

THE NEW TIMES

\$ 10 per annum post free.

Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne.

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

VOL. 51, NO. 3.

MARCH 1987.

Registered By Australia Post—Publication No. VBH 1001

Australia and New Zealand Edition. Published in Melbourne and Auckland.

BUILDING THE WORLD SOVIET STATE

By Eric D. Butler

"Of all the centralised governments.... Russia is by far the greatest threat to the individual, whether he is called a proletariat or anything else. To suppose that the most naturally reactionary and politically inexperienced nation in the world can, or wishes to, solve problems exercising Great Britain is merely fantastic. I believe that the state of affairs in Russia has been consciously achieved by truly anti-social and anti-cultural forces, and that any attempt is being made to achieve it all over the world by methods which, I think, it is vital should be better understood. I should like to state unequivocally that it is my conviction that centralisation is being fostered everywhere and from the same source and with the same object - world dominion."

As Lenin and his fellow Bolsheviks were well aware that their seizure of power in Russia was only made possible with the backing of International Finance centred on Wall Street, it is not surprising that Lenin was able to predict with accuracy that International Finance would finance economic blood transfusions from the "decadent capitalists" to sustain the Soviets. Lenin correctly observed that a world Soviet system was impossible without the creation of an international economic system. Lenin's spiritual successors, both in Moscow and Peking, have warmly applauded the brainchild of The Trilateralists, the New International Economic Order.

The merging of the Soviet economy with that of Western nations is now taking place at an accelerating pace. A clear indication of the shape of things to come has been provided by Australia's Hawke Fabian Socialist government, which has instructed the Trade Department to provide the Soviet Union with a consultant to assist the Soviet to market its goods in Australia. The Trade Minister, Mr. Dawkins, is urging Australian farmers to consider buying more Soviet Belarus tractors, instead of US machinery. Selected Australian companies have been encouraged to strengthen economic relations with the Soviet Union. Shortly after his first election, Fabian Socialist Prime Minister Hawke visited Communist China which, like the Soviet Union, is now actively promoting "liberalisation", and promoted the concept of joint economic ventures between Australia and China, particularly in the steel industry.

MERGING ECONOMIES

One of the most important men at the recent international World Economic Forum in Switzerland was not Australian Prime Minister Hawke, who allegedly impressed international bankers and similar people with investment prospects in Australia, but senior Soviet official, Mr. Ivan Ivanov, of the Soviet State Foreign Economic Commission. Ivanov's message was straight out of the International Bankers' Trilateral Commission text books: the development of joint economic ventures between the Soviet Union and the Western nations. Ivanov was responsible for new legislation which permits foreigners for the first time, to obtain an equity in Soviet industries. Backed by the International Bankers, large industries from the non-Communist World are already taking advantage of the Soviet's "liberalisation" programme.

- C.H. Douglas in "Whose Service is Perfect Freedom."

Generally overlooked in all the hoo-ha about President Reagan selling military equipment to Iran, with the Israelis acting as the vital go-between, and making an enormous financial profit in the process, is that Reagan has agreed to increased American economic links with the Soviet Empire. Only recently Reagan restored Communist Poland's Most Favoured Nation trade status. More loans from the international bankers are now in order. Even if Reagan finishes his Presidential term, he has been effectively destroyed. Trilateralists like Vice-President George Bush and others are in the ascendancy. Soviet psycho-political war has successfully presented "new-look" Soviet leader Gorbachev as a moderate and progressive Soviet leader prepared to work together with the West. While there is growing economic collaboration through the US-USSR Trade and Economic Council, there is growing fraternisation in education and other fields. All this is presented as preferable to the threat of a nuclear holocaust.

MARX AND DEBT FINANCE

It is not without significance that Karl Marx, often described as the founder of modern Communism, never once attacked the power of International Finance. While Marx was practically living in the British Museum, financed by his wealthy friend Engels, who had made a fortune out of the exploitation of English child labour, William Cobbett, one of the greatest Englishmen of all time, was arousing the nation with his brilliant attacks on the credit monopoly and the debt system. Cobbett's robust language was that of the authentic patriot, a man who cried out against all alien influences, including that of Jewish speculators. He was a spokesman for those who were outraged by the destruction of British industry, and the widespread poverty resulting from debt finance.

But there was not a word from Marx about the dominant role of debt finance. He attacked every form of private property, claiming that once the institution of private property, particularly decentralised small-scale property, was abolished, a new Golden Age would result. Marx was little more than a plagiarist, most of the ideas which he summarised in *The Communist Manifesto* having been borrowed from others. His idea of the class war had originated with Weishaupt, founder of the notorious Illuminati.

By the time of the publication of *The Communist*

Manifesto in 1848, various forms of Socialism had been tried with disastrous results. Even Robert Owen's Co-operative Movement, undergirded with a very different philosophy to that of Marx, had failed, particularly in the United States. Clearly Marx was seen as an asset by those who were driving to centralise power through the power of credit creation. Marx, along with his borrowed ideas has been widely publicised over the years, while comparatively few have heard of William Cobbett, and those who have, attacked the credit monopolists. The various Marxist movements have, right up until the present time, strenuously opposed any form of realistic financial reform. Soviet leader Molotov was quoted as saying at the time of the Great Depression in the 'thirties, that he and his colleagues knew all about Social Credit, and that it was the one movement they feared.

