

THE NEW TIMES

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

Vol. 48, No. 6

JUNE 1984

Registered By Australia Post—Publication No. VBH 1001

TOWARDS WORLD DOMINION

By Eric D. Butler

The following are the notes of an address given by Mr. Eric Butler at the 1984 Annual Queensland State Seminar of The Australian League of Rights, held in Toowoomba on May 25:

No realistic study of the United Nations is possible unless the fact is grasped that this organisation, now openly attempting to create the structure for World Government, is the incarnation of a philosophy, which is as old as man. The essence of that philosophy is that if a small group of men, an elite, have sufficient power, they can create what they envisage as the ideal society.

It was the distinguished Jewish writer, Dr. Oscar Levy, who made the penetrating comment that the ideal is the enemy of the real. It comes as a great shock to many to be told that the idealists, with their concepts of the type of Utopia in which all should live, are anti-Christian; they are attempting to take the place of God, claiming that they know what is best for their fellows. As individuals, many of these idealists are pleasant and well-meaning people. But they are possessed of the very Devil.

The liberal idealist is the forerunner of the naked totalitarian. Every step centralising power results in resistance by individuals and generates increasing social and economic problems. These are then used as the justification for the use of still more centralised power. Those in the grip of the will-to-power philosophy are like the alcoholic who believes that his problem can be solved by increasing his consumption of alcohol!

AN OLD CONCEPT

The concept of some type of World Government is as old as man. The problem of power occupied the close attention of both the Greeks and the Romans, but they provided no satisfactory answer to the problem of how the individual could be protected against the State. Alexander the Great obviously paid little attention to what he learned from the famous Greek philosopher, Aristotle, setting out to use the sword in his attempt to conquer the whole of the known world. It is said that he broke down and cried because there were no more worlds left to conquer.

The Roman Empire eventually collapsed, not because of the superiority of the barbarians outside the gates, but because of the excessive centralisation of all power. The coming of Christ brought the solution to the problem of power. Christ stressed the value and uniqueness of every individual, of freedom inside a framework of proper Authority, and personal responsibility. The group and systems existed to serve the individual.

It was the incarnation, even if somewhat imperfectly, of Christian values, which resulted in the flowering of a Civilisation basically different from all previous Civilisations. But it was a Civilisation hated by those who rejected the Christian revelation. Secret Societies of various types, the Illuminati being the most influential, kept working away to erode the foundations of that Civilisation. These anti-Christian forces first erupted into the open with the French Revolution, a

prototype for the successive revolutions which have shaken Western Civilisation. Lord Acton wrote of the design behind the chaos of the French Revolution. The same type of design can be observed behind the growing tumult of this violent and destructive century.

A BARRIER TO WORLD GOVERNMENT

The comparatively successful development of the British Empire, based upon the Christian concept of the importance of individuals and decentralised power, reaching the peak of its influence at the turn of the century, appeared to offer an insurmountable barrier to those who sought to create New World Orders of any kind. The growth of the British Empire was a working model of how true unity in human affairs was possible through decentralisation of power. Marxist revolutionary Lenin was correct in his assessment of the British Empire as the major barrier to the establishment of a Communist World State. The culture associated with that Empire was anathema to what has been aptly described as the Dark Forces.

These Dark Forces erupted into the open during the First

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.

World War. As that awful conflict moved towards what was, in retrospect, but an Armistice before the conflict was extended in 1939. The First World War saw the Bolshevik Revolution imposed upon Imperial Russia and the proposal that the ground should be laid for the establishment of World Government via the League of Nations. The powerful international banking groups who had financed the Bolsheviks were also the promoters of the League of Nations concept, manipulating the idealist President Wilson of the United States. But the concept made little appeal to the American people and their political representatives. The advancement of the programme for World Government required further conditioning of people who still clung to the idea of self-government and national sovereignty.

The Great Depression, initiated in 1929 by the Wall Street international bankers, provided the opportunity for a further assault on national sovereignty. There was a spate of propaganda claiming that the centralisation of power, particularly financial power, was essential for the future of mankind. Subversive influences expressed themselves through elitist organisations like the Council for Foreign Relations in the United States, and its counterpart in Great Britain, the Royal Institute for International Affairs. In an address in Copenhagen in 1931, the British historian, Professor Arnold Toynbee, gave an address of the greatest historic significance. Toynbee is a proponent of the cyclic theory of history, that like human beings, which develop from youth through to maturity and then to decline and eventual death, Civilisations also grow and inevitably die. This view flatly disputes the Christian view that the doctrine of inevitability runs contrary to concept of conscious individuals changing the course of human affairs through faith and will.

AN HISTORIC ADDRESS

Toynbee's address is so important that we can profit by quoting from it at length:

"If we are frank with ourselves, we shall admit that we are engaged in a deliberate and sustained effort to impose limitations upon the sovereignty and the independence of the fifty or sixty local sovereign independent States . . . The surest sign, to my mind, that this fetish of local sovereignty is our intended victim is the emphasis with which all our statesmen and our publicists protest with one accord, and over and over again, at every step forward we take, that whatever changes we may make in the international situation, the sacred principle of local sovereignty will be maintained inviolable. This, I repeat, is a sure sign that at each of these steps forward, the principle of local sovereignty is really being encroached upon and its sphere of action reduced, and its power for evil restricted. It is just because we are really attacking the principle of local sovereignty, that we keep on protesting our loyalty to it so loudly. The harder we press our attack upon the idol, the more pains we take to keep its priests in a fool's paradise . . . lapped in a false sense of security which will inhibit them from taking up arms in their idol's defence . . .

