

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. 48, No. 5

MAY 1984

Registered By Australia Post—Publication No. VBH 1001

PRESIDENT REAGAN DOES THE KOW-TOW

By Eric D. Butler

Shortly after Ronald Reagan was elected President of the United States, and while those who call themselves conservatives were still cheering what they believed was a major set-back to the forces of world revolution, I cautioned that the Achilles Heel of the Reagan Administration would be its financial orthodoxy. In a book directed at American conservatives in 1968*, I stressed that financial ignorance made it impossible for conservatives to implement principles concerning limited, decentralised government and competitive free enterprise. I predicted that failure to deal with basic causes made defence against Communist economic warfare impossible. President Reagan's visit to Communist China is the latest manifestation of the retreat by those who call themselves conservatives.

Much has been made of the necessity for American diplomacy to create a balance of power between the Soviet Union and Communist China, but the major thrust behind the Reagan "kow-tow" is the carefully fostered view in the United States that America's internal economic problems can be solved by a growing flood of exports to what appears to be a vast, relatively untapped market for surplus American production. Other industrialised nations are also attempting to export to China. If the purpose of exporting were related to the sane objective of paying for required imports, it would be logical to ask what does Communist China produce which the U.S.A. requires. But the major attractiveness of exporting to Communist China is the fact that China is relatively underdeveloped, thus making it appear more likely that the goal of a "favourable balance of trade" can be achieved.

But, of course, if there is to be, in the main, a one way flow of exports into China was the U.S.A., Japan, and Western European nations, how are the Chinese Communists going to finance these imports? This takes us to the core of international power politics: Communist China has to be provided with huge international credits, loaned at interest by the International Bankers. The International Bankers and their public relations officers have long sought to achieve "normal relations" between Communist China and the U.S.A. The first major step was taken by Dr. Henry Kissinger, with another "anti-Communist" American President, Richard Nixon, making his historic visit to Peking to assure the Chinese Communists that he would like to stand firmly with them against the dreadful Soviet Union. The same International Bankers, who had been financing economic blood transfusions to the Soviet Empire for over half a century, were now offering to do the same for Communist China.

BEHIND THE "SPLIT"

Behind the programme to build up China is the longer-term objective of developing the New International Economic Order, this strongly supported by both Moscow and Peking. While there have undoubtedly been conflicts between Moscow and Peking concerning tactics for defeating the West, there has been a unity of purpose masked by the same type of propaganda which has deluded the West for years about the "split" between Stalin and Tito of Yugoslavia. Generally overlooked by those who uncritically accepted this "split", was Tito's strong stand on behalf of the Soviet Union when

the Hungarian Revolution threatened Communism in 1956. One of the most scholarly works ever produced on this subject came from the late Dr. S. Draskovich, one of the best-informed experts on the deeper aspects of the Communist conspiracy I have ever met. No one attempted to dispute the Serbian leader who carefully documented Tito's role as a major Soviet Trojan horse, and who wrote the great classic, *Must America Surrender?*

Now come the warnings of top Soviet defector, Anatoliy Golitsyn, the man who played a key role in exposing Soviet moles in the West, including the British traitors Vassall, Philby and Blunt, earning an honorary CBE from the British government. He has been consistently attempting to persuade Western intelligence agencies that the West has been deceived

OUR POLICY

To promote loyalty to the Christian concept of God, and to a society in which every individual enjoys inalienable rights, derived from God, not from the State.

To defend the Free Society and its institutions - private property, consumer control of production through genuine competitive enterprise, and limited, decentralised government.

To promote financial policies, which will reduce taxation, eliminate debt, and make possible material security for all with greater leisure time for cultural activities.

To oppose all forms of monopoly, whether described as public or private.

To encourage electors always to record a responsible vote in all elections.

To support all policies genuinely concerned with conserving and protecting natural resources, including the soil, and an environment reflecting Natural (God's) laws, against policies of rape and waste.

To oppose all policies eroding national sovereignty, and to promote a closer relationship between the peoples of the Crown Commonwealth and those of the United States of America, who share a common heritage.

by the Communist world for nearly thirty years by a deliberate campaign of disinformation on the Sino-Soviet "split". What Golitsyn says in his recently published book, *New Lies for Old*, cannot be easily dismissed. It is certain that economic links have been maintained between Moscow and Peking in spite of the "split". The much-publicised coming major military clashes between the Soviet and China has never eventuated. But irrespective of the truth about the situation, the financing of both China and the Soviet Union has helped to drain the economic as well as moral resources of the non-Communist world, a world that is progressively collapsing internally. The "split" has aided the Communists, not the West.

The retreat by the Reagan Administration was vividly demonstrated when it capitulated on the issue of the Siberian natural gas pipe line, and then continued to finance large supplies of grain to the Soviet in spite of all the rhetoric about the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. An administration, which claims to be anti-Socialist, makes increasingly record Keynesian deficit budgets in an attempt to prevent a major collapse of the American economy. It is being sucked down into a hopeless military situation in Latin America, where it is impossible to halt the tide of Communist-backed revolution while the debt-ridden Latin American nations are told by the international debt merchants that sacrifices in living standards must be made in order to service the debts.

