

# THE NEW TIMES

Registered for posting as a Publication - Category "B" \$7.00 per annum post-free. Box 1052J G.P.O., Melbourne.

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

SEPTEMBER. 1980

Vol. 45, No. 9

## GROWING INTERNATIONAL TRADE WAR AND THE THREAT OF THE WORLD STATE

**"I suppose most statesmen at the present time would agree that their primary problem is to create employment, and to induce trade prosperity for their own nationals, and there are few of them who would not add that the shortest way to achieve this would be to capture foreign markets. Once this, the common theory of international trade is assumed, we have set our feet upon a road whose only end is war. The use of the word 'capture' indicates the desire to take away from some other country, something with which it, being unable, also, to be prosperous without general employment, does not desire to part. That is endeavouring to impose your will upon an adversary, and is economic war, and economic war has always resulted in military war, and probably always will." — C. H. Douglas in *"The Monopoly of Credit"***

Since the above words first appeared, in 1931 events have continued to confirm what Douglas warned about. And today, like the Bourbons who allegedly learned nothing and forgot nothing, the politicians of the world are raising their voices as they threaten one another about the subject of trade. Prime Minister Fraser of Australia, his Deputy Minister, Mr. Doug Anthony, and other senior Ministers have been bitterly criticising the policies of the European Economic Community. Reprisals are threatened against EEC exports to Australia. Mr. Anthony says that a ban could be applied to \$1000 million worth of European goods. But after talking aggressively to EEC representative Gundelach when he was in Australia, Mr. Anthony was told that people who lived in glass houses should not throw stones. Mr. Gundelach reminded Mr. Anthony that Australia's own trading policies were not exactly liberal, a point which some of Australia's South-East Asians have made.

### ANZAC NATIONS VERSUS THE E.E.C.

It was the renegeing of the EEC on a sheep meat deal, which produced the strong exchange of words. But the EEC decision is based upon the necessity to try to placate its own primary producers. French sheep producers, for example, have votes. France and Ireland have been pressing for a ban on New Zealand butter, which they claim is contributing to the mountain of unsold butter inside the EEC. The EEC is also asking New Zealand to cut down on lamb exports to the EEC. Under present financial rules, if New Zealanders do not export their primary production their already critical conditions could become even worse. The former relatively amicable and mutually advantageous trading relations between the United Kingdom, Australia and New Zealand have been replaced by bitter controversy since the United Kingdom entered

the EEC. The advocates of the British entry into the EEC scoffed at any suggestion that the inevitable result must be deterioration in relations between the old Dominions and the United Kingdom. Edward Heath was one of those who even suggested that British entry into the EEC would enable the British to make a bigger contribution towards the Commonwealth.

But it was the same Edward Heath who made the equally nonsensical statement about British entry into the EEC being essential to strengthen Western Europe against the Communist. Common Market countries have supplied the Soviet Union with subsidised food and are actively engaged in exporting on credit vast quantities of industrial equipment and technology to the Soviet. This is a very strange type of anti-Communism!

Not only is the EEC attempting to keep primary products from Australia and New Zealand out; it is also trying to stem the flow of Japanese cars and other Japanese production. The U.S.A. is doing likewise. Reeling under the impact of the restrictive financial policies being imposed in a futile attempt to reverse inflation, the American car industry is in a state of paralysis. The

### NATIONAL SEMINAR ON DEFENCE OF THE FAMILY

This year's Annual National Seminar of The Australian League of Rights, to be held in Melbourne on Saturday, October 4, following the Annual New Times Dinner on the Friday evening, October 3, will be on the theme of How To Preserve and Extend the Traditional Family. There will be an excellent panel of speakers, including some outstanding women.

Japanese are being warned about their car exports, while thousands of millions of credit are being made available to try to prop up the hopelessly bankrupt Chrysler organisation. It is not without significance that while every suggestion for ending inflation by applying new credits to reduce the prices of basic items in the economy is bitterly opposed by those controlling the creation and issue of credit, massive credits can be made available to try and sustain major industries. Credit is also available through various Export-Import Banks and similar institutions, in an endeavour to stimulate exports.

### **EXPORTING TO THE COMMUNISTS**

The "fight for markets" produces some strange anomalies, making absurd most of the rhetoric of anti-Communist politicians, as witnessed by the Australian Fraser Government's desperate attempt to stop Australian competitors attending the Moscow Olympics while at the same time increasing its primary production exports to the Soviet. Now comes the news that fiercely anti-Communist Singapore has increased its exports to Vietnam, much of this vital oil. But even more striking confirmation of the developing international crisis is the news that for the first time a Taiwan firm has openly placed half-page advertisements in Hong Kong's two leading Communist dailies to promote sale of its electrical and electronic products to China and its Communist stores in Hong Kong. The Chinese Communists now permit Taiwan goods to be sold so long as they are marked "Made in Taiwan, Province of People's Republic of China." Taiwan's anti-Communism is being eroded by the relentless pressure of finance-economic policies, which force every nation to strive to export more than it imports to obtain "the favourable balance of Trade".

