

THE NEW TIMES

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

Vol. 47, No. 9

SEPTEMBER 1983

Registered By Australia Post—Publication No. VBH 1001

WHERE IS THAT "RECOVERY"?

We have before us a collection of press cuttings going back over many months, all reporting the statements of "eminent economic experts", business leaders and others, concerning the long-awaited economic recovery. Australia's weekly magazine, *The Bulletin*, features the Hawke Government as hanging on to the coat tails of the American recovery. Economic Editor for *The Australian*, writing in *The Weekend Australian* of 23-24 July, boldly proclaimed, "Australia's economic recovery should begin within months because the U.S. economy is now growing even more strongly than the most optimistic predictions of just a few weeks ago".

But what is the nature of the "recovery" allegedly taking place? And, equally important, what are the problems from which we are recovering?

In order to answer these and associated questions, it is essential to go back to basics. Developments in the United States graphically demonstrate the close relationship between financial policy and production. Following the Federal Reserve Bank's decision to permit the American banking system to increase the rate of credit creation, the American production system has increased its output. A graph shows that since last November the overall industrial production index has consistently improved every month. The increase in the rate of credit creation started last year and parallels the increased industrial production.

BASICS

If increased industrial production signals a recovery from recession, does this mean that the basic cause of the depression has been inadequate production? Were there problems with the production system? These questions pose another basic question: What is the true purpose of the production system? C.H. Douglas said that a problem correctly stated is a problem half solved. If the purpose of the production system is to provide "full employment", an objective to which politicians and economists everywhere still at least pay lip service, then the obvious solution is to start abolishing technology and all labour-saving equipment. Earth moving machines should be abolished in favour of picks and shovels!

However, if it is accepted that the true purpose of production is consumption, and that what individuals genuinely desire should be produced in the shortest possible time, well might it be asked, "have there been any shortages of production during the recession?" The truth is that during the recession, with tens of millions not involved in the production system, these termed unemployed, there has overall been adequate production. There have been no physical problems from which to "recover".

The basic requirement of life is an adequate food supply, clothing and shelter. Even during the worst general Australian drought in recorded history, the nation's primary producers provided such an abundance of every type of food that there were still huge surpluses for exporting. The Common Market countries have produced huge gluts of food and, like other countries, have been trying to dispose of the gluts by providing subsidised food to the Soviet and other Communist-dominated nations. The Soviet's inefficient food production is the result of collectivised farming and the vast diversion of resources to the maintenance of the massive military machine.

NO PRODUCTION PROBLEMS

Recent years have demonstrated beyond all argument, except perhaps amongst the completely brainwashed, that the

non-Communist nations have no real production problems. Only in a complete totalitarian society like the Soviet Union is it possible to implement a policy of "full employment", with large numbers in concentration camp activities and the equivalent of digging holes to fill them up again. Governments of all types, irrespective of their labels, have had to resort to massive deficit budgets to help obtain sufficient money in order to finance even the relatively small unemployment and other pension schemes. Without such schemes there would be a massive political revolt in Western countries like Australia. One of the major explanations for the recession has been the urgent necessity to curb monetary inflation. This requires a restriction in the rate of new credit creation. This policy bankrupts business organisations and escalates the number of unemployed. Apart from the economic sabotage, the social and human damage is horrendous. Large numbers, particularly amongst the young, may never recover from their ordeals and be recruited for anti-social or revolutionary purposes. A restrictive credit policy certainly forces down the inflation rate, much of this the result of producers and retailers heavily discounting in an attempt to survive. Legitimate profits are limited. But there is a limit to the deflationary programme; if taken too far there must be a complete economic collapse and political upheaval. When the commentators talk of economies having "bottomed", they mean that there is to be an increase in the rate of credit creation.

A MATHEMATICAL CERTAINTY

As we have demonstrated over many years, with events confirming our assessments, it is mathematically certain that an increase in the rate of credit creation will produce an

DINNER MESSAGES

A feature of the Annual "New Times" Dinner is the number of people from around the world who attend in spirit by sending appropriate messages. Once again they are invited to attend in this manner. Guest of honour this year is that outstanding Australian leader, Mr. Bruce Ruxton, O.B.E., President of the Victorian Branch of the Returned Servicemens' League. The Dinner will be on Friday, 30th September, as usual at The Victoria, Little Collins Street, Melbourne.

Those wishing to attend in person must send \$16 with the booking. Messages to be sent to The Chairman, "New Times" Dinner, G.P.O. Box 1052J, Melbourne, 3001.

increase in the inflation rate. Already there are warnings in the U.S.A. that the economic "recovery" is starting to increase the inflation rate. Americans can only obtain access to consumer goods by increasing their financial indebtedness. Increased food production, primarily grain, can only increase the necessity, under present financial rules, for America to export more. But to whom? Mainly to the very Communist nations which are the reason for the massive American defence programme!

So far from the current American "recovery" stimulating the economies of other countries, it can only intensify the growing friction resulting from international trade war. If other nations follow the American lead and increase production by a change in credit policies, the friction will mount as all attempts to solve internal problems by attempting to increase exports. There can be no recovery from the disease destroying Civilisation while present economic and financial policies are pursued. Grandiose programmes for "rationalising" the economies of the world on a global scale, under the title of the New International Economic Order, are doomed to failure. Every attempt to centralise power still further merely intensifies the disease. As this becomes more obvious to a growing number of people, there is a willingness and a desire

to consider a genuine cure for the disease.

