

THE NEW TIMES

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

VOL. 50, No. 3.

Registered By Australia Post—Publication No. VBH 1001

MARCH 1986.

Australia and New Zealand Edition. Published in Melbourne and Auckland

THE PHILIPPINES AFTER MARCOS

The most revealing event following the defeat of Marcos in the recent Philippines elections was a television interview between the Governor of the Central Bank of the Philippines, Mr. Jose Farandez, and well-known Australian ABC political commentator, Mr. Richard Carlton. The Governor said that he had felt it necessary to resign his position following the Aquino victory, but that he had been re-appointed for a term of six years. In a very polished performance, the governor discussed the Philippines situation in a very detached manner, an indication of his confidence that he would continue to exercise the same kind of power exercised during the Marcos regime.

Although generally described as a democracy, the Philippines is a very different country from Western democracies. There is much comment about the corruption of Marcos, but corruption and associated practices are almost a way of life in the Philippines, and Marcos is probably no worse than many others, some of whom continue to stay in office under President Aquino. As C.H. Douglas has said, modern democracies in all countries are facades behind which real power is exercised by those who never face the electors.

There is little doubt that the Marcos machine rigged the voting to produce an election victory. But fraudulent election practices take place in every country where elections are held. Americans will recall the close contest between John Kennedy and Richard Nixon, with the result being decided by a handful of votes in Chicago, some of which appeared to disappear. Studies of the career of Lyndon Johnson reveal that many of those who elected him originally to the Senate appeared to have emerged from their graves to vote! One of the great values of the Monarchical system is that the Head of State is not subject to the corruption of a voting system.

The fate of Marcos was sealed when "leaks" from the American State Department and other official sources in the United States cast serious doubts on the Marcos war record and other aspects of his past history. Influential American papers like the *New York Times* also indicated that it had been decided in the highest international power circles that Marcos had to go. Judged by Western political standards, which admittedly have reached a very low level, Marcos was undoubtedly corrupt. But it appears that the international power groups had decided that Marcos must go as part of a long-range programme.

The growing Communist problem in the Philippines has, to a great extent, been the result of the harsh finance-economic policies imposed. These policies are related to the huge international debts of the Philippines. Mrs. Aquino has inherited these debts and, if she is to improve the economic situation in the Philippines, then she must come to grips with the debt problem. There is no evidence that Mrs. Aquino has the slightest understanding of the financial problem, and for this reason is probably content to re-appoint the governor of the Central Bank as an expert.

Mrs. Aquino creates the impression of a person who, while genuine and well meaning, has little understanding of the deeper forces of revolution. There are those who believe that she will be exploited and then eventually deposed, a type of Kerensky of the Philippines revolution. Already there are ominous reports of Mrs. Aquino negotiating with representatives of the New Peoples' Army, directed by sophisticated Marxist-Leninists, who are shrewdly campaigning for "land reform".

The Philippines provide a classic example of how Marxism exploits conditions imposed by orthodox finance. The same is happening in all debt-ridden Third World nations. Revolution will

continue until the debt question is faced. From the point of view of genuine American strategic interests, a big question concerning the Philippines is the major American military bases there. Can these be retained if the situation after Marcos continues to deteriorate? Unfortunately the record is not encouraging, when one looks at those American policies, which have helped to remove political leaders from office in the past. There was Batista in Cuba, who was then followed by Castro. Remember what happened in Vietnam, and the eventual loss of the big bases built there by the U.S.A. And there was the Shah of Iran. Consider also what is being attempted in South Africa.

DEBT AND REVOLUTION

The nexus between Debt and Revolution becomes progressively clearer. Unfortunately the Philippines may provide yet another example of this nexus. Australians and New Zealanders would be well advised to take more than a passing interest in the subject, as should the rest of the Free World. The issue before the West becomes progressively clearer - eliminate debt, or be eliminated by revolution.

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.

TO WHAT END?

by James Guthrie, B.Sc.

The following brilliant essay first appeared in *"The New Times"* thirty years ago. A pioneer Social Credit thinker and writer, James Guthrie had a deeply analytical mind. His essay stands the test of time. The questions asked thirty years ago urgently demand an answer.

"So many powerful instruments have been placed in the hands of research workers and so large is the number of highly skilled men engaged in technological developments that the frontiers of technical knowledge are expanding at breathtaking speed, but it cannot be said that the benefits accruing to the individual man and woman from this enormous activity are expanding at the same breathtaking speed, I mean benefits in the form of a more leisurely way of life, freed from the cruder compulsions and anxieties of the animal world.

The use of solar energy and automatic machinery has so multiplied the power available for production that it has produced a major revolution in the supply market, but, unfortunately for us, there has been no parallel revolution in the buying market — that is, in the purchasing power of the people. The large discrepancy between productive power and purchasing power would have reached a climax, visible to the meanest intelligence, had not two world wars conveniently come along and removed by destruction all surplus production.

In the days of small-scale production, when most goods were made by hand, the price of goods was almost entirely the cost of labour, so that the money paid out each week in wages was sufficient or very nearly sufficient to enable the members of a community to buy the goods for sale in that district; what was not sold for money was exchanged or sold on the premises. Nowadays, with the use of automatic machinery, machinery charges are sometimes very much greater than labour charges, so that the wages, salaries and dividends paid out by producers are not sufficient to buy goods produced by them. (1).

Last year (1953) saw the change over from the "sellers' market" to the "buyers' market", which means the change over from the scarcity produced by war to the plenty produced by peace. This brings in its train the problem of financing the consumer to buy the ever-increasing volume of goods coming from mass production industry now released from the strains of war. The hire-purchase system, which has increased enormously during the past year, is a desperate attempt to bring the collective purchasing power of the community nearer to the collective prices by helping people to "buy this year's production with the aid of next year's salary.

From the consumer's point of view the trouble with these consumer credits is they have to be paid back; from the producer's point of view the trouble lies in the fact that there are too many trying to "milk the same cow", that the consumers take too long to pay the last instalment, and long before it is paid there is a new model on the market clamouring for a buyer.

