

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. 11&12

NOVEMBER - DECEMBER 1984

Registered By Australia Post—Publication No. VBH 1001

THE INTERNATIONAL ASSAULT ON THE LEAGUE OF RIGHTS

Students of the many revolutionary publications around the world, these being produced by both Zionists and Marxists, will have noted the many references to the League of Rights. Particularly in Canada and Australia, the campaign against the League of Rights has moved more into the open, with a developing unholy alliance between Marxists, Zionists and some Christian groups.

1984 saw an intensification of the campaign against the League of Rights, the last meeting of Mr. Eric Butler's Canadian tour, in Victoria, British Columbia, resulting in "human rights" demonstrators attempting to intimidate people from attending what was a private meeting by invitation only. Photos were taken of those attending, with a threat that these were being used for files for further action. The revolutionaries in Canada bluntly state that they are going to make it impossible for the League to hold meetings and want the League officially declared an illegal organisation. Pressure was applied on those who had hired venues for League meetings.

Just prior to Mr. Eric Butler leaving for Canada, a new storm of anti-League campaigning burst, with the smearers reaching a new all time low. Under parliamentary privilege, the Secretary of the Victorian Cabinet, Dr. Coghill, charged that Mr. Eric Butler had been collaborating with the Japanese on the eve of the Pacific War, and reactivated the old smear about the alleged wartime "inquiry". The smear was then picked up by the hatchet men like Mr. Phillip Adams, former Communist turned millionaire.

League of Rights Assistant National Director, Mr. Jeremy Lee, issued a comprehensive and devastating answer to the smear, which was supplied to the media right throughout Australia. But it was generally ignored. This reply appeared in the November issue of the League's monthly, *Intelligence Survey*, copies of which may be obtained from Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne, Australia, 3001.

MANIPULATING CHRISTIANS

While in Australia the anti-League smearers were able to use public funds, with former Communist, now Fabian Socialist, Mr. K. D. Gott, being engaged at \$1500 a week to "monitor" the League of Rights, and to counter its activities, in Canada the Zionists said that they were doing their own surveillance work. Zionist statements make it clear that they regard the Canadian League of Rights and its National Director Mr. Ron Gostick as the main target for attack.

The manipulation of many Christians by the Zionists, who skilfully exploit the "chosen race" myth, highlights the warnings made many years ago by the founder of Social Credit, C. H. Douglas, who said that the realisation of practical Christianity

necessitates the repudiation of the "Judaeo-Christian" myth. This myth is the Achilles Heel of the Christian Church, as so effectively exposed in Douglas Reed's great classic, *The Controversy of Zion*. Limited supplies of this work are still available from the League of Rights.

In Australia there is increasing controversy inside the mainstream Churches concerning the League of Rights. The Uniting Church is becoming seriously divided. An example of misguided Christians associating with the Zionists and Marxists in the anti-League campaign, is provided by a special "study document", prepared by Dr. John Brown, general secretary of the Commission for World Mission of the Uniting Church in Australia, and issued as a supplement to the Uniting Church National News Network.

Dr. Brown does not define what he means exactly by "racism", but speaks of "Christian opposition to racism." Dr. Brown charges that the League of Rights "depicts Jews in violent and obscene terms", and goes on to quote Andrew Campbell's pathetic "study" of the League of Rights. Dr. Brown says that if the League were to "achieve a significant influence on Australian political life", there would be "repression of minority ethnic groups (especially Jewish) "and, perhaps most revealing, "The severance of diplomatic and commercial relations with all Communist countries, regardless of internal changes within the Soviet bloc or of the implications in our international relations."

BATTLE LINES CLEARER

Dr. Brown also warns that if League influence continues to grow, there will be "a significant decline in civil liberties" and "suppression of all forms of public opposition to government policies, and of dissent in any form." This is a classic example of Orwell's double-speak. Dr. Brown is charging the League with threatening to do what in fact he and his ideological fellows are attempting to do in order to curtail the influence of the League.

Looking back on the developments of 1984, it is now possible to see much more clearly the developing pattern of a co-ordinated international campaign against the League of Rights. The battle lines are being openly established. The major battles have still to be fought. But the campaign against the League everywhere is a striking confirmation that it is being increasingly effective. That is the good news at this time.

BOOK BANNING IN CANADA

Zionist pressure in Canada has resulted in book banning on a scale unprecedented in a Common Law country. Even Gary Allen's bestseller *None Dare Call it Conspiracy* is listed as being on the banned list! Supplies of books being imported by the Canadian League of Rights have been seized.

Canadians are not considered capable of judging books like *The Nameless War*, by Captain Ramsay, and *Red Fog Over America*, by William Carr.

But it is *The Hoax of The Twentieth Century*, which has been the major target for the book banners. This meticulously documented work by Dr. A. Butz, examining the evidence concerning the alleged gassing of millions of Jews by Hitler's Germany, has never been answered. No attempt has been made to disprove Butz's extensive documentation, to show an error of fact. The weakness of the Zionist position has been demonstrated by the resort to name calling smearing.

The book banners in Canada have even seized copies of the Butz book out of libraries, although this has produced at long last some reaction from academics, who constantly claim they support the open investigation of all subjects.

As we go to press we learn that a supply of *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century* have been seized from the Red Deer College, Alberta.

It would appear that the election of a Canadian Federal Government calling itself conservative has had no effect on the advance of totalitarianism in Canada. But those responsible for the book banning in Canada, and the attempt to stifle any public discussion on the "Jewish Problem", could be creating a situation, which will eventually result in a massive backlash.

Canada is not only a member of the British Crown Commonwealth, but is in more ways than one a vital front line for the whole Free World. What happens in Canada could have far-reaching international implications. Douglas correctly observed that the "Jewish Question" would emerge as the central issue of the twentieth century. Developments are proving him right.

TERRORIST RABBI KAHANE

American-born Rabbi Meir Kahane, an open advocate of terror, was elected to the Israeli Parliament at the last Israeli elections, his policy being to drive all Arabs out of Israeli occupied territory, which means that no Palestinian should be permitted to live in his ancient homeland.

A convicted criminal with a long record of violence in both the U.S.A. and Israel, Kahane heads the notorious Jewish Defence League. Kahane has boasted that "The Jewish Defence League preaches violence and also proves it is in accordance with the Halakah." Kahane claims to have 4,000 of his "boys" "doing some very good work." It has members of the Jewish Defence League who physically assaulted Mr. Patrick Walsh at Mr. Eric Butler's Toronto Seminar last year, and who destroyed the premises of the Institute of Historical Review in California.

Previously denied entry into Canada because of his criminal record, Kahane attempted to enter Canada after being elected as a Member of the Israeli parliament His application for permission to enter Canada for a speaking engagement was signed by about 35 Toronto Rabbis.

Unlike many Zionists, Rabbi Kahane does not attempt to dis-

guise what Political Zionism really means. He spells it out"... Zionism and democracy do not go together. Zionism contradicts democracy. Zionism gives Jews all the rights, it gives none to non-Jews ... I want to expel all Arabs from the country..."

An American Jew, Mr. Jack Bernstein, who lived in Israel for over six years, returned to the U.S.A. completely disillusioned about Zionism in practice, stating, "Zionism is a political movement started mainly by East European Jews who for centuries have been the main force behind Communism-Socialism. The ultimate goal of the Zionists is 'one-world' government under the control of the Zionists and the Zionist-oriented Jewish international bankers."