THE BASIC PROBLEM

The Hawke government in Australia is also trying to tie the Australian economy to exports to Communist China. As shown by C.H. Douglas before the end of the First World War, modern industry, increasingly automated, with technology replacing human labour, does not distribute sufficient purchasing power during any given period to enable its total production to be bought at a profitable price. Even a child can see that if computer-controlled and automated machines take the place of human beings, then the flow of wages is drastically reduced. The wages of the machine are not distributed. In a sane world this type of development, one result being something called unemployment, would be regarded as a tremendous advance towards a leisure state with the wage system being progressively replaced by the dividend system. The obvious starting point is to reduce immediately the age of voluntary retirement on an adequate pension and to make way for the young unemployed to enter the production system.

As Douglas said, failure to change financial policy, which first requires a philosophical change, must result in expanding economic activity, financed by escalating debt, in a desperate attempt to keep the economic system working. As nations become more developed, it is stressed that there must be increasing export drives, even if to declare enemies. The overall result is a world of mounting tensions, these in turn exploited for the Big Idea, which is to "restructure" production systems everywhere in order to create the One World State. This grandiose programme requires that national sovereignties be broken down and homogeneous populations broken down by "multi-culturalism".

In making his "kow-tow" to Peking, President Reagan has naturally made soothing noises about the future of Taiwan, this primarily for his Republican supporters back in the U.S.A. But anti-Communist Taiwan is also being sucked into the vortex of global centralisation with increasing exports to the Soviet bloc. In the run-up to the 1984 American Presidential and Congressional elections, the main Democrat candidates have literally groveled to Zionist Israel in an attempt to gain the support of the powerful Zionist lobby. They know where the real source of power lies, but the groveling will do little good for Mondale or any other candidate, as the Reagan Administration has also almost completely capitulated on the Israeli issue, leaving the Soviet with a clear run to exploit the disillusioned Arab world. Unless something unusual happens, Reagan will almost certainly be re-elected in November, accompanied by warm applause from Americans who believe themselves to be true conservatives. These people are deluding themselves. No genuine conservative programme is possible with subversive, anti-social financial and economic policies.

NO FUTURE ON CHINA ROAD

The Reagan "kow-tow" to Peking should, however, alert a growing number of Americans to grasp the realities of their plight, and to concentrate upon building the only type of political movement which can reverse American disintegration: that is, a grass roots movement which seeks, for a start, to bring Members of Congress under the effective control of their electors. It was the famous Chinese sage Confucius who said that it is not much use running harder if you are already on the wrong road. The Americans should get off the road to Communist China as quickly as possible.

* The "Achilles Heel" of the Conservative Movement.

ZIONISM AND THE MULTIRACIAL SOCIETY

Recent letters to the Australian press by Zionist spokesman, Mr. Isi Leibler, officially supporting what has been termed the Asianisation programme for Australia, indicate that high Zionist policy is directed towards breaking up homogeneous societies.

The brilliant British writer, the late A.K. Chesterton, had something of great importance to say on this subject in an article in his publication, "Candour", back in 1956. It is most relevant to the present plight of the world.

Arnold Toynbee, in an article on the tercentenary of the readmission of the Jews to England, writes:

"The Jewish citizens of the United Kingdom are welcomed as valued members of the national family without being expected to pay the price of 'assimilation', in the sense of an abandonment of their Jewish religious heritage. It is accepted that, for British Jews, there need be no conflict of loyalties."

The one part of that passage about which there can be no dispute is the fact that Jews in Britain have not had "to pay the price of 'assimilation'." In other words they have claimed, and been allowed, the right to practise discrimination.

BOND INDEPENDENT OF RELIGIOUS BELIEF

As discrimination embraces the whole of art and everything else in life that is precious, we should indeed be churlish even to question, let alone to deny, this right. We must nevertheless

give such discrimination its correct name.

Dr. Toynbee unduly narrowed the issue by his reference to the religious heritage of the Jews. Much as the orthodox may deplore the atheistic, the same word covers both. Although the Ashkenazim are not of Semitic origin, they have combined with the Sephardim to form an identifiable racial entity, and although through the ages the Jewish religion has stood zealously on guard against assimilation, the kind of discrimination practised has been in effect a racial discrimination.

There is a Jewish bond, which is independent of religious belief, as was shown when the late Harold Laski came knocking at the Zionist gate. He made no pretence of returning to the religion of his fathers. Yet it was as a Jew that he knocked.

DEVOTION TO RACE

There is in Jewishness itself a value that Jews treasure, and

NEW TIMES—MAY 1984

they are right to treasure it. A corporate spirit to which men and women have clung through so many vicissitudes, and which they have defended with such single-minded passion, is not a thing to be cast aside at the bidding of the Zeitgeist.

It may be because the Jews have resisted the inducement of what must often have seemed the line of least resistance that they are today approaching the zenith of their prosperity and power. It may be because Britons almost everywhere now succumb to that temptation that they are rapidly reaching the nadir of their own.

What is lacking in our people today is passion of any kind, let alone the fierce, unyielding passion of the Jew to survive and be himself. The passion itself — as distinct from some of its manifestations — is admirable. It is the fire of life.

WHERE TOYNBEE GOES WRONG

Where I think Dr. Toynbee begins to go wrong is in supposing that for British Jews there need be no conflict of loyalties. A race so passionate would find its soul rent asunder if at every stage it tried to make a nice adjustment between one loyalty and another.