Producers, armed with an almost unlimited means of production, competing on a world scale for an artificially limited purchasing power find themselves in a very desperate position. A factory, making guns, radios or silk stockings, which finds its market glutted, faces bankruptcy unless it can find new markets, and is compelled to send out high-pressure salesmen to try new tricks to make what is already sold appear obsolete; to this end it has endlessly to produce new models.

To re-tool a modern factory to mass produce a new model of anything is a major operation, and a very expensive one; but such are the financial and political needs to maintain full employment that the whole organisation of a factory has to be disrupted to start a new model before production on the old model has reached full momentum. It is futile for economists and sales managers to tell us that consumers are benefiting from these continuous and expensive changes.

As an engineer and user of cars, I am very interested in new developments and better motorcars, especially cars that require little attention, which last as long as the cars of thirty years ago have a minimum of trouble-making gadgets and cost

half the price of the present car; yes, I am very interested in better cars; but I am very hostile to trouble-making gadgets and the need for the constant repair or replacement of ridiculously inadequate parts.

I notice too that the ladies are becoming critical of the exploits of the mighty chemical industry, which produces stockings, which last only a few days. Under the heading of "Women Critical of the 'Laddering' Habits of Fine Nylons" the *"Mercury"*, Hobart, June 4th, 1954, stated: "A survey yesterday revealed that nearly 10,000 pairs of stockings are bought in Hobart and suburbs every week". Considering that this area has a population of about 70,000 and nylons cost from 10/- to 15/- a pair, it would appear that some of the other producers are going to have some difficulty in obtaining a share of the limited purchasing power of the Hobart area.

The dividends we are receiving from the prodigious amount of mechanical and human energy consumed by industry and the various services is not what we expect from applied intelligence, and I see no reason why we should accept it from applied science. Knowledge, as it accumulates, should lead to new revelations, clarify our ideas, and give us new strength and serenity. There is nothing in knowledge as such which need scare us into the unhealthy panic-like rush to produce new gadgets and scrap high-class machinery capable of many years of useful service; these things do not arise out of the needs of the consumer (which industry is supposed to serve). Neither do they arise out of the advice of the hard pressed technologists who carry industry on their backs. Socialists proclaim in their trite manner that all this useless production arises out of the profit motive, but as this can be said about the activities of any sane man it does not help very much, nor does it explain anything of importance. The profit motive demands that industry should do exactly the opposite to what it is doing — i.e., refuse to scrap expensive machinery while it is doing a sound engineering job.

The producer is in a nasty position if he and other producers, finding their unsaleable products piling up, decide to take a holiday from production, they find by so doing they have cut off the purchasing power of the consumer in the form of wages, salaries, which is necessary to remove goods already in the shops. Nowadays it is fairly well known that modern economies collapse immediately the production of capital goods ceases, thus continuous industrial expansion, whether or not it is a practical necessity, is financial necessity to maintain the additional purchasing power required to buy the consumer goods produced by every community.

The artificiality of the financial system which is ruthlessly imposed on us and our governments, and its inability to reflect industrial facts; its disastrous social consequences and its continuous urge towards war were carefully explained by C.H. Douglas over 30 years ago. The following statement from *"Economic Democracy"* is so revealing and so explanatory of what is happening today that I make no excuses for repeating here as I did in the previous series of articles.

"... it must be borne in mind that the existing economic system distributes purchasing power through the same agency which produces goods and services — i.e. payment for work in progress. In other words, if production stops distribution stops and, as a consequence, a clear incentive exists to produce useless and superfluous articles in order that useful commodities already existing may be distributed.

"This perfectly simple reason is the explanation of the increasing necessity of what has come to be called economic sabotage; the colossal waste of effort which goes on in every walk of life quite unobserved by the majority of people because they are so familiar with it; a waste which yet so over-taxed the ingenuity of society to extend it that the climax of war only oc-

curred in the moment when a culminating exhibition of organised sabotage was necessary to preserve the system from spontaneous combustion.

"The simplest form of this process is that of 'making work'; the elaboration of every action in life so as to involve the maximum quantity and the minimum efficiency in human effort. The much-maligned household plumber ... the machinist insisting on a lengthy apprenticeship to an unskilled process of industry, such as the operation of an automatic machine tool, are simple instances of this. A little higher up the scale of complexity comes the manufacturer who produces a new model of his particular specialty, with the object, express or subconscious, of rendering the old model obsolete before it is worn out. We then begin to touch the immense region of artificial demand created by advertisement; a demand, in many cases, as purely hypnotic in origin as the request of the mesmerised subject for a draught of kerosene...

"In another class comes the stupendous waste of effort involved in the intricacies of finance and book-keeping...

"There is the burden of armaments and the waste of materials and equipment involved in them even in peace time; the ever-growing bureaucracy largely concerned in elaborating safeguards for a radically defective social system ... All these and many other forms of avoidable waste take their rise in the obsession of wealth defined in terms of money; an obsession which even the steady fall in the purchasing power of the unit of currency seems powerless to dispel; an obsession which obscures the whole object and meaning of scientific progress, and places the worker and the honest man in a permanently disadvantageous position in comparison with the financier and the rogue ... The tawdry 'ornament', the jerry-built house, the slow and uncomfortable train service, the unwholesome sweetmeat, are the direct and logical consummation of an economic system which rewards variety, quite irrespective of quality, and proclaims in the clearest possible manner that it is much better to 'do' your neighbour than to do sound and lasting work."

"*Economic Democracy*", by C. H. Douglas, from which I have just quoted, was published in 1920, over thirty years ago. It has been said that it takes twenty years for a new idea to percolate to the consciousness of the responsible minority; thirty years have passed and still the basic facts of industry and finance, let alone the finer philosophic points so ably marshalled by Douglas, are hardly known, even by those whose whole future is so desperately affected. Nevertheless, Douglas and his followers have exposed the fact that "depressions" are unnatural, are manipulated by men and produced by restriction of credit. This is a very great gain, although only an initial step in the battle for freedom of the individual against the tyranny of organised ignorance.