THE EVIL OF CENTRALISATION

As demonstrated by Brook Adams, a member of the famous American Adams family, in his carefully documented work, *The Law of Civilisation and Decay* (1895), the basic cause of the collapse of all Civilisations has been the excessive Centralisation of power over the individual. Centralised power, irrespective of how it is labelled, drains power and creative initiative away from the individual, one inevitable result being a soul-destroying bureaucracy. The will-to-power has manifest itself in various forms since the beginning of time. It was the stifling of the individual by a mass of Pharisaical controls and regulations which the Founder of Christianity so strongly attacked. Every individual, including even prostitutes, was a unique being and of value in the eyes of God. The logical result of this philosophical concept is that the group and its institutions exist to serve the individual ("The Sabbath was made for man"). The reaction of the Pharisees' leaders, the Sanhedrim, was "Crucify Him". Every form of centralisation, in which Jews play a disproportionate role, is a crucifixion of the Christ-idea.

An early Social Crediter, Dr. P. Coffey, well-known Irish Catholic priest, made the comment that debt finance was the bridge over which man was being forced to move from the relatively free society to a Communist society. Events have graphically and tragically confirmed that prediction.

A GIGANTIC CONSPIRACY

A gigantic conspiracy, with its roots deep in history, is now moving towards a decisive period in its development. That

conspiracy cannot be adequately understood without understanding the nexus between Finance and Revolution.

The famous Russian Socialist and Anarchist, Michael Bakunin, who originally was a supporter of Karl Marx, eventually exposed Marx in a statement which has a chilling relevance to the plight of the world today. Bakunin wrote:

"Marx is a Jew and is surrounded by a crowd of little, more or less intelligent, scheming, agile, speculating Jews, just as Jews are everywhere - commercial and banking agents, writers, politicians, brokers, just as they are financial brokers, with one foot in the bank and the other in the socialist movement... this Jewish world is today largely at the disposal of Marx or Rothschild. I am sure that, on the one hand, the Rothschilds appreciate the merits of Marx, and that on the other hand, Marx feels an instinctive inclination and great respect for the Rothschilds. This may seem strange. What could there be in common between communism and high finance? Ho ho! The communism of Marx seeks a strong state centralisation, and where this exists, there the parasitic Jewish nation...."

"In reality, this would for the proletariat, be a barrack-regime, under which the working men and the working women, converted into a uniform mass, would rise, fall asleep, work and live at the beat of the drum. The privilege of ruling would be in hands of the skilled and learned, with a wide scope left for profitable crooked deals carried on by the Jews, who would be attracted by the enormous extension of the international speculation of the national banks....."

(Polemique contra les Juifs, 1872.)

Two things are now certain about the drive for international power: The momentum is so great that it cannot be halted. But, the attempted centralisation of power on a global scale can never achieve its ultimate objective with the end result being a progressive break up of traditional society. Truth is the final disciplinarian and when men depart from Truth, there is disaster. But, the way back to Truth can be discovered amidst disaster. This is what Social Credit is all about. It offers the prospect of renewed re-generation. It is this prospect which must beckon all those who have not forsaken Truth. Social Credit is the light in the darkening gloom.

IF THE HYPOTHESIS FITS

By CHAS PINWILL

Looking at the financial powers and practices on an international scale, and from the outside looking in, one sometimes has to bring out the crystal ball of intuition and consult it.

This can hardly be described as "the scientific method" and produces no hard evidence, but it can and often does produce an hypothesis. It is only then, when a definite and acknowledged assumption has been put forward, that investigation can begin and has something to investigate.

Let us begin by examining a very simple transaction.

Three years ago an Australian Bookshop placed a forward order for a certain book which was about to be published in America, and paid US\$1,000 in advance. At this time, the exchange rate being \$1.00 Australian = \$1.00 U.S., this cost the Bookshop \$1,000 Australian.

After many delays, legal battles, and the author's ill health, last week the author died, the intended publication was abandoned, and the deposit was returned.

The exchange rate now being \$1.00 U.S. = \$0.66Aust., the Bookshop received a bank order for \$1,500.

What has happened here?

The Bookshop bought and sold U.S.\$1,000. There are no more or less U.S. dollars as a result of this transaction. There are however, as a result of this activity, \$500 Australian more in existence. Money has been created.

This money was created by the Reserve Bank to purchase the U.S.\$1,000 from the Bookshop. Through this, the Reserve Bank was forced to create, and to give free of debt, \$500 Australian to the Bookshop.

Most businesses who occasionally import or export have had a similar experience at some time. Some have been the

poorer for it.

Given the above example, if it had been a U.S. Bookshop forward buying from an Australian publisher, they would have paid U.S.\$1,000 and received only U.S.\$666 in return.

\$334 United States dollars would have vanished from the face of the earth without trace.

The fact of these small-time innocent commercial accidents, takes quite another aspect if one will allow the existence of professional foreign exchange dealers, backed by international Banks with tremendous resources, and enough funds to influence the market.

The General Manger of the Commonwealth Development Bank, Mr. John Fletcher, was quoted in several newspapers a few months ago, as saying that international bankers were ruthlessly manipulating the Australian dollar with a viciousness that made a rugby pack look like a kindergarten.