In as far as conflict is avoided, it must surely be through a process of rationalisation — for instance, the Jew who would be loyal to Israel (and how many would not?) and at the same time to Britain obviously has to convince himself that support of Israel is a British interest, even though in consequence the whole Arab world spring at our throat.

In some cases, no doubt, the balance swings the other way, as when Colonel Robert Henriques provoked the anger of the *Jewish Chronicle* by affirming — in answer to the impudent assertion that Jews in the British Army should wear the Star of David — that he and other Jews were proud to wear the badges of the historic British regiments in which they served.

How a real clash of interest in which Britain upheld the Arab cause — an unlikely event — would be resolved in the non-Zionist breast I do not know, but what would be absolutely predictable in such a crisis is the response of corporate Jewry.

There would be no nonsense about dual loyalty.

CONFUSED MIND

Let us hear Arnold Toynbee as he expands on his subject: "This ideal of reconciling two allegiances is significant for two reasons. It runs counter to the modern Western ideal of nationalism, and it is 'the wave of the future', not only in Britain but throughout the world.

"Nationalism does aim at assimilation, because its objective is uniformity; what it wants is a homogeneous nation, inhabiting a compact national territory, and claiming the undivided loyalty of all its members." How does Dr. Toynbee know what is "the wave of the future"? It is characteristic of this pundit to assume the omniscience of Almighty God. He would do better to lay aside his large pretensions and try to clarify his muddled mind.

In the first passage quoted at the beginning of this article he spoke of the Jews in Britain as having no conflict of loyalties, whereas now he derides the concept of "undivided loyalty". Does he use words without reference to their meaning?

MYTH ABOUT MECHANISATION

Dr. Toynbee continues:

"But this old order is being broken up by the industrial revolution, with its large cosmopolitan cities whose populations are being recruited from all corners of the earth as a result of 'the annihilation of distance' through mechanisation.

"These mighty forces are transforming an old world of homogeneous nations into a new world of multinational states, and it is evident that the way of life which Anglo-Jewry has been working out during these last three

centuries is the only possible dispensation for mankind under the new order into which we are now moving so rapidly."

It is difficult to believe that Toynbee gave any thought to those sentences before delivering himself to them. There is simply no truth in the statement that city populations are being recruited from all corners of the earth "as a result of 'the annihilation of distance' through mechanisation".

Is there one more Briton living in New York as a result of being able to fly there in a few hours, as distinct from going by liner in a few days? The great migrations of peoples took place when the horse provided the speediest transport by land, and the winds the speediest transport by sea.

This myth about mechanisation being the creator of Cosmopolis is the sheerest moonshine, or it would be were it not deliberately used to foster the idea that the nations of the world have no escape from mongrelization.

WHAT DOES HE MEAN?

What I would really like to know, however, is Arnold Toynbee's precise meaning when he says: "It is evident that the way of life which Anglo-Jewry has been working out for itself during these last centuries is the only possible dispensation for mankind under the new order".

Toynbee is notoriously a "One Worlder", so it may be that he intends to indicate no more than that citizens of "One World" will owe to it an allegiance superior to any "archaic" national allegiance. But what in the name of Heaven has that to do with Jews?

The analogy would be understandable if Jews in fact placed loyalty to the country in which they live above loyalty to their own Jewishness. Is Toynbee such a blazing simpleton, and so unversed in the contents of Jewish newspapers, that he has no

ANOTHER HISTORIC ANNUAL DINNER

This year's Annual New Times Dinner, to be held on Friday, September 29, will have as one of its major features, an Exhibition commemorating the 50th Anniversary of C.H. Douglas's 1934 visit to Australia. Any Australian readers who have material which they feel could be used in the Exhibition, are requested to contact The League of Rights, G.P.O. Box 1052J, Melbourne, 3001.

Mr. Eric Butler's Annual "New Times" address will be devoted to what has happened in the half century since Douglas visited Australia, New Zealand and Canada.

Appropriate messages for the Dinner will be welcomed from all readers, irrespective of what part of the world in which they live. Messages should be sent as early as possible.

Early bookings for the Dinner will be appreciated. The tariff is \$17 per head, which includes pre-Dinner refreshments.

Those intending to be present are requested to note that there has been a change of venue for this year, to Royal Park Hotel, Royal Parade. We believe the change of venue will meet the problem of adequate parking space.

The Annual National League of Rights Seminar will, however, be held at the Victoria Banquet Hall, Little Collins Street, on Saturday, September 30.

As usual, the organisers of the Annual "New Times" Dinner reserve the right to decline bookings for what is basically a family function.

knowledge that this allegiance is forthcoming from corporate Jewry only when no distinctive Jewish interest is involved?

One of the reasons for the success of the big Jewish international lending houses is that their directors are not emotionally involved in any national mystique. The same reason helps to explain why Jews figure so prominently among the promoters and pioneers of Communism.

Jews in general, it goes without saying, are neither international financiers nor Communists, but they now have, in addition to their own corporate entity the world over, the duty of allegiance to Israel. Should there be those who recognise no such compulsion, for the most part they keep very quiet about it.

Thus if membership of the World State, for which Toynbee has long been a hot gossamer, were to be based on the attitude he appears to recommend, there would be such a riot of conflicting loyalties that treason would be the norm.

The only people with any reason to be loyal to the World State would be the Jews, because with their fully integrated racial consciousness they would be the only people to retain their own identity and would therefore themselves furnish the World Government!