Israel is a terrorist State created by terrorists and still run by terrorists. Rabbi Kahane is frank about the real nature of Political Zionism. Unfortunately many Christians believe that a terrorist movement is a manifestation of God's will.

EXPLOITING THE ETHIOPIAN TRAGEDY

There is much more to the Ethiopian drought and famine than the international news media have revealed. Those who know Africa are well aware that it has from time immemorial suffered from severe droughts. They are also aware that not only rural Ethiopians are suffering from famine, but that the people of other African countries, Somaliland for example, are also suffering. But it is Marxist-dominated Ethiopia, which has been selected to tug the heartstrings of basically compassionate Western peoples. Soviet strategists must be delighted.

In most of the highly emotional material concerning Ethiopia, comparatively little mention has been made of the Marxist Government dominating the country. Ethiopia is a satellite of the Soviet Union, a base of considerable strategic significance. The Soviet Union has a major naval base at Amara, and it is estimated that the Soviet has approximately 3000 military advisers in Ethiopia along with hundreds of civilian assistants.

The Marxist Government's cynical attitude towards famine conditions may be judged by the spending of \$200 million on a celebration of the 10th anniversary of the military coup, which brought the Marxists to power. 500,000 bottles of Scotch whiskey were shipped to Ethiopia late in September. More expensive liquid refreshments have been sent since. There are reports of food, mainly melons, being exported from Ethiopia.

While the Thatcher Government is giving liberally in various ways to help alleviate human suffering in Ethiopia, the Soviet Union does nothing, but does contribute considerable financial support to revolutionary Scarghill to assist with a blatantly political strike, which has as its objective the destruction of the British Government

The widespread threat of famine throughout the whole of Africa, with the exception of South Africa, has been one of the major results of the premature European retreat and "liberation" movements. Enormous amounts of foreign aid have been provided during the "post-colonial" years, much of it wasted by corrupt African politicians on military equipment, most of this provided by the Soviet Union. For example, the Soviet has provided the Ethiopian Marxist regime with at least \$2 billion in military aid, this used in attempts to destroy rebellions in Eritrea and other provinces. \$2 billion would buy a large amount of food for victims of famine.

But the Marxists are not interested in works of famine relief and charity. Let the gullible West provide this while they concentrate upon consolidating their Ethiopian base.

Irrespective of how much aid is provided for Africa, it will make little contribution to the basic problems of Africa, which are not drought, but the type of economies, the African politicians, often advised by Western liberals who ignore African realities. Billions of loans, which can never be repaid, and direct hand outs, have been provided for "liberated" Africa, but most of this has been used, not to develop a realistic agricultural programme, but for industrial and urban expansion programmes. Traditional tribal realities have been ignored.

At the same time that the humanitarianism of Western peoples are being exploited to alleviate famine conditions in Ethiopia, there has been an increase in the international campaign against South Africa where there is adequate food production, not only to feed all the peoples of Southern Africa, but also to export to the north of the continent. During his recent visit to the U.S.A. Bishop Tutu of South Africa, a black priest who talks about peace while endorsing the use of the violence to destroy European government, was given major media exposure while he sought to influence the Reagan Administration to take a much stronger stand against the South African government.

Like all governments, South Africa's is far from perfect. But the alternative to the law and order now prevailing is chaos and more famine. The tragedy is that basically decent people throughout the Western world are being exploited to support a strategy, which, if successful, would result in more millions of Africans suffering from famine. They would then be further exploited as they have been in the case of Ethiopia.

What is urgently required at the present time is some robust Christian realism instead of the current sloppy sentimentalism masquerading as Christian love.

SETTING THE SCENE FOR THE KEEGSTRA TRIAL

What some feel will be "the trial of the century", that of former schoolteacher, Mr. Jim Keegstra, of Alberta, Canada, will start early in April 1985. A Judge has rejected a bid to have the charges against Keegstra dropped on constitutional grounds, that they violated the Canadian Charter of Rights.

There are growing fears that the Keegstra trial will be used to stage a Hollywood-type film, with the agents-provocateurs outside the court case being used. A Hollywood producer says that Lorimar Productions are considering the making of a television movie on the Keegstra case.

With the trial scheduled to go for perhaps six weeks, it is clear that Mr. Jim Keegstra is the unfortunate victim of a strategy, which has as its main target the Canadian League of Rights.

THE AUSTRALIAN ELECTIONS

In his annual report to the General Meeting of the Australian League of Rights, National Director Mr. Eric Butler said that the Australian Federal Election results had been the best possible considering the realities of the situation.

He said that the League had played a major role in the campaigning, which had continued in depth right throughout 1984. Tens of thousands of copies of special issues of The Intelligence Survey

CHRISTMAS GREETINGS

We extend Christmas Greetings to our readers and their families trusting that they have a Holy and Happy Christmas and a New Year, which will prove fruitful in every way.

had been selectively distributed with the material being used by many not directly associated with the League.

The League's massive national campaign on the land-rights issue had eventually forced the Opposition parties to indicate some opposition, even if rather reluctantly because of fear of being associated with the League of Rights. Prime Minister Hawke had found it politically necessary to "back off" on the land rights question during the election campaign, with comparatively little being heard from Aboriginal Affairs Minister Mr. Clyde Holding.

Apart from the distribution of tens of thousands of its own brochures on the referendum, Western Australia being saturated, League actionists also made a major contribution to the distribution of over one million copies of the hard-hitting magazine, Wake, Up, produced in Queensland by The Council for a Free Australia.

Mr. Butler said that there was no doubt that the grass roots movement, generally ignored by a media predicting a major Hawke victory, had helped to ensure a most encouraging NO vote on both referendum issues, the cutting back of Hawke's majority and the defeat of his attempt to gain control of the Senate.

Mr. Butler predicted that 1985 would witness developments, which would increasingly reflect the influence of the League. He pointed out that although the election and referendum campaigns had made an enormous demand upon the League, financially and physically, already nearly 300,000 copies of the League's brochure on the League's Objectives and history had been distributed, and there was no doubt that the target of one million would be reached in the New Year. The response to this brochure was most encouraging and helping to prepare the ground for a further major advance in 1985.

The World Plot

It is a curious fact that the decreasing numbers of people who pour scorn on "World Plot" explanations of the present state of the world (not of one country only) do not appear to recognise the implications of their opinion. If they were right, the present discontents are inherent; we can do nothing more about them than we can do about the normal equipment of mankind with two legs and two arms. But if the "Plot" theory is correct then we can deal with it, great though the difficulties may be. Either all men are alike, as the Socialists would have us believe; or some are turned to the Light, and some love the Dark. That is the awful interpretation of the Judgment.

- A note by C. H. Douglas (1947).

DISCRIMINATION AND EQUALITY

By Geoffrey Dobbs

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

physico-chemical mechanisms which are common to all forms of life, since by the study of these men may hope to be able to control and manipulate the nature of other organisms, and even other men. Since this manipulation is being carried out with less and less discrimination, and without the respect of love towards which discrimination is the first step, it is likely to be increasingly disastrous.

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

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

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

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

exist", and "Down with the bourgeoisie!"

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

Sceptre and Crown
Must tumble down,
And in the dust be equal made
With the poor crooked scythe and spade.

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

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

It is the same with 'equality in the sight of God'. The 'equality' is in the sight of God, and not at all in us whom He sees with absolute discrimination of all those differences, which He created in us. God is the very last Person in whose sight we could be equal. You will search the Bible in vain for any suggestion of the universal equality of men. On the contrary, the only important use of the word 'equal' refers to

PUBLISHING PROBLEMS

We apologise to our readers for the upset in our publishing programme.

