

THE NEW TIMES

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

Vol.46, No. 1

JANUARY 1981

INCREDIBLE DEFENCE OF THATCHER GOVERNMENT'S BRUTAL ECONOMIC POLICY

Mr. Paul Johnson was editor of the Fabian "New Statesman" from 1965 to 1970, and currently holds the chair in communications in the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research. In recent years he has been widely publicised as one who has turned his back on previously held political views, much of his writing being directed against the menace of Trade Union monopoly and Big Government. Much of what Mr. Johnson has had to say about the Trade Union monopoly is true. However, it was also said long before Mr. Johnson, by C.H. Douglas, who pointed out that all monopoly is anti-social, but that the most dangerous monopoly of all was the monopoly of credit. Mr. Johnson is careful not to even mention this monopoly. If he did, he would not be invited to write for papers like "The New York Times".

Mr. Johnson seeks to show in an article in *The New York Times*, republished in the Australian weekly, *News Weekly*, of December 3, 1980, that the Thatcher Government's finance-economic policies are just what are required to solve Britain's problems. Mr. Johnson not only defends Mrs. Thatcher's policies, but also makes the incredible claim that the Great Depression was responsible for the development in the United Kingdom of the technology, which enabled the British to survive the first stage of the Second World War. Mr. Johnson's knowledge of history is as deficient as his knowledge of economics.

A POWER MAN

Mr. Johnson may have changed his brand of politics, but not his philosophy. He is a power man. He writes, "There are welcome signs that unemployment, high interest rates, and factory closings are beginning to crush the arrogance of union bureaucrats, who have long insolently enjoyed unique legal privileges and virtual immunity to criticism." Mr. Johnson's view is that in order to curb the power of union bosses, it is necessary to create mass unemployment, smash large numbers of business organisations, and increase human misery. It is certainly true that those still retaining their jobs are prepared to accept what in essence is a lower standard of living, rather than strike for higher wages. But there is a limit to how far this sadistic programme eulogised by Mr. Johnson can be taken. Relatively high social security payments may ensure that there is no direct revolt by the unemployed in the immediate future. But it is significant that as high unemployment develops in all Western industrialised nations, so does the rate of violence. Recent reports state that West Germans are shocked by the violence amongst young people.

As outlined by C.H. Douglas in his last major work, *The Brief For The Prosecution*, the financial policies which sabotaged British industry during the Great Depression, made adequate military defence impossible and eventually contributed to the start of the Second World War. If it had not been for the generosity of the eccentric, but wealthy patriot Lady Houston, it is improbable that the famous Rolls Royce Engines used to power the Spitfires and Hurricanes in the decisive Battle of Britain, would ever have been developed. While British industry was starved of financial credit, adequate credits were being made available to rejuvenate the German economy under the National Socialism of Hitler. Not surprisingly, many people at the time came to the same conclusion that Mr. Paul Johnson has come to today: that a regenerated economy is only possible under "strong leadership". Uncritical admirers of Winston Churchill do not like to be told that he once eulogised the Hitler leadership.

The successful development of the British industries such as aircraft and electronics, which made vital contributions towards the survival of Britain, was not the result of the Great Depression, but the expanded credit made available when Neville Chamberlain took over the British Conservative Government from the disastrous Stanley Baldwin. During the Second World War there was tremendous pressure to develop technology. In most cases there were no difficulties about finance. But it is blatantly false to suggest that great unnatural disasters are necessary for the development of technology.

AN "ECONOMIC REVOLUTION"

Mr. Paul Johnson writes that "The great mass of Britons do not fully understand the economic revolution Mrs. Thatcher is attempting to bring about." Mr. Johnson, subscribing to the export or perish doctrine, sees the Thatcher revolu-

tion as one which will result in greater exports and an exchange rate with cheaper raw materials and "larger overseas sales and service forces." This type of policy is, of course, being pursued by all other industrialised nations, some of whom have a more passive labour force than is the case in Britain. As demonstrated in Douglas's book, *The Monopoly of Credit*, the end result of this policy must be fiercer trade war, eventually leading either to military war, or an exploitation of the threat of war to attempt to create a World State.

Mr. Johnson's eulogy of Mrs. Thatcher is breathtaking. After referring to the experiences the British "enjoyed" under Winston Churchill's wartime leadership, Johnson claims that "It is not merely reassuring, it is exhilarating, and it explains why Mrs. Thatcher's personal popularity — and in turn, her self-confidence increases steadily, despite the daunting statistics and the real evidence of hardship. The British, in short, are once more undergoing the splendours and miseries of real national leadership. They like it." Mr. Johnson appears to have forgotten what the British electorate thought of Churchill when they threw him out of office in 1945. Even in his own electorate there was a massive protest vote against him for an Independent.

