

THE NEW TIMES

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

Vol. 49. No. 7

JULY 1985

Australia and New Zealand Edition. Published in Melbourne and Auckland

THE TAXING QUESTION

As graphically documented in his recent book, *"Australia's Looming Farm Disaster"*, Mr. Jeremy Lee shows how the rural communities of Australia, New Zealand, Canada and the United States, are being destroyed as effectively as if invaded by conquering armies. They are being conquered by financial policies, which continuously force up their financial costs. Debt, taxation and inflation are taking a deadly toll. The social implications are horrendous. "Get bigger or get out" is still the battle cry of the centralisers, who want to see farmers amalgamated along the lines of much of secondary industry. The philosophy behind the policy is the will-to-power.

The assault on the farmers of the Free World is now being intensified with the threat of "reforming" taxation systems, allegedly to help ensure that the system is "fairer", does not unduly penalise the energetic, and also to block those, loopholes which those nasty "tax dodgers" have been exploiting. Even under orthodox financial policies, there are certain taxes, which are more destructive than others. For example, in a modern series economy, if a tax is applied to an item like transport, which is a basic essential for that economy, it not only increases the cost of transport, but that cost is then multiplied right throughout the various stages of production. A Sales Tax is directly and indirectly inflationary.

THE REAL MEANING OF "TAX REFORM"

All "tax reform" schemes are designed, not to reduce total consumption tax concept is designed to ensure that no one can escape the tax master's demands. Even the poorest members of society, who must eat, have clothes and other basic essentials, must therefore be taxed. The whole system has become so complicated that few can find their way through the maze of taxes, with taxes being levied on taxes. The philosophy behind the taxation system is that unless the individual is put in a strait jacket he will devise ways and means to escape paying taxation. The individual is increasingly treated like a criminal, with hordes of tax collectors necessary to try to police a system, which the majority of people detest.

Taxation is only accepted without open revolt, because many are still mesmerised by the abstraction called finance, which obscures reality instead of reflecting it. If financial symbols reflected reality, the whole basis for taxation would be destroyed. For example, higher taxation on any product would then only be justified if production associated with that product was making it impossible for more important production to take place. We are not in the business of promoting whisky, but it is hard to see how the production of whisky is in any way preventing the building of houses, or roads. The proposed consumption tax in Australia would mean that all books and magazines have to be taxed. But in what way does the production of this journal use resources, which are required to produce sufficient food? The question only has to be asked to reveal the completely fraudulent nature of modern taxation.

If taxation is compared with a levy paid by members of any sporting club, then the amount of taxation required for the legitimate purposes of any government or community activity should be agreed to by the members of society. Even in Municipal government, which is still closer to the people, it is difficult for the ratepayers to have a real understanding of how their rates are being spent. But there is more chance of finding out. Generally speaking, there is an allocation of rate revenue to specific activities. In some parts of the world, Local Government Acts do provide ratepayers with the means whereby they can challenge the raising of loans or different projects. A referendum can be forced if enough ratepayers petition for one. But there is no such check on bigger governments, all of which encourage Empire building.

ABSURD NONSENSE ABOUT TAXATION

It is constantly stated that modern governments must impose high taxation as they are required to provide so many services for the people, and that they have no other sources of finance. This is absurd nonsense, as witnessed by the fact that all governments, including those, which call themselves conservative, rely upon deficit budgets to help finance their activities. Deficit budgets provide an extra amount of new money, without which economies would collapse completely. Then there are semi-government organisations, which also borrow, this also bringing new money into the community. Individuals also find they have to borrow in order to purchase the abundance of consumer goods available. But all of this borrowed money is created as a debt, debt that carries interest charges.

Escalating debt, heavy taxation and continuous monetary inflation, and the attempt to centralise power, were the basic causes for the collapse of the Roman Civilisation. The financial policies of

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.

Rome stripped the rural communities of their sturdy, independent peasant farmers, and herded them into the ant heap of Rome. The same is happening today. The death of Western Civilisation is associated with the death of the traditional family farm and the smaller decentralised centres it sustained. The rural communities are in revolt, as witnessed by the mass rallies in Australian capital cities. But these revolts have, until now, been negative. However, a new note is being heard, with farmers starting to grasp that their individual members of Parliament must be held personally responsible for the imposition of higher fuel and other costs, with the threat of worse to come under consumer taxation. The regeneration of our Civilisation must start in the smaller centres, where there still is much more health of all kinds, and then affect the bigger centres.

A SUGGESTED START

A start could be made to reduce the present high level, and complexities, of present taxation systems, by several simple steps.

All deficits should be written as credits, instead of interest-bearing debts, and applied to abolishing the most inflationary taxes such as Sales Tax. Farmers' debts, along with Municipal debts, should be reorganised on a much longer-term basis and at an interest rate no greater than the cost of administration. All necessary capital works should be financed by new credits, issued on the basis of the estimated life of the assets thus created, with interest rates again no greater than the cost of administration.

It has been estimated that the above steps would result in an immediate reduction in total taxation by at least 25 per cent, which would result in societies moving off their present disaster courses. After a period of time, the results of these steps could be assessed and further steps considered. Confucius said it is no use running harder if you are already on the wrong road. The first essential is to call halt and start to retrace one's steps. As this is physically possible, freedom from financial mesmerism would make it financially possible.

WHERE ARE WE GOING

By J.D. Malan

Mr. David Malan is, like his late Father, Mr. John Malan, a man who approaches economic problems with the precision of the trained engineer. He is the author of several booklets, his "Natural Cost And The Ownership of Money" being a masterpiece of lucidity in its explanation of the basic cause of inflation.