In spite of technological developments and the increasing use of solar energy many people believe, and the press continually reiterates the belief that it is immoral to receive anything at all without the expenditure of human labour, therefore no work no pay, no daily production no income, hence the most foolish of all demands in this mass production era, for full employment, and the attack on any persons receiving dividends; yet dividends for everyone is the logical and ethical means of distributing the abundance made possible by the inventions and technological developments of the last century; instead of dividends we get what we would expect from those who consistently refuse to publish a balance sheet, dividends in reverse, i.e., taxation.

It is only by the maintenance of an artificial scarcity that control can be exercised by the international hierarchy; it is only by the threat of scarcity that men can be coerced into submission to a licence system, a licence to live. Dividends without taxation and the out-pouring of abundance made possible by technology in the service of man would defeat the whole purpose of the servile police state. Many of the followers of Douglas did not realise the epoch-making character of these revelations and consequently were ill prepared for the reception with which they met at the hands of officialdom.

The basic facts of industrial potential are not obscure, and the basic facts of the creation of credit are not denied, not even by bankers; why then are the minds of even the so-called intelli-

gent minority, when it comes to questions of social, political and economic affairs, why are they in such a tangle of false sentiment and false information?

The answer to this question is probably more important than anything else that Douglas and his followers have had to say: their statements based on worldwide experiences can be summarised thus: They found the entire daily press closed to them; they found that no financial experiment in Alberta or anywhere else was to be permitted; they found information vital to the very existence of a country, although published in other countries, was excluded from British and British Dominion daily papers; they found, too, that no public man in any country was willing or was permitted to give any recognition by word or deed of any financial ideas other than those formulated by the policy makers of international finance.

There is little doubt now, among those acquainted with the facts, that governments are controlled by permanent super-governments which dictate financial policy, and the financial system is used as an instrument of government to impose an alien policy on every country brought under its sway. The financial system is no longer a means of facilitating the exchange of goods but rather is an instrument of coercion for obtaining obedience to policies, which the natives of each country very much resent, but do not know, or are prevented from knowing how to escape. Douglas tried to show people how to escape; that is why he was consistently excluded from the press and especially from the universities where our young leaders were being lead astray, by government-subsidised schools.

You are justified in saying that these statements are suggestions of an all-embracing and corrupt tyranny, but apart from the detailed evidence available, is one not justified in saying are not the happenings of the last forty years evidence of something very horrible, something consistently anti-Christian, consistently anti-British and completely irrational.

THE DIVIDEND OF THE MACHINE

When Watt invented the steam engine and Faraday made the discovery which started the electrical industry, these men set in motion an endless train of technological developments, the end of which, even now, we cannot even dimly envisage. When we realise that a 1 h.p. electric motor is the physical equivalent of 10 men, occupies a very small space, costs less than 5/- a week to feed and doesn't stop for meals or sleep, we can see that the industrial revolution has a much greater potential than we have been lead to believe. With the extension of electrical power into the home and the advent of the all-electric house, a very wonderful service has been rendered the housewife, yet, although this service has been made available to a large section of the population, nobody, I think, would deny the fact that no collection of electrical gadgets will take the place of human help in the home; unfortunately, few people today can compete with industry even for the help of their own families.

There is another important feature which should be carefully noted, the distribution of electrical energy, and the use of the diesel engine, has made possible, or could have made possible, a much larger variety of small local industries, producing quality goods; but instead, the monopoly of credit has created monopolies in production; and, to keep the over centralised factories operating, the country for miles around is socially disintegrated; homes and farms are robbed of labour, and, as if this were not bad enough, young families are robbed of their mothers (just like Russia), to tend the ever revolving wheels; the machine instead of becoming the servant of man has become his master; instead of giving him leisure it has regimented him and his whole household.

In this age when men travel faster than sound, when men see in atomic energy unlimited supplies of power; amidst the miracles of radar, television and life-saving drugs, I think we should draw apart for a while, from the continuous mass worship of scientific novelties and ask a few simple questions; ask, for example: "If centralised industry wants us to buy a new model every year, instead of every ten years, in order to keep its men and machines in full employment why does it not bring down

prices or tell us what to use for money?"

If industry, by the increasing use of mechanical labour, cannot give some leisure to human labour, what is its purpose?

If industry, as it boasts, is giving service to the homes of the people, why is it necessary to drag an increasing number of married women from their homes to pay for this service?

Surely we are entitled to expect something radically different from what we are getting from the colossal mobilisation of mechanical, financial and human power.

Surely we are entitled to expect a little more leisurely way of living, a little relief from unnecessary economies, and some statement of accounts to explain why we are receiving no dividends.

THE EXPORT RACKET

Once the State propaganda agencies have mesmerised us into the belief that we must export or perish, instead of what is more likely to be the truth — export and perish — then we are in a position where the "experts" can say the following:

(1) That all exportable articles used at home, instead of being exported, are practically wasted;

(2) That those who use articles which could be exported are (in England) robbing children of necessary food, or (in Australia) upsetting the balance of trade, and therefore the "full employment of the population.

The exporting of surplus production is a legitimate basis for export trade, but the financial transactions of most of the export trade are suspect. If we take the case of Australian wheat in 1954, although there was a large "surplus" available for export the price of this wheat was so high that it was unprofitable for Australians to use it for producing eggs, and therefore eggs were scarce, although wheat was plentiful. Between the mountain of wheat and its use for poultry, was one effective barrier — price.

The following is a newspaper editorial written in September, 1954, which represents official thought in most countries:

"Australia must lose no time in showing its deep concern at the suggestion of an official advisory committee that huge surplus stock of American food — butter at this stage — should be dumped on the world markets.

"The situation of primary production in the United States is a striking illustration of the difficulties which can arise when a system of price subsidies gets out of hand, and factors of supply and demand are entirely ignored.

