

# THE NEW TIMES

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

Vol. 44, No. 10

OCTOBER 1979

## REFUGEE PAWNS IN THE INTERNATIONAL GAME

**Since Prime Minister Lee of Singapore made his charge that the Communist Government of Vietnam was deliberately using refugees as an assault weapon against neighbouring nations, the evidence has mounted to confirm this charge. The policy of deliberately using refugees to achieve political objectives is the logical end result of the development of major refugee problems since the time of the First World War. The past half-century has seen more people uprooted from their traditional homelands than in any previous period in history.**

One of the major problems to come out of the post-second World War period was that of the Palestinians, driven into the deserts by the terrorist campaign conducted by the Zionists. One of the most prominent of the Zionist terrorists was the man who is now Prime Minister of Israel. The sickness of Civilisation may be measured in part by the fact that terrorist Begin of yesteryear, responsible for the hideous deaths of harmless men, women and children, is today treated with at international conferences as if his murderous past does not matter. At no time has he expressed any regrets for his bloody acts.

The Palestinian refugees have become put pawns in the international power play, exploited by the Communists and their agents. Enormous publicity has been given to the refugees from Vietnam but relatively little given to the plight of the Palestinian refugees, who have been a festering sore in the Middle East ever since 1948. Zionist influence in the media has been so extensive, as proved by the courageous anti-Zionist Jew Alfred Lilienthal, that the Palestinian refugee problem, the basic cause of the continuing Middle East crisis, is little understood. Premier Lee has complained that the media has concentrated on the "human interest" aspect of the Vietnamese refugee question to the point where the deeper implications are suppressed.

### NEW TYPE OF WARFARE

A study of how the Vietnamese refugee question is being exploited reveals that a new type of warfare is being used. If only one aspect, the emotional, is publicised, then the targets of the new type of warfare are not only neutralised but can readily be persuaded to participate in their own destruction. The much more realistic attitude of the Asians towards the Vietnamese refugees is in marked contrast with that of Europeans, particularly those who call themselves Christians. While genuine Christians should be involved in "good works," enormous amount of what passes for Christian activity today, is in essence but ambulance work - - a concentration upon the destructive results of evil policies rather than upon working towards removing the policies. The Communist Governments in

Asia are in the position where they can continue almost indefinitely to force out a stream of refugees. Even if the number reaches ten million, this would have little effect in Asia, but the acceptance of these millions into countries like Australia, New Zealand and Canada could mean forcing the European into a minority situation. European culture would be submerged.

Linked with the refugee question is that of infiltration. It has now been established beyond all argument that a number of the "boat people" are Communist agents. In a survey of the situation in Canada, Mr. Patrick Walsh, former undercover agent for the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, has drawn attention to an interview in *The Forge*, the Pro-Peking Canadian Communist paper, with a young Vietnamese of Chinese origin who arrived recently in Canada with the first boat people. The article-interview starts off with the statement that "the former teacher and his wife were lucky enough to have been selected by Canadian immigration officers a few months ago out of the thousands of their compatriots crammed into refugee camps all over South East Asia."

Mr. Walsh comments, "If these 'selected' refugees are a criterion of the type of boat people we will get in Canada, this means an invasion of pro-Red Chinese refugees, many of them (according to this interview) who were arrested 'simply for having a portrait of Chairman Mao or Hua Guofeng in their house or for subscribing to (Red) Chinese periodicals'." It would be instructive to know how many of the refugees, those from Vietnam being mainly of Chinese ethnic background, were encouraged to leave because they were the wrong kind of Communists, following Peking instead of Moscow.

The current situation recalls the remark by Karl Marx, which C. H. Douglas described as of great historic significance, that the English would never make their own revolution and that foreigners would have to make it for them. During his Australian tour, Mr. Ron Gostick of Canada produced a photostat copy of a 1934 Comintern document which stressed the importance of Marxists exploiting immigrant groups. The Communist strategy is to create instability and a sense of deepening crisis as the

first step towards forcing the individual to surrender to more centralised controls. But Communist strategy is but part of a bigger strategy designed to drive mankind into the World State. The Communists continue to be sustained with massive economic blood transfusions from what is called the Free World. Those who make the financial credits, the international bankers, obviously exercise power far in excess of that of the Communists. In the last analysis, it is their policies, which have created the state of the world. The refugee problem could be ended very quickly if the international bankers cut off all credit, which enables the Communists to survive on the economic

blood transfusions from the Free World. But attempts to have this sensible and realistic policy adopted meet with the most violent opposition.

Douglas once observed that a natural sympathy for the underdog was being exploited to create a world in which everyone but the few at the top. There are many pawns in the international game. Large numbers of different types of refugees are numbered amongst the pawns. Natural sympathy for them must find expression in much more realistic action than participating in programmes of self-destruction.

---

## Why I am a Social Crediter

By BRYAN W. MONAHAN M.B., B.S.

