

# THE NEW TIMES

\$8 per annum post free.

Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne.

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

Vol. 47, No. 7

JULY 1983

Registered By Australia Post—Publication No. VBH 1001

## SOCIAL CREDIT AND THE JEWISH QUESTION

*By Eric D. Butler*

**The author of Social Credit, C.H. Douglas, constantly stressed that Social Credit was "practical Christianity", which means the application of the truth, which Christ revealed. It has been increasingly stated that Christianity has failed, but this generally refers to the failure of the Church to provide leadership and guidance on the great issues of the day. Where guidance is offered, it often reflects the Marxist view that only the State can solve man's problems. The Church is badly afflicted with the collectivist virus, and the origins of that virus can be traced back to the Pharisaism Christ challenged. But now we have the situation where the spiritual successors of the Pharisees have been successful in persuading large numbers of people, including professing Christians, that there is a "Judaeo-Christianity".**

From the beginning of the Social Credit revelation, which stressed that all systems, financial, economic, political and social, exist primarily to serve the individual, and which formulated a concrete policy to make this philosophy a reality, providing the individual with genuine freedom, Jewish influence everywhere was organised against Social Credit. The true story about the destruction of the Social Credit challenge to financial tyranny in Alberta, Canada, cannot be told without reference to the major role of Jewish influence.

As Douglas said, Jewish opposition to Social Credit was logical; it was opposition to what was realistically assessed as the policy of that very Christian philosophy which the Pharisees had so violently rejected. To become real, Christian philosophy must have a policy. Faith without works is death. But a Christian policy is impossible until Christians honestly face the Jewish Question. It was the distinguished Jewish writer of Sephardic background, Dr. Oscar Levy, who wrote in a famous letter published elsewhere in this issue, that "The question of the Jews and their influence on the world, past and present, cuts to the root of all things and should be discussed by every honest thinker". It is to the credit of a number of Jews that they have had the courage to discuss the question in the face of bitter vilification.

### THE MODERN PHARISEES

All leading Jewish authorities agree that modern Judaism is the spiritual descendant of Pharisaism. *The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia* says under "Pharisees":

"The Jewish religion as it is today traces its descent, without a break, through all the centuries, from the Pharisees . . . The Talmud is the largest and most important single piece of (their) literature . . . and the study of it essential for any real understanding of Pharisaism."

The distinguished American Jewish scholar, Rabbi Louis Finkelstein, Chancellor and Professor of Theology at the Jewish Theological Seminar of the United States, has set forward clearly the relationship between modern-day Judaism and the Pharisees in what has been described as the most authoritative writing on the subject:

"Pharisaism became Talmudism, Talmudism became Medieval Rabbinism; and Medieval Rabbinism became Modern Rabbinism, but throughout these changes of name, inevitable adaption of custom, and adjustment of Law, **the spirit of the Ancient Pharisee survives unaltered.**"

(Emphasis added).

In the Gospel of St. Matthew, Christ is recorded as beginning His denunciation of the Pharisees with the words, "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites" and concluding with a most devastating climax, "Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?"

In St. John we read what is perhaps an even stronger denunciation of the Pharisees: "Ye are of your father, the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh for his own: for he is a liar, and the father of it".

### BREATH TAKING SUBVERSION

It is breathtaking that Christian teaching and traditions can be subverted to the point where that which Christ denounced has become the "Judaeo-Christian heritage"! The present crisis for Christianity has only been possible because of the persistent Jewish campaign to subvert Christianity and the failure of Christians to grasp the full implications of Christ's message.

A manifestation of the campaign of subversion can be read in *Judaism and The Vatican*, a classic example of the understanding research of the French scholar, Count Leon de Poncins. This is a work, which should be read by all Christians, irrespective of their denominational affiliations, outlining the Jewish campaign to exploit Vatican Council II. In the face of many objections and with an obvious desire to escape the charge of "anti-Semitism", which has often been directed against the Church of Rome, those assembled at the Vatican Council agreed to a statement that there is "a great spiritual heritage common to Christians and Jews", and that "it is the wish of this sacred Council to foster and recommend a mutual knowledge and esteem". The official American publication of *The Documents of Vatican II* explains in a footnote that the word "mutual" "tactfully expresses the request of Cardinal

Ruffini, Archbishop of Palermo, that Christians should love Jews, and Jews should declare that they will not hate Christians and he asked that certain passages in the Talmud be corrected".

No genuine Christian should "hate" anyone. In the case of Jews Christians can only feel the deepest sympathy for people who are victims of Pharisaism and its collectivist policies, and who are constantly subjected to the frightening propaganda of the Zionist terror machine, which seeks to convince Jews that they are constantly threatened by another "holocaust". The Christian must seek to help Jews to free themselves from Pharisaism. But how can Christians do this if they themselves are victims of the "Judaean-Christian" hoax?

The philosophy of Judaism has been described by Douglas as that of the one-way street. This has been demonstrated since Vatican Council II when anti-Christian passages in the Talmud, such as the reference to Christ as the illegitimate son of a Roman soldier, have contrary to the hopes expressed at the Council, been retained. Any Christian who can bring himself to read the filth contained in the Talmud will find it impossible to reconcile this with the view that there is a "Judaean-Christian heritage".

Just as the swear term "anti-Semitism" is a relatively modern invention, so is the term "Judaean-Christian". The most careful study of Christian literature over the centuries will not reveal any references to the term "Judaean-Christian heritage". The early Christian Fathers certainly did not believe in such dangerous nonsense. The term has been coined by the propaganda men of the notorious Anti-Defamation League and similar organisations, primarily for Christians, not for Jews. Jewish spokesmen do not believe in the reality of any "Judaean-Christian heritage".