"I will not prophesy. I will merely repeat that we are at present working, discreetly but with all our might, to wrest this mysterious political force called sovereignty out of the clutches of the local national States of the world, and all the time we are denying with our lips what we are doing with our hands."

That is a clear outline of the subversive tactics of the Dark Forces. Those tactics have been perfected by the Communist conspiracy, as well as by other subversives.

One of the most influential of the subversive movements which emerged in Great Britain during the Great Depression years, was Political and Economic Planning, headed by Mr. Israel Moses Sieff of chain store fame, who expressed his sympathy with the Soviet type of central planning. P.E.P. was responsible for the significant statement that it was only "in war, or the threat of war", that the British would accept large scale planning. One of P.E.P.'s publicists said in February,

1941, that British foreign officials still thought in terms of sovereign States, and "have not realised that Herr Hitler has at least performed the useful office of abolishing the various State Governments of Europe".

FEDERAL UNION

No sooner had the military conflict between Nazi Germany, the British Commonwealth and France got under way, than there emerged a highly publicised campaign throughout the entire English-speaking world, including the United States, advocating something called Federal Union. -The Federal Union concept had been first publicised in a book, *Union Now*, written by a prominent *New York Times* journalist, Mr. Clarence Streit. The Streit proposal was that, for a start, there should be a union of the five British Commonwealth nations, the United Kingdom, South Africa, Canada, New Zealand, and Australia, with the United States and Ireland. Streit said that these seven States should "establish the nucleus of a world federal union, to which other democracies could be admitted".

Streit was probably an idealist, but it is significant that his campaign was lavishly financed, with full-page advertisements appearing in the big dailies. Under the Streit plan the proposed ratio of representation was the U.S.A., 27; United Kingdom, 11; Canada, 3; with Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and Ireland having two votes each. The U.S.A. vote would have outnumbered the total vote of the British Commonwealth nations. With the United States firmly established as a firm base for International Finance ever since the American Civil War made it impossible for any American State to secede from the Union, a Federal Union based on Streit's formula would mean that the promoters of the concept saw it as a tactic for taking over the whole British Commonwealth and its vast natural resources.

The Federal Union campaign by Streit and his backers triggered the emergence of a vast literature on the subject of solving the problems of mankind through federations. Bolshevik leader Leon Trotsky had advocated a United States of Europe. Another Socialist by the name of Adolph Hitler also expressed support for a United States of Europe concept, and preceded to impose it by force.

Master Marxist strategist Lenin stressed that a world Communist State could not emerge until a world economic system had been established. It is natural, therefore, that both the Moscow and Peking Marxists claim Lenin as the spiritual father of the New International Economic Order.

Closely following Streit's book was *Federal Union* by R.W.G. Mackay, graced by a foreword by Sir Norman Angell, and endorsed by influential people like Lord Lothian, appointed British Ambassador to Washington early in 1939. Like all proposals for a federated world, the Mackay concept stressed the vital importance of one governing centralised financial power. The principle of further centralising financial power on an international scale is one, which commends itself to the International Bankers.

Sir Victor Sassoon of international banking background was one of the many powerful internationalists who joined the Federation bandwagon. Appealing to fear, Sassoon said, "There is no other way to stop Hitler. It is now so obvious to businessmen of the world that a Federal Alliance is necessary that it hardly bears discussion. England must come into a democracy of the United States, with the full right of Statehood. It is also obvious that England must give up her traditions and institutions of government".

Mr. James Warburg, a member of the Warburg international banking family, also stressed the Federal Union theme in *Peace In Our Time*. In Australia, Professor Julius Stone, a zealous Zionist, Professor of Law at Sydney University, in an Australian Broadcasting Commission broadcast, said that a "great debt" was owed to Federal unionists. The war had shown that "Government on a continental and even

on a world scale was shown to be possible". Stone will be remembered by many as the man who bitterly attacked Australia's first native Governor-General, Sir Isaac Isaacs, in his booklet, *Stand Up To Be Counted*. Sir Isaac Isaacs was an Australian nationalist who, in spite of being a Jew, refused to bow to the pressure of Zionism.

Early in February, 1940, Mr. Adolph A. Berle, Assistant-Secretary of State and a former member of President Roosevelt's Socialist "Brain Trust", gave an address to the Political Union at Yale University, in which he declared that at the end of the war it would probably be up to the United States to save Europe from collapse, indicating that it might be necessary for the U.S.A. to give away some of its vast stocks of gold in order to establish an international currency".

Shortly afterwards the City Editor of *News Chronicle*, London, wrote, "In helping to stimulate gold production, the South African authorities might remember that the war is, in one of its minor objectives, a war to make the world safe for the gold standard". (February 2, 1940)

THE REAL OBJECTIVES OF WORLD WAR TWO

With penetrating foresight, C.H. Douglas predicted that the real objectives of the Second World War were to destroy the British Empire as a preliminary to re-organising the world on a system similar to that operating in the Soviet Union, to strengthen the power of International Finance with a return to the gold standard, and the creation of the Zionist State of Israel.