The following Paper by Mr. Malan was presented to a Seminar on INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS IN QUEENSLAND, at the Carseldine College of Advanced Education, on May 17, under the auspices of the North Brisbane Branch of The Australian Democrats. The "Joh" referred to is the controversial Premier of Queensland, Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen.

THE QUESTION

The question 'Did you have breakfast this morning?' is one to which a 'yes' or 'no' answer can reasonably be expected, but 'has Joh gone too far?' is not so simple — it is similar to the well known teaser 'have you stopped beating your wife?' How do you answer it? Such questions are, of course, unanswerable.

'Yes, Joh has gone too far', implies that his tactics are right but he has overplayed his hand. 'No, he has not gone too far' suggests that he is either correct in what he has done or has not yet gone far enough. Neither answer is correct.

There is no point in considering which is the fastest means of getting to Sydney if you really want to go to Gympie. As Confucius said "*It is no use running if you are already on the wrong road*". So, where is the right road? What are the current industrial arguments all about?

Fundamentally, they are about jobs, or rather the threatened lack of them. At least that is the generally accepted view. Union leaders insist that jobs must be created for their members, but industry is told that it must become more efficient, which can only result in less human labour being required when industrial processes are improved. Clearly, you cannot have it both ways.

If the provision of jobs is to be the primary objective of industry, then labour saving devices, such as, for example, computers, are plainly undesirable. Perhaps we should also get rid of earth moving machinery and go back to picks and shovels — or even tooth picks and teaspoons! The idea is obviously stupid.

Imagine a society in which everything anyone wanted was produced by self-maintaining and self-perpetuating machines, without human intervention. Impossible? Very probably it is, but under such conditions there would be 100% 'unemployment', nobody would have any income and, if we insisted that the prior possession of money was to be a condition of access to the products of the industrial system, as is the case today, and we still insisted on observing present financial rules, we would all starve in the midst of mountains of food and other desirable things.

At the other extreme, we could go back several centuries and easily guarantee zero unemployment but at the cost of low living standards, very little leisure and plenty of hard work — in other words, slavery.

Obviously something is wrong with these two mental pictures. It is that they are based on a simple assumption which, when examined critically, has no basis in fact but which today is almost universally believed to be so obvious that it needs neither proof nor even close scrutiny. This false belief is that the only way to distribute money, which is the universal ticket system by means of which goods and services are distributed, is through employment, either directly or indirectly. It is simply not true.

NATIONAL INHERITANCE

Anyone who is lucky enough to inherit from a deceased relative a large parcel of shares in a successful company, or perhaps win a large prize in a lottery, would happily live on the income, which he would then receive as a result of his good fortune. Such an income would provide the freedom to indulge in some favourite project - learning to be an artist, devoting time to a charity or simply playing more golf. The fact that nobody would refuse an inheritance of that sort highlights the fact that personal freedom is, in the final analysis, what everyone would like to have, and what should be the basic objective of civilisation. It is, in fact, part of human nature for each one of us to want to be free to conduct our own life in our own way.

We cannot all be lucky, but in fact there is a vast common inheritance in which we all possess a life interest and from which we should all be entitled to receive a dividend, the amount of which being dependent on the efficiency with which the inherited knowledge was used by industry. In the imaginary fully automated society all production would be in this category and we would all be entitled to receive an appropriate dividend, but no other income. Perhaps it is just as well that such a situation can never really happen!

At present, however, the existence of this inheritance is generally unrecognized and we are denied access to it. Much of the industrial

PLANNING FOR "NEW TIMES ANNUAL DINNER"

Every "New Times" Dinner has a special flavour, but there will be something really extra at the 1985 Dinner, which will commemorate 50 years of continuous publication. Past displays at Dinners will be dwarfed this year, with generally unknown history of "The New Times" and associated activities brought alive.

The Dinner will be held at The Victoria, the venue for practically every Dinner, on Friday, October 4.

The Dinner will be followed on Saturday, October 5, by what can best be described as a National Crisis Seminar, dealing with the growing disasters now openly threatening the Free World. A constructive programme of salvation will be outlined by a panel of outstanding speakers.

Sunday, October 6 will be a full day for actionists — and what a day it promises to be!

Private hospitality can be extended to country and interstate visitors. But they must book well ahead.

Make a note of the dates — NOW.

unrest today stems from an instinctive belief on the part of a large part of the population that we are being deprived of something, without a clear understanding of what it is, how to get it or even how to recognize it if we did get it. Even so, this common inheritance is very real.

Consider again the hypothetical fully automated society — how far along the road towards that admittedly unattainable goal has modern technology taken us? It is probably well over 30%, but that figure will do to illustrate the point.

On that basis 30% of all production is the result of the application of knowledge inherited from past generations, rather than the direct result of present day human labour, yet no attempt is made to equitably distribute that percentage of total production, which is part of our common heritage.

LOOKING FOR SOMETHING

When working conditions were oppressive around the time of the first industrial revolution, trade unions had much to complain about. Today, however, working conditions are generally satisfactory and the actions of unions, including going on strike, are usually aimed at obtaining for their members that elusive and undefined 'something' they believe they should have.

The only way, so we are told, that the unions' objective can be achieved is to demand from employers more and ever more money — through the mechanism we call a 'strike', also referred to as 'industrial action' but which should be termed 'industrial in-action'. But it is easy to see that such an objective can never be achieved in that way. Under present financial rules, every dollar added to nominal wages results in something less than a dollar in the employee's hands and something more than a dollar added to the price of the goods or services produced. Even if some employees gain a temporary advantage by obtaining their extra purchasing power before the prices of products from other industries are similarly affected, the advantage is an illusion since it is rapidly wiped out by the actions of other unions demanding that they receive similar increases.