As a result of developments beyond our control, we were unable to publish the November issue, but had planned to produce a double November-December issue, providing a full coverage of the Calgary and Vancouver Seminars and Dinners at which Dr. and Mrs. Geoffrey Dobbs spoke. These functions were part of the programme to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the historic C. H. Douglas tour of Australia, New Zealand and Canada.

Unfortunately the transport strike in Australia upset the planned double November-December issue under emergency conditions, with the January issue being a 12-page issue.

We trust that our readers will bear with us while we get our publishing programme back to normal.

the ways of God (Are not my ways equal? — Ez. 18, 29). But! here the word is used in an archaic sense more equivalent to 'equitable'. It is but a trick of the language to slip from: 'equality in the sight of God' to 'it is self-evident that all men are created equal', but in the process the 'equality' has been transferred from God to man, and has changed its meaning.

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

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

"HERITAGE" RUN AMOK

BY CHAS PINWILL

What can account for the spectacle of 100,000 people marching in the streets in order to save unaltered, a riverbed, which not 50 of them have ever seen, or ever will?

Or demonstrations in California against kangaroo culling "to extinction" when a whole continent has still twice as many kangaroos as people?

The now daily efforts across the world to save rain forests, seals, or whales — through impeding bulldozers, scrambling across ice flows or assaulting steel ships in rubber boats with outboards — is all too familiar.

Already in the name of the defence of our natural heritage, our heritage of private property rights, hard won over centuries from Kings and defended from Governments, and even the Constitutional heritage of Australia have been severely mauled.

Estimates of above 30% of Australia's land mass being set aside to protect Aboriginal tradition, the demand by N.S.W. Cabinet Minister Mr. Crabtree that 12% of land be allocated to National Parks, Legislation for Heritage Registers, Marine Parks and wilderness areas, and now a proposal to take 10% of New South Wales for defence purposes, have made it very likely that over half of Australia may soon be out of bounds to ordinary Australians.

A growing division between Australians, something along the lines of "The Greenies versus The Rest" is not healthy from anybody's point of view.

ALL CONSERVATIONISTS

All men are inescapably conservators through the dictates of their own natures.

Few would allow that there lives a soul, with soul so dead as to have no concept of beauty. This, if it is real, carries along with it an urge to protect.

The maintenance of the very lives of the majority of modern populations is obviously dependent upon our present agricultural and industrial heritages.

Few with any knowledge of the subject would allow that the enormous waste of built-in obsolescence, the creation of useless "work projects" to keep the population "empayed", the consumption of vast forests, mineral and oil resources to feed an unproductive bureaucracy, and much else of this nature, is short of a tragedy.

The world has long been familiar with the farmer who tried, through good organic practice, to leave his soil richer than he found it, familiar with the squire who defended his fox, beaver or badger from the ravages of the scalp hunting poacher and nurtured his patch of forest, and with the home owner who loved and maintained his historic dwelling.

The inclination to conserve has always, except in times of riot or revolution, been commended.

This naturally sound instinct, could, if it could find constructive outlet and employment, challenge the madness of over

active economies dedicated to employment, to less demanding ones upon resources aimed at the only object of production, that is, consumption.

A finance/economic system which regards new car factories, in a world with embarrassing over production of cars, as advantageous, for employment reasons, without providing citizens firstly with the purchasing power to use present production, might find an answer through a serious and truly dedicated conservationist movement.

It is insecurity, which engenders greed. Consult any farmer who feeds his pigs automatically all they wish. Within two days they exhibit all the stoic disinterest in food of an English lady. There is indeed hope for men.

But starve those men of access to an abundant self-evident production, through a contrivance of unemployment through unemployment, and he and his society will madly build factories or dams for yet more unsaleable production, skyscrapers for bureaucrats, or pyramids in order to overcome a "scarcity" which didn't exist.

If just a few more conservationists could understand this underlying pressure towards increasing wasteful demands upon resources, conciliation rather than a conflict could result.

Social Credit has long set out the answers through universal empayment to the limits of required production, for the purposes of consumption, in a manner, which would enfranchise all men with their national inheritance of productive capacity.

But there is nothing of this ilk to be found in the controversy. For something is rotten in the state of conservation.

Something has changed twixt the old conservator, or conservative and today's conservationist.

The symptoms are apparent to all men of good will, but why is the fashion to stop the symptoms outstripping the mental effort towards a cure, and who stands to gain.

AN EXPLANATION OF THE POWER OF THE "CONSERVATION" ISSUE

As previously pointed out our economy is intent upon employment as a means to consumption, not upon production for consumption with the means for consumption, namely money, automatically provided.

But agricultural employment was destroyed early this century by the tractor, the most revolutionary machine of the 20th century. From 40% of the population engaged in rural industry to 5% in 50 years, and still embarrassing over production.

So what? So on into the cities and secondary production. The automated machine severely reduces employment here, and still is doing so. So what? So on into tertiary industry? Enter the silicon chip.

URBANISATION

The result of this was an increasingly urbanised population, as never before in history. With nobody too sure why they're all crowded into the cities anymore, unless they understand employment — ordered societies, and there is not too much of that there anymore.

As never before in the history of man, urbanisation beyond precedent has cut his overwhelming majority from the soil, animals, nature, the wilds and contact with his organic roots.

He doesn't curse the leaches in the forest, or know the feel of the bull ant bite, or forgive the bitter cold rain 9 miles from Gundagai. He romanticises his deep, often unarticulated, sense of loss of the reality of nature in his life.

He quite rightly and naturally experiences this intuitive sense of loss. He has no access to nature or the discipline of its great cruel/kind reality.

THE MEDIA

This however is but part of it. The next part of his problem is an artificial contact with the natural world, call it the electronic media.

Whatever might be said, and plenty could, of the stupid bias of the media, infested with slick idiots, with no real knowledge, which it has and is and hasn't, respectively, that might be let pass at the moment. Even the sophisticated subliminal assault, an open secret of advertising, upon the baser instincts of men may be put aside. However another factor cannot.

Television is the greatest crescendo of stimuli ever to accost the senses of man, and he doesn't know how to cope.

Alcohol has been with European man for 2,000 years plus. He has developed a few conventions, disciplines himself to them with difficulty, "no alcohol before sundown", "don't drink alone", "don't mix your drinks" etc. If it can be said he copes, it is with difficulty, and primitive cultures tend not to cope at all; a veritable scourge to Red Indian and Aboriginal communities.

Television is but 20 years old.

The artificial environmental stimuli wash over modern man. One moment he is deep in rain forest (jungle in the untoward connotation), the next high on a temperate mountain (perhaps smoking Alpine cigarettes), in a tourist urge for the barrier reef he then goes submarine, if, like me, he is a "Doctor Who" fan, he is then literally out of this world.

All in ten minutes, all in his living room, and he can't smell or touch a dammed thing.

A man out of realistic touch with nature, experiencing a deep yearning for it, and then treated with an artificial inassimilable unceasing storm of artificial contact with everything in the universe, animate and inanimate, can be sold a story, and if he isn't, will invent one.

RELIGIOUS DECLINE

A third reason for the "conservationist phenomenon" of great importance is the decline of the Church. The natural or "nature" religion of man is pantheism. The wiles and guiles of nature mystify him.