Since Douglas issued his early warnings that the "fight for markets" must lead to military conflict, the Second World War, which was exploited by the International Bankers and the International Communists to advance a programme of totalitarianism, there have been a number of major conflicts, starting with Korea. All enabled vast quantities of production to be wasted. Enormous quantities of military equipment, costing in financial terms tens of billions of dollars, have been poured into the Middle East because of the Israel-Arab situation. The total international waste is so astronomical that it is impossible for the mind to comprehend what is taking place. But it is certain that mankind is facing the greatest threat in recorded history. Those responsible for the policies, which have produced this crisis, will, like the alcoholic, do everything to deal with the crisis except remove the cause, and precipitate an international nuclear holocaust in which they, along with tens of millions of others, could be destroyed. However, much more likely than a nuclear conflict is the advancement of the programme to exploit the crisis to drive a fearful mankind into the World State.

### **FRAMEWORK OF WORLD STATE**

The framework of what is proposed can already be seen with the development of The United Nations and its proliferating subsidiaries such as the Food and Agriculture Organisation, The United Nations Cultural and Educa-

### **THE TRAGEDY OF HUMAN EFFORT**

by C. H. Douglas.

A 1936 Liverpool address in which Douglas examined the correct principles of association and why violation of those principles always results in disaster. The failure of party politics. Price 85 cents.

tional Organisation, and many others. The Trilateral Commission and its New World Economic Order are warning evidence of what is planned. The veteran American Republican Senator, Barry Goldwater, who appears to have had his eyes opened since he was being badly advised in 1964 when he stood for the Presidency. In his autobiography, *With No Apologies*, Goldwater charges that the Trilateral Commission "represents a skilful coordinated effort to seize control and consolidate the four centres of power -- political, monetary, intellectual, and ecclesiastical." Goldwater points out that all national sovereignties will disappear if the Trilateralists are successful. "It is intended to be the vehicle for multinational consolidation of the commercial and banking interests by seizing control of the political government of the United States."

### **THE PATH TO WORLD PEACE**

Unless the growing drive towards the World State is halted, disasters as great as a nuclear holocaust threaten Mankind. The drive can be halted by effective exposure of what is proposed, and by at least one nation demonstrating that the path to world peace and stability is by correcting its own internal financial policies so that there is no longer the need to "fight" anyone for markets. Surely it is not beyond the capacity of sufficient people to grasp that if massive credits can be made to "fight" for foreign markets, the same credits could be made available so that people had sufficient purchasing power to buy their own production.

### **THE NATIONAL WEEKEND**

The League of Rights is on the move promoting several new major developments. These will have taken firm shape by the time of the highlight of the League Year, The National weekend in Melbourne, starting on Friday, October 3 and finishing on Sunday, October 5.

There will be a tremendous programme. Details later. But it is essential that early bookings be made for "The New Times" Dinner, to be held on Friday, October 3, at The Victoria, Lt. Collins Street, Melbourne. The Dinner donation is \$11 per person. This covers everything for the evening.

As usual, League supporters in and around Melbourne can offer private hospitality for country and interstate visitors. But those requiring this should let League headquarters know immediately. Forward planning is most essential.

Write to Box 1052J., G.P.O., Melbourne. Or ring 63 9749.

# Security, Institutional and Personal

By C. H. DOUGLAS

*An address at the City Hall, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, on March 9, 1937*

The matters on which I propose to speak to you tonight are so simple that, were it not for one fact of human experience, I should hesitate to trouble you with them. The fact is that it is the simplest matters that always form the subject of the most profound misunderstanding, and in regard to which the average individual is the most difficult to convince of any error in his belief. You will remember that it was a matter of common certainty for many thousands of years that the sun revolved round the earth, and when the astronomer Galileo produced quite unshakable evidence to show that, on the contrary, the earth revolved round the sun, he was regarded as a blasphemous heretic and was severely punished.

Now the first of these very simple matters, which I propose to bring to your attention, is the difference between policy and administration, together with the primary importance of policy. If a man is standing on the platform of Newcastle Central Station it is obviously of primary importance whether he decides to go to Edinburgh or Darlington. The question as to whether he goes by a fast or a slow train, whether he finds that the railway is well or badly operated, or whether he decides finally to go by motorcar is of secondary importance to the question of his making up his mind *where* he wants to go.

## A Policy of Work

In all the discussions, which are allowed to obtain wide publicity on the affairs of the world at the present day, every effort is made to concentrate attention upon questions of administration, on *how* to make the railway in my allegory better, or *how* to improve the road or the motorcar.