THE CREATION OF UN

As the Second World War moved towards its conclusion, a number of international conferences laid the groundwork for a major advance of the programme for creating a "New World Order". A major result was the establishment of the United Nations Organisation at San Francisco in 1945.

Although it was the name of Stettinius which reached the world during the San Francisco Conference, much of the main organisational work was done by the little publicised Leo Pasvolsky, a Russian born Jew who had what has been described as "a varied political past". When Stettinius was U.S. Secretary of State, Pasvolsky was credited with being his "eyes, ears and pen".

Pasvolsky was the architect of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, where the basic groundwork for the San Francisco Conference was carried out. Pasvolsky did the negotiating with the Russian delegates.

At the San Francisco Conference it was the top American State Department official Alger Hiss who played a major role as Acting Secretary General. Hiss had previously played a major role at the Yalta Conference where the sick and dying Roosevelt agreed to a programme, which ensured that the Soviet Union emerged from the Second World War as the only victor. Hiss was, of course, later exposed as a top Soviet agent. One of the founding officials of the United Nations, Sir Raphael Cilento has related how he witnessed Hiss stacking the organisation with his fellow Marxists. As documented by Griffin in his basic source work, *The Fearful Master*, the United Nations was designed from the beginning to advance the programme of International Communism while weakening the Western nations. The UN has been described by defectors from the Soviet Union as the Communists' major international front organisation.

Associated organisations like the World Food and Agriculture Organisation, the World Health Organisation, the United Nations Education and Cultural Organisation, and others are all part of a grand design. The most important of these organisations is the International Monetary Fund, a product of the Bretton Woods Financial Agreement worked out in New Hampshire, U.S.A., in 1944. The principal figure at the Bretton Woods conference was the American Secretary of State, Harry Dexter White, although he was aided by people like Coe, the first Secretary of The International

Monetary Fund and the British economist and author of deficit financing, John Maynard Keynes. White was appointed as the first U.S.A. Director to the International Monetary Fund by President Truman just prior to his exposure as a top Soviet agent. White allegedly committed suicide and was never brought to trial. There is some doubt about White's alleged suicide. Coe was also exposed as another top Soviet agent. He fled the United States and was reported to have been advising the Chinese Communist Government for some time.

During the public debates prior to the Chifley Government in Australia accepting the Bretton Woods agreement, it was significant that the Communist press supported the acceptance of the agreement, as did Communists everywhere. The signal had been given that such an agreement was essential for the centralisation of power internationally. In the United Kingdom it was the Attlee Socialist government, backed by the whole Marxist movement, which agreed to the Bretton Woods programme. Aided by Lord Beaverbrook's papers, a small group of Conservatives campaigned against the acceptance of Bretton Woods. They correctly saw Bretton Woods not only as a major blow against British sovereignty, but as a threat to the British Empire. Acceptance of Bretton Woods was the first major retreat by the British following the military conflict in which they had played such a decisive part. Later came another disastrous defeat with the surrender to the European Economic Market. International Finance played a major role in forcing the British to make a surrender, which broke the back of British Commonwealth unity. The internationalists were delighted.

THE ZIONIST CONTRIBUTION

No examination of the history of the programme to create the World State would be complete without reference to the

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.

vital Zionist role in shaping and furthering that programme. The will-to-power is inherent in all peoples, but it takes on a special significance when it is linked with a Messianic concept of a "Chosen Race" with a Divine mission to rule the world. The distinguished Zionist leader, Dr. Nahum Solokow, in his book *The World Crisis*, claimed that the League of Nations was "a Jewish idea".

In a remarkable book, *Geneva Versus Peace*, M. De Saint-Aulaire, a former French Ambassador to Great Britain, a man with enormous international experience of international diplomacy during and after the First World War, quotes extensively from a dinner conversation he had with one of the Jewish International Bankers who helped finance the Bolshevik Revolution. The French diplomat quotes the Jewish banker as saying:

"In the management of the new world we give proof of our organisation, both for revolution and conservation. Our organisation for revolution is evidenced by destructive bolshevism, and for construction by the creation of the League of Nations, which is also our work. What is the end? It is already determined by our mission. Israel is a synthetic and homogeneous nation . . . We are a League of Nations which contains the elements of all others."

Commenting on this Jewish banker's statement, M. De Saint-Aulaire said, "The brotherhood of bolshevism and the League of Nations was no novelty for me . . . Those who look for the truth elsewhere than in the official documents know that President Wilson, whose election had been financed by the Great Banks of New York, rendered almost complete obedience to its beck and call. They know the famous telegram, or rather the telegram destined to be famous, addressed on May 28, 1919, from New York to Mr. Wilson from Jacob Schiff to dictate to him concessions for Germany . . . Up to the receipt of this telegram Mr. Wilson had vigorously supported Clemenceau's point of view, but he at once changed his attitude in order to conform to the word of command from the association for the League of Free Nations, directed by Jacob H. Schiff and five other American financiers..."

A study of numerous Zionist statements reveals the once

central message: A Messianic sense of mission which supports all policies, including that of multiracialism, which help to erode national sovereignties and prepare the way for the New World Order.

The founder of modern Zionism, Theodor Herzl, writing in his famous book, *The Jewish State*, frankly admitted the link between revolution and use of financial power to remake the world: "When we sink, we become a revolutionary proletariat, the subordinate offices of all revolutionary parties; and, at the same time, when we rise, there is the terrible power of the purse".