God is not only everything, but everything is god. Nature in its totality is worshipped, and why not, he's seen it all on T.V. Of course, he's also seen nothing, but if he's seen nothing else he'd better believe it.

THE ANSWERS

Some are already happening. Where an income independent of employment is possible, be it only the dole, the move away from the confinement of the cities is happening. "Acreage" is the answer, and to some small extent, if the rest of the world and taxes stay their distance, I believe it is helpful.

The conservationist movement is going to have to grow up and look for answers before it's anti-social concentration on admittedly harmful symptoms is left to history.

The rural life without a rural income still means starvation. Employment in a world in which the machine works 24 hours

without coffee breaks, puts labour on the wage of less than a third of the maintenance of a machine, for repetitive jobs. Money ain't bread, man, and bread ain't money. One is the reality, the other its symbolisation, and we shall have to insist that there is a difference.

THE MOST IMPORTANT CHALLENGE OF TECHNOLOGY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Quite apart from the social and cultural consequences of modern technology, there is another area that is very significantly affected by technologies and which in turn influences the living population of the world. Modern technologies have created a growing demand for the earth's resources, and they have also developed the means to acquire those resources at an

ever-increasing rate. And in the long run, that is if there is to be a long run, commonsense suggests that demand will have to be balanced against the sustainable availability of renewable resource's. In that sense the success of modern technology poses a very important challenge to human ingenuity and an even greater challenge to the present generation for the future of all life on earth.

I do not think that any discussion about modern technology can ignore what is certainly the most important challenge of modern technology to mankind; namely the development of the generation of power from nuclear reactors and of nuclear weapons. Both these products of technology pose baffling dilemmas. Evidence suggests that conventional power stations, together with some of the industries they supply, plus vehicle emissions, are mainly responsible for the acid rain which is destroying forests and killing life in rivers and lakes throughout the Northern latitudes. Nuclear power stations may pose other problems, but they do not produce acid rain. Then again, all the evidence points to the successful deterrent effect of nuclear weapons. Although they do not stop small wars or the invasion of stronger powers by their weaker neighbours, they have prevented escalation, and they certainly appear to have discouraged armed conflict in Europe. Yet many people still seem fervently to believe that wars are created by weapons. The trouble is that any weapon capable of killing is dangerous the moment it gets into the hands of anyone with the intention of using it. For nearly 100 years Britain had a naval fleet more powerful than those of the rest of the world put together, but it was not called up to go to war until 1914. What is known to the Jewish people as the Holocaust was perpetrated without the use of any military weapons at all. More people have been killed by motorcars or by terrorism than by bombs.

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

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

SUBSCRIBE TO "INTELLIGENCE SURVEY"

Keep abreast of the revolutionary developments threatening Australia. Subscription rate: \$8 by direct subscription only from G.P.O. Box 1052J, Melbourne, 3001.

The Brief for the Prosecution*

By C. H. DOUGLAS

"The Brief for the Prosecution", which was first published in 1945, and has recently been republished, was the last of a series of writings by C. H. Douglas on the realities of international politics. The following extracts from "The Brief for the Prosecution" provide evidence of the genius of Douglas and his long-range perception of the forces, which have brought the world to the present crisis.

CHAPTER IX

BANKERS AND REDS AGREE

M. CLEMENCEAU, "the Tiger," is said to have remarked, "Some essential virtue has gone put of the British." That is possibly, but not certainly, true. "Britain," and the inhabitants of the British Isles, are by no means identical. It may be noticed that when the consequences of our strange peacetime policies bring about a major catastrophe, the shadowy influences which have produced it hand over the situation to some extent to the native-bred, whose efforts are still heroic, if unnecessarily costly.

At the outbreak of war in 1939 a paean of joy ran through the American Press, and the denizens of the various international Socialist and World Planning bodies, such as the Fabian Society, P.E.P., and the Royal Institute of International Affairs, were happy in the assumption that whoever lost the war, they had already won it. Orders-in-Council, restrictions, registrations, and bureaucrats (those belonging to the organisations just mentioned moving quietly into the second-best seats) appeared with the air of a stage army which had been kept waiting a little too long in the wings.

Mr. Anthony Eden, fresh from a revivifying trip to Washington announced, "It seems that our New Order must be built through war. But it will be built, just the same." The haste to declare our real war aims was perhaps almost indecent.

Although apparently anachronistic, the convenient time at which to consider the furious attack on Mr. Neville Chamberlain and his policy of "appeasement" is in connection with its apparent failure, and to provide it with the correct background it is necessary to survey a field not very obviously that of foreign policy.

The Chamberlain family, of sound British stock and stable middle-class history, rose to considerable but not outstanding wealth largely through their connection with the Birmingham firm of Guest, Keen & Nettlefold, the early manufacturers of the wood-screw known as "self-driving," *i.e.*, not requiring a hole to be bored for it. Later, amongst other interests, they acquired control of the small joint-stock bank, the Birmingham & Midland, which, by amalgamation and expansion became the largest Joint Stock Bank in the world, the present Midland Bank. Even here their influence is probably more sentimental than financial.

Prior to 1914-1918 the Chairman of the Bank, Sir Edward Holden, was, known to hold very "advanced" views on the actual nature of the business carried on by banks, and its bearing on national policy. The common idea that a bank is merely a custodian of its clients' money, which it relends at interest to safe borrowers, was not taken seriously by him, although it is incorrect to attribute to Sir Edward the enunciation of the explosive theorem that "Banks create the means of payment out of nothing" (*Encyclopedia Britannica*) which was explicitly stated by H. D. Macleod in his *Theory and Practice of Banking*, at least twenty-five years earlier.

But the history of the Midland Bank during the Armistice years is marked by several features unique to it amongst the "Big Five" banks to whom the numerous smaller banks had in the main been affiliated. The first of these was the series of Annual Addresses by Sir Edward Holden's successor, Mr. Reginald McKenna, a politician rather than a banker, of which perhaps the most significant was that containing the famous statement, "The amount of money in circulation varies only with the policy of the banks . . . Every loan creates a deposit, and the repayment of a loan destroys a deposit . . . the purchase of a security by a bank creates a deposit, the sale of a security . . . destroys a deposit." It is unlikely that these Addresses were actually written by Mr. McKenna himself, and some grounds exist for the belief that he did not understand them, but there is

little doubt that they were part of a considered and immensely important policy operating through the Bank as an organisation. The Bank "of England" was not amused. The Gold interests with Sir Henry Strakosch and the *Economist* were not amused. The Chosen Race was annoyed.

All the large banks expanded physically at the temporary cessation of hostilities, partly to absorb in real estate, and conceal by writing down, the fantastic profits they had made by War Finance. But the Midland took a highly individualistic line even in this. It opened branches bringing its total number up to approximately two thousand, but only in Great Britain and Northern Ireland. All the other banks expanded abroad also.

A decorous disapproval of Bank "of England" policy, and of Mr. Montagu Norman, was fairly evident, the "chequelet" incident to popularise small cheque payments being a case in point.

But the profits made by the banks were probably the least important aspect of their 1914-1918 activities. The immense production necessitated by the war had rendered it inevitable that manufacturing concerns must borrow on an unprecedented scale, and the influence of Sir Edward Holden's views on the methods adopted is beyond dispute. As a consequence all the banks, but particularly the Midland, had come into a control of industry far beyond anything previously existing, just as their creation of the means of payment out of nothing was unique in its magnificence. The situation, which must have been dear to the Board of the Bank, was precisely that which the big German D Banks, to which the "Big Five" English Joint Stock Banks had been brought to correspond, had achieved before the war under the direction of Ballin, Ramenau and others. Industries were merely departments of banking Government, controlled by debt. So far as the "Big Industry" was concerned, this control was practically complete. There remained the elimination of small business, which, as it transpired, was surprisingly difficult.