CITADEL OF INTERNATIONALISM

How far Arnold Toynbee understands the real inwardness of what he preaches I do not know, but if no great faith is reposed in his *bona fides* he can scarcely complain.

He it was who boasted that in his campaign against national sovereignty he habitually denies with his lips what he does with his hands, which is another way of saying that he betrays politically those who place their trust in his word.

Chatham House, the citadel of internationalism in Great Britain, for many years employed him as Director of Studies, and it is no surprise to find that the subscription list of that body contains the name of almost every large Jewish financial and commercial firm in the land.

The policy Toynbee expounds is Jewish policy, because it assails the national independence of all peoples except the Jewish people, whose abiding loyalty to their kind in any clash of loyalties it refuses to admit.

MOST REMARKABLE PEOPLE

The Jews are perhaps the most remarkable people the world

has ever known. Their experience down the centuries teaches them that where the national spirit is strong, there do they encounter the greatest resistance to their political and economic infiltration.

Instead of making their own adjustments with a view to becoming more acceptable under such conditions, this truly sumptuous race decrees not only that the national spirit everywhere must be broken but that the nations themselves must be erased from history. Hence the "multi-national states" of which Toynbee writes. Hence the impending World State, which is much more than the visionary project thoughtless persons suppose.

The policy-makers are everywhere on the march. They have equipped themselves with the World Bank for the planting of their usuries. Soon they will have a World Police Force for the collecting of their interest. They have established Unesco as the *Propaganda Ministerium* for the planting of their ideas. Meanwhile ships by the hundred take foreign migrants to Canada and Australia.

There are "New Kenyans" and "New Rhodesians". West Indians, West Africans and Pakistanis arrive in spate at our own ports. These things are not entirely fortuitous.

The decree has gone forth — "No racial discrimination", so that the one race, which really knows how to discriminate, may maintain itself intact and rule the multi-racial, multi-coloured roost.

This all-conquering racial passion, born of a superb arrogance, should not move us to racial hatred, which is a sterile, useless, ugly thing. But if should move us, in our own distinctive way, to emulation.

OUR ANSWER

Britons can oppose, and so limit, Jewishness by a quality not named in my dictionary — Britishness. Otherwise our eclipse is certain.

The mental slop and the emotional slush in which our people now wallow have never before been characteristics of the British people. Unless we learn once again to look after ourselves as a nation and as a race we shall soon suffer our final defeat and most royally will we have deserved it.

The secret is not less racial discrimination, but more. That, however, is not the moral Dr. Toynbee meant us to draw!

Under Which King?

The following article by C.H. Douglas was originally published in "The Social Creditor", England, in 1945.

There is no single aspect of political economy, which deserves more attention, and receives less, than the nature of an order. Like so many other matters of importance and subtlety, most people understand so little of the subject that they are practically unaware that it presents any problem; still less, a problem on which the whole structure of society depends. The immense success of mediaeval civilisation (and its ultimate failure) can be seen to be linked with one conception of an order and the sanctions which sustained it; the different, but notable, achievements of the nineteenth century, and the chaos which has succeeded that short-lived adventure, are plainly the outcome of another. The problem is often stated by the use of the word "sovereignty"; and we have an indication of that identity in the title of the gold coin which ruled the nineteenth century, the English sovereign, as well as in the declared intention to remove national sovereignty to an international centre.

The essence of Mediaevalism (often, it may be noted, referred to as the Mediaeval Order) was the existence of the Church as a sanction, as an organisation for making effective certain checks and balances upon the use of physical

force to carry an order from its utterance to its execution. The Church claimed to be, and was to quite a considerable extent, a living body of Superior Law, not different in intention but far higher in conception, to the Constitution of the United States. And it is important to notice that the breakdown of nineteenth century English prosperity can be seen in retrospect to be contemporaneous with the decadence in social prestige of the village parson.

Now the nature of the problem presented to political economy, as distinct from ideology, by an order, is simply this: Either Brown gives orders on his own behalf, or Mr. Pink-Geranium gives them for him. That someone has to give orders on Brown's behalf is not in dispute. And the decision between these two courses is *ultimately* dependent on which source of authority succeeds in making results most accurately and rapidly eventuate from orders, in reasonable identity between specification and product. And the problem is complicated for Mr. Pink-Geranium by the fact that he has no one but Mr. Brown to whom to give orders, and Mr. Brown is convinced that it is more blessed to give than to receive.

There was a period, say between 1850 and 1914, in which the *economic* aspect of this problem was in a fair way to solution. The gold sovereign was a complete order system. Mr. Brown had only to tender his yellow warrant of sovereignty and he got what he wanted. He set in motion the most marvellous train of self-acting psychological sanctions. Factories sprang to life, trains ran, and ships sailed, all concerned not merely to do his will, but to do it better than anyone else. It is quite irrelevant to this particular argument that a large and increasing number of Mr. Browns had no sovereigns; it is a fact of history that the man who had one always wanted two, and in consequence, if every Mr. Brown had possessed a sovereign it would still have been effective. It is perhaps unnecessary to observe that the virtue of the gold sovereign lay not in its material but in its sanctions.