This 'dog-chasing-its-tail' process contributes to, though it is not the sole cause of, inflation and can only cause social friction. It can never solve any problems. Clearly the unions are on the wrong road, always assuming that their real objective is in fact an equitable share of the products of industry for their members, as they claim.

From the government's point of view the action of unions is alarmingly like blackmail — do as we demand or we'll punish you! - To which their only answer appears to be to try to make the threatened punitive actions illegal. There is no denying that governments can pass laws, which purport to do just that, but it is debatable how effectively they can be enforced. But even if they were enforced, would they solve the problem?

Clearly they would not, since they seek to suppress the symptoms while studiously avoiding the disease. There can be no doubt that governments, as well as the unions, are not only on the wrong roads, but they are both on very dangerous roads if the objective really is, as is so often claimed, a peaceful and prosperous society.

THE RIGHT ROAD

To discover whether there is a 'right' road, and to identify it, we must return to first principles. The only sane objective of an industrial system is to deliver goods and services where and when they are wanted as efficiently as possible. It is NOT the function of industry to provide jobs for everyone. Everyone is, however, entitled to maintain his or her life as long as possible, a fact grudgingly acknowledged by such devices as age and invalid pensions but vigorously denied by governments for others in the community.

Increases in industrial efficiency achieved by the correct application of technology, particularly that inherited from past generations, should benefit the whole of society. Clearly they do not, or at best not to the extent they should, simply because no financial mechanism exists which is capable of distributing these benefits equitably.

It is implied by the actions of unions, and to a lesser extent of governments, that there is something lacking in the distribution system, but both make quite wrong assumptions as to how the situation should or could be remedied. The position was summed up by one writer in these words:

"It is suggested that the primary requisite is to obtain in the re-adjustment of the economic and political structure such control of initiative that by its exercise every individual can avail himself of the benefits of science and mechanism; that by their aid he is placed in such a position of advantage, that in common with his

fellows he can choose, with increasing freedom and complete independence, whether he will or will not assist in any project which may be placed before him.

"The basis of independence of this character is most definitely economic; it is simply hypocrisy, conscious or unconscious, to discuss freedom of any description which does not secure to the individual, that in return for effort exercised as a right, not as a concession, an average economic equivalent of the effort made shall be forthcoming.

"It seems clear that only by a recognition of this necessity can the foundations of society be so laid that no super-structure built upon them can fail."

That quotation outlines the objectives, which many are seeking today, yet it was written in 1919. We have seen vast technological advances since then, but clearly there has been little or no change in the nature of social problems, except that they are today probably much more severe. It is also very significant that over at least that same period of almost seventy years there have been no changes in the financial rules which, as already explained, are at the root of present day troubles.

THE RIGHT TO STRIKE

Much has been said about the 'right to strike' — but what does that really mean? There are only two ways to get anyone to do anything they would not do if left on their own — persuasion or the application of force, either physical or psychological.

The application of physical force has long been abandoned, but psychological force, in the form of threats of starvation, are widespread, mitigated to some extent by the so-called 'unemployment benefits' given grudgingly to those whose services for the time being are not required by the industrial system.

For at least the last forty years it has always been possible for an employee to resign from his employment. The essential difference between doing so and 'going on strike' are that, in the latter case, many employees act in unison and they do so in such a way as to deliberately inflict some hardship on others, either employers, customers or the general public. If there were no implication of impending hardship there would be no point in the 'strike'.

Blackmail is a criminal offence with which Mr. A could be liable to be charged if he was found to have demanded money from Mr. B under threat of otherwise revealing to Mrs. B his love affair with Miss X. But if a number of Mr. A's simultaneously demand money from the corporate equivalent of Mr. B under threat of otherwise acting in a way far more disruptive than revealing an illicit love affair, we are expected to regard their actions in an entirely different light and to vigorously defend their right to do so. Why the different standards?

The simple fact is that the so-called 'right to strike' is nothing more than another facet of the process of centralising power over people. The prospect of some minor and temporary financial gain for the people taking part in the strike is merely a bait to secure their co-operation in the process. The fact that they may be hurt is incidental and the identity of those who stand to benefit from the centralising process is never revealed.

If each employee was "placed in such a position of advantage, that in common with his fellows he can choose, with increasing freedom and complete independence, whether he will or will not assist in any project which may be placed before him", as already

MR SID WOOD

It is with deep regret that we record the death of Mr. Sid Wood of New Zealand. The Wood was a early convert to Social Credit and later became the founding President of the New Zealand League of Rights, a position he held for many years. He travelled extensively throughout New Zealand and played a major role in laying the foundations for the growth of a virile League of Rights

Mr. Sid Wood was a deep student of history, writing and lecturing extensively on the subject. He held the view that the British peoples had a special place in history, and also great responsibilities.

We share with our New Zealand readers a deep sense of loss in the departure of Mr. Wood. But his pioneering work for The League of Rights will be an inspiration for those who follow.

quoted, there would be no point in 'going on strike'. If some condition applicable to some particular employment was unacceptable and sufficient numbers of individual employees exercised their right to end their association with that activity, because they had the economic freedom to do so, the condition would soon be changed.

WHERE WE STAND

The present industrial situation can be summarised as follows:

- (1) The unions are demanding something by specifying what they claim is the only way to get it, rather than by demanding the results they want — which they claim to be a more equitable distribution of industrial production.
- (2) The method, which the unions claim to be the only way of achieving their demands, is such that they can never succeed. This fact suggests either that they are extremely naive or that their real objective is not revealed, a conclusion which may well turn out to be the correct one.
- (3) The Government is attempting to suppress the unrest, which is the natural and inevitable result of trying to do something the wrong way, by making the symptoms illegal while ignoring the cause.
- (4) The real problem, which plagues both parties to the argument, is never discussed. That problem is, of course, an unnatural financial policy.
- (5) The much discussed 'right to strike' is nothing more than a necessary part of the process of centralising power. It cannot benefit those to whom it is claimed to be so important.