#### "JUDAEO-CHRISTIAN" ABSURDITY

Rabbi Iezar Berkowitz, Chairman of the department of Jewish Philosophy, Hebrew Theological College, writing in the authoritative religious journal, *Judaism*, winter, 1966, succinctly outlined the absurdity of a Christian-Jewish dialogue inside the framework of the "Judaean-Christian heritage":

"As to a dialogue in the purely theological sense, nothing could be more fruitless or pointless. Judaism is Judaism because it rejects Christianity, and Christianity is Christianity because it rejects Judaism. What is usually referred to as the Jewish-Christian tradition exists **only in Christian or secularist fantasy.**" (Emphasis added). The fantasy exists in Christian minds because it has been implanted there. Christian shepherds have failed to protect their flocks.

Which brings us back to the subject of Social Credit and the

#### "IS THE WORD ENOUGH?"

By Eric D. Butler

The latest, and perhaps the most thought provoking of Eric Butler's series of writings on "practical Christianity".

"If God's Kingdom is of the spirit, then he who would truly know God must accept personal responsibility for that Divine gift which has been entrusted to him, and seek to give substance to that spirit by deeds, not by debates concerning words. No great artist has ever appeared merely by reading books on art, or by studying the rules concerning art. Those who seek to march in the vanguard of a new Christian advance must demonstrate the depth of their faith by **WORKS** which make Truth a living reality."

Essential reading.

Price \$1.35 posted from all League addresses.

Jewish Question, one that Douglas said was directly related to the future of Civilisation. Christ said it is impossible to get figs from thistles. Policies are rooted in philosophies, and anti-Christian collectivist philosophies cannot produce Christian policies. The retreat from freedom and personal responsibility to societies dominated by bureaucratic legalism is a manifestation of a return to Pharisaism. Social Credit strategy and tactics are directed towards regenerating Christianity. The first essential is a break from all forms of Pharisaism. What is urgently required are for some twentieth century followers of Christ to follow in His footsteps and to throw down the challenge to those who are "of the synagogue of Satan. Those doing this will expect to be crucified by the smearers. But why should those who have faith in Christ fear to bear witness to the Truth? This is a question, which might be directed to the Christian clergy.

#### The Constitutional Issue

"The constitutional history of England is largely the history of the efforts made by autocrats to govern without Parliament, and of the checking of this tyrannical ambition by whatever estates of the Realm have been powerful enough to make an effective protest.

"Wise rulers (like Queen Elizabeth), however, absolute their theoretical sovereignty, have always in practice recognised the authority of Parliament and ruled by deferring to it; bad or foolish rulers (like King John or Charles 1, or James III have ignored or defied Parliament and been worsted.

"For sell what they would, or borrow where they might, the time always came when the Sovereign needed money, and was obliged to summon a Parliament in order to ask for it.

"Thus, in the last resort. Parliament has always been able to bring tyranny to heel by a resolute refusal to pass a money bill except on its own terms . . .

"It has been reserved for the Socialist Government to undertake the breaking of this decisive weapon in the hands of Parliament . . .

"I should give my vote to the Conservatives on the constitutional issue alone, even if there were no other grounds for preference. Never again do we want to hear a Minister of the Crown proclaim: 'We are the masters now.'

"The essence of democracy is that the Government should be the servants, not the masters, of the people; no Government which forgets this is fit to bear rule, because it has in it the makings of a tyranny."—Dorothy L. Sayers in *The Evening Standard*.

#### 'Science' and Bernard Shaw

And an old soldier, Mr. Charles McLoughlin, sends us this further passage from Shaw's pen:

"The science to which I pinned my faith is bankrupt. Its tales were more foolish than all the miracles of the priests.... What it spread was not enlightenment but a malignant disease. Its counsels, who should have established the millennium, have led directly to the suicide of Europe. I believed them once more wholeheartedly than any religious fanatic believed his superstitions; for in their name I helped to destroy the faith of the millions of worshippers in the temples of a thousand creeds. And now they look at me and witness the great tragedy of an atheist who has lost his faith. Oh, that I could but find it! I am ignorant and frightened! I have lost my nerve: I know only this, that I must find the way of life for myself, and for us all; otherwise we shall be irretrievably ruined."

—*The Tablet*, July 28, 1956.

## HISTORIC LETTER BY DISTINGUISHED JEWISH WRITER

By general consent, the late Dr. Oscar Levy, a Sephardic Jew, was one of the most distinguished Jewish writers of this century. His strong opposition to Political Zionism caused him to be smeared along with other prominent anti-Zionist Jews. One Australian victim of this type of smearing was Sir Isaac Isaacs, who insisted that he had one loyalty, that to Australia.

When the British writer Mr. G. Pitt-Rivers wrote a brochure, *The World Significance of the Russian Revolution*, in which he dealt with the predominantly Jewish influence in that revolution, he sent the manuscript to Dr. Levy before publishing. The following are extracts from Dr. Levy's reply, which are as significant today as when first made in July 1920.

It is appropriate to comment that prior to the Second World War, it was possible for men of goodwill, both Jew and Gentile, to have a rational discussion on the "Jewish Question". Today it is regarded as a crime even to raise the question.

Dr. Levy wrote:

"Dear Mr. Pitt-Rivers: When you first handed me your MS on *The World Significance of the Russian Revolution*, you expressed a doubt about the propriety of its title. After a perusal of your work, I can assure you, with the best of consciences, that your misgivings were entirely without foundation. No better title than *The World Significance of the Russian Revolution* could have been chosen, for no event in any age will finally have more significance for our world than this one. We are still too near to see clearly this Revolution, this portentous event, which was certainly one of the most intimate and therefore least obvious, aims of the world-conflagration, hidden as it was at first by the fire and smoke of national enthusiasms and patriotic antagonisms.