Mrs. Thatcher's "real national leadership" was put to the test on the Rhodesian crisis. She capitulated to the international pressures, which insisted that even a black Government under Bishop Muzorewa was not sufficient. The policies being pursued by Mrs. Thatcher meets with the approval of the international credit monopolists. So far from enjoying Mrs. Thatcher's "exhilarating" leadership, tens of thousands of British are attempting to flee, as are the New Zealanders, under similar leadership by Mr. Muldoon. If in a spirit of what can only be described as invincible stupidity, Mrs. Thatcher perseveres with her present destructive policies, she will be handing over almost certainly to a Marxist Government. Mrs. Thatcher's apologists will, of course, then claim that if only she had had more time, her policies would have been successful. The British do not have to react to the Thatcher Government's brutal and unchristian policies; they can apply pressure to ensure that enough Conservatives react to replace Mrs. Thatcher with someone heading a Government introducing much more constructive policies.

A POLICY OF LIBERATION

The first step necessary for breaking the Trade Union Monopoly is to break the Credit Monopoly. This means a financial policy which results in falling prices, reflecting the reality of a reduction in the true costs of product as a result of increasing technology, and growing economic independence for the individual. Genuinely independent individuals do not tamely submit to any form of monopoly. To suggest, as does Mr. Paul Johnson, that the British only give of their best by inflicting repressive and humiliating policies upon them, is an insult, which will be resented by people of British stock and genuine British culture everywhere. But they must react to their present crisis in their traditional spirit of voluntary co-operation, demonstrating that this is a more constructive revival. They will not, of course, be assisted by the large alien masses imposed upon them and should recall what Karl Marx said about the British not being able to make their own revolution and that foreigners would have to make it for them.

"Programme For The Third World War"

From time to time we republish extracts from the writings of C.H. Douglas in order that a new generation of Social Crediters may be introduced to the prophetic genius of this outstanding individual. "Programme for The Third World War", out of print but planned for re-production, first appeared serially in "The Social Crediter" between April and August 1943. That is nearly 40 years ago. Events since then have only served to highlight what Douglas wrote. The following are the first three chapters and part of the fifth chapter.

I DON'T know if there are any readers of these words who believe that if Adolf Schickelgruber, better known as Hitler (but perhaps more correctly described as Rothschild), had, in the inscrutable wisdom of Providence, been dropped from a second storey window at an early age, there would have been no World War. There may be. There are kindly people who believe that Henry the Eighth had six wives because he was just unlucky, and that Mr. Anthony Eden goes to Washington at critical periods because he belongs to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel amongst the Christians.

But to any such, I will render the only service to them in my power. I advise them not to read any further. For in this matter, to suppose that the cure for war is to make it impossible for anyone to wage war is to concede victory to the organisers of the great wars of, at least, the past two hundred years. War is a terrible affliction—none of us at this time is likely to overlook that. But the danger, which threatens us, is that, in sheer horror of ever more devastating and, so far, completely inconclusive wars, we may surrender to slavery so far-reaching and irrevocable that its contemplation is a glimpse of hell. Or, shall we

say, we are faced with the permanent enthronement of Might divorced from Right, without Might risking even a kick on the shin.

That is, of course, the inescapable alternative so long as we are content to accept the present situation as a war between the Axis Powers and the so-called United Nations. No prizefight promoter was ever put out of business because the contestants were both battered into insensibility and remained permanent wrecks, more especially if he was in a position to arrange that likely bruisers should starve or fight. Anyone who cannot see that the depression of 1929-33 is of a piece with the re-armament of 1933-1939, or who will believe the nursery tales concerning the "Men of Munich" and their efforts to defeat the promoters, can only pray that they may be preserved from foolish speaking.

But there are encouraging signs that prizefights are not taken quite so much at their face value. Without pausing to recall the various reasons, which were adduced for the comparatively localised wars of the nineteenth century, and previously, it may be noticed that our wars are, if bloodier and more devastating, proportionately more high-minded and mystical. It may be remembered that

the earlier, or 1914-1918, phase of the present war was fought for the purpose of making the world safe for democracy. Democracy in the abstract having been so far removed from Democrats as to be virtually unassailable, and, like a certain well-known brand of whisky, still running and ten times the price, we are now lending to defend the right to be free, thus enthroning Freedom with Democracy, while bringing Magna Carta and Regulation 18B within the orbit of the Lease-Lend Agreement. Hypocrisy being the tribute, which vice pays to virtue, we may at least hope that it shows some indication of becoming more expensive. And it will be noticed that the "B."B.C.'s strongly marked religious fervour (combined with State Socialism") has, with unerring instinct, realised that the primary British need to hear about the weather, which enabled a Hymn to be administered at 10-30 a.m. in "peace" time before the Weather Bulletin, has now been transferred to the curious craving for information as to the exact number of inhabited but unnamed localities freed by our Russian Allies. So we have our Hymn and Alleluia at 7-59—practically a certainty. You get your dose.

While there appears to be a widening comprehension that the actual labels of the contestants do not indicate the destination of the major stakes involved, it is nothing less than astounding to observe the inability (to give it the most charitable interpretation) of even the more favourably placed commentators to see the facts which are available to anyone. For instance, Mr. W. Herridge, for some time Canadian High Commissioner in Washington, is sure that we have to do thus and such, or the next war will be between Fascism and Communism. To assess the value of this prevalent idea, let us examine the origins of Fascism and Communism.

. . .