"The programme of price supports for producers (not consumers) has loomed large as a political issue in recent years. As a result the American Government is now the embarrassed owner of 1,750,000,000 pounds worth of foodstuffs kept in silos, storage plants and caves all over the country. Storage costs alone are 125,000,000 pounds a year.

"Part of the goods in storage consists of a thousand million lbs. of butter, which, it is proposed, should be sold to the world outside. As the United States would be glad to get rid of it at almost any price, this would amount to dumping, with grave consequences to all other dairy exporting countries, including Australia and New Zealand.

"The problem America has built up for itself must be solved by America — but domestically. It would be a shocking example of unfair trade practice if America sought to relieve her problem by crippling the export industries of her friends, one by one. Australia should make its objections immediately and strenuously," (5)

Here the writer is saying that by making the growing of butter remunerative the government can produce such an abundance of food that it becomes embarrassing. This abundance of food is obviously most embarrassing to the politico-economic set-up of the world today; this has been known for many years (at least since 1920), but it is tragically obvious that alleged Christian scholars have not been able to give us its philosophic significance.

It should be noticed that Great Britain and Europe had to sacrifice much of their political, economic and cultural freedom in order to get food. I suggest that a scarcity of food was centrally organised for that purpose.

Page4

The editorial quoted above admits that the over-abundance of food came into existence by means of a **financial stimulus**, namely, subsidies. This is obvious enough. What does not seem obvious is that subsidies given to the consumer as well as to the producer would very quickly rid the Americans of their surplus butter. Major Douglas was excluded from the world Press for suggesting this.

Do you think this suggestion is very terrible? After all, is it not a fact that butter is made to be consumed? Is not that the justification, and the only justification, for making butter?

THE CITY DWELLER

The complexity of urban civilisation, the specialised work and the specialised living conditions are creating a type of man which is comparatively new and whose characteristics are scarcely yet known, yet the perversions of personality produced by city life are so common that little notice is taken of them.

For thousands of years and until very recently most families lived on the land, drew their sustenance direct from the land. Work changed with the seasons and as long as the sun shone and a minimum amount of attention was given to the land, growth took place and the harvest duly arrived. The nexus between cause and effect were readily recognisable; local history supplied records of good and bad farming; there were not the huge nebulous city masses doing unknown tasks, in unknown places for some unknown purpose.

We should suspect that there is likely to be some strange reactions to this cutting adrift from thousands of years of direct contact with the soil and its cyclic operations. The change has been violent and magnified by the quite unwarranted centralisation and specialisation. With the advent of the distribution of electrical power and the availability of small power units, there has remained no further justification for most of the centralised production and the herding into cities of such large masses of people. Most problems of the city are artificial problems in so far as they arise out of a refusal to recognise the nature of this universe and the Christian heritage of man: "The sabbath was made for man not man for the sabbath." Most of the city problems are insoluble and are not worthy of the colossal amount of energy devoted to them. The modern city dweller has his eyes and ears bombarded daily by what is called news - selected "news" — and the more he hears and reads the more muddled he becomes; he is at the receiving end of a long chain of events, his news, like his food, has lost much of its life-sustaining quality, and its nature is such as to create a demand for the perverted way of living supplied by city life.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE WELFARE STATE

Most important social problems are political, and important political problems are essentially religious. The creation of credit not only dominates the life of every individual in the community but dominates the policy of every organisation, spiritual and temporal. Education, which in its modern phase is a fight for the soul of man, should be ultra vires the State. Our cable services ("and the truth shall make you free") are amongst the most disreputable of all modern commodities. We don't want opinions about these things; we want someone to speak with Authority, not the authority of the alleged "majority", but the Authority of the Law.

It must be obvious that once you concede the need for total planning, or central planning as it is usually called, i.e., the planning by a tiny minority of the industrial, financial, economic, educational, cultural and therefore religious activities of the vast majority, you have automatically sold out the entire Christian heritage of freedom.

Hayek quotes Lord Acton as follows: — "Whenever a single definite object is made the supreme end of the State, be it the greatest happiness of the greatest number or the support of any speculative idea, the State becomes for the time inevitably absolute." (4)

This statement of Lord Acton's may be amplified thus: Once the individuals of a State can be persuaded to have the main arteries of life giving energy, spiritual, psychological and material,

NEW TIMES - MARCH 1986

cut off from their local needs and activities and diverted to a single purpose, then the central government, ipso facto, has received sanction for a State of War and can logically introduce the entire apparatus of a military type of organisation with absolute power at the apex and complete subservience at the base. Furthermore, any person whose criticism does not subserve the central purpose will most certainly be excluded from all organs of publicity, "over the air", on the ground, and "underground".

It is remarkable that although some alleged Christians see the danger in the centralised power of the Socialist or Welfare State and object to the loss of their freedom of choice, they nevertheless are quite willing to see their favourite reform made the "supreme end of the State", thus introducing those restrictions in practice which they so much resent in principle.

Young architects are very prone to fall victims to the central planners who dangle in front of them pictures of grandiose structures of concrete and glass; the export industries are given special privileges when the Government embarks on an export drive; directors of the bureaucracy have a special interest in the restrictions of the Welfare State as each restriction enhances their power and increases their staff: without restrictions there is no justification for a bureaucracy most of the police force, and taxation and excise officials are kept in full employment by those maniacs who believe they can create a Utopia by law.

The late Dr. S.L. Frank Hibbert, writing on "Utopian Heresy", warns against trying to realise "Christian perfection through a compulsory social organisation". He further states "in so far as it (Socialism) aims at subordinating to the State all economic life and inter-social relations, making them fit in with a definite plan enforced by the State, it degenerates into the despotic idea of bringing about a moral reformation of society by the methods of 'grabbing and holding fast'.