**A veteran Australian Social Crediter who wrote to say he unfortunately could not attend the Annual Dinner, passed on the information that in all his recent years of activity he had never had the type of response he was obtaining from the distribution of Dr. Monahan's booklet. "Why I am a Social Crediter." He urged that others make use of the booklet. In order to assist in promoting a special campaign at this critical time we are reprinting from the September-October issue of "The Social Crediter" the text of Dr. Monahan's essay:**

When as a medical student I reached the study of pathology, I found that one of the exercises set by my professor was to write a paper on the course of the illness of a patient who had died, and on the post-mortem findings, and on what was known of the nature of the disease, which had caused his death. The case, which I had to deal with, was one of pernicious anaemia; of the cause of this, at that time, really nothing was known. There were in the textbooks a number of theories concerning this cause, and all of these were unsatisfying. But we were supposed to read beyond the textbooks. We had to go through various journals with the aid of a cumulative index and collate the research being done all over the world on the pathological mysteries of the time. Eventually I found some recent work, which was instantly recognisable as having approached the true fundamental cause. My exercise now acquired an altogether new significance and interest. I remember clearly my excitement and pleasure as I read my paper to my fellow-students, and their interest too in the virtual solution of an old problem. It was after that that the treatment of pernicious anaemia with liver restored the ill to health and saved many from premature death.

In the many years since then I have seen a number of these fundamental discoveries made and applied, and I have for long been impressed with how, in many cases, the truth, when disclosed, is quite definitely recognisable.

As a student I had to live away from home; but I returned home by an overnight train journey for my vacations. Thanks to the depression, I had to sit up all night on these journeys, and miserable experiences they were. But shortly before one of these trips, I saw Douglas's *Economic Democracy* on a friend's bookshelf, and idly took it down and turned a few pages. The subject matter was something quite unfamiliar to me, but it caught my interest, and I asked to borrow the book. I read it on my train-trip, in one session and far into the night.

Apart from the inconvenience of my reduced allowance, I did not at that time take any interest in the depression. I remember that my scientific training made me scornful of the idea that it was due to sunspots; but probably some other of the now clearly absurd theories then current seemed satisfactory enough. So I read *Economic Democracy* not in the hope of finding a remedy for the depression, but purely from intellectual curiosity; I wanted to know what the author

meant by the term.

*Economic Democracy* was written long before the depression; nevertheless, to anyone who could grasp its thesis it provided an instant understanding of the depression. That was of considerable interest and importance, no doubt, but it was not what made the impact on my mind. What possessed me was the fact that *Economic Democracy* represented a perfectly unitary concept of the greatest profundity. It was clearly the key to an understanding of diverse problems of political economy.

So it has proved. History appears to the Social Crediter as crystallised politics, as Douglas put it, and no longer as a string of disconnected and unrelated episodes.

Douglas himself described Social Credit as practical Christianity, and what he means by that is best told in his own words:

"The speech of the Earl of Darnley in the House of Lords on July 10, 1946, affords an outstanding instance of a little recognised, but formidable problem. Perfect in form and manner, it was a moving appeal for the replacement of Power Politics by the Christian Ethic and the Golden Rule. Where, it may be asked, is there any problem in that, other than one of wholesale conversion? Let us, in order to elucidate the difficulty, compare Christianity to the Theory of Thermo-Dynamics, and assume for the purposes of the argument, that all the essentials of that theory were widely known two thousand years ago. It is not difficult to imagine that those who grasped the implications of it might say 'Here is the key to a better society. Here is the title deed to a leisure world. Disregard all else, and apply thermo-dynamics'. Remember that we are assuming that James Watt was still to be born. And the world at large would have said 'This man says the magic word is Thermo-Dynamics. Crucify him'.

"Now the fact, which ought to be patent to anyone, is that it is the Policy of a Philosophy which is important (because it is the *evidence* of things not seen); and that Thermo-Dynamics means nothing without Heat Engines, and Christianity means nothing without the Incarnation. You cannot drive a dynamo with Boyle's Law, or the 'Queen Elizabeth' with Joule's Equivalent. This country is not now the Policy of a Christian Philosophy, and before it can again, as an organisation, put into practice *successfully*

NEW TIMES—OCTOBER 1979

those Christian principles, for which Lord Darnley pleads, it must understand their application through proper mechanisms—not so simple a matter as he would appear to think it is. Failing that, the children of this world are, *in their generation*, wiser than the children of Light. Chivalry, 'Manners makyth Man', were imperfect Christianity; The Century of the Common Man' is not."

To be a Christian is something more than to profess a belief in Christian doctrines. It is consciously, as an individual, to stand in a unique and isolated relation to God. And Christianity means too that the one thing that matters in this world is what each individual becomes in the sight of God. In the Christian view, therefore, economics and politics are important solely in their facilitating the development of Christian *individuals*.

The world we live in is, however, quite definitely increasingly anti-Christian. The political economy of the so-called Welfare State is collectivist—exactly the antithesis of a Christian political economy. The psychology induced by this visibly inhibits the full flowering of unique personalities, while it encourages the sins of envy, greed and sloth.

Individual initiative is subordinated to collective irresponsibility, most clearly revealed in the universal, anonymous, irresponsible ballot, but quite plainly to be seen as well in every field of life.

The deterioration brought about by the political economy of collectivism is evident in the increasing difficulty so many people display in grasping Social Credit. The policy of Social Credit simply does not fit the philosophy of collectivism; and it is the philosophy of collectivism, which more and more informs modern education and pervades propaganda. People now largely lack the mental organs to understand Social Credit. The implicit assumptions of *Economic Democracy* are truly Christian, derived from a period when society was evolving into a more nearly Christian Society. It had no doubt far to go; but Social Credit would have speeded that evolution as nothing else could have done, since it provides the basis of that rather awful freedom where a man becomes responsible to God for his own development and achievement.