THE WORLD STATE WILL FAIL

While there have been spectacular steps taken towards the creation of the World State, every step results in greater disasters for mankind. We can predict with complete certainty that the programme for creating the World State will founder on the rock of Reality. Truth is the ultimate disciplinarian in human affairs. It has been said that the Mills of God grind slowly, but they grind exceedingly small and with certainty. G.K. Chesterton wisely observed that the man who jumps over the cliff not only violates the Law of Gravity; he also demonstrates the Truth of that law. The plight of the world today is a graphic demonstration for the existence of that absolute we call God.

Solzhenitsyn is correct when he says that the regeneration of a dying Civilisation depends upon "a return to God". But it requires far more than a mere affirmation of belief in God. St. Augustine said, "It is left to Christianity to make real the barrier which philosophy has created in the way of absolutism". The practical Christian must challenge at all times the policy of centralising power as anti-Christian. If God's will is to be done on earth in human affairs, it can only be through individuals who have sought to discover the laws governing human associations and, from a Christian viewpoint, work to make human activities conform to those laws. Any type of government, which prevents the individual from exercising effective control over his own affairs, is anti-Christian. World Government is the most anti-Christian of all, even if large numbers of professing Christians support it.

"WHERESOEVER THE CARCASE IS..."

By C.H. DOUGLAS

The following article, which first appeared in "The Social Crediter" in 1941, at a time when the outcome of World War Two was far from clear, provides further evidence of the genius of Douglas and, like all of Douglas's writings, will repay careful study.

Since its original publication in The Social Crediter in 1941 this analysis has been repeated before in these pages. It deserves repeated study and this reprinting will serve to acquaint our newer readers of the profound understanding of the late C. H. Douglas.

(I)

Now that Mr. John Winant, millionaire, assisted by Mr. Benjamin Cohen, has come from the International Labour Office at Geneva, as Ambassador and instructor to Mr. Ernest Bevin on the Labour Policy of Great Britain, Mr. Averill Harriman, multi-millionaire, has come to take charge of our Finance, Mr. Wendell Wilkie has taken our temperature, and Mr. Harry Hopkins, late of the Federal Loan and Mortgage Board, remains as bailiff's man, and all of these are enthusiastically welcomed by the Socialist Party, it is perhaps of some interest to find an answer to the riddle — "When is a rich man not a rich man?" (for the purposes of Socialism).

The first answer can be obtained by inspection, as our Math's Master used to say. It is when his riches are the result of monetary manipulation, and particularly, the result of bond flotation and sale. Each and every one of

our, probably long-term, guests is in the orbit of the Kuhn, (i.e. Cohen), Loeb Finance Group. Not one of them is a manufacturer, or an agriculturalist, but all of them are here primarily to fix the conditions under which both manufacturing and agriculture are, they hope, to be carried on for the next five hundred years. And all of them are in enthusiastic agreement with the Socialists in the main tenets of Socialism. These are:

- (1) A preamble that sets out the many glaring defects of the present Economic and Social Systems. (No mention or criticism of Finance permitted.) Obviously this gets a majority vote at once.
- (2) "Labour creates all wealth." Wealth is the object of life, especially if not used but exported. There fore *Present* labour has a right to all wealth so long as it exports it. Anyone who has the enjoyment of wealth without labour is a parasite. (From this postulate is derived the curious inversion that any one paid by the State is *ipso facto* not a parasite.)
- (3) The holding of property, particularly land or buildings, by an individual, is robbery of the Public and is likely to lead to the use of property for

pleasure. The holding of property by *any* organisation is better, and the larger the organisation and the more secure it is from criticism by individuals, the better it is. The State, which is immune from Prosecution by Legal Process, is better still, at the moment, but a World State, which would be Omnipotent, would be best of all.

- (4) Everything can be reduced to a Book of Regulations. For this reason, a Civil Servant in Whitehall, or Washington, or Geneva, can farm land in Ross and Cromarty, or Cheshire, or Alberta much better than the farmer who lives on the land. Or if he can't, it doesn't matter much, does it? Nobody knows the Civil Servant's name, he'll never see the farmer or the farm, and anyway, both the farmer and the Civil Servant will be dead soon.
- (5) The main objective, therefore, is to take everything from the individual, vest it in an untouchable organisation, the larger the better, and thus change the choice of minor tyrannies, which are vulnerable into an overriding single tyranny, which is invulnerable. Taxation is the primary tool by which to attain this desirable end, but restrictive Law, and in particular Licence Law, is a valuable auxiliary. But Law is the Agency both of taxation and Licensing.

When you have done this, you can put everyone on the wage and salary list, and invent a job for them, even if it's only filling in Forms to show how many people are filling in Forms. Then you will have solved the unemployment problem, which is the curse of Capitalism — if you don't know enough to recognise it as the coming of the Age of Leisure. And if people don't like filling in Forms, well, "He that will not work, neither shall he eat."

Now, there is every justification for the acceptance of Socialism of this character by a very large majority of the population at this time, for reasons which a little later. I propose to recapitulate briefly. It is a remarkable tribute to the sound instincts of the Anglo-Saxon public that the majority is not larger, and that it is far from solidly convinced.

But before dealing with the grounds for the views somewhat reluctantly held by this majority, let us for a few moments consider their millionaire friends, for instance. Mr. Winant, Mr. Averill Harriman, or even President Roosevelt, not forgetting Mr. Benjamin Cohen, *et al.*, in the background. Why are they so anxious to vest all property in the State, at any rate in England, and to tax the private property owner out of existence?