The point I want to impress upon you at the outset is that we are having a policy *imposed* upon us, and that policy is the cause of our troubles. Any discussion as to how that policy shall be administered, whether by a dictatorship, so-called democracy, Fascism, Bolshevism, Nazism, or otherwise, is merely irrelevant.

This policy, which is practically identical everywhere, whether in Russia, Italy or Germany, is the gospel of work. "If a man will not work neither shall he eat." It is not for nothing that Paul, the Roman Jew, is the patron saint of the City of London.

I must emphasise the point that the policy is *not* "If a man does not work there will be nothing to eat." To the extent that such a statement is true, the other statement is reasonable. But to say that all men have to work in industry at trade union rates for trade union hours before it is possible for all men to eat, is flagrantly untrue, and becomes less true every day, *except as a policy*.

I propose to bring as forcibly as possible to your attention that it is not the prime object of existence to find employment. I have no intention of being dogmatic as to what is the prime object of existence, but I am entirely confident that it is not comprised in the endless pursuit of turning this originally very beautiful world into slagheaps, blast furnaces, guns, and battleships. It is just at this point that the extreme simplicity of the dilemma in which the world finds itself becomes evident, and it is at this point that it is so difficult for most of us to grasp what is equally simple, which is that the mere fact that some of us may earn our living by building a battleship does not in itself mean that it would not be possible for us to live much better, more comfortably, and more safely, if that battleship were not built.

Do not misunderstand me. This is not an address on pacifism. On the contrary, I think the determined opposition of the oligarchy, which rules us to any

effective financial reform has made war nearly inevitable and rearmament imperative. What I am endeavouring to explain is that the fact that you were paid wages for designing and building a battleship, and that with those wages, salaries (or, if you are shareholders in the companies that build them, the dividends), you buy yourself the amenities of life, does not mean that it is written in the law of nature that you cannot get those amenities unless you build a battleship. If, in addition to having your energies diverted to building a tool of destruction instead of a tool of construction, you are going to be taxed to pay for it and for the money the banks create out of paper and ink to pay your wages, you will be a triple loser.

## Passports to Prosperity

But you have no doubt noticed—though you have perhaps not noticed it so much on the North-East Coast as we have noticed it in the South—that the setting to work of a large proportion of the industrial population of this country on the manufacture of things intended to kill or wound or otherwise inflict pain and misery upon other human beings, has been accompanied by what our lords and masters refer to as a revival of prosperity. And they are already explaining that their best efforts are being devoted to finding methods by which we shall be kept busy, when, if ever, we have enough battleships. The most hopeful avenue, they consider, is to capture further export markets. But they do not explain that other countries also, under this remarkable system of ours, wish to capture export markets—that this effort to capture further export markets will, therefore, require the building of further battleships so as to keep other people in what we consider is their proper place.

If you were to say to an intelligent child that the aim or objective of the average human being was to live in a pleasant house, have sufficient to eat, and to be well clothed, I think that child would say at once that what you ought to do was to build sufficient pleasant houses, grow sufficient food, and weave whatever clothes you require—and then stop and enjoy yourself. But most of us, I am afraid, are not intelligent children. Some of us are even economists! And to be an economist it is impossible, apparently, to imagine a state of affairs in which, if you want something, you proceed to make it. The economist says it cannot be done that way. If you want a loaf of bread you must obtain employment making radio-sets, or machine-guns, or something else.

Once again, do not misunderstand me. I am not saying that you should not make radio-sets or machine-guns. What I mean is that it is not fundamentally necessary to make radio-sets or machine-guns in order to obtain a loaf of bread. An easier and shorter way is to grow and grind the wheat and then bake the bread. The radio-set, which you do make, will probably be used for the purpose of misinforming you in regard to the true price of bread, and the machine-gun will probably be used to shoot you down. But that is entirely your business.

Now if you say this sort of thing to an orthodox economist or to your bank manager, he will probably look at you with pity for your simplicity and will say, "Ah, but this country cannot support its own population." The first reply which I think most of us would make to this remark is that it does not support its own population very well at the present time; and the second comment one would make is that if it is a question of feeding the population, how is it that the amount of home-grown food which is produced is steadily decreasing, rather than that

efforts are being made to increase it?

The point which I am endeavouring to get you to realise is that what is called full employment is always put forward as being the aim of our modern society, and it is assumed, and never argued about in official circles, that without full employment it is impossible for the population of the country to be fully supported in food, shelter and clothing, and that it is better to have full employment making poison gas, than any unemployment.

### **Institutions Filching Security**

I do not propose this evening to go over the well-known fact of the startling increase in productivity per unit of human labour during the past 150 years. I am going to ask you to take it from me that it is only the diversion of a very large percentage of human activity to ends which either do not conduce to its health and happiness, or are even a direct threat to those desirable ends, which prevent us from supporting ourselves in great comfort and security with the accompaniment of an amount of leisure which would enable us to make the fullest use of our opportunities.