Over the last few years, I have observed more and more serious thinkers becoming aware that our bad times and recurrent crises really mean that we stand before the probability of the actual death of the civilisation we have known; generally speaking they perceive that it is in the collapse of the philosophical basis of our civilisation that the trouble lies. What remains of this basis is embedded in institutions, or carried by the older generations. But the latter are being steadily replaced by new generations brought up increasingly with 'State' school education; and this is steadily becoming both more secular and more technical. And in the schools of most denominations, where religion is taught at all, it is taught with less conviction. It would be absurd to say that the majority of modern youth, where it is religious at all, is deeply religious, and idle to hope that it will become so with the passing years.

"The end of man is self-development"; "the field exists for the flower". These are the fundamental postulates of Social Credit. All the great religions have these postulates—or, from the religious point of view, I should say insights. It is not what man has in common with other men that is important, but what is unique in him. How could *Hamlet* be written, or the Archduke Trio be composed by the mob? Indeed, what any creation means is unique for each individual.

The postulates of the 'Welfare' State are radically different. The first and most fundamental is that the end of man is employment—"working to buy a living". The second is equality—"lack of quality".

NEW TIMES—OCTOBER 1979

I remember vividly a passage in a book I read as a student—I believe it was *The Mind in the Making*—which described a mental process called "rationalising". Rationalising is supplying a 'good' reason for an action, which has a different true motive. Most of the economic and political doctrines of the 'Welfare' State are rationalisations from its fundamental postulates. The idea of equality springs from envy of quality, and its economic rationalisation is expressed in confiscatory taxation. The idea of Full Employment is rooted in Primordial Fear—fear of hunger, fear of living alone, fear of others. Its political rationalisation is Planning, Organisation, and Bigness—i.e., away from individual initiative, personal responsibility, and recognition of one's essential loneliness as a unique Spirit.

Envy and fear also give rise to Will-to-Power—power over others—and Planning and Organisation are a perfect rationalisation of these base drives.

I do not think that there is any doubt that Christian civilisation and the Welfare' State are antithetical: the 'Welfare' State is a manifestation of Anti-Christ. Indeed, part of the creed of most Socialism is conscious, militant atheism.

The 'Welfare' State is also anti-Social Credit; and I believe that in its inception, though not in its momentum, it is consciously so. The fundamental idea underlying Social Credit is that the community exists for the sake of the individual; that the development of industrial organisation is for the sake of freeing the individual to the maximum practical extent from occupying his time in working in order to exist. If ten men and a machine can do the work of a hundred men, then the necessity to work *for a living* is reduced to one-tenth. The important product of industry is leisure. Leisure, of course, does not mean inactivity. It means the opportunity to do something besides work for a living.

Christianity can only have meaning if man is *primarily* spiritual. Now Spirit does not "work", it creates. It follows then that man's primary activity should be creative, not industrious. This must not be misunderstood to imply that there is anything wrong with work. Work is the curse of Adam when it is imposed by necessity; it is the gift of God when it is personal, creative, initiative.

The whole emphasis of the "Welfare' State is on necessity. Man must be fully employed. His education must be primarily to fit him for employment; his medical service to keep him fit for employment; and to ensure that he remains in employment, he must not be able to accumulate savings.

The basic mechanism of the Social Credit conception is the National Dividend, of increasing purchasing power. This expresses the right of the individual to an unconditional share in the common cultural inheritance, increasing as that inheritance grows. Now at one time we were quite naturally approaching a National Dividend. As share holding became more widespread, so more individuals obtained an unconditional income to supplement, and in some cases to replace, what they 'earned'. Given time, and either stability, or an increase, in the purchasing power of money, share holding could have become universal. What Douglas discerned was that the dividend is the natural successor to the wage, which it should progressively displace in importance. The conception of the citizen as a share-holder rather than as an employee correctly reflects the fact that modern production is overwhelmingly the result of the application of power through machines; human labour, for all its importance as a catalyst, being of steadily diminishing importance as a fraction of power.

The greater part of our industrial equipment, and an even greater part of our knowledge both cultural and technical have come to us from our preceding generations. Whoever may "own" individual units of production, their use-value depends on the community. It is useless to produce

a million pairs of boots if nobody wants boots—or if nobody can buy them. Now what is important about modern industry is its tremendous potential *capacity* to produce, and to increase its capacity. But that capacity is drawn on only to the extent that purchasing power is distributed; and it is distributed not in relation to capacity to produce, but in relation to payment for work done. We cannot tell how 'rich' we actually are until the means to draw on the potential capacity of industry is distributed.

But it is quite clear that there is a tremendous unused capacity. It was revealed during the war, when fantastic quantities of goods were produced. They mostly were not, in the ordinary sense, goods of any use to civilians; but the industrial capacity, which produced them, could as well have produced consumers' goods. Again, a large part of our industrial effort goes into exports; and it is generally agreed—even asserted—that if foreigners would buy more we could considerably expand our exports.

I do not want in this essay to go into technicalities, and so will only say that a surplus of exports over imports is a real net loss, like war production. Sending goods out of the country without importing their equivalent simply means that there are fewer goods available in the home market. It is only unceasing propaganda to the effect that we live on our exports that prevents everyone realising that unrequited exports make us poorer than we need be.