Now the *political* equivalent of the gold sovereign is the vote, and the merest glance at our life and times is sufficient to establish the conclusion that it fails to work. There is nothing in the possession of a vote, which remotely approximates to the power of choice and the certainty of delivery enjoyed by Mr. Brown with his golden sovereign in the latter days of the nineteenth century. No one outside the walls of a mental hospital would contend that the individual voter gets what he votes for, or voted for what he is getting. So obvious is this that the greatest difficulty is experienced in getting people to vote at all. The vote costs nothing; and

it is worth precisely what it costs. If it cost ten shillings to vote, how many votes would be registered?

But the matter does not end there. While the political vote is valueless to the individual, it enables the Satanic Powers to claim a mandate which it in fact does not confer, and which it is powerless to enforce. The situation is so satisfactory that the ballot-box is a cardinal provision of the World State, and it is clear for any ordinarily intelligent person to see that it is the intention—and in "Britain" the rapidly developing fact—that the economic vote will be destroyed in its nineteenth century effectiveness, and substituted by the political vote as exercised in Russia.

It is urgently necessary to realise these matters because they dominate our future. British Governments now hold office by a trick; no British Government has any genuine mandate. Our whole political system is not merely irrational; it is a fraud and usurpation. We have allowed the vicious nonsense which derided the values established by a thousand years of unique political experience to destroy in our name every safeguard against tyranny provided by historic continuity in the Three Estates, and we welcome the people who spawn this nonsense when they desert the Europe they have wrecked. Nothing can save us but a drastic de-hypnotisation. It is coming; but it may kill us.

—C. H. DOUGLAS.

The Common Law

Traditional Rights in a Collective Age

By the RT. HON. SIR HENRY SLESSOR

The following authoritative article first appeared in "The Times", London, England, on August 9, 1946, and is worthy of the closest study at a time when Common Law is threatened by UN Human Rights Commissions and similar bodies.

"The common law is nothing else but reason", declared the great judge Coke at a time when it was in almost as great a peril as it is today, though for different reasons. The then fashionable desire to exalt personal sovereignty, which arose in repudiation of the medieval idea that the law was over all, had resulted in the surrender of many libertarian notions in the administration of justice; the inclination to continental principles of Roman law was exemplified in the Star Chamber Court and in the resurrection of notions of royal prerogative. The defeat of the claims of James II, pointing in a similar direction, enabled England to maintain the ancient traditional system of jurisprudence, dating from Saxon times, that spread throughout the whole Anglo-Saxon world, to the United States, and to the British Dominions. For nearly two centuries the common law stood unquestioned as the guardian of English rights; even radicals such as Wilkes based their claims upon it, as did other men so different in political outlook as Cobbett and the Chartists. It was the one subject on which nearly all Englishmen were agreed.

Of late years, however, a change has come over the juristic scene; the desire to effect alterations in the social structure has led to a vast spate of legislation in every field challenging the old static notions of legal right. Courts of law have been said to be incompetent to deal sufficiently speedily with modern problems. In many departments of State activity tribunals of varying kinds, administered often by persons untrained in judicial determination, have been created by statute and even by regulation or order. The power of the King's Bench to control such quasi-judicial bodies when they err in law by the old machinery of *certiorari* or *prohibition* has in some cases been deliberately removed. Examples are to be found in housing legislation and in many other laws; the immemorial right of a man to appear by counsel or solicitor is often specifically forbidden; local authorities, elected for administrative purposes, with no necessary knowledge of the juridical art, have been entrusted with purely judicial duties, as, for instance, in the case of

the determination or what constitutes an extortionate rent—decisions which may have legal and personal consequences to an impeached landlord. Over and above all, the tradition in which the common law has been nurtured, that of respect for previous decisions in order to find the principles to be applied to a particular case and to ensure certainty, has no established place in these new tribunals, which may or may not keep records of their previous determinations but certainly are under no obligation to follow them.

An outstanding illustration, soon to be tested in practice, arises under the new industrial injuries measure, which is to supplant the statutes dealing with workmen's compensation. Under the old law the Court of Appeal and the House of Lords have for years been concerned to lay down a *corpus* of principle whereby judges of fact may determine whether an accident "arises out of and in the course of the employment". A similar limitation of right, in similar words, appears in the new insurance statute. But will the new statutory tribunal be guided by the accumulated wisdom of the judges on this matter? We do not know, but there is no compulsion for it to do so.

Another disquieting feature is to be found in the curtailment of the independence of the judicial office. The reduction of the salaries of the judges in 1931, not by Act of Parliament but by an Order made under statute, caused much perturbation among jurists. It was pointed out that such a procedure invaded the principles of the status of judges laid down in Acts of William III and George I, which latter status purported to secure that the salaries of the judges were absolutely to be safeguarded. The age-long principle that the senior judge should preside in the Court was sought to be overthrown by a recent Act empowering the Lord Chancellor to appoint a Vice-President of the Court of Appeal, notwithstanding that he is not the senior Lord Justice, and still later the Lord Chancellor was given power to "direct" into which division of the Supreme Court a judge

should be ordered to perform his duties.

Thus, little by little, both the functions and the status of the judiciary are being impaired. One is tempted to ask where and when will the process end. That the Crown is immune from suit is no new thing, but, as the ambit of the activity of the Crown extends, a further curtailment of the processes of law, unless something be speedily done to make the Crown responsible for the wrongs committed by its agents, is almost inevitable.