*Employment as an end in itself is a concerted policy to be found in practically every country. It is an international policy, and it proceeds from the great international power in the world—the power of finance.* It is conscious, and it is sustained by every argument and force at the disposal of that great international power, because it is the means by which mankind is kept in continual, if concealed, slavery.

May I ask you to divest your minds as far as possible of every political preoccupation and to consider whether the fundamental policy of Fascist Italy, so-called Communist Russia, the United States, Germany, and Great Britain is not identical, and that it is, by varying methods but with identical objectives, to force people to subordinate themselves, for a number of hours per day greatly in excess of those really necessary, to a work system?

It is a matter of common observation that this full employment becomes increasingly difficult to insure in respect of what is called the home market; therefore, foreign markets, which it must be remembered are equally desired, under this insane system, by every country and, therefore, are matters for fierce competition, are stated by our bank chairmen to be essential to our prosperity.

Since these foreign markets are equally matters for the competition of every country, sooner or later this competition leads to friction, and from friction to the threat of war, with the result, which is very much to the advantage of our lords and masters, that we have to build large and expensive navies and air forces to deal with the situation which our competition for foreign markets has brought about. Of course the building of these fleets provides more employment, and therefore the system is carried on a little further towards the inevitable catastrophe.

If you have followed me so far, you will begin to see that all the efforts which we make towards so-called security at present are merely action taken to preserve, for a little longer, institutions, and notably the financial and industrial institutions, and that in working to preserve these we only insure ourselves, as individuals, further hardship and anxiety and eventual catastrophe.

### **Correct Action the Only Saviour**

It is not too much to say that the whole future of the human race depends, if not upon an understanding of the problem which I am trying to put before you tonight, at any rate upon correct action in regard to it.

I can at once imagine that you will say, "How is it possible to obtain correct action in regard to this problem until a very large proportion of the people concerned understand what the problem is?" Well, the answer to

that is really very simple too.

*If you could only persuade people to ask for what they want, instead of for some method through which they think that what they want can be given to them, the problem would be half solved already.*

Nothing is more dangerous than inexact knowledge. It is the man who thinks he can sail a boat who wrecks a boat, not the man who knows he can't and doesn't try, but merely says, "Let me out." At the present time the affairs of practically every country are at the mercy of a small group of people who know exactly what they want, which is *not* what you want. This small group manipulates much larger groups, who don't know what they want, but think they know how to get it.

The working man of this country has been taught by propaganda of all kinds that it is a meritorious thing for him to say "I want work," but a contemptible thing to say "I want money." Once again, please do not think I am suggesting that there is anything virtuous about laziness. Far from it. There is nothing especially virtuous about work either. I have worked at least as hard as most people, and most of the time I did it because I liked it. The healthy human individual requires work of some kind, just as he requires food; but he is not a healthy individual, mentally at any rate, if he cannot find work for himself, and probably find work, which he can do far better than that which is arranged for him by somebody else. If he cannot, he ought to be in a mental institution, which, in fact, is where most of us are, the headquarters being the Bank of England.

There has been a cant-phrase in politics in this country since the days of Mr. Asquith that the will of the people must prevail. Mr. Asquith was probably one of the greatest experts in modern history at arranging that the will of the people did not prevail. And the method which was followed though not initiated by him—a method which still appears to be successful—is to divide up the population into warring sects, each of which imagines that it has a complete set of blue-prints for the construction of an immediate Utopia. Since practically all these Utopias are schemes for penalising somebody else, you have only to adopt each in turn and eventually you will have reduced everyone to a dead level of slavery, which is what is happening.

### **Escape from Utopia**

Now, once again, I can imagine quite a number of people in this audience saying that I am one of those people who has a complete set of blue-prints for the construction of a Utopia, and therefore perhaps you will allow me to explain exactly why I should not agree to that charge. I have no views whatever as to how my neighbour should spend his time, so long as his method of spending it does not infringe upon my own liberties.

To me it is a matter of no consequence whatever that many or most people are very much richer than I am. The only financial matter which *is* of consequence to me is that I shall be well enough off to meet my own needs, which are quite modest, as I believe are those of most people. The technical proposals which I have put forward from time to time may be considered to differ from, let us say, the well-known beliefs of Utopianism, such as Fascism, Communism, State-Socialism, and so forth, in that, so far from exerting further compulsion upon individuals in order that they may conform to some machine-made conception of a perfect state, *I should like by the simplest possible methods to provide people with the means of making their own individual lives approximate to their own ideas, and not to mine.*

The more I see of Governments, the lower is my opinion of them and I am confident that what the world wants at the present time is a great deal less government,

and not a great deal more.