The 'Welfare' State is a perversion of what a Social Credit Society would be. Social Credit as a system of political economy starts from the conception that power-driven machinery potentially makes all of us wealthy, both materially and in leisure, and provides the basis for spiritual development which, from a Christian point of view, is the one thing that matters.

A first approximation to our wealth is the National Debt. Apparently, the National Debt means that we owe ourselves vast sums of money—which makes the National Debt meaningless. In fact, however, the National Debt represents part of the capital value of our real assets, and as such could be used as the basis for the distribution of a periodic dividend. Again, I do not wish to go into the technical side, and would ask my readers to concentrate on the question of whether such a dividend is desirable, if possible, which I am certain it is.

The 'Welfare' State assumes that everyone should have an income; the majority by working for it, and the ill, disabled or aged as a right. The fact that it is an admission of right, and to that extent a conceding of the Social Credit case, is disguised by the financial juggling which accompanies it. What the ill, disabled and aged consume is a proportion of the goods being currently produced, and that has nothing to do with financial contributions made in the past. Now of course it would be perfectly possible to pay everyone an amount equivalent to what is paid on the average to the ill, disabled and aged—a universal, equal, dividend. Nothing would be changed if this was done, and those in employment had the amount of this dividend subtracted from their wages, *with a corresponding fall in prices*. Nothing would be *physically* changed, but there would be great psychological changes. Everyone at all times and without question would have something to fall back on, while yet retaining the incentive to 'earn' more. The complex administrative effort of 'Welfare' payments could be reduced to a fraction, with the useful possibility of its personnel entering 'productive' employment to enlarge the national cake.

This, or some such method, is of course but a first step. The fundamental idea is that the dividend, however initiated, should progressively displace the wage, whereas the principle of the 'Welfare' State is that the wage should displace the

dividend—an aim which it is achieving by a deliberate policy of inflation, accompanied by high taxation and confiscatory death duties. Let no one suppose these things are done because the Government 'needs' the money. They are the practical politics of anti-Christianity. They are meant to bind man to the material level, and so inhibit his spiritual development.

The policy of Social Credit is just the reverse—progressively to free man from the shackles of material necessity, and to encourage his spiritual growth.

There is no suggestion that that could be done in a day, or even in a generation. But the all-important thing is the aim. The aim is to foster by every means possible the maximum development and differentiation of the individual. It would mean a different objective in education, and a new emphasis by the Churches—an emphasis on the teaching "I came that ye might have *life* more abundantly".

I am not a theologian, and would not write what follows except that there are indications of a similar line of thought in theological circles.

There really can be little doubt that the traditional teaching of the Church makes less and less sense to modern man. On the other hand, there is equally no doubt that Christianity is one of the most powerful spiritual forces in history. The explanation of these facts lies, I believe—and, as I remarked, there is support in theological circles for the belief—in confusion between the myths and the meaning of Christianity. The myths and the doctrines of Christianity incarnate truths; but the language in which they are expressed derives from a period entirely unlike our own; a period when man's conception of practically everything in the Universe was radically different from ours. To take a minor example, mediaeval man could quite easily believe in a Hell of fire and brimstone, located somewhere under his feet. Few people could hold that belief today. But that is far from meaning that there is no such thing as Hell.

The core of Christianity is its revelation of the nature of Man and his relation to God. But that revelation had necessarily to be couched in language suited to the concepts of Christ's contemporaries. That is why so much of Christ's teaching is in the form of parables, which clearly separate the *meaning* of the parable from its form in a way, which enables the meaning to be apparent through the centuries.

Modern man no doubt is apt to associate the word Spirit with something that can be kept in a bottle; or else he fails to conceive it at all. And yet, in the light of contemporary knowledge and understanding, it is perhaps more easily conceived than ever. Spirit is creative initiative. It is the power that makes events other than they would have been in the routine of nature or custom.

It is being said on every hand that we need a spiritual revival. This demand really means that we need a formulation of the nature of man the truth of which is self-evident to modern man. If man is nothing but a collection of physico-chemical reactions, he doesn't differ in any essential from a lump of rock, and his future is of no consequence. But if he is primarily Spirit *utilising* physico-chemical reactions, his life on this earth is in vain unless he experiences himself as primarily Spirit, and leads his life to achieve the flowering of his Spirit.

Spirit stands opposed to routine. Spirit may *create* routine, but is active as such only in an act of creation. Therefore to tie men to routine is to deny the life of the Spirit. Early life consisted almost entirely of routine, of conformity to necessity. It is only in our age that the possibility of relegating to machines a large part of the routine of getting a living has become apparent. But the true benefit and use of machines is lost if they merely enable man to get more 'work' done, and to squander in a few centuries the resources of the earth.

One of our modern standpoints, which enable us to see more clearly, is the recognition that many age-old problems are wrongly put. One of these is the problem of the meaning of life on earth. I do not believe there is an answer to this general question. The true problem is: "What meaning is *given* to each particular life by the person living that life?" To be born, to be indoctrinated, to be 'fully employed', to die—is a senseless routine. But to be born, to become conscious, and to put a meaning into one's life is the highest creative activity, to which the routine of life should be entirely subordinated. By this I mean that it is not what one does that matters, but why one does it. It is not the technique of the artist, which matters, but what he creates. Of course, the highest creative achievements require perfected techniques for their adequate embodiment; but perfected techniques become unconscious, and are only the means to the expression of creative activity.