Why, for instance was it freely stated in Washington in 1920 that a certain notorious witness was given £10,000 from New York to advocate the nationalisation of the coal industry; that the Railways, although ostensibly Company owned, are since 1920 entirely divorced from the control of their Shareholders; that Mr. Montagu Norman "welcomes" nationalisation; that the London School of Economics, founded by the Fabian Society but mainly endowed by Sir Ernest Cassel, is practically a manufactory for Bureaucratic Socialists with international financial doctrines; and much other evidence to the same effect?

However reluctantly, I feel that we must abandon any explanation of these phenomena, which assumes, for instance, that Messrs. Winant, Harriman, and Hopkins (assisted by Mr. Benjamin Cohen) have come over here to commit financial suicide, or to sell all they have, and give to the poor. I feel almost certain that the "New Order" in Europe, and Great Britain in particular, like the Socialist Paradise in Russia, while it may impoverish and enslave millions, and destroy the culture and achievements of many centuries,

will still leave Messrs. Harriman, Kuhn, Loeb, *et al.*, assisted by Mr. Benjamin Cohen, in a situation which they regard with complacency. That is, of course, if nothing goes wrong.

We have therefore to approach Socialism, in order to appreciate it as a policy, from a somewhat unfamiliar angle. What is it that is concealed in a doctrine whose first postulate is a protest against economic inequality, which makes it so attractive to a special group of international millionaires who are the outstanding beneficiaries and primary cause of the inequalities attacked?

Obviously, the answer to this most important question will be found, not in what Socialists have said, but in what Socialism has done. And the first step to understanding what Socialism has done, is to be clear in regard to what Socialism has *not* done, such as invent and develop railways, roads and bridges, motor cars, dynamos and aeroplanes. The activities of Socialists have been almost exclusively in the field of Law (assisted by Mr. Benjamin Cohen *et al.*), and the situation in which we find ourselves is only to be understood by considering the Socialist legal trend against a background of scientific advance for which Socialism can take no credit whatever, but for the use of which it is responsible to the extent that its legislation has affected such use.

(II)

It is, I think, important to keep in mind this fact that Socialism is simply a system of Legalism, because it is not a British product, and all Legal Systems must be based on some particular conception of Society and must aim at realising or perpetuating that conception. Socialism is "German," in the same sense that the Rothschilds (Redshields) are "German," or that the Reformation was "German," or that Kuhn, Loeb, or the Warburgs are "American." It is, and has been always, primarily a theory for export, and in the country of its nativity, has been, and is, kept severely in its place, which is to crush independence. The hey-day of "German" Socialism was in the day of Bismarck, who said of it "We march separately, but we fight together."

The downfall of Russia in 1917 was consummated by the introduction, in a special train from Germany, of Lenin and Trotsky. Freemasonry, financial and moral corruption, and Socialism, accompanied by a horde of petty bureaucrats, have brought about the downfall of France; and the strong tendency of the better elements of French society, in all classes, to Anglophobia is the result of the widespread conviction that the British Government is now merely the tool of the same Dark Forces.

The situation we have to consider, therefore, is simply this. Two quite distinct influences have been at work for at least two hundred years. On the one hand, we have had the material progress of the industrial arts, which, as most people know, has been easily sufficient, considered by itself, to raise every member of the British public, by the use of power, to a position of economic independence, while at the same time reducing the necessity for economic labour to a small fraction of that available. Almost contemporaneously with this, we have witnessed a systematic expansion of Legalism, of which Socialism is an increasing part, which ignores and in fact systematically attacks and distorts this situation. And the nett result is insecurity, more labour-hours, poverty, and war.

While it is probable that a majority of those who are interested understand how this situation has been brought about, it may be desirable to recall that the *physical* causes have been: Export of production, either unpaid for, inadequately paid for, or paid for in raw material only

useful in the production of further material for export. The objective of this has been exchange manipulation. Grossly unbalanced production — too many machines, too few comforts. Sabotage: Artificial trade booms and slumps, with the breakup of plant and organisation.

Large-scale "Rackets" such as the Grid Electricity Scheme, which was an imitation of, and inspired from the same source as the Utilities racket in the U.S. Hundreds of millions of pounds worth of magnificent machinery and plant was consciously and unnecessarily broken up in connection with this scheme alone. All of these were rendered possible by subtle propaganda, which treated money as wealth, and only employment paid for by money as being the production of wealth.

The *political* cause was the determination to maintain the monopoly of credit and to buttress that monopoly by Law. The most vital result of this was that purchasing-power was, and is, inadequate to buy the goods produced at the prices at which the price system requires that they should be sold, so that a majority of production has to be given away to an enemy, while the purchasing power involved in its production is used to make up the deficit in respect of the remainder. At the same time, the controlled Press hypnotises the public to demand universal employment. Of course, nothing could be more favourable to the temporary re-establishment of this system than the present holocaust of sabotage and free gifts to the enemy if the world is still foolish enough to agree.

We are now perhaps in a somewhat better position to proceed with our examination of the apparently contradictory attractions of Socialism, *if we realise that it is simply more Law, an extension of exactly the process which has stultified the process of the industrial arts. There is no more prospect of producing a tolerable state of Society by passing more Laws, and imposing more sanctions, than there is of repairing a motor car suffering from a choked carburetor by devising a fresh tax upon it.* The world is suffering from a fantastic and unnecessary book of Regulations, every additional one of which, while apparently beneficial at the moment, exacerbates the disease.