A DECISIVE PERIOD

We have over many years stressed that in the earlier stages of a conspiracy it is relatively easy for the conspirators to mask their intentions, particularly when large numbers are hypnotised about finance, a type of black magic, and economics, but that as the conspiracy moves towards its final objective, it is impossible to disguise what is proposed. This is the critical stage when a successful revolt is possible. We believe we are now entering that stage, with many people realising for the first time that there is a conspiracy, of which the United Nations is a central part. We pointed out many years back that it was too late then to halt the momentum of the sickness being imposed upon Civilisation, that it would have to run its course. But we also expressed confidence that the sickness did not need to be fatal if sufficient people prepared themselves to act as antibodies, ready to foster regeneration when the sickness reached its climax. This is the situation now. We have moved into one of the most decisive periods in history with those who share the knowledge and understanding provided by the Social Credit revelation, holding the key to the future.

THE MOST IMPORTANT CHALLENGE OF TECHNOLOGY

The following address by His Royal Highness, the Duke of Edinburgh, in opening the Fellowship of Engineering Symposium on 26th April, received relatively little publicity. It may be that the Duke put a point of view that was unpalatable to the controllers of the media. We feel that the address is of more than passing interest:

I have to say that every time I come into this hall my heart sinks. The first time I came in here — I have just worked it out — was 45 years ago to sit the Civil Service examination to get into the Navy. And I sat somewhere over there, and I have never quite got over it.

As you have heard, I have been a great supporter of the Fellowship of Engineering ever since it came into being in 1976. I attended the Privy Council meeting the other day at which the Charter was approved, and that gave me a great deal of pleasure. As a matter of fact, I was promoting the idea of such a body at the time that I was President of the late — I am not so sure how lamented — Council of Engineering Institutions, back in the late 1960s, so I am delighted to find that the Fellowship is in a sufficiently flourishing state to be made responsible for organising this important Symposium, sponsored so generously by the Honda Foundation.

However, I am sure you will have noticed that a Symposium on Technology is being organised by a bunch of engineers, which makes me wonder what is the difference between engineering and technology. Or is it that some people prefer to use the word technology because they still think of engineers as grubby-handed men in blue overalls carrying a spanner and an oilcan. In that case I can say that I am very glad to see that the Fellows have put on their Sunday best for this occasion! Mind you, the academic ones are always in these clothes — I think.

Anyway, I am sure that the papers to be read will provide a great deal of interesting material, the speakers are highly distinguished in their fields, and I expect their contributions to stimulate a lively debate.

The title of the Symposium says 'Social and Cultural Challenge of Modern Technology'. This could be taken to mean that modern technology poses a threat to society and culture, and by implication that technologists need to be more responsible and considerate. Equally I suppose it could mean that the challenge is to society to make the best use of modern technology in the long-term interest of human civilisation. However, I notice that most of the speakers are a bit wary of the word challenge. Instead they appear to prefer such words as effects and impact of technology on society and culture. One title refers to regulation and control while others speak of potential and future possibilities. And of all the titles, the only one that refers to regulation and control implies that technology poses some sort of threat to modern society.

Of course there can be no doubt that technologies do change

social and cultural patterns, but then, for example, so do crimes or wealth. However, it is worth bearing in mind that technologies are not developed with the express purpose of changing society or culture. The primary object is to meet perceived practical human needs. Vastly improved standards of transport and communications, public health and hygiene, housing and household gadgets inevitably change ways of life. All these can raise material standards of living, and they certainly make it possible to increase the quantity of human inhabitants of this earth, but there is no evidence to suggest that they improve the quality of human behaviour or stimulate greater artistic talents.

Quite apart from the social and cultural consequences of modern technology, there is another area that is very significantly affected by technologies and which in turn influences the living population of the world. Modern technologies have created a growing demand for the earth's resources, and they have also developed the means to acquire those resources at an ever-increasing rate. And in the long run, that is if there is to be a long run, commonsense suggests that demand will have to be balanced against the sustainable availability of renewable resources. In that sense the success of modern technology poses a very important challenge to human ingenuity and an even greater challenge to the present generation for the future of all life on earth.

I do not think that any discussion about modern technology can ignore what is certainly the most important challenge of modern technology to mankind; namely the development of the generation of power from nuclear reactors and of nuclear weapons. Both these products of technology pose baffling dilemmas. Evidence suggests that conventional power stations, together with some of the industries they supply, plus vehicle emissions, are mainly responsible for the acid rain which is destroying forests and killing life in rivers and lakes throughout the Northern latitudes. Nuclear power stations may pose other problems, but they do not produce acid rain. Then again, all the evidence points to the successful deterrent effect of nuclear weapons. Although they do not stop small wars or the invasion of stronger powers by their weaker neighbours, they have prevented escalation, and they certainly appear to have discouraged armed conflict in Europe. Yet many people still seem fervently to believe that wars are created by weapons. The trouble is that any weapon capable of killing is dangerous the moment it gets into the hands of anyone with the intention of using it. For nearly 100 years

Britain had a naval fleet more powerful than those of the rest of the world put together, but it was not called up to go to war until 1914. What is known to the Jewish people as the Holocaust was perpetrated without the use of any military weapons at all. More people have been killed by motorcars or by terrorism than by bombs.