The foreign exchange markets of the world never close, for as the sun sets in one continent, it rises in another, and given the capacity of modern communications to give instant telecommunication to any financial market in the world, and the capacity of the modern computer, the number of transactions, or transmutations of a lonely Australian dollar into other currencies and back again in each 24 hours is almost infinite.

THE SPECULATORS

For every A.\$1,000 million exchanged annually, on a permanent 24 hour basis all year round, this only represents \$11.4 million per hour. On this basis a relatively modest fund of \$10 million could produce a distortion in any given hour.

If all the U.S. dollars currently on offer for Australian dollars were bought, the Australian dollar would tend to fall, and the purchaser would then have the U.S. dollars with which to repurchase them at the lower price. At this point the exercise can begin again.

If at the end of the day, for every A.\$1 used in this way, the speculator had \$1.01, this would represent a profit of 365% per annum compounded daily. If this doesn't sound so much to you, just compounding it every 50 days gives an annual return of over 1,500% per year.

If this were done by a foreign bank operating in Australia with just \$10 million being used in this way, at the end of a

year, the Reserve Bank would have been forced to create an additional \$150 million Australian dollars and pay it to that foreign bank.

Now of course, all this is nothing but hypothesis. But does it fit?

Banking and foreign exchange has been de-regulated by Mr. Keating. Subsequently, we have witnessed an invasion of foreign Banks. There are now 83 (last count) Banks and financial institutions dealing in foreign exchange in Australia.

How many of these foreign Banks have sought your funds on deposit, or shown interest in giving you a loan? Most are simply not interested. Then, why are they here?

Since Mr. Keating's de-regulation, we have noted that the dollar, has had its problems. The foreign debt has galloped over the \$100 billion mark. And yes, the Reserve Bank has been creating more and more Australian dollars at a fantastic rate.

While Mr. Keating promised that lower interest rates would result from the entry of foreign banks, we note that he has ever since been insisting upon higher interest rates to "try to defend the dollar". Well, Mr. Keating, who's attacking it? And how?

Has any opposition Member sought Mr. John Fletcher's views? Or, called for an enquiry? No.

Does any attempt to regulate the capacity of Banks to create Australian dollars make sense, if the capacity to force the Reserve Bank to do it for them, and then give them the funds, is theirs to command?

Of course, if these foreign exchange operators were to hunt in a pack, the distortions could be exaggerated to greater advantage. Perhaps Mr. John Fletcher's choice of the word "pack" is not insignificant.

Where a Bank has representation in both Nations whose currencies are being exchanged, then pressure can be exerted in unison from both sides and in both Nations' foreign exchanges.

Australia can defend itself from this in several ways. Fixing exchange rates with periodic changes at unspecified times and to values in our national interest, is one way.

Handing control to the speculation of international banks is not in the national interest.

CONSCIOUS BETRAYAL?

"This England never did, nor never shall,
Lie at the proud foot of a conqueror,
But when it first did help to wound itself;"

- Shakespeare, *King John*, Act V (our emphasis, Ed.).

On 3rd November 1986 the House of Lords approved the Single European Act on Third Reading without a division. Despite his previously strongly expressed objections to this measure, Lord Denning eventually capitulated "in face of the inevitable". Thus we suffer a further diminution of our national sovereignty and are taken a further step towards centralisation of control and ultimate One World Government.

To emphasise the true significance of this event and to enable readers to give wider exposure to the conspiracy for One World Government, we reprint relevant warnings by C. H. Douglas and B. W. Monahan.

"The idea underlying the Common Market is the idea that underlay Hitler. Hitler . . . was no more than the tip of the iceberg, the great reality being an immense totalitarian bureaucracy. If that happened to be a German, or even a Prussian, bureaucracy, it might be distinguishable as an oppressor; but a multi-national bureaucracy which would

have enormous powers would in the end be just as oppressive, but less distinguishable because more anonymous and hence, virtually impossible to overthrow. Nuclear war being 'unthinkable', armed forces would become police forces. The idea that elected 'representatives' would have any control over this apparatus is absurd. Furthermore, if Britain, for example, did not like the results (and it must be assumed that Britain fought 'Hitler' in anticipation of such results) any attempt to contract-out would be illegal -- a n act of 'rebellion'. The overriding objective of the organisation would be 'greater industrial efficiency' and, of course, the development of the under-developed countries, meaning a redistribution of wealth on a world scale; so long as workers with coloured skins were getting less than those with white, a need for equalisation of incomes would be apparent. Greater industrial efficiency might well require the re-location of workers having 'special skills'; any objection by nationals to being relocated among foreigners no doubt would attract the attention of the Race

Relations Board. And so, by easy stages, to 'desegregation' of employment, and an 'end to nationhood'."

— B. W. Monahan, *The Survival of Britain*, 1971.

"One of the advantages of sovereign nations lies in the possibility of diversity in the way of social organisation, the opportunity to try out different possibilities. But we see that as the world becomes richer in its ability to produce goods and services, so we are told that it is becoming increasingly difficult for a nation to live to itself. This is made the excuse for imposing similar systems and objectives on every nation, and the similarity of the proposals everywhere — 'Full employment', 'State Socialism', and the abrogation of national sovereignty — is a clear indication of the operation of a world policy proceeding from a world centre and having an ulterior motive. . . ."

— B. W. Monahan, *An Introduction to Social Credit* (2nd edn.) (1967).