"It was certainly very plucky of you to try and throw some light upon an event which necessarily must still be enveloped in mist and mystery, and I was even somewhat anxious lest your audacity in treating such a dangerous subject would end in failure, or what is nearly the same, in ephemeral success. No age is so voracious of its printed offspring as ours. There was thus some reason to fear lest you had offered to this modern Kronos only another mouthful of his accustomed nourishment for his immediate consumption.

"You rightly recognise that there is an ideology behind it (the Russian Revolution), and you clearly diagnose it as an ancient ideology. There is nothing new under the sun; it is even nothing new that this sun rises in the East . . .

"For Bolshevism is a religion and a faith. How could these half-converted believers even dream to vanquish the Truthful and the Faithful of their own creed, these holy crusaders, who had gathered round the Red Standard of the prophet Karl Marx, and who fought under the daring guidance of these experienced officers of all latter-day revolutions — the Jews? . . .

"There is no race in the world more enigmatic, more fatal, and therefore more interesting than the Jews. Every writer, who, like yourself, is oppressed by the aspect of the present and embarrassed by his anxiety for the future, **must** try to elucidate the Jewish Question and its bearing upon our Age. For the question of the Jews and their influence on the world past and present, cuts to the root of all things, and should be discussed by every honest thinker, however bristling with difficulties it is, however complex the subject as well as the individuals of this Race may be.

"For the Jews, as you are aware, are a sensitive community, and thus very suspicious of any Gentile who tries to approach them with a critical mind. They are always inclined — and that on account of their terrible experiences — to denounce anyone who is not with them as against them, as tainted with 'medieval' prejudice, as intolerant Antagonist of their Faith and of their Race.

"Nor would I deny that there is some evidence, *some prima facie* evidence of this antagonistic attitude in your pamphlet. You point out, and with fine indignation, the great danger that springs from the prevalence of Jews in finance and industry, and from the preponderance of Jews in rebellion and revolution. You reveal, and with great fervour, the connection between the Collectivism of the immensely rich international Finance — the democracy of cash values, as you call it — and the international Collectivism of Karl Marx and Trotsky —

the Democracy of any by decoy cries . . . And all this evil and misery, the economic and political, you trace back to one source, to *one fons et origo malorum* — the Jews.

"Now other Jews may vilify and crucify you for these outspoken views of yours; I myself shall abstain from joining the chorus of condemnation! I shall try to understand your opinions and your feelings, and having once understood them . . . I can defend you from the unjust attacks of my often too impetuous Race. But first of all, I have to say this: There is scarcely an event in modern Europe that cannot be traced back to the Jews. Take the Great War that appears to have come to an end, ask yourself what were its causes and its reasons: you will find them in nationalism. You will at once answer that nationalism has nothing to do with the Jews, who as you have proved to us, are the inventors of the international idea. But no less than Bolshevik Ecstasy and Financial Tyranny can National Bigotry (if I may call it so) be finally followed back to a Jewish source . . .

"The great question, however, is whether the Jews are conscious or unconscious ones, but please do not think that I wish to exonerate them on that account . . . A conscious evildoer has my respect, for he knows at least what is good; an unconscious one — well he needs the charity of Christ — a charity which is not mine — to be forgiven for not knowing what he is doing. But there is in my firm conviction not the slightest doubt that these revolutionary Jews do not know

### ANNUAL DINNER AND SEMINAR

The 1983 National Weekend starts with the Annual New Times Dinner on Friday, September 30, followed by the National Seminar on Saturday, October 1, and the National Action Seminar on Sunday, October 2.

Readers should make every endeavour to participate in what is the highlight of the year. The National Secretariat of the League will, as usual, start their annual convention in the morning of Friday, September 30. The New Times Dinner, to be held as usual at The Victoria, Little Collins Street. The charge will be \$16 per person and no bookings will be accepted unless accompanied by the \$16. Guests should indicate if they want a fish or a vegetarian Dinner. Also if they have friends with whom they wish to be seated.

The organisers of the Dinner reserve the right to decline dinner applications.

The National Seminar will almost certainly concern itself with one of the major national issues confronting the nation, the constitutional battle.

The Action Seminar on the Sunday will be a feast of action reports and projects. Dinner will be provided at a nominal charge.

As usual, interstate and country readers desiring to avail themselves of private hospitality are requested to forward their request at the earliest opportunity.

All bookings and enquiries concerning the National Weekend should be directed to G.P.O. Box 1052J, Melbourne, 3001.

what they are doing; that they are more unconscious sinners than voluntary evildoers.

"I am glad this is not an original observation of mine, but that you yourself have a strong foreboding about the Jews being the victims of their own theories and principles. On page 39 of your pamphlet you write: 'It may be that the Jews have always been instrumental in bringing about the events that they most heartily disapprove of; that maybe is the curse of the Wandering Jew'. If I had not the honour, as well as the pleasure of knowing you personally, if I were not strongly aware of your passionate desire for light and your intense loathing of unfairness, this sentence, and this sentence alone, which tells the truth, will absolve you in my eyes from the odious charge of being a vulgar anti-Semite.

"No, you are not vulgar, you are a very enlightened critic of our Race. For there is an anti-Semitism, I hope and trust, which does the Jews more justice than any blind philo-Semitism, that does that merely sentimental 'Let-them-all-come Liberalism', which in itself is nothing but the Semitic Ideology over again. And thus you can be just to the Jews without being 'romantic' about them.

"You have noticed with alarm that the Jewish elements provide the driving forces for both Communism and capitalism for the material as well as the spiritual ruin of this world.