The answer to the original question 'has Joh gone too far?' to the extent that it can be answered at all, must be 'yes', but only because he is quite definitely on the wrong road. Even this answer, however, must be heavily qualified by pointing out that, under the circumstances brought about by unnatural characteristics of financial policy, he probably had no alternative and therefore, for that reason, perhaps the answer should be 'no'. As I said at the start, the question is really unanswerable.

A similar question 'have the unions gone too far?' must receive virtually the same answers and for the same reasons. Furthermore, they must also be qualified in exactly the same way.

The Key question is, of course, what is the right road?

If the real objective of both governments and the trade union movement is to achieve a peaceful and prosperous society enjoying an equitable distribution of the fruits of an efficient industrial system, the answer is easy — they should be working in close co-operation to correct the manifest injustices in our present financial system.

The fact that such a spirit of co-operation, irrespective of party politics, is unlikely under present conditions is prima facie evidence that the real objectives of at least one of the parties to the dispute are not what they would have us believe. If the real objective of either party is social chaos and eventual collapse, no matter why they want it, then clearly their present methods are correct, because that is the inevitable result of the present course of action of both parties to the dispute.

One fact, which must be made crystal clear, is that no amount of confrontation between unions and governments, in the way we see it today, can achieve anything other than chaos. It is equally important to recognize that to tolerate union actions which amount to social blackmail can only lead to equally disastrous results.

One other possibility must at least be mentioned, and that is that both parties to the dispute are themselves the victims of a much wider and more sinister conspiracy to reduce our country to a state of chaos for reasons, which are never disclosed. There is a large body of evidence, which indicates that such is indeed the case. If this is so, then there are vastly more powerful motives for all parties to the present dispute to cease fighting each other and start co-operating to identify, tackle and defeat the common enemy.

'Sit down and talk about it' is certainly part of the necessary prescription for peace — but only if the real cause of the problem is to be the subject of discussion. In the absence of a clear determination to study and understand the cause of the problem, all the talk in the world is quite useless.

Even though they do not have the power to completely eradicate the cause of the unrest, the Queensland Government does have the constitutional power to deal with the financial aspects of the problem in such a way as to set an example which other States could and would follow. However, there is no evidence at present that they have the will to act in this way, due primarily to insufficient grass-

roots pressure on politicians in the required direction — no doubt because of a general lack of understanding of the real nature of the problem.

The Trade Union movement, on the other hand, does not possess the constitutional power to deal with society's financial problems directly, but they unquestionably do possess the ability to generate significant 'pressure on elected politicians, if only it could be used in the right way. If their motives were honest, the combination of co-ordinated effort from Trade Unions plus the constitutional powers of the State Government would quickly ensure that the requisite level of general understanding would soon be achieved and the problem would be dealt with to everybody's satisfaction.

If the financial question is not tackled, by the methods outlined or by some other means which produces the same results, the inevitable outcome will be more and more chaos and ultimately social degeneration leading to an open communist style dictatorship in Australia.

If the financial question is tackled in the correct way, fierce opposition can be expected from those who would stand to lose the power they at present enjoy through the manipulation of a perverted, dishonest and unnatural financial system. The reaction from these quarters, which are mainly international, would be the surest indication that the line of action being pursued was truly 'On Target' — after all, no battle worth winning ever lacked adversaries. The fact that no such reaction is in evidence today is conclusive proof that the real cause of the problem is being ignored.

The solution to the financial question is, in fact, surprisingly simple. After all, money is merely a man made ticket system and, like all man made systems, can be changed by man. It happens that the required changes are quite simple, even though of supreme importance.

It must never be forgotten that, as the same author quoted earlier has so wisely said:

"Systems were made for men, and not men for systems, and the interest of man, which is self-development, is above all systems, whether theological, political or economic. "

CONCLUSION

It is a matter of grave concern that Australia is today threatened with serious social disruption simply because of a refusal on the part of all sections of the community, particularly politicians and trade union leaders, to face facts. The stand by the Queensland Government against what amounts to blackmail could serve a useful purpose if it could be means of bringing to public attention the real cause of today's problems.

So far there is no evidence to suggest that such an awakening is taking place, however, it has been wisely said, "even the longest journey must start with one step." Is it too much to hope that perhaps one person here tonight may see the light and so set in motion the urgently needed process of social awakening and regeneration? It will be a difficult road to follow and one fraught with many setbacks and frustrations, but the journey must start

BOOKS LISTED AT KEEGSTRA TRIAL

The following great classics by the distinguished British historian, Mrs. Nesta Webster, have been brought forward in defence evidence at the Keegstra trial in Canada: They are, fortunately, available in Australia. "World Revolution". \$15 posted.

"Secret Societies and Subversive Movements" \$16.50 posted. "French Revolution" \$16.50 posted. "Socialist Network" \$10 posted. "Boche and Bolshevik" \$8 posted. "Surrender Of An Empire" \$14.50 posted.

Even Winston Churchill praised Nesta Webster's masterly scholarship — until he surrendered himself to the Zionist cause.

Those wishing to purchase a complete set of Nesta Webster's works may obtain them at the discount price of \$70 posted. This offer will remain only until the end of July.

"Facts are Facts", by the Jewish convert to Christianity, the late Benjamin Freedman, quotes extensively from The Talmud, cited by Keegstra in his defence. \$6.00

The above books are available from all League bookshops.

somewhere — so why not here and now?

It is my earnest hope that such may prove to be the case — if only because the alternative is that we will leave to our children and grand children a country in such a mess that they will forever brand the twentieth century as 'that time when apathy ruled the day'. It is certainly my earnest hope that my own grand children will never have to say 'why didn't grandpa do something when he had the opportunity'.