Most crooks in a big way are Saviours, although, through the ages, at long intervals, there have been Saviours who were not crooks. These latter can generally be identified by the fact that they are unpopular until a long time after their, in the main, violent death. But we are not now concerned with them.

Al Capone saved both the whisky business and the American sufferers from the local urge to mind other people's business and provided the excuse for setting up the American Gestapo, Herr Schickelgruber-Hitler-Rothschild is saving Europe from Bolshevism and providing the opportunity for America to reconstruct Europe and Signor Mussolini has disposed of plenty amidst poverty. The list is in no way exhaustive.

The technique of this saviour business is simple and was well understood by Robin Hood, who took all you had, and gave you back your car fare. Modern Chancellors of the Exchequer, beginning with Mr. Lloyd George who took nine pence from us all and gave some of us four pence back, subject to tax, regard it as the core of Finance. Generalised, the idea is to arrange an intolerable situation, and save you from it at the cost of accepting one barely tolerable. You are threatened with going all the way to Moscow, if you don't agree to go half way to Moscow. If you don't like Churchill, try Emmanuel Shinwell.

In considering the probable slogan for the next World War now so confidently predicted in well-informed quarters as a preliminary to giving up some more freedoms to avoid it, we shall, I think, be well advised to look at the well-tried principle just enunciated, and to consider whether any developments of the pre-1914 and pre-1939 periods are common to the "improvements" which have been introduced into civilisation, and whether they appear to follow the standard technique. Such an enquiry will be found to provide somewhat remarkable information.

Now, *once you have surrendered to materialism*, it is quite true that economics precedes politics, and dominates

it. It is not in Bolshevism, Fascism, the New Deal, and P.E.P. or the London School of Economics Fabian Society that we shall find the origins of what we are looking for. These are ostensibly political systems, and derive from, rather than give birth to economics. While this is obvious and axiomatic, it is not so obvious, although equally axiomatic that the principle works both ways. That is as much as to say, *if you can control economics, you can keep the business of getting a living the dominant factor of life, and so keep your control of politics*—just that long, and no longer.

Now let us look at the developments in economic control. Don't confuse this with technical progress, with which it has nothing whatever in common. Probably the most important aspect of this subject is one with which the general public is completely unfamiliar, although some of its component members might be interested to know that the curious, illogical, and immensely publicised attack on what is called "the profit motive" is designed to provide what Lord Stamp called suitable psychological preparation. To the small circle familiar with the subject, it is known by the innocent title of "management control."

It may perhaps be remembered by those who notice such things that one of the usual and effective replies to the complaint of oppression by large corporations, banks, railway and public utility companies, *etc.*, is that the average shareholding in them is of the order of a few hundred pounds. The personal control of the partner or majority stockholder has been replaced by the small shareholder. The argument is of course exactly the same as that which measures democracy by the percentage of the population having votes. That is easy to apprehend when your attention is drawn to it. What is not so easy, and requires a good deal of technical knowledge of a highly specialised kind, is to understand the rapid and extensive, and very silent revolution which has been taking place in the legal power of the stockholder over an undertaking for which (on the idea of the reality of money) he provided the capital. Since most of this alienation is the work of German-American-Jewish lawyers, commonly called Corporation Counsel, it had, up to the outbreak of the present hostilities, developed further in Germany and America than in Great Britain. Possibly with the able assistance of Mr. Benjamin Cohen, Jr., of the U.S.A., who has been here for some time, there are signs that we are catching up, and the organisation of the Bank of "England" is clearly devoted to it.

However that may be, it is patent that the separation of ownership from control, which is a feature of stock dispersal and legal devices such as voting trusts (one of which has just been constituted by Sir Stafford Cripps, Minister of Aircraft Production, in respect of the arbitrary acquisition of Messrs. Short Bros.), proxies, and other devices, is being pursued systematically in regard to industrial property, just as it is, under the agitation for "nationalisation," in regard to land and credit.

It would take us much too far afield to pursue this aspect of the policy into its amazing ramifications. But two results are significant. The first is that the shareholder is at the mercy of the stock market. His connection with what was originally his property is little more than the loose expectation that a group of men, who have nothing to expect from him and little to fear, will consider his interests, which they are continually told by the "B."B.C. and the Archbishops, are dubiously moral. Most shareholders would agree that they don't get much consideration and will get less. If his stock is not exchangeable for valuable considerations (and who controls the Stock-Market?) he is expropriated.

The second is that he can have no say in the use that is made of "his" property. It becomes, in theory, the tool of a neutral technocracy, but anyone of ordinary common sense knows that it obeys the policy of whoever appoints the management. Let us say, capturing export trade. It

is the International Banks who appoint the management.

This systematic separation of control from ownership and responsibility began in Germany during the days of Ballin, Rathenau, Bleichroeder, Deutsch and others of the Jewish ring of bankers and industrialists who surrounded the Kaiser. It was transferred to the United States by the Warburgs, Schiffs and Strausses with such lawyers as Felix Frankfurter assisting. The core of the idea is power without responsibility. You cannot effectively punish a corporation or sue a Government Department.