It is difficult to dissociate the position and influence of Neville Chamberlain from the importance and outlook of the Midland Bank. He had the tidy, narrow, bureaucratic mind of the dealer in figures, together with the imaginative deficiency of the English middle-class.

He was scrupulously honest, and his standard of political honour was far above that to which post-war British politics had fallen. He was a genuine patriot, and it is highly probable that he was so disgusted with the pseudo-democracy, which was leading clearly to disaster, that he fell easily into the trap, which opened invitingly before him.

The war had demonstrated that raw materials, and particularly nitrogenous chemicals were the key to victory. Reginald McKenna, who had succeeded Sir Edward Holden as Chairman of the Midland Bank on the latter's death, attempted to bring about a merger between British Dyestuffs and Nobel's Explosives. He failed, for some reason which does not transpire, the project re-appeared under the leadership of Sir Alfred Mond in an enlarged form, the Midland Bank appeared to become more orthodox, and Mr. McKenna became a Director of Imperial Chemical Industries; and Sir Harry McGowan (Lord McGowan) of I.C.I., and Lord Ashfield of the socialistic London Passenger Transport Board, and a Director of I.C.I., became Directors of the Midland Bank, a very bushy tail on an admittedly large "dog." This was in 1926, and subsequent events can only be understood in the light of these arrangements, in particular the interlocking of the Midland Bank with the largest American Bank, the Chase National.

It should be remembered that when in 1931 Neville Chamberlain displaced Philip (Viscount) Snowden, who regarded the Bank "of England" as the greatest moral force in the world, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, the country was bled white by the contractionist policies of the internationalists. Chamberlain at once set in motion the mechanism of credit expansion by abrogating the Gold Exchange Standard, which made the grip of the Bank of England nearly absolute. Stanley Baldwin was Prime Minister and remained Prime Minister until May 1937. A Napoleon, a Bismarck and a Pitt, all rolled in one could not have repaired the mischief of Baldwin's tragic fifteen years of power, in the two years of peace, which remained. Had it not been for the quiet English gentleman who succeeded him, those two years would have been cut in half, and the *Luftwaffe* would have been over London without so much as two squadrons of effective

fighter opposition from the R.A.F.

It is difficult to write patiently of the stream of abuse directed at the Munich policy. The scurrilous attacks of the American press are understandable. The collectivist New Deal was already a failure. The German-speaking Jew control in Washington was even stronger than in the time of President Wilson. No one outside a few technical experts believed that the United States could be harmed even by a fully victorious Hitler, and a large body of commercial opinion was already mobilised around the slogan, "We can do business with Hitler." The prospect of another war in which America would keep out and again rise to fantastic prosperity on a war boom was too alluring to be relinquished. The situation is explained with engaging candour by Mr. A. D. H. Smith, in his biography of Colonel House, President Wilson's adviser: "It may not be to our credit, idealistically, but the fact is we used the European democracies and their Allies for our purposes; they did not use us, except incidentally. And if Mr. House were alive today [1943], he would say that is exactly what the United States has been doing since Britain (*sic*) and France declared war on Germany in 1939." (*Mr. House of Texas*, p. 172.)

But the spate of synthetic bilge regarding our unpreparedness which was poured out from domestic quarters which had done everything possible to encourage Germany and to hinder re-armament in this country is only explicable on the assumption that a well-known technique of the Communist Party was in operation—to accuse your opponents of what you have done, or intend to do, yourself. Not a single word of this abuse was directed to the Money Power, the Press or the B.B.C. It must be remembered that the internationalist policy was interlocked with such institutions as the League of Nations, the International Labour Office and the Bank of International Settlements, inaugurated with the assistance and blessing of Viscount Snowden. The same group of noisy Socialist journalists, most of them deriving such ideas as they possessed from alien sources, who shouted "Down with the Men of Munich," had worked and talked against re-armament and extolled collective security, while demanding intervention in favour of Abyssinia and Communist Spain. Their assumption of the right to a moral attitude for which they were not prepared either to work or fight is perhaps the only palliation of Mr. Stanley Baldwin's foreign policy, or the lack of it.

But there can be no doubt that the internal economic system of Great Britain underwent a radical change for the worse in 1931 that, without the spectacular incidents which marked the inauguration of the "New Deal," a carefully prepared system of controls running parallel to it was imposed, specifically designed to accelerate monopoly. The complete story of the forces brought to bear will probably never be told; the formation of the great cartels and the financial control of British industry during the American boom in the interests of American investors were certainly preparatory; but in that year Britain, no longer great, adopted the beginnings of a new theory of life completely alien to her genius—the conception of the country as a single factory having many departments, the head office and control-room being the Bank "of England." The London School of Economics, endowed by the German-speaking Jew Sir Ernest Cassel, and largely staffed by Socialist aliens, "to train the bureaucracy" (much of it temporarily in "private" employ) "of the coming Socialist State," had come into its own. How much of the responsibility for Dunkirk rests on this hastily imposed bureaucracy will never be known.

It must be insisted that the tragic history of the Armistice years was neither adventitious nor inescapable. It is quite true that the number of individuals who are capable of estimating the consequences of an economic policy is not large. But the moulders of socialist-cartelist policy knew exactly where they were going, and they were going in the same direction in every country. The objective was a rigid, comprehensive military-industrial framework in which the individual would disappear except as a tool of high policy. It was the complete antithesis of everything the Englishman had built upon the foundation of Magna Charta and Habeas Corpus, and it led us straight to the beaches of Dunkirk and the arrest and imprisonment of nearly seventeen hundred persons without trial and without the formulation of a charge, under Regulation 18B.

The history of the last few years of peace will probably not be told, if at all, for many years. It is obvious that; even if the re-organisation policy to which Chamberlain had obviously committed himself had been intrinsically sound, which is highly debatable, it

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF "THE NEW TIMES"

Next year will mark the 50th Anniversary of "The New Times", the first issue being published in early May 1935. In spite of, at times, what appeared to be insuperable obstacles, including many financial crises, The New Times has over half a century served the Social Credit movement, initially in Australia, but subsequently throughout the whole English-speaking world.

The 1985 Annual "New Times" Dinner, to be held on Friday, October 4, will be a special commemoration function and an event of great historic significance. We anticipate that readers from all over Australia will be in attendance and to participate in the Annual National Weekend of The League of Rights. Readers are requested to make a note in their diaries now.

offered the perfect opportunity to hamper the rearmament. Rearmament was hampered; and it is certain that such success as was achieved was the result of cutting adrift to a considerable extent from the advisers who surrounded Baldwin, and that Chamberlain's unpopularity had far more to do with that than with any reasonable grounds for criticism, under circumstances for which he was not responsible, of the successful efforts which delayed the resumption of military war.

The bureaucratic state, however, demanded war for its final enthronement, and not only war, but a long war. It must be observed that the productivity of the modern power-tool system had brought out into strong relief the effect of the monopoly of money by the banks, and the abnormal consumption of war was needed to force back into the factories the balance of the populations not engaged in mutual destruction, so that "Plans" might be matured to keep them there. It is hoped that the memory of the ordinary citizen, doped with Hollywood films, monopoly broadcasting and defective education, will be short enough to permit the contradiction between the "poverty amidst plenty" of the 1930's and the "full employment" aspirations of the bureaucratic state in the immediate post-war years, to escape notice.