There are thus two aspects of Socialism, attracting very different supporters. There is the aspect, which attracts Messrs. Winant, Harriman, and their like, with Mr. Benjamin Cohen, the Incarnation of Law, joyously assisting. These people see in Socialism, quite correctly, a line of thought which can only lead to the concentration of power in their hands, power they are determined to maintain and extend, just as Stalin and Hitler have power which the Czar and the Kaiser never had. The aspect which attracts the rank and file of Socialists is in the main something much more subtle, I think.

Passing over the fairly obvious influence of the revenge complex on the part of the under-privileged (who have for the most part been kept in that position by the millionaire "Socialists" in order to be used as a disintegrating force) and the attraction offered by petty bureaucracy to lovers of power without responsibility, I believe that one definite delusion accounts for more Socialists than any other single cause. It is the delusion of the supremacy of the intellect, with the derivative that an order is the same thing as its execution.

Now, anyone with reasonably wide experience of life and affairs knows that the intellect has very definite limits. "The Professor" is recognised as a legitimate butt for mild humour, not so much on account of his knowledge, as for the lack of any ability to use it in his daily life.

We recognise that what is lacking, is something we call judgment, or (very misdescriptively) "common" sense, and that this faculty, so rare that when it *is* combined with

intellect it can almost command its own price, is an ability to check constantly and almost automatically, theory and ideas, against experience. It is exactly the lack of this faculty, which is conspicuous in Socialist circles, which by common consent draw their support largely from the influence of well-meaning elementary schoolteachers. The modern State-controlled school is the perfect model of bureaucracy, designed primarily for control by the Government rather than for any genuinely educational objective. There is no standard of output, except *Si momentum requiris circumspice*. Once again, it is evidence of the magnificent material of the British people that a large and increasing proportion of these teachers are revolting against this tendency. But a good deal of harm has been done.

Now to this type of mind, the fact that you can multiply x by itself five times, for instance, and the result is called X^5 is not merely proof of a fifth dimension, it is ground for a political world of five dimensions. Or to put the matter another way, "the-Government" can order golf-club secretaries to grow asparagus in bunkers. Therefore asparagus will grow in bunkers. This confusion between Aristotelian and Baconian thinking is one of the most valuable tools of arch intrigue.

At this point, it may be desirable to dispel the idea, if it exists, that international financiers spend their time hatching out, e.g. Socialism.

To paraphrase a well known example from the theory of Chance and Probability, if ten monkeys tapped ten typewriters long enough, they would be bound, eventually, to write Karl Marx's *Das Kapital*, as well as everything else, even if they didn't understand it. But that would not mean that it would be broadcast weekly with variations by the B.B.C., commented upon by the "Woof," sponsored by the "Daily Poursuivant," modified for use in schools and Churches by the London School of Economics, and hailed on the outbreak of war as the Blue Print of the New Order. It is control of *distribution* upon which international financiers rely to stultify *production*, either of goods or of ideas.

What happens is that a comprehensive watch is kept on proposals of every kind and from every source, which have the smallest bearing on major issues. As an instance of the rapidity and efficiency with which this intelligence service acts, I might perhaps cite the fact that in less than three weeks from the publication of what might be called the first article on the relation between Finance, Centralisation and World Hegemony, which appeared in the *English Review* in 1918, an important member of the Rothschild family had sounded an alarm in appropriate quarters about it. If a proposal is dangerous to financial and high political interests, the press is closed to it. On the other hand if it is an attack on any interest *other* than these, and particularly if it is buttressed by "moral" argument, it is subterraneously assisted, since the destruction of these interests does not mean that they cease to exist—it merely means that they are transferred to international Finance. It is hardly too much to say, at this time, that if a policy of social reform is not attacked in the Press, or refused reasonable publicity it is certain to contain, hidden in it, a conspiracy against the plain man. The torrent of abuse, misrepresentation, downright lying and calumny, which has been directed against Social Credit, more particularly in Canada and Australia, is probably the highest compliment to its potential effectiveness which could be offered by the world's mischief makers.

(III)

It is clear, I think, that it is exactly in the realm to which Socialism has contributed nothing, the realm of individual initiative, invention, and scientific discovery, that

we have made our progress towards a leisure civilisation, security, and culture. And exactly in the realm in which Socialism operates exclusively, that of Law and the infringement upon the liberty of the individual, that the major and increasing frictions of Society occur, and the stultification of Science is accomplished. It is not the concern of Science to deal with Distribution. And with regard to Finance, which is the mechanism of Distribution, Socialists and the Financier have always been of like mind. In this, we approach the answer to our original question — why does Socialism receive support from International Finance and specifically German-American-Jew Finance? That answer is that Law places the sanctions of the State behind the collection of taxes. Socialism with its slavish adulation of the State, aims continually at the transfer of Property to the State. This property then becomes available as security for State Loans created by the Financiers out of paper credits — i.e., the monetisation of the collective credit of the community concerned. The Bondholders are exactly what their title would imply — they are the slaveholders of the "New Order."* Just enough of the Bonds are distributed to the Public to obscure the real nature of the transaction and to create a vested interest in the protection of the Financier.