Looked at from this point of view, what we call employment has two aspects. The first is the aspect of necessity. Man's basic physical necessity is to get and consume food because he lives physically by the transformation of energy. The human, and some other animals, require in addition the equivalent of some form of clothes and shelter. The measure of the amount of 'employment' required to meet these necessities is provided by animals. Some animals notably carnivores living in fertile areas, hardly need "work" at all. Others, particularly vegetarians, consume a large proportion of their time in obtaining food, simply because of the bulk they must consume to obtain the vital constituent; they need.

The other aspect of 'employment' is self-employment, or voluntary employment. We do not think of this as employment; we call it play, or the pursuit of a hobby, or devotion to a cause. Because it arises from personal initiative, it is spiritual activity, in contrast to activity imposed by material necessity.

Thus, from a spiritual point of view, work is bad while play is good. This at first sight surprising proposition is, however, confirmed by experience. We are always attracted, and often enchanted, by the display of free initiative. It is the play of infants and children and even of animals, which we love. It is works of art, which inspire us. It is the creative aspect of work in progress, which draws our attention. Against this, work "for a living" for the most part requires compulsion. This is not because there is something wrong with human nature—for otherwise it would not be "nature". It is because work in excess of what is strictly necessary is unnatural. "Consider the birds of the air . . . the lilies of the field . . ." Will we never take Christianity seriously?

Social Credit is the way to take Christianity seriously.

Social Credit represents the antithesis of the Planned Society; but it is still legitimate to have a concept of a Social Credit Society. The first characteristic of a Social Credit Society is that it takes its form from a profound regard for the supreme importance of the individual. Each individual is to be considered as *potentially* the most perfect of his kind; and Society to exist to enable each individual to develop his full potentiality. This, of course, is the way we regard say the breeding of racehorses. True, in that case breeding is controlled by careful selection of characteristics; but each foal is regarded from the point of view of its possible potential, and its environment is arranged for the sake of that potential. A racehorse is expected only to win races, and, perhaps, to beget other winners, whereas the human individual has wider potentialities than any other creature. His environment, therefore, must be such as to allow those potentialities opportunity for manifestation.

The second characteristic of a Social Credit Society is that it regards each generation as the real and true heir of all the past. Any Society is rich with the accumulated knowledge and possessions of the past. Only a fraction of that wealth is contributed by a given generation—yet, in anything but a hand-to-mouth existence, each generation contributes more than it consumes. Perhaps the simplest way of grasping this important matter is to imagine what we may call the "development" of this planet to be completed; that all the houses needed have been built, all the roads, ships, factories and everything else. Perhaps all production is done automatically, and all power supplied by "breeder" atomic piles. There would be 'employment' for no one; and everyone, equally as co-heirs, would have the right to share in the amenities provided. Otherwise, what use would all the productive capacity be?

Well then, we are considerably advanced towards that state of affairs. The fantastic industrialisation that has so far been achieved is the product of a mere two hundred years—and proceeds ever more rapidly. Out of a possible span of perhaps millions of years for the human race, the transference of work considered as necessity from men to machines occupies only a few hundreds. And as those few centuries reach completion, so should succeeding generations be progressively freed from necessity. In any other view, we are merely the slaves of our successors instead of the heirs of our predecessors.

It is as well perhaps at this point to deal with the fallacy that the people of the industrialised countries owe something to those of the non-industrialised. This is an argument developed to rationalise the policy of Full Employment. Full Employment in highly industrialised countries produces more than any sane society can consume; Foreign Aid programmes get rid of the surplus. In fact, however, the industrialised nations have shown the non-industrialised "how the trick is done". We should, on humanitarian grounds, be willing to help the non-industrialised to achieve our successes; but the idea that these few generations have a duty to industrialise other countries, which, as we did, for hundreds of thousands of years have remained in a more or less stationary condition, has only to be stated to be seen to be untenable. It is as if one man in his lifetime should have to provide for his own descendants and those of his neighbours.

The technical proposals of Social Credit are clearly adapted to the sort of society we conceive. One proposal is a falling price-level, which obviously would progressively eliminate a number of problems, which at present threaten the collapse of the society we know. This proposal, of course, is not a vague suggestion; Douglas demonstrated quite rigorously how it could be done with precision, in accordance with the condition of the economy, and without loss to producers.

The second technical proposal is the distribution of a universal dividend, as discussed previously.

Let us look at some effects of these proposals. On the birth of a child, it would become the recipient of a periodic cash payment. This, of course, would be spent by its parents, so that the child would not be—as so many now are—a "burden" on its parents. We are already familiar with this idea in principle through Child Endowment; but Child Endowment has become quite inadequate through inflation. Here again, the importance of a falling price-level is apparent.

As, over the years, the purchasing power of the dividend increased, it would come to cover more and more of the expenses of rearing and educating a child. Received, at first, by the parents on behalf of the child, it would nevertheless help to establish the essential independence of the

child. We are not unacquainted with such a situation; some children are heirs to an income from birth, and this provides for their upbringing in almost any circumstances, and gives them a feeling of security and independence as they become old enough to understand these circumstances.

The National Dividend, beginning as a relatively small amount, would need to have a purchasing power just sufficient to maintain an individual. It appears to be desirable that it should increase only slowly much beyond this until society had become adjusted to new concepts, and had outgrown the more prominent evils, which have appeared as the result of materialism and 'Welfareism'. But at a low initial level it would give the recipient a degree of true independence and yet leave him with an incentive to earn more. He would be more free to choose how to earn more.