"Despite the virtual conspiracy of collusion between the Party leaderships to keep decisions about joining the Common Market and abrogating British national sovereignty beyond the jurisdiction of the electorate, it is evident that the electorate is deeply uneasy to a degree where something had to be done about it. The technique is an old and proved one; *organise* the dissidents, and then lead them up the garden path. Hence the Safeguards Campaign to gather in all those "who believe that Britain should not join the Common Market without stringent and effective safeguards". This of course means "*should* join the Common Market (with safeguards which can be dropped once the Treaty of Rome is signed)". The fundamental idea is to get the cattle into the pens first; while they roam around loose they may become unmanageable"

"It is vital to realise that if the British electorate is tricked into surrendering its sovereignty as a nation, the surrender will be irrevocable unless the whole scheme — plot — for One World Government collapses. The nearer One World Government comes to achievement, the more catastrophic that collapse will be. Hitler's was an attempt at such Government, and its collapse nearly destroyed Europe, and in any case, paved the way for the present attempt, or was part of it.

"The date of the next British election . . . is not yet known; but it probably marks the end of the remaining (and diminished) opportunity to preserve national sovereignty.

"For remember: If treason is *allowed* to prosper (higher parliamentary salaries?) none *dare* call it treason. Once supreme international power is achieved, it will be used against those who have surrendered to it."

- B. W. Monahan, *The Survival of Britain* (1971).

"It is many years since Douglas warned that Parliament might not persist much longer; but that while it did, it was the sole agency through which the pressure of public opinion might be brought to bear on those responsible for the disastrous policies which have since encompassed the downfall of the British Empire, and reduced Great Britain to a mendicant at the seats of financial power. Britain's potential *physical* capacity to have sustained the Empire which she created is greater than ever; the ruin has been caused by the traitorous permeation of Fabianism in the interests of internationalism — the subordination of British national sovereignty to the authority of international institutions, the organs of World Government, by those in control of the International Financial System.

"Although its effectiveness *vis-à-vis* the Cabinet has declined enormously, and, since the destruction of the home defence forces (a potential challenge to Cabinet authoritarianism), almost vanished, Parliament still exists; on behalf of the British *people* whom it represents, it should call to account those responsible for our destruction.

Douglas's warnings, now proved to have been completely accurate, have been continuously available to those in responsible positions. If these latter have ignored them through mental incompetence, they should be certified accordingly and put away. But if, as increasingly seems to be the case, it is conscious betrayal of national sovereignty which underlies the imminent catastrophe, impeachment is the last recourse." (*Op. cit.*)

"The group in control of the banking system is using the financial and industrial systems in the pursuit of a long-range objective — the objective of world dominion for that group. Such a policy is in conflict with the desires of those to whom it is applied. Where we have an opposition of policies in this way, we have a state of war in the most general sense: 'War is the pursuit of policy by other means' (Clausewitz). In this sense, the translation of policy into practice involves the concept of *strategy*. 'Strategy is the employment of the battle to gain the end of the War' (i.e., the objective of policy) . . . 'Strategy forms the plan of the war' (Clausewitz).

"What has become quite clear is that the world is indeed in the grip of a conspiracy of which the Financial Power of 'no geographical nationality' is the nerve centre, operating through Fabian Socialism and Marx-Leninist Communism. The Money Power does not, and never did wish to improve the money system — its consequences in war, sabotage, and social friction are exactly what is desired. This, I think, exactly defines the task which society must face and solve - or perish. *First* to attack and defeat the Money Power, *then* consider the re-organisation of the money system'."

(— C. H. Douglas, *Programme for the Third World War* (1943).)

"How is a conspiracy which has been pursuing its aims for at least a quarter of a millennium, and which is now so obviously approaching its climax and culmination, to be defeated? Probably the shortest answer to that question lies in another: Why has the Conspiracy, with all its immense power of finance, patronage and propaganda not already achieved its aim?

"The aim of the Conspiracy is regimentation - - the reconstruction of society in the pattern of the ant-hill and the bee-hive. But the true progress of the industrial arts is in the opposite direction, affording, *potentially*, to an ever-increasing degree, the basis for social and individual diversification, which is the direction of human evolution. The Conspiracy has to proceed, therefore, against the stream of human aspirations, by creating a false picture of economic reality and making this the basis of the 'inevitability' of planning and regimentation.

"In attacking the Money Power, a sound grasp of economic reality was, for a long time, our only weapon, and is still an indispensable tool in any long-range programme of reconstruction, and defence against any renewed attempts by the few to dominate the rest which might be made if the present one is defeated.

"But that there is a Conspiracy is now sufficiently documented to make exposure the first line of attack. No conspiracy can withstand exposure. The International Conspiracy is of such a magnitude as to be to most people incredible — until they study the available evidence, which today, thanks to those who have appreciated the immediacy of the danger, is now freely available. So the basic strategy of survival is exposure of the conspiracy against society as we have known it.

"The tactics of this strategy are to disseminate the evidence and spread understanding. What has already been achieved in this direction undoubtedly has slowed down the Conspiracy's advance, and otherwise the fate of Cuba might already have befallen us. It is true that the main battle-front

is in the U.S.A., the present headquarters of the Money Power. But American public opinion is being alerted by a massive and co-ordinated campaign of exposure.