"But then you have at the same time the profound suspicion that the reason for all this extraordinary behaviour may be the intense Idealism of the Jew. In this you are perfectly right . . . From Moses to Marx, from Isaiah to Eisner, in practice and in theory, in idealism and in materialism, in philosophy and in politics, they are today what they have always been; passionately devoted to their aims and to their purposes, and ready, nay, eager, to shed their last drop of blood for the realisation of their visions.

"But these visions are all wrong', you will reply . . . 'Look where you have led the world to. Think, that they have now had a fair trial of 3,000 years' standing. How much longer are you going to recommend them to us and to inflict them upon us? And how do you propose to get us out of the morass into which you have launched us, if you do not change the path upon which you have led the world so disastrously astray?'

"To this question I have only one answer to give, and it is this: 'You are right'. This reproach of yours, which — I feel it for certain — is at the bottom of your anti-Semitism, is only too well justified, and upon this common ground I am quite willing to shake hands with you and defend you against any accusation of promoting Race Hatred: If you are an anti-Semite, I, the Semite, am an anti-Semite, too, and a much more fervent one than even you are . . . We (Jews) have erred, my friend, we have most grievously erred. And if there was truth in our error 3,000, 2,000, nay, 100 years ago, there is now nothing but falseness and madness, a madness that will produce an even greater misery and an even wider anarchy, I confess it to you, openly and sincerely, and with a sorrow, whose depth and pain an ancient Psalmist, and only he, could

### **PROTECT THE CONSTITUTION CAMPAIGN**

The Australian Federal Constitution is under a massive attack, designed to destroy the States and to prepare Australia to be fitted into the New International Economic Order. Defence in depth has been undertaken by the League of Rights, and all Australian readers are requested to participate by a selective distribution of the special issue of *The Intelligence Survey*, devoted exclusively to a comprehensive survey by Mr. Jeremy Lee. It is imperative that this special *Survey* be placed in the hands of as many responsible people as possible, preferably with a covering note.

Bulk prices are as follows: 6 copies \$3; 12 copies \$5; 50 copies \$15; 100 copies \$25. These prices include postage.

moan into this burning universe of ours . . . We who have posed as the saviours of the world, we who have even boasted of having given it 'the' Saviour, we are today nothing else but the world's seducers, its destroyers, its incendiaries, its executioners . . . We who have promised to lead you to a new Heaven, we have finally succeeded in landing you in a new Hell . . . There has been no progress, least of all moral progress . . . And it is just our morality, which has prohibited all real progress, and — what is worse — which even stands in the way of every future and natural reconstruction in this ruined world of ours . . . I look at this world, and I shudder at its ghastliness; I shudder all the more as I know the spiritual authors of all this ghastliness . . .

"But its authors themselves, unconscious in this as in all they are doing, know nothing yet of this startling revelation. While Europe is aflame, while its victims scream, while its dogs howl in the conflagration, and while its very smoke descends in darker and even darker shades upon our Continent, the Jews, or at least that part of them and by no means the most unworthy ones, endeavour to escape from the burning building, and wish to retire from Europe into Asia, from the sombre scene of our disaster into the sunny corner of their Palestine. Their eyes are closed to the miseries, their ears are deaf to the meanings, their heart is hardened to the anarchy of Europe; they only feel their own sorrows, they only bewail their own fate, they only sigh under their own burdens..."

### **Heredity**

One of the curious features of these curious times is the constant repetition of statements such as "all men are born equal," by which it is intended to convey the idea that race and heredity as mere superstitions—or "Fascism." This phantasm does not, of course, apply to animals—the buyer of the pedigree bull in Scotland, recently, for about £14,000 would not have agreed to take delivery of the same weight in beef-on-the-hoof from any of half a dozen dairy herds within a few miles of Perth, where the aristocrat was sold.

The only argument ever adducted in regard to human beings in this relation, which bears a superficial veneer of plausibility, is that marriage is purely haphazard, whereas cattle breeding is not. The premise, of course, is that all the subtle forces, which, more particularly up to the nineteenth century, influenced human selection, are recognised and understood. Only a generation bemused with Darwin on a postcard, neatly mixed with London School of Economics materialism, would have the assurance to believe that. —*The Social Creditor*, July 20, 1946

### **Modern Liberalism**

"The older liberalism believed . . . in a limited state . . . Modern liberalism has shifted to a belief in one or another degree of what may properly be called in a general sense, Statism . . .

"Undoubtedly liberals differ a great deal among themselves to the degree of their Statism. Some incline more toward Marx, some toward John Maynard Keynes . . . But all modern liberals agree that government has a positive duty to make sure that the citizens have jobs, food, clothing, housing, education, medical care, security against sickness, unemployment and old age; and that these should be ever more abundantly provided. In fact, a government's duty in these respects, if sufficient resources are at its disposition, is not only to its own citizens, but to all humanity. Contemporary American liberals are probably unanimous, for example, in accepting an obligation — to be implemented at least in part through government — to help feed and succour the hungry of the underdeveloped regions, and to aid them in improving their material condition."

—James Burnham in *Suicide of the West* (1964)

# CALVINISM AND THE WORK ETHIC

By Eric D. Butler

I have received a long letter from a Canadian reader criticising my reference to Calvin in my article, "Dividends or Slavery?", published in the April issue of *The New Times*. Mr. Freer of Peterborough, Ontario, challenges me to apologise for an alleged misrepresentation of Calvin, and to publish a quotation from Calvin — although he says, "I don't think you will". With great respect to my correspondent, the quotation has little relevance to the main point I was making. However, the matter is sufficiently important to devote a limited amount of space to Mr. Freer's complaint and the issues he raises.