Now, up to this point, it should be clear that there is really no room for discussion. There is not a single Socialist measure, which has not involved increased taxation — Taxation which is unnecessary but which increases the power of the Financier. At the date at which these words are written, the expenditure of the British Government has reached the colossal figure of £14,000,000 *per day*. No one in their senses believes that this sum is being raised, either by taxation or "saving." It is, as to its major part, a bookkeeping device to transfer Public Credit to Financiers. When the war has gone on long enough to ensure that the necessary arrangements have been made under the plea of military necessity ("Only in time of war," or under threat of war, will the British Government engage in long range Planning," as Mr. Israel Sieff's P.E.P. journal remarked) the maximum amount of taxes, although not all that are "due" as interest on these paper loans, can be extracted from the individual, so that he can never become his own master. Since inability to pay all will be admitted, the interest will be scaled down. The genuine subscriber, as distinct from the creators of large credits, will thus in effect lose his money. And it should be remembered that these colossal credits are based on destruction not construction.

Such a situation requires the elimination of autonomous States. One centralised Police Force ("as easy as A.B.C.") will provide the Sanction for the Tax Collector. Herr Hitler is eliminating European States, the United States is eliminating the British Empire, Japan proclaims a "New Order" in Asia, and, through National Socialism, the New Deal. Communism, or funeral Reithism, Utopia arrives with the day on which Hitler (if you live in England) Churchill (if you live in Germany) or Mussolini, are "beaten". Stalin, Roosevelt, Taxes and Banks will accompany Mr. Benjamin Cohen, *et al.*, into the Dawn of the New Day.

Perhaps.

I have already suggested that an illusion has been systematically and consciously fostered both by the corrupt Press, and by political propaganda covertly paid for by international financiers, that the world's populations must

maintain themselves by persistent and increasing "work" and competition for export markets; that this illusion can only be maintained by every kind of waste, and that the periodical wars which are a necessary agency of this waste are used to rivet fresh bonds, in every sense of the word, on the deluded public. But there are certain other aspects of the matter, which are both significant and curious. One of these is the success with which Old Testament "religion" is used to recommend Socialist doctrines, in much the same way that Cromwell's illiterate and half-crazed bible-thumpers prepared the way for the victory of the City of London Whigs, and their shadowy Continental backers, the readmission of the Jews to England, the foundation of the Bank "of England," the loss of the American Colonies by taxation, and the black era of child-labour and unbridled industrialism which characterised the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. No one who has any familiarity with the subject can fail to recognise the revival of the same technique, modernised, in the Dispatches from Our Own Correspondent on Mount Sinai, which are broadcast by the "British" Broadcasting Corporation before the more secular news, which follows at 8 o'clock. The frenetic adjurations to "sacrifice," i.e. to pay more taxation ("which with proper psychological preparation can be greatly increased"), which were a feature of Lord Stamp (of the Bank "of England")'s pre-war speeches, also bore the same suggestion that we hearken unto the Chosen Messenger of the Lord — invariably bringing bad news.

I am quite willing to accept any alternative explanation, which fits the facts. But I find it difficult to understand the traitorous mismanagement of the affairs of this country for the last twenty years, in the face of the warning of 1914-1918, to go no further back, and the rewards and honour which has fallen to those who have been responsible, on any other assumption than that the situation in which we find ourselves today was consciously designed by much cleverer men than any of the well-known political shop-window ornaments who did their bidding. And further, that the arrangements to sell the British Empire required an organisation much older than twenty years, and included the sale, at one and the same time, of exactly those conceptions of individual liberty which, with some justice, we consider flourish best in these islands.

While, therefore, I have no doubt that Pan-Germanism at the moment represented by Hitler, is the immediate enemy, and, as the result of the skilful planning of the real Enemy can only be crushed and must be crushed, as the outcome of a long and devastating war, I am equally confident that victory over Germany is only valuable if it is accompanied by victory over those who at one and the same time helped Germany to re-arm, and prevented Great Britain from re-arming until re-arming inevitably meant a long war. I mean that mysterious international Power which at one end of the scale crosses all frontiers, dictates every Budget, and imposes the policy which maintains its own strength, and at the other, uses its Socialist dupes to fortify those sanctions of the State which render revolt impossible.

The solution of the problem is not a light matter, and is more difficult with every day's delay. For my own part I am convinced that, having in view the devastation which these men have let loose for their own ends, no action is too drastic which renders them and their Organisations incapable of further harm.

Once they are out of the way, with their powers of Bribery and Blackmail, there is plenty of goodwill and ability in the world to guide "the forces of nature to the service and well being of Man

*"Slavery will be abolished by the War. This we and our European friends are in favour of. For slavery is but the owning of Labour, and involves the care of the slave. The same result can be obtained by controlling the money." Circular issued to Bankers in the United States at the end of the American Civil War.

TO THE POINT

Writing in "The Brief for The Prosecution", C.H. Douglas drew attention to Karl Marx's famous statement of 1870, that "The English are incapable of making a Socialist revolution, therefore foreigners must make it for them," Douglas observed that the statement was one of "high historical and practical value". In the mounting debate on immigration in Australia, it is highly significant that both the Marxists and the Political Zionists are united in their opposition to "racism", a political swear word used to describe anyone who stresses the importance of trying to maintain a homogeneous people. A genuine national culture, one that makes it possible to resolve problems in an orderly manner, is only possible when there are a homogeneous people. As the very term implies, "multiculturalism" is anti-national and subversive, favouring those with a vested interest in imposing alien policies.