Now I want to get a further perfectly simple idea into your minds. And that is that *Governments are your property and you are not the property of Governments*. There is no more pernicious and blasphemous nonsense existent in the world today than the statement which has been incorporated in the constitution of the modern dictatorships, which claims that the State, by which is indicated the Government, is everything and the individual is nothing. On the contrary, *the individual is everything and the State is a mere convenience to enable him to co-operate for his own advantage*. It is this idea of the supreme State in its various forms, which has made the State the tool of the international financier who has mortgaged all States to himself.

*The first step towards the security of the individual is to insist upon the security of the individual. I hope that is not too difficult to understand. If you place the security of any institution before the security of the individual, you may prolong the life of that institution, but you will certainly shorten the lives of a great many individuals. Institutions are means to an end, and I do not think it is too much to say that the elevation of means into ends, of institutions above humanity, constitutes an unforgivable sin, in the pragmatic sense that it brings upon itself the most tremendous penalties that life contains.*

A great deal of our trouble in this country arises from the fact that, while we place great faith in the aristocratic ideal (if you prefer to call it the principle of leadership I shall not object), yet we have allowed all those influences which make the aristocratic ideal reasonable and workable to be sapped and wrecked by the exaltation of money as the sole certificate of greatness, and have allowed cosmopolitan and alien financiers to obtain a monopoly of money. We have retained the ideal and allowed the material of which it is constructed to become hopelessly degraded. In consequence, we are governed in the aristocratic tradition by a hypocritical and selfish oligarchy with one idea, and one fundamental idea only; the ascendancy of money, and the essential monopoly of it.

The essence of the aristocratic tradition is detachment—the doing of things in the best way because it *is* the best way, not because you get something out of it. That requires that the leader shall be secure. No one is secure nowadays. At the root of the growing danger of Government and other embodiments of execution is the idea that human beings are all alike. So far from this being the case, I believe that as human beings develop they become increasingly different. But they have common factors, and those common factors are the only part of the human make-up, which can be dealt with by a democratic system, and ought to be dealt with by a democratic system.

It was, I think, Emerson who said, "We descend to meet." Whoever said it, it is profoundly true. We all require food, clothing, and shelter; and we *can* combine, and *ought* to combine, to get those necessities as a condition for our further acquiescence in combining for any other agreed purpose. The primary use of a Government in a sane world would be to make it certain that the greatest common measure of the will of the population, from whom it derives—or ought to derive—its authority, is enough money for decent sustenance.

### **The Menace of Utopianism**

Now a great deal of what I have been saying can be reduced to the good old English advice to "Mind your own business." But I should like to expand this to "Don't meddle with your neighbour's business, but assist him to mind his own." The difference is the difference between saying to a destitute friend, "I will convey you to a Poor-Law institution where you will be given three meals a day if you do exactly as you are told," on the one

hand, and on the other hand saying, "I will settle £50 a year upon you for life, which will at any rate keep you in necessities; what *kind* of necessities you obtain you can judge for yourself."

There is no more dangerous individual in the world at the present than the Utopianist. Mr. Montagu Norman, Governor of the Bank of England, is a Utopianist. Mr. Chamberlain is a Utopianist. Lenin was a Utopianist, Hitler is a Utopianist. Just see where Utopianism has landed us. It is the Utopianist who provides the public excuse for nearly every theft of public property, which has ever been committed.

Let me give you a simple instance of what I mean. We have all heard of the agitation for the nationalisation of the coal industry, and, in particular, of the raw material, coal itself. Now the actual amount which is obtained by the royalty-owner averages about three-pence a ton, so that whatever the ethical aspect may be, the practical effect upon the price of coal is quite trivial. But the international bankers who hold this country in pawn consider that their mortgage upon it would be more secure if it was backed by the coal deposits, and I can assure you that the result of nationalising coal would merely be to increase the security of the debt which we owe to certain international financial houses, and would not affect the well-being either of the miners or the consumers of coal to any perceptible degree.

### **Freedom the Only Policy**

It is not my intention in speaking to you tonight to go to any extent into technical details, or I should like to explain to you the colossal fraud of taxation. But the device of arbitrary taxation, for which the public justification is obtained from carefully worked up "popular" opinion, is one of the most powerful weapons by which the various sections of the population are kept in antagonism with each other, and by which at the same time the power and independence of each one of them is reduced.

One of the greatest difficulties with which we, in the Social Credit Movement, have been faced has been the skilful exploitation of human frailty by our opponents, the financiers, so that the community, and even the Social Credit Movement itself, has been split and kept from effective action. Another has been to persuade the industrialist that the financier was just as much *his* enemy as he is of every other section of the community at the present time.

There is only one policy which will obtain the unquestioned acceptance of everyone for himself, and that is comprised in the word "freedom." And it is exactly that policy which, in my opinion at any rate, requires to be made universal. The oligarchy, which rules us, is, of course, favourable to freedom for its own members, but it is implacably opposed to freedom for the general public. Since the key to economic freedom, as the world is organised today, is the command of money, it follows that differential and arbitrary taxation is the greatest enemy of freedom, which the legislative authority has at its disposal.