"The champions of this type of socialism lose sight of the fact that life is not an artificial rational construction but organic creativeness and that all creativeness, including the moral, can only take place in freedom; hence every suppression of freedom paradoxes life and with it the powers of goodness, apart from which there can be no way of bringing life to greater perfection." (6)

The "reformer", with his ardent desire to perfect human nature by some form of compulsory social organisation (brute force in disguise) has been the terror of mankind, and has been responsible for bloodshed and cruelty on a vast scale. By selecting one group of "reformers" after another the men in power can muster some semblance of "popular support" for destroying the power of each minority in turn, thus most of the spadework for professional planners is done by enthusiastic amateurs.

Some socialists, who dislike Nazi Germany and Communist Russia as much as any freedom-loving person, cannot yet see that those two monstrosities were not only the legitimate children of Socialism, but the only possible children. Many people have an idea that by suitable "education" perfection can be reached in human beings in much the same way as perfection is reached in the manufacture of mechanical things. There are few things more dangerous than an inadequate idea, and of all social ideas I cannot conceive of one more inadequate than that of trying to produce human perfection by compulsion.

B.A. Fletcher, writing in the "*19th Century*", June 1949, said: -

"With foolish ideas in our heads of the inevitability of human progress, we have seen with horror and surprise, the eruption into civilised life of cruelty, lawlessness and depersonalisation on a vast scale. Realising that these demoniac outbreaks must have historic roots we have been forced to look again at the development of thought during the past three centuries, and we have seen how the basic idea of Western civilisation, the uniqueness of the individual, has steadily weakened, there has therefore been a fresh attempt to discover the true nature of man and consider his destiny."

The central planner, working downwards from his blueprint to the individuals who have to be fitted into his plan never has accepted the uniqueness of an individual - indeed, he dare not. Without mass uniformity the central planner cannot plan. If

NEWTIMES - MARCH 1986

the individual does not fit into the plan he has to be altered to fit it; that means he has to be depersonalised by "brain washing".

Uniformity is the watchword of the totalitarians, the socialist politician, the socialist schoolmaster and the socialist industrialist. Deviation from uniformity (from the Party line) is considered the greatest political crime, and it carries the penalty of complete exclusion from all organs of publicity.

"The uniqueness of the individual" is essentially a Christian conception, and is anathema to the "Planners". Organisations of men demand uniformity and a legal rigidity, which is the chief enemy of that organic growth so essential to self-development.

"Total planning produces a selection of leaders in which low characters gain the upper hand. Totalitarian discipline demands uniformity. This is most easily achieved at the lower spiritual and moral levels. The lowest common denominator contains the greatest number of people. Paramountcy is in the hands of the malleable and the credulous, whose vague notions are easily led, and whose passions are easily whipped up. Unity is most simply attained in hate and envy.

"Particularly serviceable are the industrious, disciplined, energetic and ruthless, who possess a sense of order, are conscientious over their work, remain absolutely obedient to the authorities, and are characterised by a readiness for sacrifice and by physical courage. 'Unserviceable, on the other hand, are the tolerant, who respect others and their opinions, the spiritually independent who stand up for their convictions even against a superior people possessed of civil courage, who are inclined to consideration for the weak and the sick, and who repudiate and despise mere power, because they live by an ancient tradition of personal liberty.'" (7)

If the individual is to fit into any social organisation he must naturally submit to the discipline peculiar to it, but the submission must be voluntary; and unless he can contract out of any organisation without victimisation he is not a free man, and if he attempts to free himself he is entitled to some moral support from the Christian Church.

The voice of the Church on this question has been very vague and halting. We have found in religious circles the same attitude as in the political sphere — an incredible uniformity of all parties in favour of social experiments supporting the centralisation of power.

We have found, too, a puritanical zeal for reform by compulsory methods, and an almost sadistic desire to victimise any section of the community, which showed the slightest sign of enjoying the "life more abundant".

There is little doubt that the task of the planners has been made possible by the able assistance of "reformers" nourished on an overdose of Karl Marx, Darwinism and Old Testament theology. The Church could give great assistance to the better elements in the community by counteracting this vicious philosophy and stressing the Christian conception of the "life more abundant".

THE CHRISTIAN CONCEPT OF FREEDOM

That which differentiates a man from an animal is his ability to make a choice and a decision over and above the needs and appetites of the moment. Wisdom has usually meant the ability to ascertain the laws of the universe and conform to them; and a moral choice implies a desire to work "along the grain of the universe" and the will to do so, as against the choice which is ignorant or perverse.

"Where the consequences of actions are likely to be terrible it is well that men should know the truth. Men do need continually reminding that the Reign of Law — that inevitable nexus of cause and consequence, which holds throughout physical nature — holds also in the sphere of conduct. No one who has watched the actual working out of the Reign of Law in individual character or in the external consequences of action in social life — regenerating or devastating as the case may be, can miss the glory or tragedy which follows the right or wrong in moral choice."

Canon Streeter adds the following note on "moral choice": "Right choice depends quite as much on knowing what one ought to do as well as on the will to do it. That is why in

the Bible, wisdom is regarded as an essential of morality. The individual conscience is an unsafe guide unless it has been educated, not only by right living but also by reflection on moral issues. Conscience is not a 'labour-saving' device to exempt us from the trouble of thinking."*

If the Christian God the Father is prepared to countenance the possibility of pain and suffering and tragedy by giving freedom of choice to each of us to develop our individuality in our own way, then we must assume that this freedom is part of God's purpose, so fundamentally essential that even death is not considered too high a price to pay for it and we must assume that without freedom of choice the divine destiny of man would be impossible.

"And ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free." This puts freedom, in the Christian world, above truth, in fact supplies the only solid reason for the pursuit of the truth. Christians therefore are not without guidance when they attack the problems of the individual vis-à-vis the modern all-powerful government. In case there should be any doubt about what we mean by freedom, C.H. Douglas has defined it for us as "freedom to choose or refuse one thing at a time". It is possible to give a government a great deal of power, provided the individual can contract out of any situation as it arises without being victimised. "Democratic" Governments have consistently claimed the right to victimise minorities because they claim to represent the majority; this makes "democratic" Governments more difficult to fight than an open dictatorship, and leaves the individual ridiculously vulnerable to victimisation. It is becoming increasingly apparent that the individual must be protected by some permanent authority, which is ultra vires the Government temporarily in power.