Everybody, I think, knows that the destructive power of nuclear weapons is vastly, almost immeasurably greater than that of conventional weapons. Therefore in all logic there is really no point in having any more of these weapons than the bare minimum to provide a credible deterrent. What really matters are the scruples of their possessors, the character of those individuals with the ultimate power to unleash them.

People are far more dangerous than inanimate objects.

Many years ago Albert Einstein said that nuclear power had changed everything, and added significantly 'except our way of thinking'. It is tempting to suggest that nuclear weapons are the ultimate social and cultural challenge of modern technology, but it would not be quite accurate. The challenge is not to such abstract concepts as society or culture. The challenge is directly to our human nature and to the way we think and the way we use our brains. The question is whether the threat of cataclysmic disaster can possibly bring those traditional origins of conflict, human greed, ambition and good intentions, under some sort of rational restraint and control.

DOUGLAS'S ATTEMPT TO AVOID THE SECOND WORLD WAR

During the new burst of Zionist smearing of Social Credit in Canada, it has been claimed that the author of Social Credit, C.H. Douglas, was pro-Hitler. Even the most casual reading of the writings of Douglas reveals that he was completely opposed to National Socialism. Douglas also saw Hitler as a tool, even if an unconscious one, of the international conspirators against Western Christian Civilisation.

But the smearers refer to Douglas's alleged correspondence with Hitler. The truth is that Douglas wrote to Hitler, warning that his policies were playing into the hands of the very groups Hitler was verbally criticising. The Douglas approach was an attempt to avoid the threatened Second World War.

Hitler's failure to respond in any way to the Douglas letter demonstrated beyond doubt that his policies were, as Douglas later charged, Jewish policies. For the record, we publish both the letter Douglas sent to Hitler, together with the memorandum, "Warning Europe". This document was also read in the Australian Senate by Senator Richard Darcy, Labor Senator for Tasmania, and a supporter of Social Credit.

THE HITLER LETTER

Douglas's letter to Hitler, "despatched through a trustworthy channel", was published on the front page of *The Social Crediter* of 6th May, 1939 and read as follows:

May, 1939

Herr Fuehrer,

As an introduction to the attached memorandum*, I would request permission to bring to the notice of your eminent self the following observations:

- (a) While it is claimed, and is no doubt sincerely believed, that there is some conflict of ideologies between the 'democratic' group of Powers and the Totalitarian group, there is, in fact, no such conflict — all of them proceed equally from the fundamental assumption, which is no doubt believed to be indisputable, that full employment of their populations is the test of success. Their differences are of method only.
- (b) If this claim rests on a 'moral' basis, then it must be observed that it raises up practical problems, which appear to be only soluble by recourse to a war of mutual destruction certain to result in anarchy and final subjection to a Transatlantic survivor.
- (c) If, however, it is claimed that full employment is a practical requirement of an advancing civilisation, it can easily be shown that the contrary is the case. While it is recognised that the present production of armaments in every country has been forced by the general assumption that unemployment is equivalent to economic destruction, it must yet be obvious that the full employment which armaments provide is both temporary and at the same time perhaps the ultimate example of waste and inefficiency.
- (d) This employment policy, which is here challenged, is now recognised to be inseparable from the Jewish Financial System.
- (e) A simple change in this system would make full employment unnecessary, eliminate the competition for markets and destroy the power of the international Financier — a power which war only increases and which, if not destroyed, will destroy civilisation in Europe.

May I earnestly request that the present crisis may, in the key position in the history of the world, which you hold, be used to force an exposure of this false and destructive policy?

It is indisputable that, if this were to be made the major issue of any such conference as has been proposed, not only Germany but the whole civilised world would be united in support of the action taken by you. Not President Roosevelt, but yourself, would be recognised as the representative of all those values, which are cherished equally in the so-called democracies and their artificially created antagonists.

Yours faithfully,

C.H. Douglas

*The memorandum here referred to was a copy of the 'Warning Europe' memorandum already published.

WARNING EUROPE

PREPARED BY MR. JOHN MITCHELL OF THE
UNITED RATEPAYERS' ADVISORY ASSOCIATION

The memorandum referred to by Douglas appeared under the heading, "Warning Europe", in *The Social Crediter* of 29th April, 1939 and read as follows.

War in Europe with its consequent destruction of what remains of stable and civilised society, will not be averted unless responsible officials in the Governments of Britain, Germany, France and Italy recognise the identity of the true Opposition forces in the world, and that the face of themselves, their governments, and the people of their country depends very largely upon their governments formulating policies in accordance with that recognition.

If war should come, the fate that would befall Europe and its governments was well defined by a well-known Englishman in a speech at a City Club luncheon in Cleveland, Ohio, as reported by the *Sunday Times* on Easter Sunday. He "predicted that a world war would start during 1939 from which America would emerge as 'dictator of the world'."

"He added that the conflict would 'reduce Germany, Italy, France and England to ruins!'"

The Great Powers of Europe in ruins, and America Dictator of the World!

Let it be stated at once that the true identity of the masses opposed, from the point of view of **who will gain and who will lose** (which, of course, is the only realistic basis of decision) is Europe against America and Russia (politically and economically in vassalage to America).

No appreciation of this statement of fact is possible unless it is realised who constitutes the real rulers of America and Russia, as distinct from the figureheads officially reputed to be in control.