"But the struggle embraces the whole world, and exposure should be effected wherever it remains possible. Douglas once pointed out that modern wars are prize-fights between A and B for the benefit of C, the promoter, and that what was required was the combination of A with B for the elimination of C. Widespread exposure is the means to this end."

— B. W. Monahan, *An Introduction to Social Credit* (1967).

Extracts from "My Country Right or Wrong?" by Enoch Powell, *Telegraph Sunday Magazine*, 16th November 1986.

"The second half of my life has seen the deliberate dismantling of that country itself. That country used to be a free country. By this we mean a country whose citizens lived under laws they made themselves in their own Parliament and administered in their own courts. Not any longer. I protested. I opposed it. I refused to acknowledge it; but in 1972 Britain gave that freedom away by agreeing to join the Common Market . . .

"The House of Commons surrendered in the most formal

and comprehensive manner its exclusive right to make laws and to levy taxes and the exclusive right of our courts to judge judgments. . . .

"Yet the British Parliament did this thing and continues to uphold it, though a single vote is still all that would be needed to retrieve its old authority. What is worse, the electorate shrug their shoulders and mutter that they never liked it, but they go on putting up with it.

"The surrender to the Common Market is so comprehensive that beside it the European Convention on Human Rights is in danger of seeming trivial. It is not trivial. Britain has accepted that its government, its Parliament and its courts can be overruled, on application from another country or from one of its own citizens, by a panel of foreign judges interpreting a woolly document about 'human rights'.

"Nations that renounce their self-respect and their independence do not, in this hard world, escape punishment. There is retribution ahead for the slothful acquiescence of Britain in its own dishonour. Ahead there lies a future of discord and violence, of mutual recrimination and hatred — the future prepared for a nation which declared that it was no nation and its people no people, a nation which committed suicide.

"Can such a country be my country?"

The Situation and the Outlook

By C. H. DOUGLAS

Originally published in *The Social Crediter* in 1946

(I)

The termination of large-scale military activities on the Continent of Europe—the pivotal theatre, to which the others were subsidiary and on which their destiny depended—is now sufficiently a matter of history for it to be possible to estimate their relationship to an ultimate objective, and to see also the pursuit of that objective "by other means". Any attempt to do this intelligently must proceed from one of two hypotheses; either the world was, and is, in the grip of blind fate, "written in the pyramids", *etc.*, or it is exhibiting the results of a policy derived from thinking man, in which case mundane fate, while conditioned to some extent by previous action and persistent deduction, is susceptible of "repentance" (thinking again or against) and compensatory action. It is on the latter hypothesis that the comments which follow are based, and if it is fallacious, it is obvious that neither they, nor perhaps any others, have any consequence. No policy, no cure.

It is necessary, in my opinion, to bear in mind that a policy *must* derive from a philosophy; and for this reason, and with some reluctance because I am well aware of the antagonisms which are aroused, I feel it would not be honest to omit the expression of an opinion which has been crystallising, so far as I am concerned, for some years. The more conventional form in which the idea to which I refer is phrased is that we are engaged in a battle for Christianity, and that is true. But it is surprising in how many ways, practically, realistically, factually, it is true. And one of these ways is almost unnoticed, except in its derivations—the emphasis placed by the Roman Catholic Church on the family, and the steady unrelenting effort to destroy the very idea of family and to substitute the State, by the Communists and Socialists, who, with the World Financial Group, are the real body of Anti-Christ. Please observe that what most people mean by family nowadays is a unit *contemporaneously* composed of parents and children. It has no extension in time; the flash of consciousness we call the present is all that is allowed to this idea of "family"; and therefore

it has no stability, because it lacks a dimension.

Now it is this very idea of impermanence and scorn of tradition which can be seen to be the key-note of the New Order which Mr. Anthony Eden, for instance, was so well informed as to prophesy almost before the first shot was fired in 1939. Life now is to have no stable principles; property is yours just so long as an institution does not want it; you are no judge of what is best for you, and what you want does not matter. Everything is to be conditioned by "the common good". The group is supreme over the individual; the flower exists for the benefit of the field.

This lack of stability is closely connected with a curious inversion. *Demon est deus inversus*. We mouth Social Security and live in a prison on the edge of a volcano. We decry privilege in favour of "the common good", double our Cabinet Ministers' salaries, and institute and maintain priorities in every one of the decreasing facilities of a dying civilisation. We cannot build houses, so we steal them. We cannot play the game, so we change the rules. In the face of the greatest crops in history we ration bread. We export immense quantities of goods we need ourselves to *e.g.*, France, and refuse to take payment in wines, having raised the price of Algerian claret from about twopence a litre, its cost of production, to about fourteen shillings, its "Government" price. We talk about the necessity to avoid inflation, and we negotiate immense and irrational wage increases unrelated to any intelligible wage policy and prevent the goods to which they relate from reaching the wage market; and, having with the support of fifty years' propaganda against profits obtained control of the national resources, we install a Chancellor of the Exchequer who disposes of the National Credit to our disadvantage, and cuts off the National dividend at its source—a rate of interest on the national capital account—while arranging that the real wealth produced goes abroad to be credited to the national capital account of our active enemies.

These matters are not episodic, they are all connected with an intelligible philosophy. And the raw material of that philosophy is the common man—the amorphous group, the tool of that terrible Power which fights relentlessly for our destruction. It is very necessary not to confuse "the common man" with any economic class, perhaps more necessary in these days than ever before, although its characteristic does not change. "Crucify Him. Release unto us Barabbas. Now, Barabbas was a robber."