The power taken by governments is taken from the individual; and not only is the individual stripped of this power, he finds when he fights for his rights and freedom, that his puny efforts are dwarfed by a massive accretion of power stolen from millions of people and concentrated in the hands of the Chosen Few. The individual, confronting the great monopolies, governmental and semi-governmental (monopolies cannot exist without Government protection), finds himself legally and financially in such a hopeless position that only a few, inside or outside the Church, have the temerity to challenge the Central Power which is so very obviously the seat of corruption and a direct challenge to the whole basis of Christian life on this planet.

The individual is entitled to some assurance that the men, who by various stratagems have captured the central government, are not given the right to do permanent damage to his country; are not going to confiscate his property by vindictive taxation and manipulation of the currency; are not going to interfere with the education of his family; tamper with the news services, or with his food or water supply, or with his weights and measures (a depreciated currency is a fraudulent measure which destroys all other measures).

The character and personality of man, as Canon Streeter suggested, grows or becomes distorted according to how he meets the problems of life. He can meet these problems face to face or escape rapidly down the easy path especially organised for him. There is no such thing as a purely economic problem, a purely political problem or a purely spiritual problem. If we are among the more responsible section of the community the problems we tackle, whether they appertain to the Church, to education, or industry, or even to food or water, will bring us to a point where we shall have to ask permission, or obtain money, or do something beyond the capacity of a heavily taxed community, at that point the problem becomes political. For any responsible man to say he is not interested in politics is to say he is not interested in life.

Although party politics would nauseate any decent man that does not supply him with sufficient reason for saying he is not interested in politics. Crime always nauseates, but honest men generally play some part in trying to reduce it and protect possible victims.

"Christianity", as C.H. Douglas has said, "is something inherent in the very warp and woof of the Universe, or it is just another set of interesting opinions." Many gallant fighters have

believed that the Christian Charter of political freedom, enshrined in these immortal words "The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath", was backed by an Authority superior to all government authority. The principle here expressed is either inherent in the very warp and woof of the Universe or it represents just another interesting opinion.

In Britain the Church is being challenged to speak with Authority and state where it stands in this fight for the freedom of the individual.

Some tough fighters are getting weary trying to stem the march of the totalitarians; they find it difficult to imagine a Power so overwhelming that it is superior to the massed legions of Caesar; but the Church claims to represent this Power. It knows that It is available for use; the question is, has it the courage to use It.

The ancient sun, which shone over Antony and Cleopatra tomorrow, will herald the newest of days. That we can make this statement at all, and have it readily accepted, shows a recognisable continuity of purpose behind the gigantic force, which gives life to this planet; above all it indicates integrity behind the Grand Scheme of things, which stands out in violent contrast to the catastrophic changes of fortune, which has befallen so many human institutions.

If we accept, as we are bound to accept, the fact that there is a Mind behind this universe, we are also bound to accept the fact that this Mind is not working erratically but according to certain principles, which, to say the least, have stood the test of a very long time. Modern revelation points to the fact that the deserts produced on the surface of this fertile earth are not the acts of God, but the acts of men, and we can probably say the same about a great deal of human suffering and disease. Nevertheless much of the suffering of innocent people has appeared to men and women as pointless and unnecessary and some have bitterly asked "Where is this Christian God?" "Where is this God of Love? This God the Father", and it is difficult sometimes to understand why a human father, far less God the Father should permit of so much suffering.

And here we come to one of those vantage points where we catch a glimpse of the working of God's Laws in contrast to the working of man's laws. No doubt men could have been saved a lot of pain and suffering had they been made like robots in an environment in which they had no power to alter, or made like primitive beasts without the higher powers of appreciation and discrimination which tends to intensify suffering.

When man was created in God's image he was given freedom to fulfill his divine destiny or destroy himself and his environment.

That this freedom to choose is a fundamental part of the Grand Scheme is obvious enough; it is also obvious that because of this freedom some suffering will ensue, what is not so obvious, but rather repugnant to all Christian thought, is that suffering should be on such a ridiculously elaborate scale, indicating not ordinary evil-doing, but organised evil, on a gigantic scale. To be blame ordinary men and women entirely for this is not only unfair, it appears to me to be cowardly, especially if we consider the case of war. We have been informed from all sides and from all levels that no people want war, yet we have war. We can say therefore that the ordinary men and women not only did not choose war, they had no power of choice. No one would suggest that the conscript armies had much choice or got much fun or glory out of war. We can say very definitely that the suffering and degradation of the victims of war were due not to freedom of choice at all, but to the complete lack of it, which is a very different story to what we have often been asked to believe. Apart from the unimaginable sufferings in Socialist Germany and Communist Russia, the supreme tragedy of the vast experiment of anti-Christ lies in the inability of so-called Christian people to realise that this organised evil which has been responsible for the murder of millions of innocent people is an inherent part of the principles and practice of the Socialist State, wherein all decisions are made by the chosen few, the rest of the population being merely robots, that is if they wish to live. In the modern socialist state there is little difference between the

military conscript and the economic conscript; the evil we meet with is organised evil, centrally organised evil. Fundamentally there has never been a possibility of a food shortage on this earth unless it was centrally organised.

We have got to realise that the traditional strongholds of Western Civilisation are already in the hands of men who, following the same socialist policy as Germany and Russia, are quickly reaching the same destination, not only in Europe, but in England and America. The problem is to get enough men and women to see the danger while there is still time to take action. Any so-called Christian who sees his country being turned into a vast political prison and blames every man except those directly responsible, is in the nature of things suspect, and should be exposed.

Dr. S.S. Laurie once said, "When we think of these things we realise the greatness and the difficulty of the task assigned to men...."