President Roosevelt's own position was succinctly described by Walter Lippman in the *New York Herald Tribune* on 27th June 1932. He stated: "It is evident that Roosevelt is not the leader of the forces behind him. He is being used".

Mr. Walter Lippman is in a position to know. He, it should be remembered, is commonly credited with being the author of President Wilson's "Fourteen Points". In the *Encyclopedia Britannica* matter is quoted to the effect that this document, laying down the general conditions of peace, was drafted by Dr. S. Mezes, D.H. Miller and Walter Lippman.

The real rulers of America are the great New York bankers, the leading group being Kuhn, Loeb and Co. The controller of this group is Felix Warburg, whose father, Paul Warburg, was well-known as the 'Father of the U.S.A. Federal Reserve

Board'.

Before the war a 'de facto' dictatorship was imposed upon the policy of the United States by the 'concentration of banks' controlled by Warburg. So great was the popular clamour in America in 1912 against this Banking Trust that President Wilson, who was a protégé of Kuhn, Loeb and Co., was obliged to set up a Commission of enquiry.

The Report presented by the Commission of Enquiry to Congress, contained findings which were alarming: 'A Banking Trust' did exist: it included five principal banks, which controlled one hundred and twelve important banks, as well as numerous financial and industrial groups scattered throughout the United States and other parts of the world; the power of the 'coalition' was enormous. In adding together the Capital sums represented by the banks, which formed part of the 'Trust', and by enterprises dependent upon them, the Commission arrived at the almost incredible figure of 22,245,000,000 dollars, or more than 556 milliard French francs, and, at five dollars to the pound, 4,449,000,000 English pounds. All of which was grouped, in 1912, around Jacob Schiff, and was dependent upon his sole will.

The Commission of Enquiry was in no way deceived, and concluded its Report in the following impressive terms: "The powerful grip of these men is placed upon the lever which controls all credit, and its wheels turn or stop at their signal".

The result of this enquiry was the formation of the Federal Reserve Board. Thereby, far from being loosened, the bonds, in which Kuhn, Loeb and Co., held the American Government, were still further tightened.

The contact of this all-powerful banking group with President Roosevelt is effected through its close associates — Bernard M. Baruch and Felix Frankfurter, who are the President's chief 'advisers'.

The measure of Baruch's domination of the American Government is evidenced by his own reply to cross examination at a Senate Official Enquiry, at which he claimed: "I suppose I was the most powerful man in the United States during the war".

During the war, Bernard Baruch was head of the War Industries Board. In him reposed authority over:

- (1) The use of capital in the private business of Americans.
- (2) Over all materials.
- (3) Over all industries.
- (4) Over all classes of men to be called to military service.
- (5) Over the personnel of labour in the country.

No project could be financed without his consent. And what is the most significant of all the considerations governing his assent was that he should fix the remuneration of the capitalist, the wages of the workers, and the prices of the products — prices not only to the Government for war supplies, but prices to the civilian population.

After, the war, Baruch went to the Economic Conference at Paris as Chairman of the American Commission.

The power, which Baruch wields today, is summed up in the two statements, which follow:

"One of the key Roosevelt advisers is Bernard M. Baruch, a power in the Wilson administration. In the absence of Secretary of State Hull and the President from Washington, Mr. Baruch we regarded as the unofficial President. Professor Felix Frankfurter, who has declined a number of important positions in the Roosevelt administration, has nevertheless had his recommendations accepted in filling nearly half a dozen of the most important legal posts in the Government and continues to function as one of the President's most trustworthy advisers."

—*The Brooklyn Jewish Examiner*

"Bernard M. Baruch is called into frequent conferences with the President. He has financed many a Congressional campaign; and is surrounded by a praetorian guard of Senators, who hang on his every word. The figure of

Baruch is swelling into enormous dimensions on the horizon of public life. He has been given credit for Hoover's appointment of Eugene Meyer, Jr., as Governor of the Federal Reserve Board. He is the Mystery Man of Washington and Wall Street."

— *"Fortune", the "Tycoon" monthly magazine*

No understanding of the diplomacy of the American Government can be valid which does not recognise that the policy of that Government is dominated by the powerful New York bankers referred to.

AMERICA'S RELATION TO RUSSIA

The Powerful Banking Interests, which rule the American government, are also the power, which governs Russia.

The evidence in support of the fact that the Russian Revolution and the subsequent Governments of Russia were financed and controlled by the Banking Interests, which govern America, is monumental.

It is only necessary here to refer to the chief document treating of the financing of the Russian Revolution. This is the one drawn up by the American Secret Service and transmitted by the French High Commissioner to his Government. It was published by the *Documentation Catholique* of Paris, on 6th March, 1920:

Section 1: states that "it was found out that the following persons, as well as the banking house mentioned, were engaged in this work of destruction: Jacob Schiff; Guggenheim; Max Breitung; Kuhn, Loeb and Co.; Felix Warburg; Otto Kahn; Mortimer Schiff; S.H. Hanauer".

Kuhn, Loeb and Co., had a complete monopoly of the contracts for the industrialisation of Russia.