It should be noted that this technique was highly developed many years before Bolshevism, Fascism, the New Deal, or P.E.P. were heard of. Bearing this in mind, we are in a position to follow the technique into governmental systems, and to consider the activities of various contemporary (if temporary) celebrities.

• • •

The practical history of Bolshevism may be said to commence with the financing of Japan in the 1904-1905 War against Russia. The Japanese Minister of Finance Takahashi wrote a Memorandum to the Japanese Government, in which he said: —

"Mr. Schiff had a grudge against Russia on account of his race. . . . for this purpose it was deemed fit to admonish the ruling class by an object lesson. Mr. Schiff saw in the war a welcome opportunity to give effect to his cherished idea." (*Jacob Schiff, Life and Letters* by Cyrus Adler.)

The immediate result was the issue of the Imperial Japanese Government 6 percent *Sterling* (not dollar) Loan.

It might appear, at first sight, that this transaction was merely a routine example of financial practice, similar, for instance, to the assistance given to Hitler by the Bank of "England" under Mr. Montagu Norman, which was so helpful in enabling Germany to re-arm.

But I think that there are differences. It is true that Mr. Norman has expressed his contempt for the general population in no uncertain terms ("The dogs bark, but the caravan moves on"). On the other hand, he has also regretted that he is no economist, and does not know what to do (*Montagu Norman: A Study in Financial Statesmanship*, by PAUL EINZIG). So we must assume that he is only the broker's man. To know with certainty whether there really are differences between financing Hitler and financing Bolshevism, we should of course require knowing who is the broker. But to revert to Mr. Schiff.

It should be realised that the effect of his initiative on this occasion was to set the British to work (it was a *Sterling* Loan) to build up the Japanese Navy, because Mr. Schiff, like all his co-racialists, dislikes culture, and prefers Kultur. The object is clearly stated—an American, or German (without reference to dates, it is difficult to say) Jew, he "deemed fit" to put the British to war against "the ruling classes of Russia" as "an object lesson."

At the same time: "The subsidies granted to the Nihilists at this period by Jacob Schiff were no longer acts of isolated generosity. A veritable Russian Terrorist organisation had been set up in the U.S.A at his expense. It covered Russia with its emissaries, charged to assassinate Ministers, governors, heads of police *etc.*.... and to create insurrection the cost was estimated at more than fourteen million [gold] roubles" (*Figaro*, Paris, February 20, 1932). Of course it all came back ten times over in profits from the "reconstruction" of Russia. To quote the banker's hymn: "Whatever, Lord, we lend to Thee, repaid a thousand fold shall be."

Now, before briefly considering the consequences of this operation, I think it is important to be quite clear that the merits or otherwise of the Russian Imperial Government, *from the point of view of the Russians*, are not in question. The only point on which we can be certain is that no Russians

have figured in general intercourse outside Russia since it disappeared. Whatever the results, and we are beginning to experience them now, the "ruling classes" were to be taught a lesson because they were not willing to take orders from a German Jew resident in America. That the results to the *Russians* were of no consequence, is demonstrated by the fact that many millions of Russians, not of "the ruling classes" perished, and millions more were reduced to poverty and exile, by the Bolshevik Revolution. But no Jews. Soviet Russia is "presented" to Europe and America and represented by two Jews, Maisky and Litvinov, who are as typically Russian as a Sassoon is typically English.

Of course the consequences were much wider. In the article in the *Ottawa Citizen*, by Mr. Herridge, to which reference has already been made—an article which reads like the *rechauffe* of a conversation with an exponent of international Freemasonry—amidst a welter of what, without wishing to be offensive, I can only describe as dangerous nonsense, he remarks, "Germany attacked; a fact of only tactical significance. For if Germany had not attacked Russia would have." In that I am sure he is right, and that the social and economic structure both of Russia and Germany make war certain.

It is not too much to say that the consequences of the activities of Mr. Schiff, his firm, and his associates were: —

(1) The inauguration of an Asiatic war complex, accompanied by a delusion that the day of the white man was over, not merely in Asia, but everywhere. "Pearl Harbour" was conceived in New York. Trouble in India dates from the beginning of this century, and was hardly existent before. Yet political reform in India has been rapid and continuous.

(2) The World War had as its fundamental idea "*Drang nach Osten*." A weakened Russia, like all these World Revolution movements played straight into the hands of Germany—the Germany of Frederick the "great" who is now being idealised by Goebbels.

(3) The transfer of the subversive activities of international finance to France and England. The technique of flooding the country with refugees, many of them propagandists, is a repetition of the period following the French Revolution. How is it that no Socialist Party has ever attacked Finance? How is it that the programme of the Commonwealth Party (notice the Cromwellian touch) reads like a banker's dream?