It is the fashion to ascribe political mistakes to ineptitude rather than to moral turpitude. To a considerable extent this is justifiable in regard to the ordinary individual. For instance, nothing could be at once more tragic and more widespread than the idea that Socialism and "Planning" is the legitimate inheritor of political and economic liberalism.

But the history of the past twenty-five years renders it quite impossible to accept this view so far as the higher direction of events is concerned. There is evidence, conclusive both in volume and character, that the international-collectivist-financiers and their Trades Union allies not only knew that the economic and political crises of 1920-1936 were primarily monetary in origin, but they also recognised in such events as the election of the Social Credit Government of Alberta that the time was limited in which they must acquire a new form of control to replace that which had previously been exercised through the monopoly of credit. Only war could provide the conditions and the time. The writing was—and is—on the wall.

Alberta provides perhaps the most decisive evidence of conscious intention, by reason of the Disallowance of all the Legislative Assembly's measures to implement a system of adequate purchasing power. The drastic and unusual course adopted does not seem capable of any explanation other than that the international money-power knew that they must be successful if tried, and dare not permit them to be tried. Even against continuous opposition from the Federal Government at Ottawa, and much disadvantageous and unfair discrimination, the Province of Alberta has been uniquely prosperous under an Administration actuated wherever possible by the general principles grouped under the term Social Credit. The importance of this matter is greater than might perhaps appear at first sight. There are very few individuals outside the ranks of political vested interests who do not regard the trend of

events with concern or apprehension. But the idea has been skilfully injected that we are merely witnessing an inevitable consequence of modern technology, and if, as someone has phrased it, you cannot take your telephone out however much you dislike it, we must resign ourselves to the loss of our "individual freedoms" in the interests of a "higher freedom."

If this were so, it would be unnecessary to cook the accounts, pervert the evidence and confuse the issues. The world (*i.e.*, the individuals in it) is *not* yearning for full employment by *centralised organisations*. On the contrary, a larger number of persons than ever before want *self-employment*. But they want purchasing power.

It is *not* true that the larger an organisation is, the more "efficient" it is, even if the efficiency of organisations were the prime, sane, objective of life, which it is not.

The greater efficiency of large-scale production "finds scant support in any evidence that is now at hand." (*Final Report, Temporary National Economic Committee, U.S.A.*, Senate Document No. 21, 1940, p. 314.) "It should be noted, moreover, that monopoly is frequently the product of factors other than the lower costs of greater size . . . where they exist. . . . It is attained through collusive agreement and promoted by public policies." (*Ibid*, Monograph 21, 1940, p. 21.)

Since *financial* results are what is aimed at in business, it is obvious that the conditions of financing small and large business may, and frequently do, make mere difference to the profit and loss account than low costs.

For instance, bulk buying may enable low prices to be paid for raw material, but this has no connection with the actual amount of labour put into the winning of the raw material. Bulk buying may be, and often is, actually and realistically inefficient; but the low unit price paid produces an illusion of low genuine cost.

Within limits the whole aspect of a balance sheet can be altered by allocating to various accounts charges, which in other conditions would swell the cost of production and expose waste. No commercial accountant would certify the accounts of the Post Office in the form in which they are submitted.

It may be objected that many of the facts to which reference has just been made have been elicited by "National" Committees, Royal Commissions, and similar bodies. This is true, but it will be noticed by anyone who will take the trouble to read the literature of the Fabian Society or P.E.P. in the realm of industry, or the Royal Institute of International Affairs ("Chatham House") in Foreign Affairs, that such findings are never quoted, and the impression conveyed is always that of the inevitability, as well as desirability, of larger units.

A further and equally important indication of what can only be described as conscious turpitude is contained in the arguments adduced in relation to a "managed," as distinguished from an "automatic" money system. The old, orthodox Gold Coinage Standard money system, in which a bank was compelled to pay call deposits in gold if required, pretended to be, although it was not, an "automatic" system. It was contended that politics could not enter into it. Price levels and the "balance of trade" automatically produced certain movements of gold, which acted in the manner of a steam-engine governor and kept trade upon a prescribed rate of revolution. It was not true, and if it had been it would still have been a bad system, since the quantity of gold in existence neither varied in any ratio to the possibilities of production nor the necessities of consumption.

But there were two assumptions in the theory as presented to the general public. The first was that it was in the nature of the universe that money should govern production and consumption. The amazing skill with which this idea was inculcated, so that the statement that "The nation cannot afford it, there is no money for it," was accepted as reasonable, should be remembered in connection with many "axioms" presented for our consumption.

But the second, that the money is and should be, non-political, was an outstanding instance of the tribute, which vice pays to virtue. It will be necessary to treat this principle with some attention at a later stage of the argument. It is sufficient for the moment to indicate that it is entirely and openly abandoned, not only in the "managed money" system in operation since 1931 in Great Britain, but in practically all the proposals for monetary reform other than those associated with Social Credit. And "managed money" is simply Planning from the top—*i.e.*, the Bank "of England."

THE FINANCIAL TEST

The rapidly deepening crisis demands that the Australian League of Rights be provided with adequate financial support to ensure that its vital work continues. There must be no faltering now.

The League's Basic Fund for 1984-85 has been set at \$50,000. This is the very minimum necessary for the League to build its programme upon. Already finance has been allocated to renovating and adding to printing and associated equipment. Increased stocks of books have to be financed.

Approximately \$35,000 has now been provided by a minority of League supporters, leaving only \$15,000 to be provided by the overwhelming majority. The League desires to finalise the Basic Fund appeal as quickly as possible. Get YOUR contribution away TODAY.

All Queensland and Northern N.S.W. contributions should be sent to Mr. Chas Pinwill, Queensland State Director, Conservative Bookshop, 461 Ann Street, Brisbane, Queensland; Western Australian contributions to P.O. Box 16 Inglewood, W.A. 6052 and all others to Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne, 3001.

CHAPTER X

THE EVIDENCES OF CONSCIOUS INTENTION

How so great their clamour, whatso'er their claim,
Suffer not the old King under any name!

Long-forgotten bondage, dwarfing heart and brain—
All our fathers died to loose he shall bind again.

Here is naught at venture, random or untrue—
Swings the wheel full-circle, brims the cup anew.

RUDYARO KIPLING, "The Old Issue."

ALFRED MORITZ MOND, 1st Baron Melchett, died in 1930, his attempt to remove industrial policy from criticism of parliament and the general public having for the time being failed. Towards the end of his life he was much concerned with the New York group of Zionist Jews who controlled the Palestine Economic Corporation and were the force behind the "New Deal."

In 1931 two closely connected events coincided with a reorganisation of the Government and the final disappearance of Mr. Ramsay MacDonald and Philip (Viscount) Snowden from politics. The first was the setting up of the New Fabian Research Bureau, with Mr. Attlee, now (1944) Deputy Prime Minister, as Chairman, and the second was the private circulation of *Freedom and Planning* by the organisation known as P.E.P. of which the moving spirit was Mr. Israel Sieff, a Russian-speaking Jew.