Next, to deal with the rights of the subject rather than the powers of the Court, apart from certain specific doctrines of public policy (such as restraint of trade or immoral intention), the subject at common law was ever deemed free to make such contracts as he would—for he was a free man. But under the plea, good or unsound, of economic justice and necessity this right has been drastically curtailed of recent years. Combinations which were formerly only made illegal by statute—as under the Statute of Labourers or the Combination Acts—are once more to be controlled; we hear much of the control of monopolies and the complementary restrictions of the activities of trade unions. The old common law right of a citizen to end his contract by due notice, either individually or in concert, is no longer acceptable to the modern legislator, be he of one party or another.

The final question arises: Is it possible to maintain the old traditional common law in this collective age? The impact of continental notions from the Roman laws or from Communist sources in these days of international tribunals and the abatement of the claims of national sovereignty are not to be discounted. Only in the greater part of the British

Empire and in the United States has the common law found favour; an old practitioner in the common law may be excused if he points out the coincidence that only in those countries has that peculiar blend of liberty and order, of toleration and duty, found a permanent footing.

"The Common Law of England is in its origin a Christian system of law", writes Mr. Richard O'Sullivan, K.C., an acknowledged authority on the subject. Speaking of one of the fathers of the common law, Henry Bracton, he continues:

Taking a text, now from the Old Testament, and now from the New Testament, anon from the writings of the Roman Civil lawyers or from the Canonists, who were the ecclesiastical lawyers of the Church; again, from a master of Jurisprudence of the Law School or Bologna, or from the precedents set by his predecessors of the English Bench, Bracton passed them all through the fires of justice and hammered out a set of legal principles which gave to the world, in the language of a famous Judge of the United States Supreme Court, "a far more developed, more rational, and mightier body of law than the Roman".

These rules and principles of the English law were constantly being refined and polished in the law schools of the Inns of Court, and by the Clerks of the Chancery, who gave us English equity. They were carried by the King's Judges, going the circuits, to the great towns and cities of England and to all the shires. In the course of time the Common Law was carried beyond the realm to Ireland, to what are now the great Dominions, and to most of the Colonies; and to the plantations and States that now form the American Union. And so the tradition of the Common Law is today a bond of Commonwealth and Empire, and a link, which unites the English-speaking peoples all over the world.

The future of the Common law is plainly much more than a matter for lawyers. The Law of England is a unique contribution to Christian civilization; its decay may prove to be one of the greatest tragedies of our age.

Goethe's Message for Our Time

"... the message of Goethe to the man of today is the same as to the man of his own time and the man of all times, namely: 'Strive to be really man! And thou thyself, be as a man living an inner life, a man who, in a way that corresponds to his own nature, is a man of action.'

"But, the question arises, can we in the terrible circumstances of our time still achieve such personal human existence? Do we still possess the minimum of material and spiritual individual independence, which is the requisite condition for success? The circumstances of the age in which we live are indeed such that the man of the present day hardly possesses any material independence at all, whilst his spiritual independence is also most seriously threatened. In every way our position, daily becoming more unnatural, is developing in a direction, which involves that in every respect man more and more ceases to be a being that belongs to Nature and himself, and is ever more subjected to the social organisation in which he lives.

"There arises a question which even half a lifetime ago we should have regarded as impossible: Is there any longer any sense in holding on to the ideal of personal human individuality, when circumstances are developing in just the opposite direction, or is it not on the contrary our duty to adjust ourselves to a new ideal of human existence, in accordance with which man is destined to attain a differently constituted perfection of his being in unreserved absorption into organised society?

"But what else is this than that we, like Faust, going astray in an appalling fashion, should break away from Nature and surrender ourselves to a monstrous unnaturalness?

"And indeed, what else is that which is going on in this frightful age than a gigantic repetition of the Faust-drama played on the world-stage? In thousands of flames the cottage of Philemon and Baucis is burning! In thousand fold acts

of violence and thousand fold deeds of murder a mentality which has lost all human qualities wages its wanton sport! With a thousand grimaces Mephistopheles grins in our faces! In thousand fold ways man has let himself be led to renounce his natural relationship to reality and to seek his weal in the magic formulas [*] of some economic or social system which only thrusts still further the possibility of escape from economic and social misery!

"And the terrible significance of these magic formulas, to whatever school of economic and social witchcraft they may belong, is always that the individual has to surrender his material and spiritual personal existence, and may continue to live only as belonging body and soul to a plurality which controls him absolutely.

"Goethe could not foresee that a time would come when economic circumstances would in this way make for the destruction of the material independence of the individual. But with the mysterious prescience by which he was conscious of the danger of the introduction of machinery, whose first beginnings he experienced; he foresaw that in the future the spiritual independence of mankind would be menaced by the appearance of a mass-will. This foreboding was the cause of his unconquerable aversion for all that was revolutionary. In his eyes revolutionary activity was mass-will trying to subject individual wills to itself. As a witness of the first indications of mass-will in the French Revolution and in the movement of the wars of liberation, he had a clear consciousness that something had made its appearance whose consequences reached beyond the range of vision. Hence his hesitant attitude to the wars of liberation, an attitude that gave occasion to much misinterpretation. He certainly desired freedom for his fellow-countrymen, but the manifestation of a mass-will directed to this end had for him a sinister look, as we know from a conversation he had with the Professor of History at Jena, Luden by name, in 1813, when with deep emotion he gave vent to thoughts, which he usually kept to himself.