"To stand aside and, under the cloak of an effeminate despair, or of a self-satisfied cynicism or even of a self-indulgent seductive mysticism to affect a certain superiority to actual and inevitable conditions is the very suicide of manhood."

If we accept the Christian God the Father and the fact of organised evil, then God Himself must be suffering along with us and naturally will take part in the struggle. Dr. Laurie continues: "It certainly seems to me that our faith in the ultimate issue and our ability to bear present evils are strengthened by thus fairly recognising cosmic anarchy as ever resisting the entrance of the divine Spirit, ever defeating the Good.

If it be that the great God Himself is engaged, here and

now, in a very serious business, then even to be a humble private in His advancing hosts is a distinction. There will always be a certain proportion of weak combatants to be pitied and helped, of traitors to be shot, and of craven spirits who slink into the rear with the baggage under cover of an easy scepticism, as to the conduct of the campaign or a supercilious and egotistical superiority to their fellow soldiers. Not to such have the advances of humanity in the past been due; but only to those who have been faithful to ideals and pursued them to the end."*

* Synthetics. Vol. II Longmans, 1906.

Notes

(1) In refutation of this statement, economists have said that machinery charges included in prices of goods made this year, although not paid out in wages this year, were paid out in wages sometime in the past and, although spent, other wages are being paid out in the process of the production of other machinery.

The main objections to financing the buying of current production by the continuous injection of loan monies for the manufacture of machinery and other capital goods are three in number:

1. That as the money comes into the community as a debt its ability to liquidate total debt is only temporary.

2. That each injection of loan money has to be greater, so adding to the cumulative deficit.

3. That the continuous production of more and more tools (capital construction) in order to release purchasing power to buy consumer goods has no physical justification, but has very serious social and moral objections, which it is the purpose of these articles to examine.

(4) "Individualism and Economic Order", by F.A. Hayek, quoting from "The History of Freedom and Other Essays", by Lord Acton (1907).

(5) "The Mercury", Hobart, Sept, 24, 1954.

(6) Dr. S.L. Frank Hibbert's "Journal", April, 1954.

(7) "The Origin and Goal of History," by Professor Karl Jasper.

UNFOLDING DRAMA IN SOUTH AFRICA

The following examination of the South African crisis comes from the pen of the well-known South African journalist and author, Mr. Ivor Benson, in the February issue of his "Behind the News" (Available from Bloomfield Books, 26 Meadow Lane, Sudbury, Suffolk, England CO 10 6TD).

The news, which the world gets about South Africa, much of it coming from South Africa, represents falsehood of extraordinary magnitude and complexity.

The facts supplied are frequently true; the confusion arises from gross misrepresentation of them. The reasoning, too, is often faultless, but proceeding step by step from spurious premises.

Nevertheless, the news about South Africa, including that supplied by South Africa's own newspapers, serves the purpose for which it is intended by the tiny minority of power-wielders who know exactly what is going on and are never for a moment confused or deceived. It is news that incites and promotes revolution in South Africa in such a way that the vast majority of the peoples of the West have not the faintest idea what is happening.

What makes the situation even more confusing is the fact that there are enough secondary motives at work to obscure the ones that really matter, the ones which make things happen the way they do and keep the revolution undeviatingly on course.

Before trying to dispel the fog with a simple total picture of the present undeclared war against South Africa, let us bring the story up to date with some of the latest items of news.

The African National Congress (ANC), which is frankly Communist oriented and supported, decided last month at a conference at Lusaka, Zambia, to "mobilise its military resources and take its action into every party of South Africa".

Landmines and other explosive weapons, which had been used in recent weeks, were described as "the opening shots in the new-armed phase".

It is common knowledge that all the "military resources" which have hitherto been used against South Africa are of Communist origin, and the Communist countries have also supplied the terrorist training the Rhodesian pattern reproduced exactly.

But, who is Oliver Tambo, the leader of the ANC who delivered these threats to a representative of South Africa's Argus press? He is one of the ANC leaders whom Mr. Harry Oppenheimer, South Africa's capitalist czar, recently met at some

secret hideout in Zambia.

* Meanwhile, Desmond Tutu, Bishop of Johannesburg and general secretary of the South African Council of Churches (SACC, a branch of the World Council of Churches), has been on a triumphal visit to the United States, holding press conferences, starred in television programmes and received by Vice-President Bush.

And what has Bishop Tutu been telling the Americans? It was now possible, he told the *Washington Post*, that militant Black leaders would concentrate on what he called "soft targets" like buses carrying White schoolchildren. Other "soft targets" mentioned by this "holy man" were the homes of the Whites where domestic servants could put poison in the tea. Perish the thought that Bishop Tutu would want to incite Blacks to such fiendish forms of militant action, but he must know his own people well enough to know that they are highly susceptible to suggestion and are hardly likely to quibble over the difference between a prediction and a suggestion.

And the English-language papers in South Africa, ever mindful of the will of the mining financiers who own them, including those who were recently in close conclave with Communist Oliver Tambo, these papers would not want to give their full support to the ANC by splashing the Lusaka threats on their front pages, would they? - or would they? And the last thing they would want to do, surely, is to feed into the minds of the Black militants the idea that the bombing of school buses and the poisoning of their White employers would be regarded abroad as "understandable" and, in the circumstances, even inevitable!

From which it follows, of course, that the owners of those newspapers and their editors must be innocently unaware of the fact that the publicity they have been giving to the ANC and to Bishop Tutu, threats and predictions included, meets all the requirements of those who are bent on drawing all Southern Africa into the same Marxist sink-hole.

A strange purblindness - not so? Yet blindness that does not allow them, even by accident, to deviate one degree from a course that happens to suit the revolutionaries and put

heart into the terrorists!

* Other things have been happening in the United States. Under pressure to abandon his policy of so-called "constructive engagement" - an alternative to all-out economic and political warfare — President Reagan has agreed to the setting up of a "bipartisan advisory committee" on South Africa, consisting of eight Whites and four Blacks. This committee, at its first session, so we are told, "was guided by American experts through South African history" and will later travel to South Africa to gather evidence and information.