The major point of my correspondent's criticism is that I wrote, "John Calvin invented the work ethic and said that work was of God and that all people should do is work". Mr. Freer is, of course, wrong in saying that I said that Calvin "invented" the work ethic. The most famous quotation in Christian literature concerning the work ethic is that of St. Paul, who said that unless men work they shall not eat. If St. Paul meant what many have claimed over the centuries, that no one is entitled to eat unless he works, he was of course wrong when he said it. Such a statement today is contradicted by computerised technology.

However, irrespective of what St. Paul meant, a much greater authority said something different: "Consider the lilies of the field . . . they neither toil nor spin; yet I tell you, even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these". Christ said that He had come in order that people might have a life more abundant. He fed the multitude without insisting that they engage in any economic activity. It was the **spirit** of Christ's teachings, which was reflected in Mediaeval Europe, not only in economic matters but in the culture of the period.

The doctrine that hard work is good for people goes deep back into history, even some of Plato's contemporaries believed in it. Long before the Reformation, there were some Christians who preached the work ethic. They were the forerunners of those who believe that the nature of man is so basically evil that he must be saved from himself. Thus is work justified. No better description of the traditional approach to economic activities, leisure and the virtue of contemplation will be found than in the writing of the great Christian philosopher, St. Thomas Aquinas.

My reference to Mediaeval Europe and philosophers like Aquinas will no doubt help to confirm Mr. Freer's charge of "sectarian bias" with a sympathy "to Roman Catholicism". As a Christian my primary concern is with seeking the truth, not with sectarianism. The history of Christianity has some very black pages, but these must be seen against the bigger picture of the type of Civilisation, which evolved over the centuries under the influence of Christianity.

## CHRISTIAN GROUNDWORK BEFORE REFORMATION

While no objective observer, irrespective of which part of the Christian Church to which he belongs, would deny that the many deep abuses which had developed inside the Church played a major part in what has come to be known as the reformation, neither would he deny that, taking England in particular, all the groundwork of a unique constitutional development and system of common law had been developed long before the Reformation. One may say he does not like his Mother, but it is not very logical to claim that in essence she did not exist. With all its shortcomings, and its abuses, these generally taking place when there was an attempt to combine both Authority and Power, the Mediaeval Church was a major influence in shaping the basic traditions of Western Civilisation.

The tragedy of the Reformation was not only that the relative unity of Christendom was shattered, but, irrespective of what some of the reformers intended, the gates were opened to developments which tended "to throw the baby out with the bathwater". It also paved the way for the open emergence of Judaic influence, generally held in check by the Church for the first fifteen centuries of Christendom. A number of eminent Jewish authorities can be quoted giving the Jewish view of

how the Reformation provided them with the opportunity of encouraging the erosion of traditional Christianity. Pope John had no intention of letting loose a revolution inside the Church of Rome when he called Vatican Council 11. But the Council provided the liberals and their associates with the opportunity to combine and, although a minority, to impose developments which have badly shattered the Church.

Martin Luther's attack on the Church abuses of his times was justified, but he obviously did not foresee the far-reaching implications of his view that " . . . a Prince can be a Christian, but it is not as a Christian that he ought to govern. As a ruler, he is not called a Christian, but a Prince. The man is Christian, but his function does not concern his religion." This view was used to justify the doctrine that men must keep their business and religious lives apart. It eventually developed to the stage where the role of the Church was diminished to the point where it was openly proclaimed that the Church had no authority to pronounce on economics and politics.

The fact that the pre-Reformation Church had weakened its own authority by its abuses does not invalidate the truth that the Church should be the Authority on the laws of God. The great Archbishop Langton and his colleagues had no difficulty in grasping this truth when they confronted King John. Only a bigot would dispute that Pope John Paul has showed great moral courage in confronting the Polish Caesar, and has correctly spoken with Authority on some basic issues.

Irrespective of what Calvin may have intended, his doctrine of predestination was eagerly seized upon to justify the development of unlimited and unbridled competition. His attempted justification of usury was also acceptable in the new spirit of commercialism.

My correspondent is correct when he says that Calvinism did not always express itself in the destructive and vulgar activities of a Cromwell. But even in England, where the temperament of the English modified the spirit of Puritanism, it still produced, as Douglas observed, opposition to cruel sports like bear fighting, not because of the suffering of the animals, but because this gave enjoyment. This is not to say that many who accepted the Puritanism associated with Calvinism were, as individuals, possessed of many fine qualities, including honesty. A critical comment on the influence of Judaism does not mean that many Jews lead what might be described as exemplary lives in a general sense. What I am concerned about is the impact of ideas on economic and political developments.

## A BREAK FROM THOMISTIC PHILOSOPHY

Werner Sombart, writing in his outstanding classic, *The Jews in Economic Life*, made the following comment:

"When we examine matters more closely . . . we shall immediately see that the struggle between Jewish and Christian merchants is a struggle between two views of the world, or at least, between two economic mentalities imbued with principles that are different or even opposed. In order to understand this statement we must represent to ourselves the spirit that inspired that economic life into which, since the sixteenth century, Jewish elements have forced their way in ever increasing volume. To this spirit they openly showed themselves so rudely opposed that they were everywhere felt to be interfering with the livelihood and subsistence of the people. During the whole time which I have designated as the period of incipient capitalism . . . the same fundamental outlook on economic relations prevailed as had been accepted since the Middle Ages . . . The unrestrained, unbridled

striving after gain was considered by most people during this whole period as unlawful, as unchristian, because the spirit of the old Thomistic economic philosophy as yet swayed men's minds, at least officially."

Sombart quotes the Jewish writer, H. Heine, as saying that the Scots Calvinists had a "Jerusalem-Pharisaic ring about their cant...." It was G.K. Chesterton who made the comment that the Puritans "created the Scottish Sabbath, compared with which the Jewish Sabbath is jolly". Christ, of course, insisted that the Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath.