THE DOMINION OF THE WORLD BY AMERICA AND RUSSIA

The Banking interests, which govern America and Russia, have the most powerful international connections. How 'unexpected' as well as extensive is indicated by the fact that during the Great War whilst Max Warburg was the trusted financial adviser of the German Emperor, Max Warburg's brother, Paul Warburg, Director of Kuhn, Loeb and Co., and founder of the Federal Reserve Bank, was as 'Grand Treasurer of the United States of America' playing a similar role at the side of President Wilson. The artful conspiracies and paralysing hindrances with which the Allies found their path beset, may be imagined; while it should be borne in mind that those engaged in the terrible struggle never had the least suspicion.

It is interesting to record that Max Warburg was one of the leading representatives sent by Germany to the Versailles Peace Conference, whilst his brother, Paul Warburg of the same financial house was one of America's chief representatives.

The interests of this group of bankers who control America and Russia are international, and their aim is the disruption of Europe with a view to their complete domination of it.

The two post war political heads of Russia have stated the intentions of the Banking Interests who control them. Away back on 26th November 1920, Lenin proclaimed: "Our salvation would be more readily assured if the imperialism Powers became embroiled in a war".

On 21st February 1935, the Political Bureau of the Communist International, the highest organ of the International, after being addressed by Stalin, passed a resolution in which it said:

"The Political Bureau is definitely convinced that a new world war is absolutely inevitable, but explains this as the obvious preparation for the world revolution. With the aim of self-preservation, and in the interests of the World Revolutionary Movement, the Soviet Government must do all possible to enter the camp of the States which build the strongest coalitions."

EUROPEAN SUICIDE

The Stage is rigged for Europe to destroy itself, and nothing

is more certain than that, if the personnel of the European Governments play the roles so carefully designed for them by the Financial Interests who rule America and Russia, they will automatically sign their own personal death warrants.

Europe can be saved at this late hour if the members of her governments will recognise the common enemy, and unite against it.

A Europe divided is the aim of American policy, whatever may appear from the 'surface' diplomacy of President Roosevelt, who can only keep the support of public opinion for himself by deceiving it as to his true aim. As all the International newsagencies, and almost the entire Press of Europe is controlled directly or indirectly by American Banking Interests, it is quite easy for him to do that. The continuous war scare, which is worked up in that Press by publishing every rumour, is one of their methods.

The true aim of American policy was stated by a leading political spokesman of the real rulers of America, Senator Key Pittman, in March this year. He said:

"It is to our interest to maintain a substantial balance of power in Europe. If any one group obtained substantial predominance, we should be faced with the necessity of defending the Monroe doctrine on the American continent."

In that statement is an admission that a united Europe would sound the death knell to the American policy for World hegemony.

ACTION FOR PEACE

Immediate action to counter this threat to Europe is needed.
Prominent persons in Britain, Germany, Italy and France,

with whom this organisation has been in touch, directly or indirectly, are already co-operating in a form of action which if pursued energetically and over a wide enough area would do much in bringing about decisions which would avert the threatening catastrophe.

The action required is essentially one for individual initiative, and not for committees, councils or any form of **open** association.

The purpose of the action is two fold:

- (a) To produce enlightenment in Government circles in Europe as yet improperly aware of the danger to both Europe **and themselves**.
- (b) To extend that enlightenment to as wide and influential a circle near each Government as time will permit, so as to build a bloc of powerful and determined opinion in each country to support decisions, which uphold policies tending to unite Europe against her common enemy.

Each person taking part in this effort has his own connections and channels through which he can work. The action at this stage consists solely in spreading throughout Government and influential circles in Europe the subject matter of this circular, supplementing it with such facts as are necessary and can be obtained from other sources.

Action already taken has confirmed the correctness of the assumption which forms the basis for pursuing this matter: a Peer of this country, who recognises the truth of what is written here, proceeded to contact certain high personages and discovered that before his effort at enlightenment they were among "the many far too stupid and simple to see the situation as it is". This line of action will remove much of that ignorance, and very likely will lead to an orientation of policy by European Governments, which will avert disaster.

DISCRIMINATION AND EQUALITY

By Geoffrey Dobbs

The following essay by Dr. Geoffrey Dobbs was first published some years ago. With a stream of "anti-discrimination" legislation threatening to drown out commonsense, this essay is more appropriate than ever. It deserves the widest possible circulation.

The debasement of our language, and especially of all those words with which we refer to that, which is good and true in life, is one of the chief methods used in the corruption of our thoughts and of our society.

My dictionary defines 'to discriminate' as 'to perceive differences, distinguish (between)'; and 'discrimination' as 'Capacity for discriminating; ability to perceive subtle differences; perception'. So we see that in the vicious catch-phrase 'no racial discrimination', in so far as this refers to something which we are agreed is evil: the ignorant lumping together of people according to their skin-colour — the sense of the word has been completely inverted. If races are to live together in harmony, what we need is 'more racial discrimination', not less.

'Stupid and ignorant prejudice about race' and 'lack of racial discrimination' are two simple phrases describing the same thing, so that to brainwash people, and especially the young, with the idea that 'racial discrimination' is a monstrous and wicked thing, is the most effective way possible to ensure a growing ignorance of each other, and hence lack of understanding between the races, leading to active hostility and ultimately that violence and anarchy which are the essential prerequisites for the establishment of the Police State.

Of course, many people nowadays use the word ignorantly, and would claim that they had no such intention, that they were merely using the word in what is nowadays its accepted meaning, and that its dictionary meaning is now out of date and incapable of being understood by the younger generation. But that, in itself, is further evidence of the damage already inflicted upon their minds and thought-processes, in so far as they have been deprived of one of the most essential tools of

thought which is provided by the word 'discrimination' used in its proper sense.

