claim to be a shrewd policy move to balance the growing power of the Soviet Union. The international financiers and their spokesmen make it clear that what they are working towards is a New World Order, one in which smaller countries like Taiwan will have to capitulate to centralised global power. But the programme could be badly upset by a number of the smaller nations refusing to capitulate.

* * *

One of the less publicised international conferences held last year for advancing the New Internal Economic Order, took place in New York late in August. The presence of Dr. Henry Kissinger indicated that this agent of the internationalists is as active as ever. Also present was former British Prime Minister Edward Heath, the man who played a major role in breaking up the old British world. Perhaps because of the presence of Mrs. Katharine Graham of the *Washington Post* the media completely ignored the conference. The conference was held under the auspices of the "Commission on Relations Between Developed and Underdeveloped Countries," headed by

former West German Chancellor Willy Brandt. Brandt admitted after the conference that the Commission had held high-level talks in Moscow in July. This Commission is on record as urging the U.S.A. to cut defence spending and to transfer domestic resources to underdeveloped nations. The Commission was originally formed at the suggestion of Robert McNamara, President of World Bank and a Rockefeller representative. It is another instrument in the drive towards establishing the New International Economic Order.

* * *

Prime Minister Ian Smith of Rhodesia has been experiencing an increasing backlash from whites that are beginning to fear that they have no future as a result of the Smith Government's strategy. Mr. Smith in self-defence has mentioned the Kissinger threat and stressed that he is attempting to meet the demands of "world opinion." We have never doubted Mr. Smith's courage or patriotism. But we have doubted his understanding of the realities of the struggle for the world. He constantly expressed the view that he "cannot understand" why Western politicians act as they do. If at this late hour Mr. Smith and his colleagues still do not understand why Rhodesia is marked down for destruction, it is not surprising that they have adopted a purely defensive strategy hoping that by progressively making concessions, they can get an agreement leading to international recognition. During recent clashes with those expressing doubts about his politics, Mr. Smith has expressed optimism that a "break through" can be achieved. He is deluding himself. Rhodesia's only hope now is an offensive on all fronts — political, psychological and military. Such an offensive would enable Rhodesia's growing army of friends around the world to make a full-scale rally to their defence.

* * *

When Prime Minister Fraser of Australia went to Communist China after defeating the Whitlam Government late in 1975, he swallowed the Chinese Communist propaganda story that Peking was no longer supporting revolutionary movements around the world. Presumably Mr. Fraser and his advisers have not heard that the Chinese Communists have been actively supporting Mr. Robert Mugabe's murderous thugs operating against Rhodesians from Mozambique. Recent reports state that this increase is now being increased. As the Western nations, including Australia, increase their flow of economic blood transfusions to Communist China, they make it easier for the Peking criminals to compete with the Soviet around the world.