It was Arthur Young, the famous Puritan divine, who summarised the Puritan views towards economics when he said, "If you talk of interests of trade and manufactures, everyone but an idiot knows that the lower classes must be kept poor, or they will never be industrious" Young appealed to religion for acceptance of this point of view — "That truly excellent religion which exhorts to content, and to submission to the higher power".

### CHANGED ATTITUDES

The distinguished author of *The Economic Effects of The Reformation*, Professor G. O'Brien, wrote: "When all is said and done, Calvinism remains the real nursing father of the

civic industrial capitalism of the middle classes . . . Since the aggressively active ethic inspired by the doctrine of predestination urges the elect to the full development of his God-given powers, and offers this as a sign by which he may assure himself of his election, work becomes rational and systematic. In breaking down the motive of ease and enjoyment asceticism lays the foundation of the tyranny of work over men . . . production for production's sake is declared to be a commandment of religion".

Just as one finds that modern supporters of Calvinism now treat the Sabbath much differently from their forbears, with laughing, whistling and other signs of light heartedness no longer being severely frowned upon, so is there a much more realistic attitude towards economic and associated activities. I take it from my correspondent's letter that he accepts that technology is in the main a gift from God and that, under proper conditions, the children of God are entitled to share in that gift. Unless Christians face this question honestly, they can make no contribution towards saving what is left of Christian Civilisation from collapsing into some type of Marxism. For my own part, I am convinced that Christianity has no future without a policy, which makes it real. And that policy is Social Credit. And, finally, I do not believe that I can be "saved" by faith alone. I accept the realistic implementation of the Doctrine of Incarnation. Faith without works is death.

---

## WHO LIFTED HITLER INTO THE SADDLE?

**Commenting on the recent faked Hitler diaries, the May 13 issue of the well-respected American publication, *Don Bell Reports*, points out that there are aspects of Hitler's career, which cannot be treated as a hoax. Those aspects concern how Hitler was financed to power. *Don Bell Reports* states "we recently were handed an article first published in 1948, by Werner Zimmerman, quoting the following from the article:**

In 1933 a pamphlet of 99 pages was published by the reputed publishing house of Van Holkema & Warendorfs Uitg. Mij. N.V. in Amsterdam, entitled — *The Money Sources of National Socialism. Three Talks with Hitler. By Sidney Warburg. Retold by J.G. Schoup.* Upon its publication the booklet was immediately bought up by agents of High Finance and the Nazi Government, and destroyed; and later replaced by a falsification. However, one copy of the original edition arrived safely in Switzerland. I held it in my own hands, and Dr. Rene Sonderegger, editor, free-economics leader and Swiss Parliamentarian, published parts of it in *Financial World History*, Resverlag, Zurich, 1936. A complete reprint is in preparation\*. Here we only want to refer to some outstanding facts, as stated in this booklet.

Felix Warburg was the famous organiser of the Hamburg-America Line. His brother, Paul M. Warburg, was a partner in the international banking house of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., New York. Sidney Warburg is his son. In 1929 the Wall Street firm, Guaranty Trust, asked young Sidney Warburg to take care of the American interests in Germany, because he knew the country and its language. American credits, amounting to 58 billion dollars were involved in Central Europe alone. President Carter of the Guaranty Trust had arranged a meeting with the directors of the Federal Reserve Board in conjunction with young Rockefeller of the Standard Oil Co., McBlean of the Royal Dutch Co., and five other independent bankers.

What were their aims? Warburg was to find and support a man in Germany who would be able to carry out a national revolution. The Peace Treaty of Versailles had given France tremendous advantages by means of the reparations, which permitted the Bank of France to embark on a financial policy directed against the English Pound and the American Dollar. This had to be stopped, the treaty amended, France to be intimidated and her financial superiority removed . . . The speculators of Wall Street wanted to exploit Germany by themselves. Who could help them?

Warburg went to Munich and met with Hitler and his

confidant, von Heydt. Result; Hitler consented to Warburg's proposal and received via the banking house of Mendelsohn & Co., Amsterdam, a first installment of 10 million dollars in order to push his political movement forward. This was in 1929. In 1931 the trend of the rate of exchange for the dollar and pound became dangerous. France received such big deliveries of goods from Germany that she was unable to pay either for the interest or on the principal of her debts. Hitler demanded further financial support: 500 million marks for a "real revolution" or 200 million marks if a legal rise to power was feasible. Warburg transacted a further 15 million dollars to Hitler, 5 million each by the banks of Mendelsohn & Co., Amsterdam; the Rotterdam Bank Consortium, Rotterdam; and the Banca Commerciale Italia, Rome. Warburg went to Rome with von Heydt, Gregor Strasser, and Goering and then returned from Genoa to New York on the "Savoya" after having fulfilled his mission. On January 30, 1933 Hitler became Chancellor of the Reich. In February, Warburg had his last talk with Hitler in the Fasanstrasse 28. In the dawn of the morning, in the doorway, Warburg once more reminded Hitler of his job: Fight against France. Then he departed for Holland.

The Fuehrer was under heavy pressure. The burning of the Reichstag building offers the sombre background. Goebbels describes this in his book *Von Kalsershop zur Reichshanziel*. The simple fact was: The party held the office, but not the power. If they wanted to win the March elections they would again need money, and plenty of it. Then, all of a sudden, a ray of hope appears, as Goebbels reports. A big amount of money is assured. Now Hitler moves, full of hope, into his last struggle for power and confidently exclaims: "We are going to be victorious!"