How deep this goes, it is difficult to realise! Discrimination, the perception of differences, is an essential property of all forms of life, even the simplest, so that to attack it is to attack life itself. No organism can survive if it cannot discriminate between wholesome and poisonous food, or between harmless and dangerous other forms of life. When it comes to human beings, the whole process of learning, of becoming a person instead of a mere lump of protoplasm, is the process of acquiring the power of discrimination.

A baby is born with scarcely any discrimination. The first person to be distinguished is usually its Mum; a good deal later, its Dad. But the recognising of these people involves also discriminating between them and other Mums and Dads' that is, discriminating in favour of 'my Mum' and 'my Dad' as against other Mums and Dads. Without this act of discrimination the Family cannot exist; and to destroy it, is to destroy the Family.

Education, both in the sense of the natural process of learning from the environment, or in the more formal sense of schooling, is simply the process of acquiring more accurate, more penetrating, more subtle discrimination. Without discrimination there is no knowledge, and no sound judgment. We all must discriminate between the things we meet in our daily lives, but the 'educated' man or woman used to be expected to have more knowledge, and a better judgment, than the 'uneducated'. This is now ceasing to be true, because education also is infected with the prevailing hatred of discrimination, and is thus destroying its own foundations. Biology, for instance, is quite literally based upon racial discrimination; but this essential grounding is being discarded

in line with contemporary prejudice, as indeed is all study of mere facts (which always require discrimination). Biology is now being unified by placing the initial emphasis on the physico-chemical mechanisms which are common to all forms of life, since by the study of these men may hope to be able to control and manipulate the nature of other organisms, and even other men. Since this manipulation is being carried out with less and less discrimination, and without the respect of love towards which discrimination is the first step, it is likely to be increasingly disastrous.

For love is not just a vague general feeling of benevolence; it is founded upon a deep respect and understanding for the precise character of the beloved, and that, in turn, is founded upon the exercise of discrimination. So here again, the attack upon discrimination is an attack upon the very core of existence.

Perhaps it may be thought that I am pinning too much upon the misuse of this one word. So it would be if it stood alone, but we know well that this is a small part of a general policy of the perversion of thought through language, and always in the same deadly direction. The attack on the act of discrimination is but the latest form of that great assault upon Christendom which first declared itself in the French Revolution (*Liberte, Egalite, Fraternite, ou la mort* — but mainly *la mort*). The American Revolution put it into our own language, and has made it respectable, to the point of being taken for granted without thought, through the noble and familiar phraseology of the Declaration of Independence: "*We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal . . .*"

This assertion is the key fallacy of the Age. Splendidly as it rolls off the tongue and affects the emotions, it is wholly false. First, it denies creation and hence the Creator, since creation (even if we have been taught to call it evolution) is an act of differentiation, that is, of making things either unequal, or different, so that they cannot be assessed in terms of equality. In all the simpler matters in which men are capable of setting up a scale of values, we are all, thank God, unequal, so that in this sense the assertion of equality is blatantly false; but those who defend it do not usually deny this. What they assert is that the equality of men lies in those ultimate values of the personality which humbler people know to be beyond human estimation, but which they, the egalitarians, are capable of assessing, and judging, and pronouncing to be equal. And this, as applied to Race, is essentially the same appalling error as that of the racial supremacists, whom the egalitarians violently denounce, namely that of setting oneself up as the Ultimate Judge of Mankind, and pronouncing upon the value of men.

Compared with this, what the judgment may be, whether that this man or this race is superior to that, or they are merely on a level, is of minor importance. Once any human scale of values is applied, it is obvious that men and races are unequal, and since the members of every race have, as an essential part of their survival mechanism, a built-in preference in favour of the special excellences of their own race, whatever egalitarianism they may be persuaded to express with their tongues, in their hearts they will be convinced of the superiority of their own race over all others. If it ceases to be so the race ceases to exist; so that the struggle against egalitarianism becomes a struggle for survival; and this is the main cause of the racial struggles of today. For racial egalitarianism and racial supremacism are but the two ends of the same stick of racism; which consists in failing to discriminate and to understand the differences between races, and to realise that they do not lie all on a single scale of values. And, indeed, the same is true of egalitarianism as applied to class, or to any other human grouping. It is never sufficient for the poorer or 'lower' class to say to the richer or 'upper' class, "We are as good as you are!" It always ends up as "We are better than you are!" and even, "Our class alone has a right to exist", and "Down with the bourgeoisie!"

The poets have always realised that human equality only becomes true in death, as, for instance, in Shirley's *Death the Leveler*:

Sceptre and Crown

Must tumble down,
And in the dust be equal made

With the poor crooked scythe and spade. For egalitarianism is literally a doctrine of death, and so long as life stirs, it is denied. This is why rivers of blood and hatred have been poured out in the name of *e-quality*, which is the denial of the *qualities* of others. But salvation lies in *discrimination*, that is, in perceiving and conceding to all men their special qualities, and refusing to sit in ultimate judgment, which involves realising that our understanding is limited.