Russia is a country of nearly 200,000,000 people with vast resources. The individual Russian has always been a brave and fatalistic soldier. For twenty years, the Soviet Government has been preparing for war. Where is all this propaganda coming from, which in quarters accustomed to denounce war as a capitalist trick, heralds as an immense military achievement *derived from the Soviet system*, the very desirable, but surely not very remarkable fact that 200,000,000 of people, fighting on their own soil, on short lines of communication, have held up (if they have held them up), *one* enemy fighting on lengthening lines of communication while an allegedly inefficient country of 45,000,000 held up three empires, and assisted the Russians? Who in their senses could argue that the most backward and illiterate country in Europe is the pattern for the rest? To anyone who will consider the evidence, I cannot see any conclusion from it but one—that the totalitarian state in all its forms is a gigantic plot against civilisation, and that only political adolescents could fail to see that it proceeds from an international source, using international bribery for the benefit of an international caste to whom all cultures and races, but one, are foreign.

The object of the various New Orders is simplicity itself—it is to prevent the rectification of the defects in the organic growth of civilisation, almost all of which proceed

from the Finance which the New Order mongers never attack.

• • •

.... One of the ideas essential to any understanding of genuine political activity can perhaps be most easily expressed in the language of gambling. To the roulette player, *Rouge et Noir* is a game of chance. To the keeper of the Bank, it is a certainty.

To the Stock Exchange gambler, gain or loss on a stock movement depends on whether he is a bull or a bear. To the Stockbroker, all that matters is that enough people shall buy and sell stocks. In this case, his percentage is a certainty. To the race goer who backs the favourite, the victory of an outsider means loss; to the bookmaker it merely means a larger gain than if the favourite won.

I do not think that the importance of understanding this principle can be over-rated, because the manipulation and perversion of the gambling spirit is of the very essence of International policy. The fundamental idea is always to play a long-term certainty against a short-term possibility so that a win for the genuine gambler is at best or worst only a postponement of the inevitable final loss. It is called insurance.

I can imagine that someone who has not devoted much attention to the subject may observe that anyone who gambles deserves to lose. That is the Whig idea, propagated to justify the fact that Whigs only invest in a certainty. But, in fact, gambling is a special form of the adventurous spirit from which all progress is born, whereas insurance is a financial fallacy; and no greater disaster can overtake a community than to lose the spirit of adventure. That is why a mass of Law, which smothers initiative and substitutes a Beveridge insurance plan for the dividends of an advancing adventure, is a creeping death.

Now, World War, Parts I and II, like all previous wars, is a gamble between A and B for the certain advantage of C. It is essential that the Programme of Part III shall be the combination of A and B, for the elimination of C. Since the position of C rests on an abstract fallacy his effective elimination is in sight.

The derivation of Bolshevism, as we have seen, covers a fairly lengthy period. Fascism, by which name it appears to be fashionable to designate anything, which isn't labelled Bolshevism, is as a tide contemporaneous with the rise of Mussolini. It is quite easy to show, however, not merely that its origin is identical with Bolshevism, but that it is merely Bolshevism wintering in the Mediterranean. Its aims are similar, and its technique, like that of "German" National Socialism, or P.E.P., is localised centralisation in order to transfer power to International Centralisation—as you might say, "C." It is the second episode, in point of time, in the advent of gangster Government . . .

LEAGUE BASIC FUND SLOWS

No doubt because of the holiday season, support for the League of Rights Annual Basic Fund has slowed. But the situation demands that it be filled as quickly as possible. The Fund now stands at just over \$26,000. The League is not going to continue making a vocal contribution to the battle for Civilisation by merely surviving. It must continue to expand in accordance with a basic programme. Get YOUR contribution away TODAY!

The "Heartland"

Following is an extract from *The State of the World*, which was first published in *The Australian Social Crediter* in March and April 1946. It was reprinted in *The Social Crediter* with an Introduction in 1967 followed by publication in booklet form:

It is not doubted today that Germany aimed at world conquest. What is not widely appreciated is the embracing nature of the strategy she followed. This strategy is carefully described, and documented, in a study by Derwent Whittlesey (*German Strategy of World Conquest*: London, F. E. Robinson & Co.). As one of the foundations of this strategy, the German General Staff developed the conception of geopolitics, which, however, was first voiced by the English geographer Halford Mackinder in 1904.

"Mackinder's concept of the geographical structure of the earth begins with the Eurasian land mass and its peripheral water areas.

" 'For a thousands years a series of horse-riding peoples emerged from Asia through the broad interval between the Ural Mountains and the Caspian Sea, rode through the open spaces of Southern Russia, and struck home into Hungary in the very heart of the European Peninsula . . . That they stimulated healthy and powerful reaction, instead of crushing opposition under widespread despotism, is due to the fact that the mobility of their power was conditioned by the steppes, and necessarily ceased in the surrounding forests and mountains . . .

" 'Is not the pivot region of the world's politics that vast area of Euro-Asia which is inaccessible to ships, but in antiquity lay open to the horse-riding nomads, and is today about to be covered with a net-work of railways? There have been and are here the conditions of a mobility of military and economic power of a far-reaching and yet limited character in this region. Russia replaces the Mongol Empire. Her pressure on Finland, on Scandinavia, on Poland, on Turkey, on Persia, on India, and on China replaces the centrifugal raids of the steppe-men. In the world at large she occupies the central strategical position held by Germany in Europe. She can strike on all sides and be struck from all sides, save the north. The development of her modern railway mobility is only a matter of time. Nor is it likely that any possible social revolution will alter her essential relations to the great geographical limits of her existence. Wisely recognising the fundamental limits of her power, her rulers have parted with Alaska; for it is as much a law of policy for Russia to own nothing overseas as it is for Britain to be supreme on

JEREMY LEE FOR CANADA AND U.K.