Remember that famous quotation "*All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing.*"

THE "NEW CONSERVATIVES"

The election of the Thatcher Government in the United Kingdom and the Reagan Administration in the U.S.A. was hailed as evidence that a new conservatism was emerging. But while both Mrs. Thatcher and Mr. Ronald Reagan pay tribute to many conservative values, and are supported by many others who are doing likewise, the reality is that there can be no revival of genuine conservatism while financial and economic policies are pursued which make growing social disintegration inevitable. The "new conservatism", which, interestingly, has some recruits from the ranks of former Jewish radicals, completely ignores the debt question.

The only indirect reference to the debt issue is the call by the "new conservatives" for a "balanced budget". Under orthodox financial policies, a balanced budget would mean the complete elimination of deficit budgets. Unless other steps were taken to ensure that the money supply was expanded, a balanced budget would help to usher in another Great Depression.

Writing in *Social Credit* shortly after the First World War, the author of *Social Credit*, C.H. Douglas, warned that unless debt finance was challenged, all that conservatives could do was to fight a series of rearguard actions eventually ending in their complete defeat.

Mrs. Thatcher's "monetarism" has contributed towards mass British unemployment, initially resulting in a slump in electoral support, which was only reversed by the firm stand on the Falklands issue. But in the absence of another Falklands, the Thatcher Government is firmly on the road to electoral defeat.

While President Reagan attempts to take a firm stand militarily against Marxist expansion in Latin America, his quick action against the threatened Cuban take over of Granada earning him national acclaim, the long-term prospects of success are nil under present finance-economic policies. The spending of billions of dollars on the much publicised "Star War" concept of military defence is absurd while at the same time the U.S.A. continues to provide vital computer technology and food to the Soviet Union.

The Achilles Heel of the Reagan Administration is the massive expansion of debt since President Reagan came to office. Debt finance makes it imperative that industrialised nations constantly strive for greater and greater exports. There is nothing conservative about governments, which, in their desperate attempts to achieve a "favourable balance of trade", are even prepared to finance the economic development of Communist China.

If Western nations adopted genuinely conservative policies, they would be able to adopt Solzhenitsyn's suggestion of saying to the Soviet: "We note how you constantly maintain that you have a superior economic system to our decadent capitalist system and we would not like to prevent you from demonstrating that superiority. We will therefore be ceasing all exports to the Communist countries in order to study the effects."

In his carefully documented study, *National Suicide*, of Western economic aid to the Soviet Union, Dr Antony Sutton points out that the West in the position of being able to wage war against the Soviet without the risk of losing one life. All that is necessary is a phone call to the Kremlin to inform the Soviet leaders that all economic aid is being stopped.

But in order to do this, Western governments would require a basic change in their financial policies. As yet there is no suggestion that the "New Conservatives" are prepared to consider this. Big Finance is not indicating that it has any fear of the "New Conservatism," which could prove to be yet one more red herring diverting attention from basic requirements for the re-generation of Christian Civilisation.

The progressive centralisation of all power, economic and political, appears to be inevitable while the centralisation of debt finance continues.

NEW TIMES—JULY 1985

The Pyramid of Power

"If any genuine attempt is made to extract a useful lesson from the history of human development, the conclusion is irresistible that the process is one long and, on the whole, continuously successful struggle to subdue environment to the end that individuality may have the utmost freedom. Now, by the operation, misunderstanding, and misuse of our financial and industrial system in its application to economics, we have created an economic position which is such a formidable threat to the material existence of the individual that he is obliged to subordinate every consideration to an effort to cope with it. Partly by education and partly by what may be called instinct, it is increasingly understood that misdirected effort and unsound distributing arrangements, while operating to minister to the will-to-power, are entirely responsible for the position in which we find ourselves.

"The practical issue at this time, therefore, is not at all whether this condition is to continue . . . it is simply one regarding the number of experiments, all very probably involving great general discomfort, which we are to endure until the inevitable rearrangement in alignment with the purpose of evolution is satisfactorily accomplished. And the suppression and perversion of the facts, on which alone sound constructive effort can be based, can have but one result—to increase the number of these experiments and the discomfort of the process."

—C. H. Douglas in "The Pyramid of Power"
from *The English Review*, 1919.

ST. PAUL AND WORK

"Wealth therefore, which is constantly being augmented by social and economic progress, must be so distributed amongst the various individuals and classes of society, that the needs of all, of which Leo XIII spoke, be therefore satisfied . . . In this connection it must be noted that the appeal made by some to the words of the Apostle, 'If any man will not work neither let him eat', is as inept as it is unfounded. The Apostle is here passing judgment on those who refuse to work though they can and ought to work; he admonishes us to use diligently our time and our powers of body and mind and not to become burdensome to others as long as we are able to provide for ourselves. In no sense does he teach that labour is the sole title which gives a right to a living or to an income."

—Pope Pius XI in his *Encyclical Quadragesimo*.

CROWN COMMONWEALTH DINNER AND SEMINAR

Readers intending to attend the Fourth Crown Commonwealth League of Rights Dinner and Seminar, to take place in London, England, on Friday, November 1, and Saturday, November 2, should note that as it has been difficult to organise group travel programmes, individuals should make their own arrangements "shopping around" for the cheapest air fares. It is probable that group tours in Britain for Australian, New Zealand and Canadian visitors will be organised once it is known who are attending. It is anticipated that there will be visitors present from the USA as well as South Africa.

Those requiring further details should contact the British, Canadian, New Zealand and Australian League of Rights.