*Taxation is a negative dividend. There is a short cut, straight and simple from the present system of modified slavery to one of comfort, security and freedom, and that is the abolition of a negative dividend and the substitution of a positive dividend.*

As many of you here are aware, the money system is an entirely arbitrary system, and the manufacture of money in the modern world costs little more than the cost of paper and ink. In saying that, I do not mean that a money system can function satisfactorily without some underlying theory, which ultimately governs the amount of money, which it is desirable to have at our disposal. But I have no hesitation in stating categorically that the existing taxation system is completely unnecessary, is wasteful, irritating, and predatory; and, further, that, in

place of it, it would be possible to issue a dividend to every man, woman, and child in this country without depriving any individual of the privileges which they may now possess, but, on the other hand, increasing the privileges of everybody.

But such a policy *would* deprive certain individuals of unjustifiable and anti-social power over others which they now possess, and since, unfortunately, these persons have come into control of the sanctions of government, the problem is not so much a technical one as a political one.

Now I am entirely convinced by my own investigation and experiences, not merely in this country but in many parts of the world, that while democracy in policy is absolutely essential to the functioning of the modern world, there is at the present time no such thing as a genuine democracy anywhere, and probably less in this country than anywhere else.

In this country the two main obstacles to a genuine democracy are the party system, with its offshoot, the Front Bench oligarchy, and, secondly, a mistaken idea on the part of the Member of Parliament that he is supposed to understand the methods by which results desired by the general public should be attained, and to pass laws which specify the actions of executive bodies and interfere with technical undertakings. None of these is correct.

A Member of Parliament should be a representative—not a delegate. It is his business to learn what it is his constituents want and see that they get it—not to tell them what they ought to have or to make himself responsible for its production. Policy and administration are two entirely separate things, and administration in this country is admirably carried on by a trained Civil Service. I include the phrase "Civil Service" the staff of great productive undertakings just as much as the officials of Government Departments. They are all technicians, and on the whole they are admirable. What they lack is clear instruction in regard to policy, and it is your business to give them that instruction through your representative, your Member of Parliament.

### Action

Now we have devised a mechanism which, if we could

induce you to carry it out, would impose your policy upon your Member of Parliament quite infallibly, and if you imposed the same policy upon a majority of Members of Parliament, that policy would come into existence. First of all you have to *agree* upon that policy, and, secondly, you have to take very simple *action*.

To agree upon a policy, it is only necessary to find a common factor of human experience. There are certain people who foolishly say that it is impossible to agree upon a policy. I think that is ridiculous. It is sometimes difficult to get agreement upon a policy for the other fellow, but there is no difficulty in getting an agreement about a policy for oneself. *The first thing that we all want it at least a minimum supply of money.* We may want more, but none of us, I think, wants less. If there is such a person in this room and he will give what he does not want to me, I will see that good use is made of it.

What is *certain*, however, is that the mechanism of democracy can *never* be applied with success to *methods* of realising a policy. An understanding of this has enabled our lords and masters to split the so-called democracy of this country on every occasion on which it was desirable to the maintenance of their power.

To submit to a democracy a highly technical question such as Free Trade or Tariff Reform, with its endless implications, is as absurd as to submit to a democracy the relative advantages of driving a battleship by steam turbines or diesel engines. Any decision obtained upon such a subject by means of a popular vote can be demonstrated mathematically always to be wrong. The more complex a subject is the more certain it is that an understanding of it will be confined to a few people who will, of course, always be outvoted by the majority who do not understand it.

But this is not true of policy. Any man who is not a congenital idiot can decide for himself whether he wants to starve to death, live in misery, or live in comfort; and I can assure you that you have only to *unite implacably upon a common policy, and to pursue it* and the proper means for realising that policy will be found for you.

---

## "FAITH WITHOUT WORKS.. ."

By Chas Pinwill

The following article was prepared as a basis for discussion at a seminar on "The Christian Caesar" held in Adelaide, South Australia, on August 16 and 17.

"Hands up for gentle Jesus, gentle Jesus meek and mild," said the preacher. His arms stretched forward, hands lifting upwards, upwards, upwards, his eyes shining in a beaming face. "Hands up for gentle Jesus" he said with a great soft white smile.

The congregation was a few hymns and Bible readings through the service and beginning to join in, warming to this lovely man.

"Here they come," said the preacher as a small cluster of hands broke upwards from the back left hand corner. "Don't be too shy to signify, for gentle Jesus meek and mild". "Hands up for gentle Jesus" said the preacher as the first faltering hands broke into a thick forest.

"O.K." said the preacher "put them down". The congregation beamed back at him, and gently, almost reluctantly, they lowered their hands.