For an admirable little analysis of the origins and activities of the Fabian Society and its offshoot, P.E.P., the reader should consult *The Planners and Bureaucracy* by E. Edwards (K.R.P. Publications, Ltd., 1943).

The nature of the former is well exemplified in a pamphlet, *The City Today*, published jointly by the Bureau and the Jewish-Socialist, Victor Gollancz, over the pseudonym of "Citizen," which reads as though it were written by an international banker concerned to idealise the Money Trust.

The public activities of P.E.P. emerged in 1933. In 1938, *Planning*, the publication dealing with such of its activities as it was desired that the public should apprehend, declared "Only in war, or under threat of war, will a British Government embark on large scale planning." This is a key statement, and it requires careful examination.

It is frequently observed, by those who have given only superficial attention to the matter, that it is perverse to object to planning. Much play is made with "the necessity of regarding the problem

as a whole." The implication is that the planning to which reference is made is the alternative to what is commonly called "muddling through." The fact that practically every article we use, from a teaspoon to a motorcar, is the result of skilled, intensive planning is apt to escape notice, yet we do not plan teaspoons and motorcars "as a whole."

The planning which results in a teaspoon or a motorcar, however, is the outcome of a desire to produce a teaspoon or a motorcar of a particular pattern, and in a free economy the pattern is conceived in the hope that it will appeal to the individual, and will be bought in competition with alternative patterns. But the planning of the Fabian Society and its colleague P.E.P. is and must be precisely the opposite. *It is the planning of whole peoples on the model of Germany by a totalitarian State, which is designed as a whole to be the best instrument of war, the national objective of Germany. The teaspoon and the motorcar alike have to fit into this conception. Comprehensive planning requires one single objective, which never varies, and to which the individual is subordinate; and comprehensive planning is only justifiable on the assumption that military war is merely one aspect of continuous war. To repeat the dictum of Clausewitz, "War is the pursuit of policy by other means." Whose policy, and to where it leads, is undisclosed.*

Once this conception is grasped, it is not difficult to realise that "only in war or threat of war" could the social and political economy of Great Britain, the great barrier to World Dominion, be remodelled in the hierarchical pattern of the German Army.

That there is no contradiction between *practical* Socialism (Planning) and extreme militarism was fully recognised in Germany fifty years ago. In 1892 August Bebel, a leading Social Democrat (Socialist) told Bismarck that "the Imperial Chancellor can rest assured that German Social Democracy is a sort of preparatory school for militarism." It could not be anything else and remain socialism.

It is at this point that the fundamental and irreconcilable antagonism between the German and the British, the socialist and the liberal (without a capital) conception of life becomes plain. It is not that the Briton is incapable of understanding, and, unless bedevilled by alien propaganda, appreciating, the necessity of rank and consequent discipline. His point of view has been put once for all by the poet of Scotland, Robert Burns. "The rank is but the guinea stamp, a man's a man, for a' that." The German outlook was put with even greater brevity by the Kaiser—"cannon-fodder."

The matter may be phrased somewhat differently, and in a manner more closely applicable to the present situation, by saying that the German, or socialist *proximate* objective is government by administration, whereas the English conception is government of administration. The first is the unbridled rule of the expert: the second is the subjection of the expert to the criticism and restraint of human need and desire.

It is a remarkable tribute to the sound instincts of the English that they have always distrusted experts in politics. If the average man, assuming that there is such a person, were to be told that this distrust is probably the root cause of their survival, and that it took the form of scepticism in regard to the Encyclopaedist who were responsible for the French Revolution, he would probably repudiate any understanding of the subject. But if the average craftsman, small trader, or farmer were asked why he voted for a Conservative, he would be quite likely to reply, "These socialists are too clever. I don't trust 'em." Some instinct warns him that sympathy for the underdog is one thing; an underdog Party in the House of Lords, a School of Economics identifying the Gold Standard and international cartels with Under Dog Economics and providing its picked graduates with desirable positions in the Bank "of England," and Somerset House, is quite another.

Where the unreasoning instinct of the Englishman (and in this the Scot and the Welshman are not so obviously included) has been so remarkable is that it has led him to a decision on a matter in regard to which reason would require an array of fact inaccessible to the great majority. Without argument, he accepts the bureaucratised state as largely inevitable in war; without argument, he indicates that it is unpleasant in war and intolerable in peace.

But it is doubtful to what extent it is generally realised that retreat from the centralised, Socialist State is much more difficult than progress towards it. Vested interests in bureaucracy are not alone the cause. The situation has been put with accuracy by Professor Brutzkus, from 1907 to 1922 occupant of the Chair of Agricultural Economics at St. Petersburg, who remarks: "it should not be forgotten that the communist state, with all resources at its

free disposal and resting on an absolute dictatorship, is the most powerful in the world; while the subjects of such a state are the most impotent of all peoples." (*Economic Planning in Soviet Russia*, p. 136.)

The foregoing paragraph, and indeed the whole of the book from which it is taken, will repay careful study, since it contains either implicitly or explicitly indications of the tremendous problem with which the world is faced in the bureaucratised or "planning" State. Professor Brutzkus, who had unrivalled opportunities of observing the transition from Czarist to Communist Russia, and was highly critical of the former, concludes: "Russian experience bears out in the clearest manner our basic conclusion—namely, that the principle of socialism is not creative; that it leads the economic life not to fruition, but to ruin."

But it hardly requires insistence that such arguments as the many adduced from various sources on the unsatisfactory condition of Russia and Germany, both examples of the planned bureaucratic Socialist State, have little or no bearing on the likelihood of a change in the system. Its very defects strengthen the *System*. Can anyone seriously suggest that Hitler or Stalin, together with the Great German General Staff and the Moscow Communist Bureaucracy, will resign voluntarily? And if they will not resign voluntarily, "the most impotent of all peoples" are not exactly in the best strategic position to *force* a resignation. The Gestapo and the OGPU can deal competently with anything of that nature.

There is no essential difference between the higher officials of a Trust, Cartel, or Trades Union, once they are free of Parliamentary control, and a Russian Commissar or an "Office General" of the Great German General Staff. None of them is creative; all of them are primarily concerned with their own positions and the perpetuation of the system, which maintains them in positions of maximum power and minimum responsibility. And not one of them can pursue an independent policy. The policy is that of the type of organisation to which they belong—it is the organisation, which makes the man, not the man the organisation.

Sir Alfred Mond's plan was one way of ending Parliamentary control of the bureaucrat; failing, resort was had to the New Despotism, "P.E.P."

Once again, there is a tendency to assume that we are witnessing an automatic, and to that extent, inevitable development. So far from this being true, it is possible to indicate exactly where, and by what steps the present situation has been reached, and in so doing, to place the conscious nature of the policy beyond dispute. One clue can be found in the nature, transformation, and mechanism of taxation.

The fundamental idea of taxation can be discerned in the maxim "*inter arma silent leges*." Taxation was originally a war measure; it was not law, it was not legal. It was simply a recognition of the fact that when the house is burning down, the millrace may have to be tapped to put the fire out. The income tax, introduced by Sir Robert Peel, was a temporary tax to replace the revenue lost by the abolition of import taxes on various articles and like Peel's Bank Charter Act, Police Legislation, and general policy, can be seen to have been a portion of a definite plan to familiarise permanent taxation, of which it is most improbable that his was the creative brain. During the whole of the nineteenth century we can see the conception of taxation as being a device to finance specific ends, changing into something entirely different—a political weapon, in the main aimed at agriculture but in general intended to make Finance the Supreme Government. The core of the plan was the National Debt and the Balanced Budget working in conjunction with the Bank of England. In order to avoid repetition, the reader who is not familiar with the technique of Government Finance may be referred to *The Monopoly of Credit*, Chap. V, for further detail.