I think there can be no doubt that the basic security and independence conferred by the Dividend, together with the confidence in the future which would result from the knowledge that the purchasing-power of money would steadily increase, would effect a rapid transformation in Society.

Under the present system, there is every incentive to waste the resources of the earth. The more copper, tin and oil that can be mined and consumed, the better. It is one thing to build a bridge of iron, but something quite different to use iron in motor engines, and build these to wear out in a limited time so as to ensure continuity of production. Immense quantities of oil are consumed in transport to and from 'employment', much of it not only unnecessary, but wasteful. All this and much else arise mainly from making income a function of employment. We owe it to the future of mankind that we should in our generation conserve the resources of the earth, and make the best use possible of those we draw on.

Now many a man can best develop himself by creative activity within the productive system, and it is in the interests of society that production should be in the hands of such people. They would work towards the highest attainable efficiency in the use of both energy and materials.

The fundamental need is to change the objective of industry from that of providing employment to that of most efficiently, automatically, and economically meeting those genuine needs of society, which can best be met by power production. But much that Man requires as a spiritual being can best be provided by his own creative activity. We have at present a vicious circle, where men are forced to buy what otherwise they might make, because too much of their time is taken up in the mass production of what they must buy.

As against this, Social Credit envisages a Society where the child is educated to understand himself as primarily spiritual and creative, whose prime task on earth is to create and fulfill the meaning of his own life. He would learn to treat his own existence as the painter treats pigment and canvas.

Many people who are generally sympathetic to the Social Credit view are yet deterred by the question—Who would do the dirty work? But there is no real difficulty here. The Social Credit technical proposals offer the possibility of a gentle transition from the conditions we know to those we hope for. Conditions, indeed, have been becoming increasingly difficult for large numbers of people for many years; we have, on the whole, been better off in the past than we are in the present. This in the main is simply a financial phenomenon—rising prices and vicious taxation. Falling prices and decreasing taxation would produce an immediate amelioration for everyone, without anything else being changed. The "dirty work" would continue to be done.

## 1979-80 BASIC FUND LAUNCHED

The continuing growth of The Australian League of Rights has made it possible for the 1979-80 Basic Fund to be kept at \$45.00; it is confidently anticipated that the increased activities of the next twelve months, including increased book sales, will provide revenue sufficient to offset escalating financial costs. The Basic Fund is now open and we would appreciate hearing from those who would like to set an inspiring example for others.

Northern N.S.W. and Queensland contributions should be sent to Mr. Jeremy Lee, P.O. Ravensbourne, Qld., 4355. Western Australian contributions Hill from now on go to The League of Rights, P.O. Box 16, Inglewood, 6052. The balance to Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne.

There is no need to stress the reality of the deepening crisis. But as the crisis deepens so do desperate people look for answers. Only the League has been providing those answers, which offer the only hope of carrying what is left of Civilisation through the mounting storm. An adequate basic financial fund is absolutely essential for the League to continue.

But it is to be expected that with the progress of industrialisation "dirty work" will be eliminated. Road-making once was the task for gangs of convicts; now it is done by machines; and to participate in the creation of new roads and other projects, will be for some people an adequate expression of their creative impulse, when they participate by consent instead of compulsion. Children instinctively take this attitude to projects, and long to grow up to take part in them. Current education largely kills this instinctive attitude by conditioning them to "earn a living"—to regard a job as a means to an end, instead of as an end in itself, an expression of creative activity.

In the long run, everything depends on the ideal we look to. Almost the only one at present is to become rich in terms of money. The only true richness is "treasure laid up in Heaven", which I take to be richness of creative experience. If we make "earning a living" of diminishing importance, and "having life more abundantly" of increasing importance, and re-orientate the social teaching of the Church and of schools accordingly, we can expect to see Society transformed—not overnight, but in the course of a few generations, for there is much evil to die out.

But much evil arises from the love of money. Social Credit, by making, eventually, everyone "rich", would automatically destroy the love of money. Money, at present, is too necessary to too many; an income from week to week is literally a matter of life or death to the majority, while to the minority money represents power. But in terms of industrial possibilities, we all should be rich.

It seems to be increasingly difficult to get people to realise that we all could be comparatively rich; that taxation is not only unnecessary, but is actual and deliberate robbery; that what we now know as Social Service payments could be universalised and increased as unconditional dividends. Almost universally, the cry is "I don't understand economics".

What is difficult to understand is contemporary economic so-called theory; and this is reasoning applied to false premises. To understand the Social Credit proposals, it is only necessary to grasp a few fundamental realities and make

NEW TIMES—OCTOBER 1979

some commonsense deductions.

The first fundamental is that labour-saving machines save labour. In the limit, labour-saving would displace all labour, and consequently some other means of distributing the product of the machines would of necessity have to take the place of wages paid for employment.

The false premise from which current economics proceeds here is that labour saved must be re-employed, and that such employment should be provided by financial manipulation. In the long run—it might be a very long run in terms of this generation, but only an instant in the history of mankind—the two policies of labour-saving and full employment cannot be pursued together, and the attempt to do so is a major cause of the inflation which is at the root of the catastrophic social unrest and disorder of our times.