In the silence the preacher's face transformed, hardened, his jaw drew taunt, his voice thickened as he challenged, "Is there any man present who has flayed another with a

bull whip? ... . Put up your hand!" Three or four of the older ladies showed the first symptoms of fright, the rest, quickly reckoning themselves innocent, leaned back with faintly exaggerated comfort. Yes, they could enjoy this game with confidence.

"Nobody . . ." observed the preacher. "Not one?" he exclaimed in astonishment. "If Our Lord were present today," said the preacher indicating a space in the front to the right with a look and a gesture, "He'd have his hand up . . ." And with a quiet voice that every straining ear heard like a trumpet blast he added, "Yes, and he'd be all alone." The congregation drew up from their comfortable pose.

"Stand up any man who has accused others as hypocrites, fools, blind, as full of iniquity, as serpents, as a generation of vipers! Stand up if you've done this not once, but more than a dozen times in the space of a short public address".

"Are we not Australians, do we not see ourselves as a

land of rugged individualists? Do we not call a spade a spade?" "No, no we don't, no not one!" This of course is a most unlikely story.

### **ASSAULTING AN IDEA**

Today in Christendom it's in vogue to emulate the good Shepherd, gentle meek and mild. Upon the descent of the ravaging wolves, a shepherd who "cries wolf and reaches for a bullwhip leaves us nonplussed and disconcerted.

Are not we sheep and wolves all God's children?

Does this mean that we must dress the wolves in sheep's clothing and cry, "sheep sheep?"

We are not commanded to hate the wolves, but the very being of a good Shepherd commands the defeat of the wolves.

To whom did our Lord refer to as hypocrites, fools, serpents and a generation of vipers? None other than the religious leaders of Judaism in His day, the Pharisees.

Were these accusations made today they would be attributed to racial fighting and the charge "anti-Semitism" levelled. Case dismissed.

Was Christ assaulting a people, a race? Of course not. He was attacking an idea.

This was the Pharisees' idea. But what is the Christian idea? Here lies the nexus of the conflict, and an understanding of Christ's words. "I come not to bring peace, but the sword."

My first effort to delineate these two different, and as we shall see, conflicting ideas was published in December 1975. I called it "Salvation (in inverted commas) Through Collectivism."

Here are the great historical irreconcilables. Salvation personal and salvation collective. Here values have their cleavage. Which has the greater value, the individual person, or the collective abstraction?

If the collectivity matter most has greater value, then totalitarianism is logical, obvious and imperative, and unquestionably moral. That the group should serve the individual is a perversion, genuine democracy is evil, and personal responsible freedoms are an abomination.

For centuries the enemies of the Christian idea have induced Christians away from the battleground. Firstly they have been encouraged not to notice the conflict. If they did notice it, they were reminded that this was politics, that is to say it has to do with policy, and power, the basis of human associations. How many times have you been assured that Christianity has no relevance, religion and politics don't mix?

### **INSIDE ISRAEL**

These two ideas in conflict are evident everywhere in the world today. Nowhere more than in Israel.

Those of us who are Christians, who believe that Christianity partakes of truth, indeed is the truth, are greatly in need of a few sharp observations to awaken us to our responsibilities.

I give a personal opinion as a basis for observation. I believe that Christianity, and Christians as Christians, have

less influence and impact on the world in this century than almost any other of the major religions.

Consider first Zionism, the modern descendant of the Pharisaic tradition. A successful candidate for the Presidency of the United States may, or may not, feature a pro-Christian stance. But one thing he absolutely must do. He must be pro-Zionist, or he most definitely WILL NOT win the Presidency. He will not win the State of New York, he will not win California, and he definitely will have bad press, he will look like a loser, and he will lose.

All Presidents of the United States this century have been and must be pro-Zionist. The Christian Church does not have the same type of political clout.

While in the U.S.S.R. the situation is similar. If you are a Christian you are singled out for all the vindictiveness of the State. But if you read the newspapers you will have heard more of Soviet persecutions of Jews than Christians.

Yet there is only one ground upon which you can immigrate from the Soviet. For Christians the Soviet border is an iron curtain, for Zionists who want to immigrate to Israel, few problems. Fill in the application form and leave. Over 30,000 do so every year. Zionist influence outside of the Soviet can command this. Christian influence cannot command that Christians leave the Soviet.

Yet it was the Christian West whose diplomacy established Israel and it is Western arms that maintain it. The U.S. Constitution disallows Church establishment yet 43 percent of U.S. foreign aid goes to Zionist Israel. Why? The Zionist does not believe in personal salvation through Christ. He believes in collective salvation in a temporal State, without Christ.

How has this been done? It has happened not because the Zionist Pharisaical idea is right or true. It has been achieved because the Zionist through history has taken action appropriate to his belief.