Our Canadian and United Kingdom readers should make every endeavour to hear Mr. Jeremy Lee, National Secretary of The Institute of Economic Democracy, a Division of The Australian League of Rights, during his coming lecture tour. Mr. Lee is a brilliant and engaging speaker with an enormous wealth of knowledge. He is recognised in Australia as an outstanding authority on the gigantic energy hoax, his book on the subject being a best seller. Mr. Lee has also made a distinctive contribution to the development of that "practical Christianity" which the late C.H. Douglas said was the only hope for Western Civilisation. Mr. Lee's Canadian tour will start in British Columbia next month and will take eight weeks. Mr. Lee will then conduct a two-week tour of the United Kingdom. His Canadian and British tour is another major development in the ongoing programme of The Crown Commonwealth League of Rights.

the ocean.'

"Remembering how large Russia loomed on the political horizon in 1904, it is easy to see why Mackinder cast that country for a role it has only now [about 1942-3] begun to play. In revising his thesis after the War of 1914-18, he retained Russia as the pivot area, calling it the 'Heartland'. He then recognised Germany as the active force in a possible combination with Russia, extremely dangerous to maritime Great Britain." (Op. cit. pp. 65-67.)

The geopolitical conception was considerably extended, and developed by the German General Staff to a theory that whoever controlled the "Heartland" held the key to absolute *world* conquest. In this, of course, the development of air power, not considered by Mackinder, made a vital differ-

ence.

As the result of the defeat of Germany, the "Heartland" is now in the absolute control of Russia, as originally envisaged by Mackinder.

In considering this situation, we must ignore ideology. Ideology is a weapon. As Stalin said, "Words must have no relation to actions . . . Words are one thing, actions another. Good words are a mask for the concealment of bad deeds." The now highly elaborated geopolitical theory makes the possession of the Heartland a temptation that may prove irresistible, if not to Stalin, then possibly to his successor. So that any realistic foreign policy must bring forth a "healthy and powerful reaction" from other nations—or so one would think.

WHAT IS USURY?

By Jeremy Lee

An independent standing for the Senate in Queensland was interviewed by the TV programme "Nationwide" shortly before the election. The candidate said that her platform was "a return to the laws of God." Pressed to elaborate, she said that every word in the Bible was true, and must be applied today if society is to be regenerated. She was asked to give an example, and replied she would re-institute corporal punishment and abolish goal sentences. She concluded with what to some might be touching faith, but to many — including quite a few Christians — is sentimental naiveté by saying that she was "leaving the campaigning up to God." If He wanted her in the votes would be there; if He didn't, well presumably she wouldn't get elected!

So much is left unanswered in this unassailable position! The deliberate refusal to accept responsibility is actually inverted into the supposed essence of the correct Christian posture. One wonders why she didn't leave it to God to fill in her nomination form? She finally received slightly under 0.01 percent of the vote.

Then again, what is her fellow Christian expected to understand by "the laws of God?" Would she, for example, have us stone adulterers? And would she cast the first stone, or, more likely, hand it to one of us?

The question is not asked lightly, or the least bit cynically. For there are many who, watching in apprehension the proliferation of unlicensed evil, hold as deep a desire as the worthy Senate candidate for a return to "the laws of God."

But is it really true that laws, which we are told, are "eternal, unchanging, immutable" means the reconciliation of 20th century society with the fixed mores of a pastoral, nomadic tribe, which colonised and warred 4,000 odd years ago? Or is it the spirit, rather than the letter of the law, which we are expected to enshrine in our way of life?

THE SPIRIT AND THE LETTER

Now the fundamentalist answers this by pointing — and quite correctly — to the many aberrations arising from the abandonment of the letter of the law. So many sins are now excused — situational ethics quite obviously one. So long as we "love" each other (spirit) does it really matter all that much about marriage? (letter). We even have modern clerics marrying homosexuals in the final ascendancy of spirit over the letter of the law. In the face of this quite obvious degeneracy, concerned Christians go scrambling back to the fixed position of the fundamentalist — and who can really blame them?

But it doesn't answer the question. For — assuming that we are expected to achieve, to incarnate, the words of the Lord's Prayer — "...Thy will be done on Earth as it is in

heaven ..." we must have a realistic concept of how to go about it.

It is the evasion of this immutable question which has led the fundamentalists helter-skelter into the "prophecy syndrome". Nothing can now possibly be done until the Second Coming, they insist, which will follow soon after an imminent period of unprecedented tribulation.

We may all agree on the tribulation — in fact it is quite obviously happening, and equally obviously is destined to get worse.

But it is a much more daunting thought that the Christian is largely responsible for this state of affairs through his consistent refusal to apply the dynamic which was an unqualified implication of the Lord's prayer and the Gospel itself. It is so much easier to blame the sins of others, and to cling tightly and immovably to the legalism of the Old Testament.