Why has this financial support of the Hitler party never been investigated, not even at the Nuremberg War Crimes Court? There it was strictly taboo to mention the Versailles Treaty and anything connected with it. Warburg's pamphlet explains this. Also explains this last big amount, which came from New York. According to H. Sonderegger, the total costs

of the lifting of the Nazis into power, in order to revive the bankrupt armaments industries and establish market monopolies, amounted to 200 million Reichmarks, namely: Wall Street paid through Warburg 126 million; Sir Henry Deterding about 50 million; von Papen received 14 million as agent to the banker Schroeder, Dusseldorf; Minister of Economics Schmitt of the Stuttgart "Alliance" about 10 million. This latter (Schmitt) was permitted to be a minister for six months, only to be replaced by Schacht, who had always been a most loyal servant of the money lords.

In the spring of 1933 the young, race conscious Jew, Sidney Warburg, became disillusioned by the Jew persecutions and the burning of the Reichstag building. He confided his disappointment to a friend and handed him his manuscript for publication. What happened to this publication was stated at the beginning of this article. But the money was given, the general purpose achieved, the Nazis were in power and the avalanche began to roll: rearmament, auto-highways, gigantic business for Shell and Standard Oil, for steel, copper, rubber. A general race for armaments began. Profits from loans, profits from armaments and related industries were made. Then came war with its immeasurable destruction of real capital wealth, a destruction that created scarcity of wealth in

Europe for decades to come and insured the interest yield from new constructions. Thoughtless, with a satanic grin, they (the international bankers and multinational executives) delivered everything, which yielded profit to the arming countries. While the Japanese were throwing their bombs on Pearl Harbour and annihilating most of the Pacific fleet, ships were underway from Australia and America to Japan, loaded with oil and gas, steel, rubber and so forth . . . The war-guilt investigators were silent about this also.

John Pierpont Morgan, Jr., the "uncrowned king" of the world, was in alliance with Hitler. The new German budget was ordered to be such as to maintain the mark stable until Morgan had sold his German papers. Hjalmar Schacht was his support.

High finance goes after profit. Death or life, destruction or construction, everything is viewed from the point of profit. It is international. It knows neither nation nor country. Ruthlessly the nations are incited to fight each other. The vanquished have always to carry the blame. Hatred — nationally coloured — is bred and cultivated to hide the wirepullers. It blinds the eyes of almost all people. But all the while, unperturbed and ruthless, rule the powers of money, of speculation, safely gathering in their loot.

---

## ISRAELI REALITIES

**Increasing numbers of people, including Jews, are starting to adopt a much more critical attitude towards Zionist Israel and its expansionist policies. Members of a Canadian parliamentary delegation who recently returned from Israel and were all agreed that they were "surprised and appalled by the Israeli treatment of Palestinians".**

**Syndicated American columnist, Georgie Anne Geyer, writing in *The Patriot*, Harrisburg, Pa., on February 10, made comments of the type, which can be increasingly heard throughout the USA:**

What exactly is going on in these extraordinary exchanges between Israeli troops and American Marines in Beirut? How is it possible that an "ally", who has been spared hundreds of deaths by our very presence, should treat the symbol of America in this manner?

It is easy to get mad. It makes more sense to go to the dictionary and read the definition of "quagmire". It reads: marshy ground that gives way under the foot, bog, a difficult situation.

Lebanon is a quagmire — for the Israelis and for us. To review the situation: There have been, as of this moment, six potentially fatal encounters between Israelis and Americans, all most definitely initiated by the Israelis. The United States probably mistakenly played them down until the last incident, when an American Marine, Capt. Charles Johnson, was forced to jump aboard an Israeli tank to stop it.

The Israeli establishment has responded with a disdain for Americans that borders on hatred. Not only did the military spokesman say Johnson was "lucky the Israeli tank commander had not dealt harshly with him", and not only did the commander say the American action "made me laugh", but the Israeli government then tried to paint Johnson as a "drunk".

It would be easy to question whether these are the words and acts of an ally or those of an adversary, but it makes more sense to see what strands can be pulled together to save an increasingly bitter relationship.

In Israel itself, several areas are developing that could lead to change. Zeev Schiff, the brilliant military correspondent for *Haaretz*, the major newspaper in Israel, wrote in his column this week that Israel should withdraw from Beirut to the 45-kilometre line within Lebanon that Israel originally claimed was necessary for security.

When I spoke on the phone with his superior analyst in Tel Aviv, he told me that this idea is definitely growing among Israeli experts.

"The confrontation with the Marines shows that we are all in a quagmire", Schiff said. "The Palestinians have found it fertile soil for intrigue and for provoking both sides".

There is a second marker for change: For the first time Sunday, in the bitter Phalangist-Druse fighting, the Israeli-supported and armed Phalangists blamed the Israelis for their losing the battle.

Still a third factor: In Israel itself, it is expected that the report of the Commission of Inquiry investigating the Sabra and Shatila massacres could jeopardise the imperial illusions of Prime Minister Menachem Begin and the increasingly mad actions of Defence Minister Ariel Sharon.

If anyone still doubts their intentions, he has only to listen to the words of Begin quoted by fundamentalist evangelist Jerry Falwell. Begin told him, Falwell reported last weekend, that the future Israeli empire would stretch from Egypt to Turkey — and the recent well-publicised Israeli military directive to harass and beat up Arabs on the West Bank is another indicator of the plans for that hallucinatory "empire".

But the suicidal nature of the Begin-Sharon axis can be seen most clearly in the harassing of the American Marines — and the deliberate and systematic insulting of America and the American presidency over the last month.

---

## The British Order of Democratic Life

"Thus a British order of democratic life is not one in which the individual citizen sits back and lets his elected representative run the machine of state with so much skill as we expect to find among efficient mechanics. It is an order of life in which the individual is fully responsible as every other for preserving our free institutions. For only when each individual plays his part in maintaining them throughout the entire community can we have any assurance that our elected representatives will preserve the true spirit, meaning and purpose of our free institutions. Freedom is not something delivered to us in a neat little package by an all-benevolent government."