Knowledge of finance was confined to a select few, and the general public was gradually trained to believe that in some unexplained way, life was becoming much more expensive. In actual fact, the general population was receiving a decreasing share of wealth produced. It never seems to have been generally observed that the "social services," which were often given as a reason for higher taxation, were almost wholly due to the inability of the individual to get by purchase what was physically obtainable, since public bodies did in fact obtain it, paying by loans which further increased taxation. The individual was not to be allowed to spend his own money. It seems so obvious to anyone who is completely ignorant of the subject that the poor are poor because the rich were rich, that no decent minded person could object to make the rich poor by taxation even if in some curious way the general body of

the well-to-do became poor without the poor becoming perceptibly more well-to-do.

It has been proved repeatedly, by the most orthodox economists, that the distribution of surplus money income over the bare subsistence level would be quite inadequate to raise the general standard of living to any tolerable stage, and would kill any but elementary industries. Over twenty years ago, Dr. Bowley stated that the confiscation of all incomes over £160 would only provide £25 per family if the sum confiscated were completely and evenly distributed. It is being proved at this time, when we are spending £14,000,000 *per day* that the confiscation of the *money-wealth* of the well-to-do would not take us very far, since on Dr. Bowley's figures, when there were well-to-do, they, collectively, had only about two-thirds of a million a day to spend.

The detail of this question is intricate and far-reaching, but the main dominant fact is simple. It is that there is under existing financial methods no relation between wealth and money, and that taxation, which is always in *money*, is levied on price values, which do not in themselves add one penny to the amount of *money* in existence. A landowner may have property, the *price value* of which is £100,000, but to pay his taxes he must get *money* from somewhere. And the money is created, not by the ownership or the cultivation of land or even by the sale of it, except to a bank, but by the banks — "out of nothing" as the *Encyclopedia Britannica* puts it.

Had this been widely understood, the fantastic taxation of the past thirty years in particular, beginning with Mr. Lloyd George's Budget of 1910, would never have been tolerated. It was not widely understood, *but it was thoroughly understood both by the international forces which brought Mr. George to power, and by the German High Command* which realised that the landed proprietor was the backbone of the fighting strength of Great Britain, and that his elimination would leave the "internationalist" in a commanding position. *The German landowner is almost completely untaxed.*

An understanding of this matter is essential to even an elementary insight into the politics of at least the past two hundred and fifty years. The fact that *money* has been kept in short supply has deluded the vast majority into believing that *wealth* was in short supply. By keeping (no matter what the improvement of process and the increase of production) the less fortunate, short of *money*, a discontented body of the population could be, and has been, kept available for agitation against every type of property except the credit or money-creating mechanism. Skilfully financed propaganda against property itself as a "private" conception has provided votes to transfer it to institutions governed from the shadows, or has so depreciated market values as to amount to virtual confiscation, without in any case detaching the conception of ownership *by somebody or something*, from it.

Out of this has grown a feature new in British life—the idea that uninstructed criticism of one's neighbour's business is normal and proper, and can reasonably be extended to any infringement of his "privileges" which does not involve interference by the police.

As it has been suggested earlier in these pages, there are sound technical reasons for regarding the large monopolistic structure of industry, with its universal wage and salary system, as being economically defective, and it is therefore all the more significant that, with a technique which, as such, must exact admiration, the whole body of controlled propaganda contrives to ignore the elementary dilemma in which the planners are placed. Either the factory-world and the mechanised farm are effective in producing an immeasurably higher standard of living under more pleasurable conditions; with much less labour, or they are not. If they are, why more employment? If not, why pursue the policy?

When the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Temple, said "We need supremely the control of human purpose" he merely voiced, doubtless without realising it, the views of the world dominator everywhere. The only distinction which can be legitimately drawn in Power Politics, of which the Archbishop's phrase is a synopsis, is the relative degree of progress to the goal of domination, and in this the Great German General Staff represents the summit of achievement up to the present. To what extent the United States of America is briefed, under the same essential direction, to assume the major role is not so apparent as it was some time ago. There is

THE INSTITUTE OF ECONOMIC DEMOCRACY

The Institute is one of the specialist divisions of The Canadian League of Rights. The Institute offers a unique service to all Canadians. It is the only organization explaining and providing specific answers to the financial and economic dilemma gripping the Western World.

The Institute is the source of information from which genuine advocates of free enterprise, private ownership of property and economic democracy — consumer control of the production system — can gain the concise explanations and solutions needed for a return to sanity. One of the first steps required to better protect the individual's freedom.

ENTERPRISE is the official organ of the Institute and is published quarterly. Associate Membership is available on application, at a cost of \$15 per year.

Associate Members receive *ENTERPRISE* plus copies of all booklets and books as they are published by the Institute, plus regular information bulletins on fiscal, monetary and economic problems.

nothing like the same homogeneity either of race or sentiment as in the case of Germany.

But in any case, the important point is that the object of Power Politics is Power. It is sheer delusion to suppose that men ultimately mould an organisation. The exact contrary is the case. The *effective*, man is moulded by his pursuits, and the only result of a dichotomy between a kindly, tolerant, individuality, and a power social and economic system is nervous instability; a fact of which the Germans are both aware and resentful. The well-known remark, "We Germans will never be gentlemen, and you British will always be fools" was, in the sense in which it was intended, a scientific statement of fact.

But it must be conceded that we have been brought to a difficult situation. The wage system could have been quite a good form of organisation if it had not been perverted in two major directions. The first, and for some time the lesser evil of it was that a man became an employer of labour by accumulating "savings," miscalled capital, with which to finance a new production venture, and the "savings" system was and is an economic fallacy resulting in restricted distribution. But a far more serious evil developed with the removal of the guild control of wage rates, accompanied by the systematic debasement of the unit of currency by the financiers. This was the inability of the wage earner to contract out of a starvation wage. It is this inability to contract out, which has enabled the plotters to staff the police forces, reaching their apex in the Russian OGPU and the German Gestapo. It is by police power that the serfdom of the world, the Socialist State of Sir Ernest Cassel, Sir William Beveridge and the other surprising allies of the submerged tenth, is to be maintained. Everything will bear a facade of legality. It is interesting to notice the resemblance, amounting almost to identity, between the methods of expropriation employed in Great Britain since 1931, under the direction of P.E.P. and those employed by Hitler. In his revealing book, *The Germans and the Jews*, the Jewish writer, F. R. Bienenfeld, remarks "The tactics which Germany has adopted towards the Jews are no longer those of the mediaeval pogroms . . . First it is made clear to the German people that the Jew is the attacker and that the peace-loving German Government is only defending itself. Whereupon, no illegal spoliation takes place, but the law, justice itself, organises robbery . . . The property of the Jew is not confiscated, but under threat of imprisonment he is made to sign an agreement by which he sells it voluntarily for one-hundredth part of its value . . . the fact that the property is sold on the same day to an Aryan at its full value and that the Aryan has to pay two-thirds of its full value to the German State is given a legal justification." (Foreword, p. xi.)

That is an almost exact description in essence of the methods employed in the last twelve years to expropriate the ordinary British property owner, and is almost word for word the proposal of Lord Hinchinbrooke and his so-called "Progressive Conservatives."