The second fundamental is that money is not a commodity, having inherent value; the idea that it is had some foundation when there was a gold currency, but has none now. Money now is simply a system, analogous to a filing system. In fact, money is one part of a complex system of accountancy. By far the greater part of this system is operated without the use of *currency*—i.e., notes and coins—at all. And even notes and coins have an inherent value only a fraction of their nominal value.

Now it is quite evident that this system is not giving satisfactory results; but once it is recognised as a system instead of a thing in itself, it becomes evident that the system can and should be altered. We are the victims of a wrong system of bookkeeping, and orthodox economic theory is merely a description of that system. The remedy is, not to try to understand "economics", but to insist that truthful bookkeeping be instituted.

Short of actual catastrophe ending life on earth, in the world of the future there will be "work" for only the few. That fact should be the starting-point of our present plans. Our children, we should say, will be wealthy; let us bring them up to get the best advantage of their wealth. Let us look to a future where the predominant activity will be, in the broadest sense, cultural activity. Where the Greeks had slaves, they will have automatic machinery. For a few generations, we have been building those machines; but now the building is almost over, and it is time to prepare for its beneficial use. We have been slaves, but are about to become free. Let us cast out fear, envy, and greed, and rejoice in all those who achieve freedom. And what greater freedom is there than a secure, independent income of gradually increasing purchasing power?

I have read, thought about, and discussed Social Credit for nearly thirty years, and have become ever more convinced that it is the only policy in accord with the true nature of man, and adapted to our present and future environment. When the genius of Douglas first proposed it, its implementation would have been relatively simple; but, as he observed a few years ago, we have dropped back some hundreds of years, and the task is much less simple now. But the task is still, I believe, the only alternative to disaster.

We have to get away from the idea that the well being of the human Spirit is measured by the annual production of pig iron; we have to appreciate that a large part of production in general represents pure waste, and is a crime against our heirs. Production for the sake of employment is sheer madness, the politics of destruction. We have built our house, now let us adorn it with works of art, furnish it with craftsmen's care, surround it with beautiful gardens, and live in it graciously and abundantly. Let us learn to be artists, making the raw materials of our lives conform to the meaning we ourselves put into our lives. The destiny of man requires the uttermost freedom, and a final, awful, personal responsibility. *Life* is initiative: the rest is entropy.

## SUNFLOWER POWER

Sunflower oil may soon provide fuel for farmers as an alternative for diesel, according to research by the Department of Agricultural Technical Services.

The Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Hendrik Schoeman, told a Press conference that sunflower oil could be used without modifications in tractors and only slight modifications in some other vehicles.

He said this development was the outcome of a year's intensive research and it would protect South Africa from international oil or food boycotts.

He added: "If every maize farmer used one tenth of the land he is now using for maize production to grow sunflowers, he would produce sufficient fuel to cultivate the remainder of his maize lands."

Officials of the Division of Agricultural Engineering said the consumption of sunflower oil in a tractor was very similar to that of diesel fuel and the cost per hour worked was nearly the same.

A tractor had been rigorously tested for 100 hours on the division's dynamometer without adverse effects.

The director of the division, Mr. J.J. Bruwer, said he believed sunflower oil could be used by diesel locomotives and large trucks. Even diesel cars could use it with slight modifications.

Mr. Schoeman said sunflowers could be grown where maize would not thrive. It would thus allow farmers to use these areas economically. Sufficient sunflower oil could be produced for industry without cutting the supply for human consumption.

Seen against the background of the world energy crisis, the achievement was of immense significance to South Africa. He said agriculture used about a quarter of South Africa's diesel. Although tests had been most successful, he added that further research was vital before sunflower oil and alternative fuels came into use.

Sunflower oil has a further advantage in that it does not pollute the atmosphere like diesel. *The Pretoria News* reported that tractors using it at a demonstration at Silverton gave off a slight trace of smoke. The smell was similar to that in a kitchen in which oil was being used for cooking.

Mr. Bruwer said it was possible that prolonged use of the oil might build up deposits in an engine but this could be cleaned out by using conventional diesel for a while.

Meanwhile the Minister of Water Affairs, Mr. Braam Raubenheimer, said his department was investigating the possibility of supplying water and storage facilities for large sugar cane plantations in the Eastern Transvaal lowveld for the production of ethanol.

He said farmers had first to get permission from the Sugar Association and it had also to be discussed with the Minister for Agriculture.

Ethanol is wood alcohol produced from fermented sugar or starch and can be added to petrol.

South African News and Views

### DINNER ISSUE

This issue of "The New Times" was being prepared as the Douglas Centenary Dinner and associated activities were taking place. A full report will appear in the November issue, which will be a special one. The Dinner and other activities were a manifestation of the tremendous new upsurge of interest in Social Credit. Nothing like this has ever taken place before. The special issue of "The New Times" will attempt to convey at least a part of the picture of an historic weekend.

## SABOTAGING NUCLEAR ENERGY GENERATION

The following article, entitled "Nuke Spooks," in the July issue of the American magazine, "Instauration," sheds a revealing light on the sabotage of the American nuclear industry. "Instauration" is published monthly by Howard Allen Enterprises, Inc. Box 76, Cape Canaveral, F.L., USA, 32920.

As Jane Fonda, Barry Commoner, Ralph Nader and Jerry Brown agitate to shut down nuclear power stations in America, the Soviet Union steps up its own nuclear program, in line with its plan for reactors to provide one-fifth of the country's energy by 1990, as much as one-third by the year 2000. The mainstay of the Russian program will be fast plutonium breeders, the kind that "nuclear engineer" Jimmy Carter opposes in the United States.