A BOOK THE PUBLISHERS DARE NOT PUBLISH

British historian David Irving, perhaps best known for his book, *"Hitler's War"*, has discovered that his status as an historian does not automatically ensure that all his work will be published.

Irving's book on Winston Churchill had been originally sold to the well-known American publishers, Doubleday, Hoffmann and Campe in German and Michael Joseph in the United Kingdom. But there was concern as the Irving manuscript started to appear. Doubleday cancelled the contract and demanded the repayment of \$100,000, which has been paid for the book. The other publishers followed the Doubleday lead.

Irving speaks and writes German fluently, which has enabled him to conduct first hand investigation of German documents in his historical researches. He was the man who denounced the "Hitler Diaries" as fakes at a time when establishment historians like Trevor-Roper were accepting them as authentic.

Students of military history have long been critics of Churchill's intervention in the field of military strategy. Churchill's role in the disastrous Yalta Conference has been played down. Just as biographies of the British economist, John Maynard Keynes, suppressed all information dealing with the homosexual practices of Keynes. So have most studies of Churchill ignored the heavy drinking habits of a man whose judgment was often impaired at the most critical moments.

It is not without significance that the Political Zionists are anti-Irving. Our understanding is that the early chapters of the Churchill manuscript document Churchill's surrender to Zionist influences. The famous British journalist, Douglas Reed, has covered Churchill's pro-Zionism in his classic, *The Controversy of Zion*. But clearly Irving has provided much more detailed documentation.

Sunday Independent, Ireland, of May 5 carries an exclusive interview with Irving by the paper's London Editor, Nicholas Leonard. The following are extracts from the interview, starting with Irving's outline of his problem with publishers:

"Doubleday finally began getting the Churchill manuscripts from me two years ago and they began expressing alarmed noises. The editor there, Lisa Drew, began contacting my agent and saying she was alarmed at some of the chapters that she'd seen about the negative attitude towards Churchill, to which my reply, at that time was 'Well, of course, Churchill's early life was negative'. He was an outcast, in the wilderness. Nobody wanted him. He was a Cassandra.

Even at the beginning of the war, the first years of it was a history of disaster—Dunkirk, Greece, Crete. It wasn't until the middle of the war in 1941, from Pearl Harbour on, that Churchill's own career began really to take an upturn and I hoped that Doubleday would wait until then.

But they were so upset by what they had read that they cancelled the contract and asked for the repayment of about 100,000 dollars, which they had paid for the manuscript. That occurred November 1983. In October 1984, Hoffman and Campe did exactly the same. By this time, they had all seen three-quarters of the manuscript.

"In this country, the manuscript has had a slightly different career. The editor at Michael Joseph who had bought it was Alan Sampson.

He left them and went to Macmillan and he was the one responsible for my books now being published by Macmillan. He began pestering me, beseeching me, to get the rights in the Churchill book so that he could publish it at Macmillans too. Macmillans also have under contract from me a book on Herman Goering, which I'm now working on, and after that a biography of President Roosevelt. "I contacted Michael Joseph, whose reply was 'we've now read your manuscript and we have serious question about the content of many of the chapters. We want to discuss them with you'." Instead, Irving got them to release him and took it to Macmillans.

"After five months of enthusiastic noises from Alan Sampson, suddenly he said, 'The board meeting is going to be on next Tuesday' but unfortunately Harold Macmillan

himself took the chair and he said that over his dead body would they publish that book. I then was left in a rather awkward position between two stools with the contract still formally belonging to Michael Joseph.

"I then opened informal negotiations with Hodder and Stoughton, who had published *'Hitler's War'*. They were full of praise but said, 'Thank you, but no,' even though *'Hitler's War'* had made them a packet and they sold 20,000 copies which is a very, very large number considering the price, even in the original hardback. I then approached Philip Ziegler of Collins. He is an old friend—".

At this point the telephone rang and Irving spoke for some minutes. "That was the BBC," he said, putting down the phone. "They're all picking my brains, you see, like vultures hanging over the remnants of the Churchill manuscript. They want to do the business about how he sold out the empire to the Americans.

"Ziegler is the man whose biography of Mountbatten has just been published. He licked his lips over the Churchill manuscript. He read the chapters and said, 'Can I read more?' He wrote me wonderful letters, saying it really was the most extraordinary, exciting material. I then telephoned him. He had told me he was leaving Collins to be an outside editor but he said, 'I very much want this to be the first book that I work on'.

I went away last month and while I was away two letters came from Ziegler, one saying 'Well, I must warn you that there are other voices in the house now' and the second letter saying 'Unfortunately, the guillotine has come down and they refuse to discuss it'."

I asked Irving if the problems arose from specific items in the manuscript or from his general attitude towards Churchill.

"Every publishing house makes different excuses—Collins made no excuse at all, which is fair enough.

Initially, Siegler said, 'this is such an appalling story that we're very, very frightened of it and I'm not really a fit person to judge whether what you are writing is true or not.'

I said, 'we can get round that easily. Let's have the manuscript read by 'a name'. I suggested Professor M.R.D. Foot or the Professor who has written the story of British intelligence, Professor F. Hinsley at Cambridge, or someone like that, particularly Hinsley because he has been through the same records as I have and he knows what records there are that do entirely call for a complete reappraisal of Churchill's role in the second world war, particularly the intelligence records.

Hinsley has covered very much the same ground as I have except of course that I've cast my net very much wider. He hasn't used foreign archives at all, whereas I have used the Russian and American archives enormously, the French archives, the private papers of French prime ministers, the German archives, the Czech papers, Polish papers, and, in particular, the records of the Russian government and their meetings with Churchill—the entire series of telegrams from the soviet ambassador in London on his meetings with Churchill and Eden and I'm very surprised to see that the meetings between Churchill and the Soviet ambassador. Ivan Maisky, go back long before the period when Churchill implies in his memoirs he started seeing him secretly.