—John Farthing in *Freedom Wears A Crown*

For this is behaviour that would be acceptable from no enemy, much less an ally. By directly challenging and then deliberately insulting American fighting forces, the Israeli establishment ought to know that it is arousing the most atavistic reaction from America. Whether it likes it or not, that is human nature.

The United States and Israel have shared a precious relationship through the years, built upon shared values and upon trust with a great people.

But many courageous Jews, within Israel and without, have been warning that Israel's present hubristic policies and actions are leading to tragedy. Edgar M. Bronfman, president of the World Jewish Congress, courageously stepped forward recently, saying, "When our children ask us about policies that seem inconsistent with the Jewish ideal they have been taught, can we answer that we must not question, only obey? I think they expect much more from us".

It is those who refuse to recognise these difficulties, and who uncritically accept every act of the Begin and Sharon government, who will finally turn the present quagmire into devouring quicksand.

---

## "WRITING OFF DEBT"

"All the world's a debt; and all the states and nations merely debtors—" thus might we parody the immortal Bard in 1983. The sheer size of the global mortgage means that we either have a total breakdown, or else we start writing off debts; to which the more knowledgeable will say "About time too!" But in fact a judicious writing-off of debt does not necessarily mean a release from bondage. It can well mean the opposite.

Since the war the United States has provided \$220 billion in Foreign Aid, \$130.2 billion in the form of economic assistance and the rest for military aid. Australia's Foreign Aid programme has topped \$1 billion in 1982-83 for the first time. Other developed nations have comparable aid programmes, all of which is justified under a fairly intense public relations barrage as a means of helping underprivileged people to the basic essentials of life.

Whether this is so is questionable. In Africa, for example, 31 nations, which are recipients of aid from Developed countries, spend more on military forces than on the health of its people, and fourteen of those also spend more on military activities than on education.

In Asia, 32 nations spend more on military programmes than on health, and five of these spend more on military programmes than on education. The figure for Latin America show 25 nations spending more on military expenditure than on health, and 15 of these spend more militarily than on education. There are a considerable number of military forces round the world, which are paid for out of aid from the West.

### BORROWED MONEY

But the money given by the developed countries to those less fortunate is "borrowed, or debt" money. Somewhere or other all money has a "please repay with interest" tag on it. A father who borrows money from his banker to indulge a son who squanders it on a sleek but lethal "set of wheels" is in much the same situation as the developed nations of the West, who have really indulged no-one but the bankers.

Despite this aid, the Third World now staggers under a debt of \$550 billion, and it is generally acknowledged that vast new money creation must be carried out to prevent a collapse: "... Those advocating renewed lending have become more vociferous . . . Former U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger told a bankers' convention in Atlanta last October "new loans must be in excess of the borrowing countries'

existing interest payments to allow these countries to keep growing" . . . (*TIME*, "The Debt-Bomb Threat", Jan 10, 1983).

However, a recent banking survey by the *Far Eastern Economic Review* estimates that up to \$200 billion in Third World Debt is probably irrecoverable.

Which raises an interesting question. If a nation — say Mexico, the Argentine or Brazil, for instance — has some or all of its debts written off, is its position better or worse? Most would say better — unless there are conditions laid down, or penalties imposed; perhaps a new government will take over, or the existing one forced to accept conditions which prevent it governing effectively. Short of military occupation, it's rather hard to see how permanent penalties could be maintained.

### GLOBAL PENALTIES

The game at the moment, from the international money-lenders' point of view, is a tricky one; how to maintain the goad of crisis without triggering collapse until the legions of the bankrupt vest their sovereignty in the hands of a global power monopoly in return for some relief — either real or imagined. It may be necessary to write off the odd debt — so long as it isn't made too obvious — as part of a "one-step-back, two-steps-forward" approach.

The Western preoccupation with internal deficits may yet prove an Achilles Heel for the international brigade. Ronald Reagan, Pierre Trudeau, Margaret Thatcher and the recently arrived Bob Hawke are all staring down the barrel of "The Deficit". It is, apparently a golden calf before which national recovery must be sacrificed. Within 48 hours of gaining office, Australia's Bob Hawke has discovered that the Deficit is large enough to forestall the implementation of his election promises. Taxes must, apparently, go up rather than down. The recovery of industry and the hopes of reducing the unemployment queue must be postponed.

The idea of "writing off the Deficit is apparently a heresy too gross to be mentioned. Which raises interesting questions. The Deficit is not "borrowed" in the normal sense. It is a creation of money by Australia's Reverse Bank, which is simply a credit in a column of the Consolidated Revenue Account, balanced by a "debit" in the bank's ledger. If the debit was simply wiped off, nobody would be one cent the poorer. Taxes could come down, and recovery started. The arguments against doing so are nothing but extracts from an idolatrous banking catechism having no relationship to reality. "It can't — it shouldn't — IT MUST NOT BE DONE!" they say, "However beneficial the results might be!"

### Inflation

Now there is one unchanging feature of every social, economic, and military conflict of the last two thousand years at least. Governmental systems may change, kings may be replaced by presidents or dictators, and feudal customs may give way to oligarchies or Soviets. Through them all runs the dual thread of money and prices.

Yet this purely artificial, and fundamentally helpful system has been the target of attack throughout the ages. Not once, but many times, men have risen to denounce the evils which they have traced to its perverted use. And all these men, as far as I am aware, have come to the same conclusion. The evils which have arisen from a defective use of the credit system are without exception due to the use of it as an instrument of policy and not as an accounting and distributive system. This is the financial embodiment of the basic cleavage between Socialism and Social Credit, between Judaism and Christianity. —C. H. Douglas. *Programme for the Third World War*, p. 54.