Russians don't even bother to construct containment domes for their reactors, though they add them to the reactors they sell overseas.

The ponderous Communist bureaucracy is responsible for all sorts of hitches in Russian nuclear projects, but not half as many as the Fondas, Commoners, Naders and Browns cause in the U.S. Perhaps that's why the Russians are so fond of these people. In this day and age energy shortages are equivalent to defense shortages. The Arabs, Iranians, Nigerians, Venezuelans and other OPEC boys should also be happy. The less nuclear power, the higher the price of oil.

The Russians are also spending a lot of rubles on MHD (magnetohydrodynamics). One MHD station has generated 20,000 kilowatts of electricity by passing a superheated ionized gas through a magnetic field—a field, incidentally, which was provided by a 40-ton super conducting magnet, the world's largest, built in the U.S. and airlifted to Moscow in 1977. For a while the Russians led the world in fusion research, but are now taking second place to a program at Princeton University, which is expected to produce temperatures of 60 to 80 million C°; high enough for the first genuine demonstration of the process which the sun has been using so successfully for billions of years.

Russia's energy problem is more geographical than geological. The U.S.S.R. uses 80% of its energy west of the Urals, while most of its fuel reserves are way down south in Baku or way out east in Siberia, where the weather is not too conducive to year-round exploration and drilling. Moreover, the Russians would rather sell their petroleum than use it. It brings in foreign currency—another reason the Kremlin pushes the nuclear solution. When asked about solar energy, Russian scientists laugh. They also laugh at the

American obsession with nuclear safeguards. The director of a Russian nuclear plant, when queried if the Soviet public had fears about nuclear power, replied, "No, we told our people it was both safe and desirable and so, of course, they accepted."

The real radiation danger, of course, does not come from reactors, which worldwide have an almost incredible safety record. Compare the tens of thousands of deaths in coal mines, compare the thousands, who have been scalded to death by bursting steam boilers in factories, ships, utility plants, even homes.

Although the main danger of radiation comes from fission and fusion weapons, the press is not interested in the conspiracy of a Jewish-owned nuclear materials company to steal uranium from the US and sneak it to Israel to make atomic bombs to drop on Arabs. No one criticizes the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and its earlier version, the Atomic Energy Commission, for permitting that to happen—and after it happened, for papering it over with perhaps the most dastardly cover up in the history of government. No, the Fondas and the college freaks and their more freakish minority professors are not interested in this. The neutron bomb? Bad, very bad. It would be used to defend the West. Napalm and antipersonnel bombs? Terrible when used against the North Vietnamese. But when dropped by Israelis on Lebanese families, the humanitarian Fonda is mum and so is Ramsey Clark and so is Walter Cronkite.

When the French made and sold a reactor to Israel, not a murmur from the nuke spooks. When France was about to ship two research reactors to Iraq, the French factory housing them was blasted by professional saboteurs—"Israeli commandoes," surmised the *Washington Post* without the slightest sign of indignation. It is interesting to speculate what the Post would have called Arab saboteurs if they had blown up an Israeli reactor.

The sabotage will certainly set back Arab nuclear research and the construction of Arab reactors and Arab nuclear weapons, but countries friendly to Arabs and Moslems have nuclear weapons and sooner or later South Africa, Pakistan, Turkey, Libya and Iran will have the bomb, if some of these

nations don't have it already.

The continuous proliferation of nuclear weapons in more and more nations is the real radiation danger, not the vastly over publicized mishap at Three Mile Island, a mishap which so far has not been satisfactorily explained.

From the viewpoint of the anti-nuclear crowd, Three Mile Island was a godsend. When blacks burn crosses on college campuses, when Jews paint swastikas on Los Angeles synagogues, when Russians train KGB agents to desecrate Jewish graveyards in Western countries, how can we be sure that someone in the pay of someone didn't deliberately turn the wrong valve or push the wrong button or twist the wrong dial? Cui bono? Who gains? When the benefit is so enormous we must consider that those who benefited most may have had something to do with the affair.

In fact, the very first reports of the incident, both on radio and TV, mentioned sabotage, though this news angle was quickly suppressed. Representative Robert Dornan of California minced no words, "All of the information to date clearly points in the direction of an act of sabotage—probably by someone within the plant." A member of the Pennsylvania legislature, Joseph Zeller, who worked for fifteen years for a firm that constructed nuclear plants asserted, "Somebody or some team deliberately crippled that plant." Jon Gilbertson, an experienced nuclear engineer, after his own on site inspection, declared, "Too many things have happened here for this not to be sabotage." Whether the above is hot rhetoric or cool reason, there was indeed an act of sabotage—by the media, whose scare treatment of the incident bordered on the psychopathic. Dr. James Rust, professor of nuclear engineering at Georgia Tech, summed it up, "It was a hoax pure and simple—and the American people were the victims."

Meanwhile, Jane Fonda, who just happens to be the star of an anti-nuclear film, "The China Syndrome," which just happened to be released prior to the Three Mile Island incident, is smiling happily as the big green pours into the box office.

At last report, someone deliberately tried to sabotage a reactor in Virginia by contaminating its fuel rods.

NEW TIMES—OCTOBER 1979