As it was at the time of Christ, a transgression of the law to preach the Christian idea, so it is today. Distributing Christian literature publicly in Israel today is a criminal offence. While Our Lord never said a word for the Pharisees, called them hypocrites, serpents and a generation of vipers, the modern Christian has re-established the Pharisaical idea in the Holy Land.

To make this happen two million Arabs were thrown out of Palestine, 600,000 of these people being Christians. A large body of Christians insists that the Jews are the chosen people in some way. Chosen by God collectively without Christ. It is often those most vocal about "personal salvation through Christ" who insist that the opposite is true!

### **FAITH WITHOUT WORKS**

The Christian West both externally and internally has retreated for the whole of this century. Christianity is right and true, yes. Then why the retreat? Because the Christian view has become that it is enough to have the truth that you don't need to do anything with the truth.

That "faith without works is death" is a true statement,

is obvious. The death of Christendom simply proves it.

Last century, the body of Communism was a handful of scattered adherents skulking in garrets. Today they control 1/3rd of the world, heavily influence a further 1/3rd, and are witnessing with anticipation the internal crises of the other third. Because their dogma of the historically inevitable dialectic is correct? No. Because the Christian soldier has vacated the field.

Because the communist takes action, action appropriate to his belief, his faith is not dead.

Does Christianity have a policy, that is, objectives set that the prayer "Thy will be done on earth" might be made a reality? Throughout the length and breadth of Christianity the answer is a nonplussed "What — Policy, objectives, action, — do they have relevance?"

There is only one small movement in the West, maligned, struggling and thrust down into the catacombs by the respectable Christian establishment, which says, "yes, Christianity is a concept of truth, of truth which has relevance to all human associations. All concepts of truth demand an action policy on that basis of truth."

"The Social Credit Movement alone says that there is a Christian Policy. There is a Christian view on power, a political policy. There is a Christian economic policy. There is a Christian financial policy, and the Social Credit Movement is prepared to say what these are." But Christian inertia is so great in this century that it is almost regarded as dangerous to hear this. It is certainly dangerous to believe it.

No doubt many Christians reading this will consider these ideas provocative. There is more. Let me tell you of a meeting that I addressed on the Communist advance.

#### IS EFFECTIVE ACTION POSSIBLE?

About 2/3rds of the audience was what I should call "every-word-is-true" Christians. They were very interested in prophecy and had a few nights before been addressed on prophecy and the emergence of the beast whose number is 666. They showed a lot of interest and asked a lot of questions.

There was one question which was not directly asked or answered, yet it decided the outcome of the evening: Since these things are prophesied to come to pass, though your exhortations to pursue a Christian policy may be all very well, how can you expect to achieve them?

If the coming of evil is prophesied, Christian policy cannot prevail. Moreover if free will were exercised towards accepting Christianity by large numbers, and a society based on Christ's teachings was established and gave such satisfaction to individuals that it were maintained, the beast of complete economic sway would not come to pass, and God's word would therefore be fallible.

It is this type of consideration, which leaves Christians transfixed, paralysed, with no seeming prospect for effective action. Outside of a second coming nothing can prevail. It is like an inert Christian frog croaking before the mesmerism of the oncoming serpent.

Unless this paralysing view is answered Christian energy cannot be released to create something on earth "as it is in Heaven".

When I was a small boy I encountered such a frog, immobile, croaking wildly and obviously troubled, though mysteriously so, for there was no apparent problem. As any other bush boy would, I approached him with a view to picking him up to examine him and solve the mystery.

As I came very close I caught another perspective. A large deadly snake arched neck wavering and slowly, very slowly closing in, had that frog completely impotent through nothing but his own fear. He could only watch and complain. He couldn't act.

Now I knew the answer. A brush hook was handy, one bold stroke. Well I didn't do it . . . another problem of courage. Instead I appealed to my father, who came and the deed was done. Unfortunately for the frog a little late. He was already wedged in the snake's throat. I enquired after his health but his problems were terminal.

---

### GIFT OF GOD

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."

Dr. Bryan Monahan in *Why I am a Social Creditor*.

### JEREMY LEE TO TOUR CANADA AND U.K.

Mr. Jeremy Lee, National Secretary of The Institute of Economic Democracy, and Assistant National Director of The Australian League of Rights, will be conducting an eight week lecture tour early in 1981 under the auspices of The Canadian League of Rights before going on to the United Kingdom to lecture under the auspices of The British League of Rights. Mr. Lee has just completed an extensive tour of New Zealand for the New Zealand League of Rights, where there has been a spectacular increase in interest in the League and Social Credit. We welcome the many new readers of The New Times.

A former Kenyan, educated in England, Mr. Jeremy Lee is a brilliant speaker on a variety of subjects. Through The Institute of Economic Democracy he has issued carefully documented material exposing the hoax of the "energy crisis".

Mr. Lee's 1981 tour will be part of the expanding programme of The Crown Commonwealth League of Rights.