What, then, of *equality before the Law*? Is there not a profound truth in this phrase? Yes! but the important point here is that the 'equality' is, or should be, a property of the Law, not of those who are before it. This reveals that 'equality' is the wrong word here, unless it is used in an esoteric sense. The right word for what we want from the Law is '*equity*'. 'Equity' and 'equitable' are active words, implying a just and fair treatment of other people; 'equality' is a passive condition. If, therefore, we use the word 'equality' we invite misunderstanding by attributing it as a passive condition to those who are subjected to the law rather than as an active mode of treatment by those who administer the law — a mode of treatment, moreover, which is necessary *because* of the inequality of men, and the limitations of men as judges of the true value of others.

It is the same with 'equality in the sight of God'. The 'equality' is in the sight of God, and not at all in us whom He sees with absolute discrimination of all those differences, which He created in us. God is the very last Person in whose sight we could be equal. You will search the Bible in vain for any suggestion of the universal equality of men. On the contrary, the only important use of the word 'equal' refers to the ways of God (Are not my ways equal? — Ez. 18, 29). But here the word is used in an archaic sense more equivalent to 'equitable'. It is but a trick of the language to slip from: 'equality in the sight of God' to 'it is self-evident that all men are created equal', but in the process the 'equality' has been transferred from God to man, and has changed its meaning.

Never has the inversion of a meaning had more tragic and far-reaching consequences.

This Essay first appeared in the form of a letter in Housewives Today for August 1968.

THE MONOPOLY OF CREDIT

By C.H. Douglas

This classic work, which first appeared in 1932, during the Great Depression, contains the authoritative A + B theorem and shows the connection between the chronic purchasing power in relation to prices and the increasing centralisation of power.

In a Preface to the third edition, C.H. Douglas wrote, "To anyone who will take the trouble to analyse the course of events . . . it must be obvious that the Monopoly of Credit, which means the effective domination of human activity, is being pursued with relentless persistence. On the outcome of this policy, so far as can be seen, depends the earthly destiny of the human race."

In an Introduction to the Centenary Edition, 1979, Dr. Geoffrey Dobbs points out how world events have continued to demonstrate the central theme of "The Monopoly of Credit:" The inflation which Douglas warned about has become the most destructive social factor threatening Civilisation.

Without a study of this book, no one can express an intelligent opinion on the deepening crisis now afflicting what is left of Civilisation. It opens the door to real understanding of world politics.

PRICE \$6.00 posted.

"The Jews"

This article by Major C. H. Douglas was originally published in 1938. It is re-published for the benefit of those who have not previously read it as well as to keep it on record.

The Times of August 15, 1938, reprints under the heading "An Italian Tirade" what is presumably a précis of an article by Signor Giovanni Ansaldo in the *Gazetta del Popolo* of Turin.

Signor Ansaldo's thesis is the increasingly close alliance between the Jews and the British Empire, and the origin of this alliance in Puritanism.

Even as reported by *The Times*, the article has much interest, not merely for the Social Credit Movement, but for the general public, since it must be obvious to any detached observer that the Jewish question is one which goes to the root of the political problems on which the world appears to be heading for shipwreck.

A great deal of the normal comment upon this matter is superficial, and even neurotic. But to say that there is no problem is to copy the lady who said, "the whole regiment is out of step except our Johnny." It is a problem, which arises spontaneously in one country after the other. It has never been non-existent in historical times, and has certain easily recognisable characteristics following a well-known historical course.

There is generally a period (in England corresponding to the period from the time of the Crusades to the readmission of the Jews by Cromwell) in which Jews were excluded from political rights. Readmission generally follows a war, civil or foreign, with its financial stringency. This is followed by a period of apparent national success and aggrandisement accompanied by spiritual deterioration, and is terminated by political, industrial and economic upheaval. Germany has a similar but shorter history.

I do not believe that there is any satisfactory starting-point for an examination of this problem other than that of biology. The Jews, through thousands of years, have maintained certain rules governing marriage. As a result, they are able to claim greater racial purity, *i.e.*, closer intermarriage, than any people of world importance—certainly greater racial purity than most of their critics. So much is a question of fact.

There are good grounds for the belief that close intermarriage has certain well-ascertained psychological characteristics of racial backwardness. For instance, "second-sight" in the Scottish Highlands and the Isle of Man was attributed to this, is dying out by the dispersion of the clans, and is a special form of race-consciousness. Racial characteristics are more uniformly present in the affil-

iated individual than where close intermarriage does not exist—which is, of course, exactly what one would expect.

Whether it is an inherited national characteristic, or whether it has become such as a result of the dispersion of the Jews with their retention of the race consciousness, it is still true that the outstanding characteristic of the Jewish race is parasitism. It is a race, which thrives upon other races, and succeeds, no doubt, very largely by its financial technique, in choking the original culture to which it attaches itself and substituting one, which it can effectively control. The Jews have never been a colonising race, and it is Trade, with its Black Magic of Finance, Salesmanship and Advertising, which is the Jewish National Home.

As I have stated elsewhere, criticisms of this nature are criticisms of a collective culture, and do not deny the existence of many individuals possessing the internal virtues of the race, which are many, while detached from its collective culture and policy. I do, however, think that the Jew is seriously handicapped by his ancestry.

It is beyond question that the penetration by Jews of the politics of a country and of the agencies of policy represented by Law and Finance seems to have only one culmination—the subordination of the policy of the Host to that, of the parasite.

The Tory Party in England was the sworn foe of the Bank of England until the rise of Disraeli. There is now no Tory Party. The Bank of England rules the country, and the Jews rule the Bank of England.