It is now almost universally conceded that "full employment", usually described as a situation where less than 4 per cent of those described as "the workforce", are out of a paid job, is impossible in the face of rapidly expanding technology. But rather than face the obvious, that if the cultural inheritance, progressively expanded by past generations, has made it possible to meet the genuine requirements of people with only a fraction of the population required to operate the production system, policy of dividends is required to reflect the reality, all types of stratagems are being suggested to deal with the situation. Longer years in schools have become a fashionable suggestion. Presumably parents should be prepared to pay to feed, house and clothe their children for a longer period. One wit has suggested that the unemployment problem would be solved by keeping as many people as possible at school all their lives! Other suggestions are that available paid work should be divided. Others believe that the growth of what are called "leisure industries" will help to provide employment for those not required in the production system. Irrespective of what is attempted, there is no genuine solution under a financial policy rooted in a philosophy, which rejects the principle of inheritance. This is sneeringly rejected as something for nothing, even by those who readily accept free sunshine, rain, air and other natural gifts.

* * * * *

The real relations between Zionist Israel and the Soviet Union are rather different from those publicised by Zionist propagandists. *The Australian Jewish News* of June 1, carried the following report from Jerusalem:

"More than 300,000 Jews live in Moscow, the city's deputy mayor, Anatoloy Kostanko, said shortly after arriving.

"He is heading a seven-strong delegation here to celebrate the 39th anniversary of the defeat of Nazi Germany.

"This event is sponsored annually with the participation of Soviet visitors by the Israel-Soviet Friendship Committee.

"The ceremony marking the event is held at 'Red Army Forest' in the Judean Hills, west of Jerusalem."

While Zionist propagandists continue to verbally chastise the Soviet Union for its alleged "anti-Semitism", Zionist businessmen in the West enjoy close relations with the Soviet leaders, not to mention the Jewish underground economy in the Soviet Union. Israel, a parasitic entity sustained by massive financial and military support from the U.S.A., is openly backing the revolutionary Khomeini regime in Iran in its war with Iraq, providing military equipment.

In the event of cutting of oil supplies from the Persian Gulf, the resulting international crisis would almost certainly see both the Soviet Union and Israel expanding their influence in the Middle East. Both Moscow and Tel Aviv are continuing to exploit their dialectical play.

* * * * *

President Marcos of the Philippines has, following the recent elections in his country, assured the International Monetary Fund that he is now in the position to impose the austerity programme outlined by the IMF, the price for its financial "assistance". The IMF's austerity programme is guaranteed to increase the revolutionary ferment in the Philippines.

* * * * *

Assuming that a recent survey carried out by the Harris Research Centre for Credo, the London Weekend Television current affairs programme, less than half the British people believe there is a God. A majority of people — 55 per cent — wants less Church involvement in politics. This helps to explain the parlous plight of Britain today. If belief in the absolute called God is dead, there is nothing left to which people, individually and collectively, can relate. The elevation of Man into his own God has always proved disastrous. Every Civilisation in history has been undergirded by belief in coherent religious system, one that postulates absolute metaphysical values, which govern human activities. When belief in those values is eroded, a Civilisation starts to die. Regeneration requires a return to belief in metaphysical values, and the incarnation of that belief into appropriate action.

C.H. Douglas said, "Unless you have some kind of reliable chart, you are a mere waif on the ocean. Clearly religion in this sense is a seven day a week matter..."

* * * * *

The problem with written history has been highlighted once again, this time by what appear to be well-documented contradictions of much of the official version of the Allied Normandy landings forty years ago. There were incredible blunders. The quality of British military leadership is attacked by General Sir James Marshall-Cornwall, in a new book, *Wars and Rumours of Wars*. A recognised war historian, Sir James has some hard things to say about Field Marshall Viscount Montgomery, charging that he made "grave mistakes" in the period immediately following the Normandy invasion. British war historian Philip Warner, author of *The D-Day Landings*, is confident that D-Day "has not yet given up all its secrets". But, so what? Any bungling at Normandy was of little importance compared, for example, with the policy, implemented by Eisenhower, of holding Allied troops back to permit the Red Army to move into the heart of Europe.

Written history is at least 95 per cent historian. Real history is crystallised politics. As yet, few professional historians are prepared to challenge the hoax about the 6 million Jews who, in the main, were allegedly gassed to death by the Nazis. This hoax is sustained by all the powers of modern propaganda. It is essential for the advancement of the policy of International Zionism.

* * * * *

There are still many unanswered questions concerning the man generally known as Hitler. Comparatively little is known about his background. He is credited with being the author of *Mein Kampf*. But those who were in prison with him, when the book was allegedly written, do not recall him writing anything. Hitler left no literary works. His physical appearance was in direct contrast with his stated concept of the ideal Nordic type — tall, blond, and blue-eyed. Was he of Jewish background, as claimed by some? Was this used to blackmail him? Was fellow National Socialist Roehm murdered because of his alleged homosexuality, or because Roehm knew who had financed Hitler initially, and much more? While it would be helpful to have answers to these and similar questions, they are relatively unimportant compared with Hitler's policies. Those policies played a major part in the developments, which have brought Western Civilisation to the edge of the abyss.