Majority "rule" with a secret ballot is the organising mechanism of "the common man", the vehicle of the subconscious, the animal man. "Father, forgive them, they are *unconscious* of what they do." Intellect is not concerned.

(II)

In order to disembarass oneself of the confusion involved in the use of words such as Fascism, Communism, Socialism and the like, and to avoid the elementary fallacy of supposing that our troubles began with the present so-called Labour Government, and can be ended by merely replacing it by a so-called Conservative administration, there is no better discipline than to turn back to the Mond-Turner Conference, and to observe its absorption in P.E.P.

The Mond-Turner Conference consisted of six of the most powerful industrialist employers in Great Britain, dominated by the international Zionist Jew, Sir Alfred Moritz Mond and his able coadjutor, and co-racialist, Sir Hugo Hirst (Hirsch). Mond had belonged to both main political Parties; so had some of the others. The six so-called Labour members of the Conference included Right and Left Wing Trades Unionists, Socialists and a Communist.

It would be difficult to get together a body of men less "political" in the Parliamentary sense. They were not there to discuss policy; they were there to make a given policy work. That policy was the World Empire of Big Business. "The high purpose of the Conference could not be more amply illustrated than by the fact that the first agreed resolution *published to the world* [my italics] was a Joint Memorandum on the Gold Reserve and its relations with industry.

"It is merely necessary for me to point out that the issue of that Memorandum to the Chancellor of the Exchequer had a definite result in the policy which he pursued."-- Sir A. M. Mond, at Harvard University, 1928.

His Master's Voice, in fact.

It is necessary not to lose sight of the undiscussed question of policy; but, before dealing with it, the sequence of events following the Mond-Turner Conference should be noted. The Conference was in 1926. The Bank of England centralised currency in 1928; the financial crash and the world depression began in 1929; P.E.P. and the U.S. New Deal became dominant in 1932. Selected nominees of Big Business trained at the London School of Economics were installed in key positions in Australia and Ottawa. Mr. Coldwell, an Englishman, with a strong dislike for England, had the extraordinary fortune to meet Mr. Nash of New Zealand at Regina when he was so successfully founding the Canadian Socialist Party, and discovered that their views were identical. Dr. Arnold Toynbee announced that "we" are working with all our might to undermine the sovereignty of our respective nations. "Hitler" undermined them by force, and at the outbreak of war a carefully prepared but unsuccessful propaganda was launched for "Union Now with Britain" [*sic*]. "Union" was, of course, carelessly disguised absorption of the British Empire by the United States.

Two main features of this period can be discerned without much difficulty: The pressure to organise larger and larger units was accompanied by bigger and worse disasters. This pressure is the outcome of what, at one end of the industrial scale, is called Socialism, at the other end, Rationalisation. Both mean Monopoly under the guise of Collectivism, and both mean de-Nationalisation—an econo-

mic not a political organisation. And the second feature is that the British Empire is an insurmountable obstacle as such, and must be disintegrated before it can be replaced by economic world control. It may be recalled that William Randolph Hearst made just such a statement in an unguarded moment many years ago.

The outcome of the last catastrophe, the Second World War, is a fresh drive towards both these objectives from the same origins. And the two ends of the scale are, one unconsciously and the other consciously, working towards both objectives at the same time. That is what is coming to be called the Financier-Socialist Plot.

At this point, the divergence between a political and a business Empire becomes easier to discern. British Statesmen of the pre-twentieth-century type were constantly accused of hypocrisy. Without examining the grounds for this charge too closely, the mere fact that it was made is instructive. Hypocrisy has been well and truly defined as the tribute vice pays to virtue. British tradition, therefore, either had, or pretended to have, a policy. What was it? Certainly not, traditionally, "business". Napoleon's gibe that we are a nation of shopkeepers was meant to be, and was accepted as, offensive at the time it was made. Nowadays we are not such successful shopkeepers, but regard shop keeping as our highest aim.

Many books have been written on this subject, but a trivial phrase is perhaps as illuminating as any of them. In even remote parts of South America, thousands of people, many of whom have no idea whether England is a continent, a country, or a planet, and may never have seen an Englishman, assure each other of their sincerity by saying *Palabra de Ingles*—"On the word of an Englishman". Notice the suggestion of stability, of continuity, and the contrast with the predatory methods of "Enabling Legislation", the Managerial State, and other current fashions which accompany our decadence.

The point is not so much—although, of course, that is important—that a political Empire has a certain set of principles. It is that those principles should be stable. Out of this, as it were by a side wind, came success and power. The conception is closely allied to "quality".

Now the *direct* aim of an Empire of Business is power, and the ultimate *material* power is that over Life and Death—War. But the intermediate device is Fashion—Instability, Change. *Palabra de Ingles*, if it has any place at all in it, is a business device helpful towards increased exports. Use it on your letter headings. Learn from Marx and Lenin the uses of lying. In fact, learn from anybody or anything except the makers of your own history and from that history itself.

Consider then Karl Marx (Mordecai): "The mode of production in material life determines the general character of the social, political and spiritual processes of life" (*Critique of Political Economy*) If that means anything at all—I am not sure that it does—it means that our desperate social, political and spiritual processes derive from "the mode of production".