"He was the first to experience something like fear for

the future of humanity. At a time when others were still unconcerned, it dawned upon him that the great problem with which approaching developments would be concerned must be how the individual would be able to maintain himself against the majority."

—Albert Schweitzer: *Goethe* (1949).

Modern Education

The root evil of modern education, says Mortimer Smith in *And Madly Teach*, is to be located in its philosophical basis. The essential tenet of this philosophy is the instrumental-experimental theory of knowing that human intelligence is animalistic, limited in scope to the stimuli of environment. We cannot know anything except what our senses tell us. There are no transcendental yardsticks by which to measure the "truth" of our observations.

This, of course, is John Dewey's pragmatism; the philosophy that holds that what "works" is "true". It follows that the only knowledge that has any value is that which results in concrete, measurable ends. Education, then, must concern itself with the practical and changing conditions of life, without reference to supposedly universal, timeless values. The past is always dead, the new is always changing and the future will reveal itself in its unpredictable dress at the proper time. Loading the student down with the "best that has been thought and said" is to handicap him in his bout with experience, and disciplining him with principles is to put limits on his potential. What he learns from teacher or textbook will never do him any good; only what he learns in his minute-to-minute experiences counts. The only function of education, therefore, is to provide an environment, a laboratory, in which the student's personality (whatever that is; the philosophy does not define it) may find proper expression . . .

—From a review by Frank Chodorov in *Human Events*, February 22, 1950.

"If Leisure is Time to Think"

"Then again there is the baneful effect of Hollywood in lowering the taste of the masses and, in fact, in lowering the whole standard of thought throughout the world. Crowds flock to theatres [written before the more wide-spread effects of television—Ed. T.S.C.], and producers revel in producing the kind of film that tickles the taste of the masses. Crowds also flock to the museums to see exhibitions of outlandish paintings, and some people argue from this that the masses are becoming art conscious. This is not true—the masses are merely what they have always been, namely stunt conscious. I am not a great believer of art for the masses—even to appreciate art and to understand art much prayer and fasting is required, and the habit of deep and prolonged thought is only acquired by those who are supposed to belong to a leisured class. If leisure means having the time to think, then there *must* be a leisured class, for without thought no human progress is possible.

—Lord Lytton in *The National Review*.

NECESSITY OF A RELIABLE CHART

"It appears to us to be axiomatic that . . . religion, in the sense of binding back to reality, is of primary importance. Until you have some kind of reliable chart, you are a mere waif on the ocean. Clearly religion in this sense is a seven days a week matter, and requires to be distinguished carefully from 'good conduct'. It ought to result in good conduct, and in fact is the only test of good conduct, but that is something else again."

—C.H. Douglas

THE JEWS IN ENGLAND

"Whether the Jews in England played any part in the overthrow of James, and his replacement by his Dutch Calvinist brother-in-law, William of Orange, is not known. But it is certain that William's English and Irish expeditions were financed by Dutch Jewish army contractors and that, as King, William embarked upon a deliberate policy of encouraging wealthy Dutch Jews to settle in his new realm...

"By the early years of the eighteenth century Jews were firmly established in English commercial life. Several prominent members of the community were sworn brokers on the Royal Exchange; the twelve 'Jew Brokers' were, indeed, the only brokers allowed to practise on the Exchange without being Freeman of the City of London.

"This commercial toleration has also brought with it certain religious benefits. In 1668, when Parliament passed a bill 'for the more effective suppressing of Blasphemy and Prophaneness', a clause was included specifically exempting Jews from the bill's provisions. The practice of Judaism in England thus, at last, acquired parliamentary approval, and this helped pave the way for the enormous expansion of the Anglo-Jewish community during the Hanoverian period.

"As a corollary, however, the Jews had to become the staunchest supporters of the Glorious Revolution of 1688, the most forthright opponents of the Stuart Pretenders (James II and his son Bonny Prince Charlie, the Young Pretender), and the most vigorous upholders of the Protestant Hanoverian succession. Economic as well as political considerations dictated this position. As shareholders in the National Debt, the richer sections of the community risked financial ruin had there been a Stuart restoration; for such an event would certainly have been followed by a repudiation of government debts. So the Jews became Whigs. During the Jacobite Rebellion of 1745 Jewish merchants and brokers closed ranks behind the government, they accepted bank notes at par and helped minimise a run on the banks. Other Jewish brokers were equally ostentatious in their support, financial and moral, for the Hanoverian cause...

"Nor were the Whig magnates slow to repay the political debts they owed to the Jews. But they could only do this to the extent that public opinion would allow. In 1744 George II and his government responded warmly to the petition of Moses Hart and Aaron Franks, the leading members of the (Ashkenazi) Great Synagogue in Longon, and successfully persuaded the Empress Maria Theresa to reverse her banishment of the Jews from Bohemia. Two years later, emboldened no doubt by the alacrity with which the government had accepted Jewish support during the Jacobite uprising, the Spanish and Portuguese congregations determined to ask Parliament to ease the process of naturalisation of foreign-born Jews. This question was to dominate the political activities of the Anglo-Jewish leaders for the next eight years. No instance shows more clearly the extent of the Whig support for the Jews in the eighteenth century, nor more forcefully the latent xenophobia of the common people."