The Germans quite simply said I was eight years or seven years late on the contract date. The same publishing house in Germany published my Rommel biography and they sold

60,000 copies of that in hardback, so they made a fortune. I bought my Rolls Royce on the proceeds of that book! They've got no reason to fear that I'm not a saleable author. They waited seven years and in the seventh year they had a change of chief editor.

Surely it is extraordinary that 40 years after the ending of the war, the matter of Churchill's reputation can still arouse such strong emotions?

"Well, you've got to realise, I think, that the generation who still sit on the boardrooms of the publishing houses, the Harold Macmillans of this world, are the generation who lost Britain our empire. It's as simple as that. They still have their blinkers on. They can't recognise that they are responsible for having lost Britain the empire and for our present economic plight, which is concealed only by the existence of North Sea oil. When that oil runs out, the full impact of having lost our empire is going to be felt by every citizen in this country, unless some other miracle has occurred".

What kind of material does his Churchill book contain that has caused such trouble with the publishers?

"The revelation, I think, in the period 1940 to 1942, of how Churchill put the United States' interests before the interests of the British Commonwealth and Empire, which is probably demonstrated most vividly by the famous Atlantic Charter meeting in August 1941 when Churchill visited Roosevelt aboard their joint warships in a bay off Newfoundland. The Canadian government only learned of this by code breaking that Churchill was there. Mackenzie King was furious that Churchill should be consulting with the United States without having had the courtesy to consult or even inform the Commonwealth prime ministers first. The attitude of Churchill to the Commonwealth prime ministers is very unfortunate.

He acted as though they didn't exist. This becomes very plain from the private diaries of Robert Menzies the Australian prime minister, and particularly of Mackenzie King, who was prime minister of Canada for 20 years. I've

used all his papers in Ottawa."

Irving said he felt that 'almost certainly' the famous episode of the late-night message from Churchill to De Valera offering progress on Irish unity against neutrality was a result of alcoholic enthusiasm. Churchill cleared the telegram message to De Valera with Roosevelt before sending it. The episode took place just before Pearl Harbour and Irving reckons Churchill's account of Pearl Harbour is unreliable and 'complete fiction.'

I asked Irving if he felt there was a co-ordinated campaign to block publication of his book or if it was simply the individual reactions of separate publishers. "There has been a campaign co-ordinated in the United States—the anti-defamation league of the B'nai B'rith, which is some kind of Jewish organisation, has circularised people—I don't know who was on the mailing list. They sent out a thirty-page circular attacking me personally about two years ago. I got hold of a copy and I warned the chief of that organisation that if one copy found its way into England, then I would proceed against them—the libel laws in the United States are very lax."

"But I do have friends throughout the world who know the work I do and as long as publishing houses like Macmillan continue to publish the Hitler book, which I'm very proud of, and which I think will eventually replace all of the existing works by Alan Bullock and Trevor-Roper and the rest of them—my book was based entirely on the primary records—and I think that there are certain forces which are frightened that my book on Churchill will do the same."

Does he feel some publisher will eventually take it on?

"I think we have to wait for the present generation—the guilty generation—to die. Then the enquiring generation will come along who want to ask 'How is it that King George the Sixth was responsible for losing even more of the British empire than his illustrious predecessor in the nineteenth century.'"

The Protocols

The Social Crediter, November-December, 1977 (Originally published in *The Information Sheet*, September, 1945)

Appropriately, from Columbia University comes another 'refutation' of the *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*. Although the book is called an 'appraisal,' the conclusion is not in doubt from the first page.

The bibliography lists eleven works which 'attack the authenticity of the Protocols,' as against ten, which uphold it; and among the latter lists Nesta Webster's *World Revolution*. This is important, since the Foreword to *An Appraisal** states that the basic problem of the Protocols—the problem of their authenticity—is obviously an historical one to be solved by the rigorous application of historical methods.

The text of the Protocols makes no claim to originality; on the contrary, there are various references to the antiquity of the plot which it portrays, the secrets of which are supposed to have been handed down from generation to generation within a select body of highly trained political experts, who are constantly applying to the problems of the present the solutions discovered by study and experience in the past. Now the refutation which has become standard, and which is given in Dr. Curtiss's book with artistic understatement, is the almost exact parallel existing between certain passages of the Protocols and passages of Maurice Joly's *Dialogue in Hell*, a book published in Brussels in 1865. The discovery of this 'flagrant plagiarism' was pub-

lished in *The Times* (London), and brought the public sensation caused by the publication of the Protocols to an end; but a surviving interest has remained and no doubt stimulated Dr. Curtiss to write his book.

The plagiarism was discovered in 1921, the same year as Mrs. Webster published her *World Revolution*, a genuinely painstaking and carefully documented piece of research into the history of certain revolutionary ideas and their sponsors. Mrs. Webster relates that when she read the Protocols "the thought that recurred at every page was: 'Where have I read that before?' and by degrees the conviction grew: 'But this is simply Illuminism!'" And she proceeds to set out in parallel columns, just as does Dr. Curtiss with Joly's text, parallel passages of the Protocols and the texts of Illuminism—*documents a hundred years older than Joly's book*. And further on she shows striking similarities between the Protocols and certain passages in the works of Lenin and other leaders of the Russian Revolution in 1917.

A 'rigorous application of historical methods,' therefore, would require Dr. Curtiss to show from whom Joly plagiarised; but there is nothing in his book which takes the matter back further than 1865, although apparently he was acquainted with *World Revolution*.