WHAT IS LAW?

The law is but a means to an end, rather than an end in itself. It becomes an ass, as the English are never tired of pointing out, when it is worshipped. The law is there for man, rather than man for the law, as our Lord pointed out. Unless it enhances the objective for which it was enacted, it is evil, a fact which the Pharisees bitterly resented when admonished by Jesus. Therefore the law is only "immutable, eternal, and unchanging" insofar as it serves the "immutable, unchanging, eternal" purpose for which Creation itself was instituted. Thus, any attempt to shape man anew into the static image of the letter of the law is just as idolatrous as to suggest that man's shape can be anything he wants, and is bound by no law at all. The first is Pharisaism, the second liberalism. Both are a form of idol-worship.

The reconciliation can only be realised by a proper recognition of God's intention for man. No more brilliant encapsulation has ever been given than our Lord's two

great commissions — to "Love God with heart and mind and soul and strength", and "to love our neighbour as ourself." Insofar as the law serves this ultimate end, it is eternal. Insofar as it becomes an end in itself, it is evil. Only by measuring the law to its "raison d'etre" can we achieve proper balance.

USURY

Now "usury" and "usurpation" have a common Latin origin. The one means the charging of unlawful interest, the other the forceful seizure of power and dominion over others. Both are a form of theft, and quite obviously contravene Christ's second commission.

A stern condemnation of usury was one of the mainstays of Magna Carta. Pope Innocent III, attempting to annul the Great Charter, resorted to the letter of the law. In his Bull "Etsi Karissimus", August 24th, 1215, the Pope said: "But because the Lord has said to us by the prophet Jeremiah, "I have set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms, to root out, and to destroy, to build and to plant", and also by Isaiah "Loose the bands of wickedness, undo the heavy burden," we refuse to ignore such shameless presumption, for thereby the Apostolic See would be dishonoured, the king's rights injured, and the whole plan for a Crusade seriously endangered..."

Luckily, however, the spirit of the law contained in Magna Carta prevailed over the letter of the law in Innocent's annulment, and occasioned a great advance in Christian civilisation.

Professor G. N. Clark, in his book *"The Wealth of England"*, described the end of the Middle Ages thus:

"Conscious planning played a very modest part in the economy of this time. In the main the Church, the king and his servants, the municipalities, or the guilds used their limited power of social control, not to impose economic plans, but merely to prevent breaches of traditional rules and standards, or at most to adapt these standards to the exigencies of changing situations. There was a certain stock of economic ideas. They were good ideas, though they were simple and general, and the written discussions of them were not to any serious extent analytical, but intended to clarify them and apply them to the relatively complex facts of economic life... The main doctrines had to do with economic justice, the principles of fair dealing. There was the doctrine that in all transactions a just price ought to be paid ... it was often explained so as to condemn something more than simple cheating. If it penetrated a little into economic analysis, it meant that the market price itself ought to be just, and that meant, roughly speaking, that it ought to depend on the cost of production and not on unfair competition or on the power of a monopolist. *There was one special sphere in which the doctrine of just price took a form very natural in a peasant society; in the sphere of finance it took the form of condemning usury. There were texts in Scripture and in Aristotle, which seemed to mean that all loans should be made without interest; and this was the official theory.... Theoretically what we call "credit" was usury, one example of the sin of avarice....*"

Clark goes on to point out later that Calvin was responsible for the change in attitude to usury: "Dismissing, as well he

might, the old arguments of principle against usury, he declared that usury was permissible except when it was oppressive *or* contrary to the common utility...." All this has a great deal to do with the present plight of the world. For the Church at the moment is heavily preoccupied with "loving our neighbours" in the Third World — and justly so. But, forsaking any examination of the sins and errors, which have engendered the current disasters, it seeks to cure one sin with a worse one. The New International Economic Order might have been Marxist in its conception, but it is being fervently nurtured by the Church. Before untrammelled usury gives way to an ultimate usurpation of power, brother Christian, surely we should let these figures speak for themselves?

Third World Debts

1971	\$ 64 billion
1974	\$108 billion
1977	\$201 billion
1979	\$300 billion
1980-81	\$451 billion - interest \$88 billion.

In anyone's language that is usury. Who is the usurer? Could it also be he who wishes to usurp world power in the N.I.E.O.?

What irony — and what an all-consuming evil — if he is aided and abetted by the Church, the Body of Christ!

"RESTRUCTURING" NEW ZEALAND

The following comment on the New Zealand situation was written by Mr. David Thompson, National Director of The New Zealand League of Rights, following the shock defeat of the Muldoon Government late last year in a by-election. There are lessons for other countries in what is being imposed upon New Zealand.

One of the underlying issues, which led to the Government's electoral defeat in the East Coast Bays (Auckland) by-election, was the clear indication of impending industrial chaos. The Muldoon Government has failed to adequately explain the reasons for its policy of "restructuring".