I don't think "the mode of production" was even remotely understood by Marx. What he meant was the business system. And I should say myself that it is the political and spiritual processes which are evidenced *by* the business system. Hence the projected World Empire of Big Business and the increasing desperation of our plight.

(III)

A dispassionate consideration of such events as the Mond-Turner Conference (not to mention the deliberations of less known bodies) ought to convince anyone that the Materialistic Conception of History, which Marx popularised, but did not originate, is, like so many other theories and ideas which are current, an inversion of the truth. Mond, and

possibly others with him, was perfectly conscious of what he was aiming at, and was animated by a *conscious* hatred of the traditional English way of life, which represented an unconscious subordination of the "employment" and production systems to spiritual and social needs. It was the remnant of Christian Europe. Given that conviction, it is not difficult to see that mass production, majority democracy, collective bargaining and collectivism, one world government (intended to be ruled by Zionists) and World War and World Annihilation are all of a piece. They are the inescapable results of a choice—conscious in a small minority, unconscious and essentially passive in "the Common Man".

It has often been observed that there has been a steady degradation in the attractiveness of life in England, and perhaps to a less extent in Scotland, as the statistical wealth of the nation has increased. Since (a) the population has increased—rather mysteriously—and (b) the rate of production per man-hour has been accelerated by a factor of at least one hundred and probably more, it is indisputable that something must be happening which is ignored. There are many factors of this character. The first is that most of our production has little value in adding to the pleasure of life. The second is that a startling amount of our exports are a complete loss, from which we get no return. A third is that we get less return each year per unit of export, so that the amount of labour paid per unit of *import* tends to remain constant, or to increase irrespective of the productivity of that unit. At the present time, as a result of labour agitation reinforced by the failure of this policy to raise living standards, actual output tends to drop.

That is the system, and its apotheosis is, "full employment" for unspecified ends. Now, in fairness to many people whose education and daily work renders it nearly impossible that they should comprehend the insanity of this policy, it has to be admitted that war is its justification. If we are to contemplate more world wars, competitive armaments, not absolute standards of military strength, are inescapable. Put quite shortly, the world is doomed, and at no distant date, if this is the only conceivable policy by which to deal with the threat of war on a modern scale.

But there are at least two policies which can be applied to the situation. One of these is being publicised by every means which modern methods can suggest. It is the policy of the omnipotent World State. And the second is hardly mentioned and still more infrequently understood. It is the policy of the Free Individual.

It is difficult to pick up any newspaper at this time without reading a suggestion of the growing risk of war, accompanied by the remark, "Of course, nobody wants war". Well, if nobody wants war, from whom do wars proceed? The answer is: From the Common Man, manipulated by his Greatest Enemy, the Power Maniac. Without the common man, the Power Maniac is helpless.

There is really no room for argument about this matter. Not a day passes without some action being taken to make the individual more impotent and to transfer his individual initiative—his personal power—to the mass. The Trades Union, the Co-operative "Movement" (Co-operation between High Finance and the "Labour" Party to monopolise and cartelise distribution), the Producing Cartels, the various infringements on real property, and, most deadly perhaps of all, the combination of calculated inflation, taxation and "coupon" restrictions are all steps to Russian serfdom.

Perhaps the greatest disservice to struggling humanity which the past hundred years has witnessed has been fostered by those "money reformers" who have supported the "nationalisation" of the Bank of England. It is simply appalling in its implications that men, well educated in the everyday sense, should be so unconscious of the very roots of the democracy for which they profess such admiration

that they cannot or will not grasp two elemental propositions. The first is that genuine control of genuine finance was the core of a genuine Parliamentary system, not its electoral devices, and that this involved getting the money from Parliament not from a Ways and Means Account, and that "nationalisation" of the Bank of England has now made it quite unnecessary to bring financial questions into the House of Commons at all. So evident has this become that the proposal to vote thousands of millions of pounds merely empties the House.

It ought to be elementary, but it is not, that if no considerable number of individuals, as *individuals*, can be found to say they want war, then the way to prevent war is to prevent those individuals from being coerced or deceived, by desire for money or State action, into a war which only a tiny minority *do* want, because of its indispensability to a Power World Organisation. The present Administration is going further and faster than any previous Administration along the course in which Mr. Churchill's Administration concurred, and against which the so-called Conservative Opposition is making no real protest—the transfer of power and initiative from the individual to the institutions controlled by International Finance. And no Power on earth can avert the consequences, failing a reversal of the policy and the discredit of its Philosophy. Those consequences are war and the death of civilisation.

(IV)

The situation, then, is that the philosophy of Hegel and Marx, to use the names to which it is generally attached; a philosophy which appears to be fundamentally Jewish with a modifying strain of Prussianism, is now temporarily triumphant in a policy of State Socialism directed under cover of a bureaucracy by a small group of international money kings, perhaps not entirely Jewish at the moment, but intending to become so. Control of propaganda in all its forms has imposed a false mental picture on the group mind which facilitates the acceptance of such patent absurdities as "full employment" in a power-production economy, centralised direction in a universal literacy, and, in fact, general stultification in the name of "the common good".

No refinements on this policy hold any prospect of salvation. It is fundamentally false and vicious, and events are the outcome of it. The greater dominance it acquires, the more events must follow the pattern of its philosophy. We are therefore driven to consider how it can be arrested, what can be substituted for it, and how that substitution can be accomplished.