What does all this mean? Answer: Nothing more than just another generator of more and more news and pictures, to be added to the present surplus generated by politicians, public entertainers, and professional activists of the kind who parade daily in front of South African embassies and consulates.

'CONFUSION IS A WEAPON'

What else has been happening? A Swiss "debt mediator", one Dr. Fritz Leutwiller, has been on a visit to South Africa to discuss with President P.W. Botha and others debts, which South Africa suddenly and unexpectedly finds itself unable to pay. Bad housekeeping? - Not at all, for most of that which is now owed was neither spent nor borrowed. How so? The black magic involved in that misfortune is not readily explained. What happened was that currency manipulations, by cutting the exchange value of the rand without any warning, trebled the debt repayment burden. What we need to know, and what the newspapers will not tell us, is that this attack on the rand was just another part of the undeclared war against South Africa.

So, what does it all mean? The information about South Africa, and interpretations thereof, can be compared with a tip-truck load of jigsaw puzzle pieces; if all spread out these imaginary jigsaw pieces would need a table the size of a football field. What we would not know, if we were crazy enough to try to put these pieces together to form a single picture — like the pieces of news about South Africa - is that they cannot be made to fit together, for they are a mixture of pieces from innumerable different jigsaw puzzles.

Tutu alone is a scrambled jigsaw puzzle in which no two parts ever fit exactly. Bishop Tutu is quite sure that President Reagan does not understand what is happening in South Africa; he, therefore, undertook, while in Washington, to "uncloud the President's vision". But are we so sure that Bishop Tutu's mind does not also need to be "unclouded"? And if we cannot be sure that President Reagan has not been able to put together all the pieces of the South African jigsaw puzzle, with so many experts to help and advise him, who else can hope to be able to do it?

Another recent visitor to the United States was Mr. Ian Smith, former Prime Minister of Rhodesia and now leader of the opposition Conservative Alliance Party in the Zimbabwean parliament. This man has been at the centre of political developments in Southern Africa ever since 1963 when he took over as Prime Minister from Winston Field, so he ought to know what has been going on - not so?

But the "worn and weary Ian Smith" (press description) who appeared at a news conference at Washington lumped together as of "clouded mind" just about everyone of any consequence in the West. He put it like this: "The West is making the same tragic mistakes with South Africa that they made with Rhodesia". And he urged the leaders of the free world "to use their influence to try and ensure that we don't drift into bankruptcy and a situation where there is no freedom".

This is an assessment not very flattering to Western leaders and their innumerable investigators and advisers.

But, how "unclouded" is the mind of a former Prime Minister of Rhodesia who believes that Western leaders are so ill-informed and so stupid that they need his assistance? Is it not more reasonable, on the face of it, to suppose that those who went to so much trouble and expense to instal Marxist regimes in Angola, Mozambique and Rhodesia understood very well what they did and are by no means displeased with the results?

So, why all the confusion about the present undeclared

war against South Africa? Why so many "clouded minds" on the subject? The short answer to such questions is that it is the falsehood, the "world of lies", that baffles, and not the truth. The truth is quite simple, but is hard to come by because it is forbidden. By whom forbidden? - By those who have the power to make things happen. But why forbidden? — Because purposes are being promoted which require concealment.

The short story, then, is that the present undeclared war against South Africa is only one portion of what Professor B.T. Bauer has dared to call "an undeclared and one-sided civil war in the West", a war aimed not only at the Whites in South Africa but at ethnic Westerners and their culture, wherever they may be.

But the "worn and weary Ian Smith" (press description) who appeared at a news conference at Washington lumped together as of "clouded mind" just about everyone of any consequence in the West. He put it like this: "The West is making the same tragic mistakes with South Africa that they made with Rhodesia". And he urged the leaders of the free world "to use their influence to try and ensure that we don't drift into bankruptcy and a situation where there is no freedom".

This is an assessment not very flattering to Western leaders and their innumerable investigators and advisers.

But, how "unclouded" is the mind of a former Prime Minister of Rhodesia who believes that Western leaders are so ill-informed and so stupid that they need his assistance? Is it not more reasonable, on the face of it, to suppose that those who went to so much trouble and expense to instal Marxist regimes in Angola, Mozambique and Rhodesia understood very well what they did and are by no means displeased with the results?

So, why all the confusion about the present undeclared war against South Africa? Why so many "clouded minds" on the subject? The short answer to such questions is that it is the falsehood, the "world of lies", that baffles, and not the truth. The truth is quite simple, but is hard to come by because it is forbidden. By whom forbidden? — By those who have the power to make things happen. But why forbidden? — Because purposes are being promoted which require concealment.

The short story, then, is that the present undeclared war against South Africa is only one portion of what Professor B.T. Bauer has dared to call "an undeclared and one-sided civil war in the West", a war aimed not only at the Whites in South Africa but at ethnic Westerners and their culture, wherever they may be.

DOCTORING JEFFERSON

As every school child knows, the Declaration of Independence holds these truths self-evident — that all men are endowed with certain inalienable rights. But in Jefferson's Virginia, of all places, the word "inalienable" was deleted from a textbook used for seventh-graders. The Scholastic Book Service, publishers of "*American Adventures*," presumably feared the word was too difficult for youngsters to grasp.

This nugget came to light in an annual report on classroom censorship prepared by a group called People for the American Way. In a stroke, the Scholastic Book Service insulted history, the brains of the young and the State of Virginia. But it also prompted a commendable response.

When the board of education discovered the deletion, it asked publishers for a list of all such changes. Not only Jefferson was doctored. The board belatedly learned that "*Romeo and Juliet*" had been revised in school texts to expunge language that was judged too suggestive for young minds.

Such disclosures ought to be routine. If publishers feel they must bow to censors for commercial reasons, let them at least surrender openly. Educators surely have the right to know when history and literature are being rewritten. So do students. Indeed, it ought to be inalienable.

From *Topics* - *New York Times*.