In essence, the 're-structuring' of the New Zealand economy is designed to concentrate (centralise) resources upon the most "efficient" industries, allowing those other industries that cannot compete with cheap imports to be demolished. It is a sophisticated type of industrial sabotage by the State. Rather than assist small, local industry, besieged by debt, hounded by rising prices (particularly for electricity) and soaring inflation, they are labelled "inefficient" and ceremoniously liquidated. The most likely industries to escape this fate are those that are export-orientated. These enjoy special tax concessions and have access to almost limitless credit.

The concept of 'restructuring' neatly complements Prime Minister Muldoon's new internationalism, and is a product of the proposals to create a new international economic order. One of the outstanding features of the N.I.E.O. is the transfer of technology, raw materials, primary products

and credit to the third world *from the West*. It is visibly beginning to happen in New Zealand. The organ specially created to provide the finance for this transfer, is known as the Common Fund. *New Zealand signed the articles of agreement for the Common Fund on June 27th in Geneva!*

The first industry to be labelled 'inefficient' was the old textile industry. Factories were closed down in several cities and country towns, and hundreds of employees lost their livelihoods. No sustained attempt was made to save the industry with further credits, or tax concessions.

The next industry to be sabotaged was the tobacco industry centred near Nelson. 360 bewildered tobacco farmers were told that they were being phased out, and that tobacco would be imported. They were "inefficient". The irony is that the tobacco growers were very efficient indeed. Most farmers had improved their crops genetically to a point where they needed only to plant half their former acreages. They had begun to diversify into other crops.

Diversification, however, is often discouraged. Mr. Muldoon, as early as 1977, assured third world sugar beet producers that he would actively discourage sugar beet growth so that it could be imported. This could be an energy crop.

With proposals for a new World Car now being floated, it is anticipated that car assembly plants could be closed throughout the country. The destruction of another local industry will mean the loss of livelihood for hundreds more employees. All this at a time when New Zealand's unemployment is the highest since the great depression!

Some industries, however, are being encouraged. Agreement has been reached to build a second huge aluminium smelter in the South Island. This is an energy-intensive industry, employing very few locals. While local manufacturers battle with high electricity costs the multinational aluminium smelter will enjoy a substantial power discount! Aluminium, of course, is to be exported.

While international markets become increasingly difficult to find for the abundant agricultural produce, New Zealand farmers are being encouraged to specialise in producing agricultural products. Self-sufficiency is not being considered, and small-scale diversification discouraged. This all makes New Zealand -- a potential paradise -- even more vulnerable to the mad-men who claim that, since big is best, and nothing can be done unless it is done on a massive scale, the only answer for survival is to create a world economy. And then a World Government, in which New Zealand could only be one small, vulnerable cog -- an agricultural quarry for other nations.

THE BREAKDOWN OF THE EMPLOYMENT SYSTEM by C. H. Douglas.

A remarkable address in 1923 foreshadowed subsequent disastrous events, including the Second World War and the continuous rise in prices. The employment system is breaking down at an accelerating rate because of improvements in technology. Douglas said, "the cry for employment is an artificial cry" Attempts to impose "full employment" in the face of technological improvements can only lead to greater convulsions. Price 85 cents.

TRADE TREACHERY

"The Kiss Of Betrayal in East-West Trade" is a hard-hitting up-to-the-minute exposure of how the U.S.A. and other Western nations have been exploited to ensure that the Soviet keeps advancing its military programme. Sensational but chilling material. One copy for \$1.24 posted. Six copies for \$4.00 posted.

"THE ZIONIST CONNECTION"

By Alfred Lilienthal

A limited supply of the most comprehensive and revealing book on the Middle East ever written, is at last available. The courageous American Jew says what Christians would find extremely difficult to say. Over 800 pages of carefully documented facts. Indexed. The famous "Glubb Pasha" -- Sir John Glubb, writes: "A prodigious performance. It covers the story of Zionism in Palestine from every angle. The amount of research is amazing, and authority is quoted for every statement. No viewpoint is overlooked. It should be read by every responsible citizen in the Western democracies,"

Price: \$30.00 posted.

"THE WORLD-WIDE OIL SCANDAL"

By Jeremy Lee.

A masterly exposure of the so-called energy crisis. All the relevant facts demonstrating that there is no prospect of oil supplies running out in the foreseeable future. An examination of the real purpose of the "energy crisis".

One copy for \$1.00 posted. Five copies for \$3.50 posted.

"WAKE UP OR PERISH"

By General Sir Walter Walker

This chilling book is compulsory reading at the present time. Until his retirement, General Sir Walter Walker was a front line Nato commander. Based upon a lecture given by General Walker, the book brings home its message with such clearly illustrated maps as "The West's jugular vein", "U.S. Military Inferiority", "The Rival Missiles", "Monitoring Moscow's ICBM's", "The Blitzkrieg war" and "Russian Geo-strategic thrusts".

General Walker reveals in his Foreword that he predicted the Afghanistan affair while in Pakistan at the request of the Zia Government. He leaves no doubt as a distinguished military strategist that the West is now living on borrowed time with hard-line anti-Soviet policies essential. General Walker joins the growing ranks of those demanding that the West apply economic sanctions against the Soviet Union.

We strongly recommend that this book be given the widest possible circulation at the present time. Price \$1.35 posted. Six copies for \$5 posted.