—Geoffrey Alderman in *The Jewish Community in British Politics*. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1983.

RELEASING REALITY

by Eric D. Butler.

Sub-titled "Social Credit and The Kingdom of God", this work is a synthesis of the history and development of Social Credit, covering every aspect of the revelations of the genius Douglas. Worth reading even if only to consider the author's examination of the practical application of "the Doctrine of the Incarnation", and other aspects of Christianity. An excellent background picture of Douglas the man. Price \$1.35.

TO THE POINT

The tragedy concerning the Libyan shooting of a British policewoman has highlighted the problems of multi-racial societies. As Western nations take in increasing refugees, there is increasing friction. And the relatively mild British response to the fulminations of the outrageous Gaddafi has primarily been determined by what, under orthodox finance, Britain sees as a valuable export market.

The international debt crisis continues to worsen, as witnessed by the Argentinian request that its 300-bank creditors to accept a further two months delay in repayments on the \$US750 billion bridging loan. Argentina is now coming under heavy pressure from the four Latin American countries, Mexico, Venezuela, Colombia and Brazil, who recently lent it \$US100 million to meet the requirements of The International Monetary Fund. Communist Poland is also having trouble in servicing its huge international debt, requesting that there be a further "rescheduling" of the debt. There is no way out of the debt crisis under financial policies, which keep on expanding debt. It can be predicted with certainty that the debt crisis is going to deepen, with every attempt being made by the international power groups to exploit the crisis.

* * * * *

Several economic "experts" are predicting a US recession in 1985. Most Americans find little evidence of any recovery from which to collapse into another depression. Each American now has a public debt burden of \$US6768. This continues to increase, as it must under the policies of debt finance. A headline reads, "US TRADE MAY BE IN FOR ITS WORST YEAR". That is why President Reagan hopes that his China visit will result in greater American exports — on credit, of course.

* * * * *

The European Economic Community, which was to be a model for the whole world, moves from one crisis to the next. The Australian sugar industry has been wrecked by the EEC dumping surplus sugar on to the world's markets. Now it threatens Australian beef producers with big meat exports into traditional Australian markets. The one thing which comes through the crisis loud and clear, is that there is no shortage of food in the world. The only shortage is purchasing power. If, of course, there is a genuine food surplus, financial arrangements could be made to enable producers to ease off their production and devote themselves to creative activities of their choice.

.....

The mental poverty of businessmen has been demonstrated in Australia with business representatives urging the Hawke government to keep the Budget deficit down to \$5000 million for the next financial year. One business spokesman said that although he and his colleagues were in favour of tax reductions, they would willingly have these deferred in order to reduce the deficit. This is support for a deflationary programme, which could only worsen the economic depression. No wonder the Socialists keep winning.

The Myth of the Trades Union

(Originally published in *The Social Creditor*, March 15, 1947)

By reason of its chameleon-like disguises, MONOPOLY often escapes notice under the label of some particular embodiment of it. When Social Crediters drew attention to the dominance of Finance in the years of the Armistice, they were merely (and the better-informed of them realised the fact) dealing with something which, *at that time*, occupied an almost unique position astride the world of production and distribution—a position derived from its peculiar claim to synthesise *value*, or wealth. Major Douglas has frequently deplored the undue emphasis on the later chapters of *Economic Democracy*. The pathetic inability of many otherwise intelligent people to penetrate below the appearance to the MONOPOLY, which was the thing in itself, has been demonstrated by the almost universal clamour, until it was too late, for the "nationalisation", i.e., complete centralisation and MONOPOLY, under an uncontrolled and uncontrollable anonymity, of Banking and Currency.

But the phenomenon is far from standing alone. For generations and almost without protest the Myth of the Trades Union, i.e., the MONOPOLY of Public Service, has gone forth.

The Myth takes the form that Trades Unionism is inherently good; a marvellous gift to suffering humanity; that British Trades Unionism in particular is the primary cause of the "emancipation" of "the worker"; and that to attack Trades Unionism is just a Tory demonstration of

obsolete reaction. Trades Unionism is MONOPOLY and inherently bad and anti-social.

The first point to notice is that Trades Unionism, like every other monopolistic economic practice, is directed against the consumer, consumption being the only aspect of the human individual, which is recognisably universal. With that Satanic ingenuity which suggests its origin, Trades Union propaganda never admitted this; its adversary was always the "rapacious" employer, the man who had the brains, the enterprise and the courage to come out of the rut, to try something new, and, to take the responsibility for it. But, in his turn, the employer was instructed, probably from the same source, that the attack of the Labour MONOPOLY could be passed on to the Individual, the consumer, by monopolistic price rings, Trade Associations, Trusts, and similar devices. Clearly, the logical next step was the Mond-Turner Conference to unify Labour and Management into a Production MONOPOLY that would eventually deal only with the Individual through a Distribution MONOPOLY

It is only the rapidly declining intelligence of the population, which prevents the fantastic absurdity of "full employment" from dissolving in a blast of derisive, but angry, contempt. It is really amazing that people will accept a falling standard of living; combined with universal slavery, while at the same time they have thirty mechanical slaves per head and modern production technique at their disposal. If that is the best we can do, then let us scrap our entire advance in the industrial arts as pure delusion, and go back to the Middle Ages before we are detonated into the Dark Abyss.