But a historical examination of the origin of the Protocols is not an 'appraisal'; it is merely a first step. It is, however, practically the only step Dr. Curtiss takes and a mincing step it is. In 1865, there was a wide diffusion of revolutionary ideas, which can be traced both backwards and forwards, and which in not very differing forms were

* *An Appraisal of the Protocols of Zion*, by Dr. John S. Curtiss: Columbia University Press: New York, 1942.

the property of many different people and groups.

Now what is required is a close examination of the parallelism of these ideas with actual events, and an explanation of their continuity as a set of ideas, which have appeared under a number of different auspices.

From many points of view, the publicity, which the Protocols have received, has been a disservice to the examination of the causes of world unrest. The programme of the Protocols may be compiled from other sources, and verified in the facts of the world, and it is literally a matter of life and death that the sponsors of that programme should be unmasked. In this, Dr. Curtiss helps not at all; he diverts attention from the main problem. And that is exactly the difficulty, which is caused by the noisy 'anti-Semitism' derived from an uncritical acceptance of the Protocols as what Nilus said they were.

The present position is this: It is easy to establish the existence of a world revolutionary programme, antecedent to Marx, and independently of the Protocols and of the *Dialogue in Hell*, both of which, however, embody its main features. Joly, in fact, "in his preface never claimed to have originated the scheme described in his book; on the contrary he distinctly states that it 'personifies in particular a political system which has not varied for a single day in its application since the disastrous and alas! too far-off date of its enthronement.'"¹

But it has never proved possible to establish the identity of the group ultimately responsible. The field of enquiry can, however, be narrowed, and there is a good deal of circumstantial evidence which narrows the field still further.

In the first place, any political programme which has existed for some hundreds of years with no modification other than adaption to a changing world could be maintained only by some group with a continuous cultural existence — that is to say, a group of which the individuals composing it recognised an objective transcending their own individual existences. Nations, of course, are such groups; and foreign policy is such a programme. There is no doubt in anyone's mind these days that both Germany and Japan had foreign policies aiming at world-conquest; these nations, however, included military warfare in their plans, whereas the world-conquest through revolution programme which is the actual source of the Protocols relied on subversion, corruption, and white-anting of national political institutions; and above all, it relied on secrecy, and the complete concealment of its ultimate sponsors.

In the second place, the programme is a *world* programme; it cuts across the boundaries of geographical nations as such, and in fact aims to abolish such boundaries. Now a programme—a policy—requires some form of power, sanctions of some description, if it is to be implemented. There have been up to the present only two major sanctions of international effect: international finance, and international communications, the latter including, of course, both information and propaganda. The sponsors of the programme are to be looked for, therefore, in connection with the extra-national groups controlling these sanctions.

It is not proposed here to narrow the field any further; a penetrating survey of the subject is to be found in *The Big Idea*, by C. H. Douglas. ⁻² It should be evident, however, that Dr. Curtiss's application of historical methods is anything but rigorous.

It might clear the air a good deal to agree that the Protocols are 'forgeries,' in order to concentrate on the question as to why they were brought forward as they were. From this point of view, it is far from improbable that both Joly

and Nilus, like Disraeli, were aware of the great programme—a programme of such magnitude as to be almost unbelievable, as incredible as the state of the world today, in fact. The credibility of the programme rests, indeed, on its own history, and on its parallelism to events. Those who have endeavoured to awaken people to the terrible danger have always been faced with the problem of how to bring it to public attention. Joly recognised in Napoleon III not the originator, but the agent of a policy; Nilus—or, perhaps, Rachkovskii ⁴—recognised in Russia the manifestations of the programme; Disraeli spoke as one who knew of the activities of secret societies, and he hinted that he knew more than he said.

There is no question whatsoever as to the authenticity of the documents from which the Protocols as well as *A Dialogue* ultimately derive. These documents were correspondence and paper seized by the Bavarian Government and published in Munich in 1787. There is equally no question that they revealed a plot against civilisation. That the Illuminati survived their suppression has been proved by documentary evidence⁵; and that the state of the world is just as one would expect were the programme revealed still being carried on, is easily confirmed by anyone who will read the programme in any of its forms, including the Protocols. There is a mass of evidence, relating not only to contemporary events, but to individuals implicated in them, which should be assessed in a Court of Law; probably in no other way can our troubles be brought to an end.

In the meantime, we can only surmise why Dr. Curtiss so sedulously ignores the material to which his own bibliography leads him. There must be a reason. Perhaps he is going to devote a second volume to exposing Joly's plagiarism.

—B.W.M.

³ See, in particular, *Coningsby*; also speeches in House of Commons.

⁴ See *An Appraisal*, p.70 *et seq.*

⁵ Full references, and important extracts, are given by N. Webster in *Secret Societies and Subversive Movements*, p.258 *et seq.*

Journalism

"Journalism is a false picture of the world, thrown upon a lighted screen in a darkened room so that the real world is not seen."

-G.K. Chesterton

MAJORITY RULE

Here is food for thought for the protagonists of majority rule: "If 25 people divide 13 to 12, are we to assume that the 12 are right? And if one among them should change his vote, would truth shift with him to the other side?"

— American writer John T. Flynn

KEEP IN TOUCH AS THE CRISIS DEEPENS

With every day that passes, events both nationally and internationally confirm the predictions of the League of Rights. The League has been in the forefront of every realistic campaign designed to at least slow down, if not defeat, the many manifestations of the advance of totalitarianism.

Let us make it quite clear: the deepening crisis is going to get worse. For this reason all subscribers should make certain at they pay their subscriptions to League journals promptly. They cannot afford to be out of touch, to be cut off from the one intelligence source, which has proved consistently reliable. Those in touch will also be kept informed on action programmes either sponsored by the League or supported by the League.

¹ See N. Webster, *Secret Societies and Subversive Movements*, p.409.

² [Now out of print.]