The very last thing, which I should desire or, as an individual, countenance, would be the association of the Social Credit Movement with Jew-baiting. After giving the matter much thought, however, and observing the emergence of a number of phenomena, which are certainly analogous to if not originating from, Jewish technique, I think it is desirable to say that the problems with which Social Credit Movement is concerned are not properly those in which the traditional Jewish mentality is likely to be of ultimate assistance, and that the risk that the traditional mentality is present in any individual connected with the race is quite high.

The problem of the Jews themselves is one, which will require a solution, and it ought to be solved. But I do not believe that a solution is possible so long as the only solution agreeable to the Jews themselves is that they shall be the dominating race. Until this complex, associated with Messianism, is disposed of, their many brilliant abilities are a menace to any organisation, whether national or otherwise, in which they are allowed to acquire a vested interest.

Escape from Utopia

A SECTION OF AN ADDRESS, -"SECURITY INSTITUTIONAL AND PERSONAL", GIVEN BY MAJOR C. H. DOUGLAS
IN 1937.

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

To me it is a matter of no consequence whatever that

many or most people are very much richer than I am. The only financial matter which is of consequence to me is that I shall be well enough off to meet my own needs, which are quite modest, as I believe are those of most people. The technical proposals which I have put forward from time to time may be considered to differ from, let us say, the well-known beliefs of Utopianism, such as Fascism, Communism, State-Socialism, and so forth, in that, so far from exerting further compulsion upon individuals in order that they may conform to some

machine made conception of a perfect state. *I should like by (he simplest possible methods to provide people with the means of making their own individual lives approximate to their own ideas, and not to mine.*

The more I see of Governments, the lower is my opinion of them and I am confident that what the world wants at the present time is a great deal less government, and not a great deal more.

Now I want to get a further perfectly simple idea into your minds. And that is that *Governments are your property and you are not the property of Governments.*

There is no more pernicious and blasphemous nonsense existent in the world today than the statement which has been incorporated in the constitution of the modern dictatorship, which claims that the State, by which is indicated the Government, is everything and the individual is nothing. On the contrary, *the individual is everything*, and the State is a mere convenience to enable him to co-operate for his own advantage. It is this idea of the supreme State in its various forms, which has made the State the tool of the international financier who has mortgaged all States to himself.

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

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

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

It was, I think, Emerson who said, "We descend to meet." Whoever said it, it is profoundly true. We all require food, clothing and shelter; and we *can* combine and *ought* to combine, to get those necessities as a condition for our further acquiescence in combining for any other agreed purpose. The primary use of a Govern-

ment in a sane world would be to make it certain that the greatest common measure of the will of the population, from whom it derives—or ought to derive—its authority, is enough money for decent sustenance.

MAGNA CARTA (1215 AD)

Some relevant extracts:

10. If anyone shall have taken any sum, great or small, as a loan from the Jews, and shall die before this debt is paid, that debt shall not bear interest so long as the heir, from whomever he may hold, shall be under age. And if the debt fall into our hands, we shall take nothing save the chattel contained in the deed.

11. And if anyone dies owing a debt to the Jews, his wife shall have her dowry, and shall restore nothing of this debt. But if there shall remain children of that dead man, and they be under age, the necessaries shall be provided for them according to the nature of the dead man's holding; and from the residue the debt shall be paid, saving the service due to the lords. In like manner shall be done concerning debts that are due to others beside Jews.

20. A freeman shall only be amerced for a small offence according to the measure of that offence. And for a great offence he shall be amerced according to the magnitude of that offence, saving his contenment (means of subsistence), and merchant, in the same way, if he falls under our mercy, shall be amerced saving his merchandise. And a villein, in the same way, if he falls under our mercy, shall be amerced saving his wainage. And none of the aforesaid fines shall be imposed save upon oath of upright men of the neighbourhood.

28. No constable or other bailiff of ours shall take the corn or other chattels of anyone except he straightway give money for them, or can be allowed a respite in that regard by the will of the seller.

38. No sheriff or bailiff of ours, nor anyone else, shall take the horses or carts of any freeman for transport, unless by the will of that freeman.

39. No freeman shall be taken, or imprisoned, or disseized, or outlawed, or exiled, or in any way harmed, save by the lawful judgement of his peers or by the law of the land.

40. To none will we sell, to none deny or delay, right or justice.

45. We will not make men justices, constables, sheriffs or bailiffs unless they are such as know the law of the realm, and are minded to observe it rightly.

THE WEST'S MISCALCULATIONS

"I might just as well not have hurried, for we are on the threshold of events which will themselves irrefutably convince the West of its own miscalculations."

— Alexander Solzhenitsyn

" Easy the Descent to Avernus "

"... Private monopolies can be destroyed by government, but government monopolies grow and spread in power until nothing less drastic than a revolt can destroy them. An all-powerful government may depend in the early stages on a free voting majority, and gather such a majority out of a coalition of favoured minorities. Then we have a tyranny of majorities. But soon, fortified by the increasing dependence of large blocks of voters upon political favour, and protected by increasing legal restraints upon the freedom of any opposition, a political hierarchy will be able to compel a multitude of dissenters to support it in fear of individual losses or reprisals. Then there is an end to even the pretence of following the will of the people. ."—(From article HOW COMMUNISM IS WINNING by Donald R. Richberg in *Human Events*, Washington, D.C., U.S.A., and August 29, 1951.