To say that Social Credit is the only policy which offers any hope to a distracted world would savour of quackery unless accompanied by a definition which is not delimited by a plan, financial or otherwise. The very essence of a plan is that it is static, not organic; and the very essence of the necessity under which we labour is that we have to recognise that life is organic, not static. The conception of Social

"THE ESSENTIAL CHRISTIAN HERITAGE"

By Eric D. Butler

This study of the Christian roots of English constitutional developments, with the stress on the value and uniqueness of each individual, is essential background reading for those concerned about the growing attacks on the Australian Federal Constitution. The importance of Magna Carta, English Common Law, and the limiting of the power of governments, clearly outlined.

Price \$2 posted from all League of Rights addresses.

Credit which first has to be established, so that the error of a static conception shall not stultify *tactical* plans, is that we must aim at liberating reality; and to liberate anything you must first be able to recognise it. A good deal of the so-called philanthropic sentiment in the world is not reality, and has no relation to reality. Who are the prime beneficiaries of U.N.R.R.A. and the "Save Europe Now" rackets?

Before touching upon immediate necessities two simple propositions require enunciation. The first is that no-one has ever been able to conceive of a stick with one end, still less to make one. When someone says (and there is a steady propaganda to induce people to say) that a policy is negative, they are talking the same kind of nonsense as those who say that what is wanted is a positive policy. No-one has yet found a way to travel nearer to Carlisle without getting further from Crewe, if you start from Crewe.

And the second proposition is that a Government is inherently and inevitably restrictive and therefore that the amount of Government which a community can stand without collapsing is definitely limited, and if Governments are competitive, the most governed community will collapse first. And therefore, the first policy to be applied to over-Government, *i.e.*, Socialism, is and must be, a negative policy—a retreat from Government; less Government.

This characteristic of Government is inherent, but is little understood. Government is of necessity hierarchical and cannot stimulate or even tolerate independent, responsible action. Anyone who has contact with Government officials knows the impossibility of getting a genuine decision out of any of them. At the best, what you get is the assurance of a precedent.

In its place (quite a minor place) and with strict limitations, this state of affairs is necessary and useful. But not when elevated to a scheme of life. Governments are not proper mechanisms to which to entrust policy. The result never varies; the world becomes progressively less pleasant to live in. As at present organised, there is no essential difference involved in "Big Business".

I am coming to believe that an extra-mundane code of principles is in the nature of reality. Given that, individual responsibility for the interpretation of the code follows logically. And the first consequence of this which leaps to the eye is that the miscalled democratic system, as generally understood, even if it had any genuine existence, is a dangerous mistake. It postulates Group Responsibility. In the mundane sense, there is no such thing. Groups are psychic constructions, probably sub-human; and the current endeavour to *e.g.*, identify every individual who happens to have a German passport with "Germany" is voodooism, and proceeds from a source in which the identity of the individual with the group is an atavistic survival.

Individual responsibility inescapably implies inequality, and inequality inescapably implies that an individual *can* (not, with the aid of Miss Ellen Wilkinson, necessarily does, at the present time) know his own business best.

These observations are not intended to be an introduction to the subject with which they deal, and I have therefore no doubt that anyone sufficiently interested to read them will be able to follow the connection with the general principles involved, of the following tactical implications:

(1) Rationing is economic ("household management") centralisation. It is diametrically opposed to Social Credit, and should be fought consistently and bitterly.

(2) Money (which comprises prices) should derive from the individual and be contributed, without coercion, to such state functions as are necessary (N.B., This is *not* a scheme). "Coupons" are simply a "Russian" trick.

(3) An individual has no more right, moral or prag-

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.

matic, to indiscriminate and unlimited voting power than he has to unlimited and indiscriminate purchasing power. Anyone who is in favour of a secret-ballot franchise on an unrestricted agenda prefers to make his purchases at a thieves' receiver. What is not for sale, ought not to be buyable.

No-one has ever produced the slightest evidence to support the "Gentle Jesus, meek and mild" conception of Christianity (except by quoting a mistranslation). It appears probable that Christianity has many aspects; the one immediately important is depicted in the adjuration "Ye generation of vipers" and in the scourging of the moneychangers from the Temple. A firing squad may be necessary.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF WORLD DOMINION

BY C.H. DOUGLAS

The whole world at the present time is suffering from a gigantic man-made disaster which threatens to culminate in a new Dark Age of tyranny. It is the fact that the disaster is man-made which forms the subject matter of this profoundly important book. Over fifty years ago the late C. H. Douglas divined the shape of things to come, and in a series of books laid bare the true and the false principles of political economy in an effort to forestall this present disaster. But the coming of the Second World War ushered in the contemporary World Revolution, and it is with the protean manifestations of this revolution that this book deals. Nothing like it has ever been published, and it will amply repay repeated and careful study. Christian Civilization could yet be restored if its underlying principles were first understood, and then applied. "A national culture is the soul of the people, and the idea that a people can lose its soul and retain its identity is of a piece with the rest of dialectical materialism But the malady is much graver now, and probably only the surgeon offers an effective solution."

The selection of commentaries comprising this very important book make it unique among Douglas's works, and highly relevant to the current situation.

\$5 Posted