

THE NEW TIMES

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

VOL. 52, No. 10.

OCTOBER 1988.

Registered By Australia Post—Publication No. VBH 1001

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

"FORGIVE US OUR DEBTS"

by Eric D. Butler.

At the recent get-together of the Finance Ministers of the industrial nations — the "world's greatest Treasurer" Paul Keating was there — along with International Bankers, in West Berlin, the subject of debt was a dominant one. The Group of Seven finance ministers, meeting before the yearly meeting of the International Monetary Fund, reaffirmed the group's commitment to the so-called Paris Club solution of the astronomical debts of the Third World nations. The essence of the solution is that much of the debt be cancelled with the balance rescheduled through longer-term debt at lower rates of interest. There are also proposals of the swapping of debts for equity. But the central thrust of every type of proposal is the further centralisation of power. The Debt Merchants are determined to maintain their dominance.

Anyone who has taken the trouble to understand the basic features of the financial system knows that the creators of money, most of it in the form of financial credit, issue this money at little real cost to themselves, that it is all issued as a debt and that when debts are repaid, money is destroyed. But an enormous amount of debt not repaid is also written off without any loss to those who have created it. While the charging of interest is a major factor in the perpetuation of the debt system, C.H. Douglas has observed that the basic question concerning money is not the amount of interest charged, *but who owns the money*. So long as those creating money have a monopoly and issue all money as a debt, they are claiming that they own the money. The claim to own all money is a claim to have the right to own the nation's real credit, its production capacity, and to direct both governments and individuals as to how real credit shall be used.

BLACK MAGIC

People only accept the dominant role of the Debt Merchants because they have grown up under the influence of what can best be described as a form of Black Magic, with witch doctors known as economic experts. While it is true that there are some differences of opinion among these witchdoctors, they are all agreed that money must be issued only as a debt and that in order to keep the economy operating, there must be "growth". The inevitable result of this is continuous inflation, which can only be "controlled". The philosophy of growth, with a resulting waste of resources on a global scale, and with disastrous effects on the environment, stems in part from the view that it is wrong for individuals to obtain anything without being employed in some form of activity, irrespective of how destructive and useless it may be. It is, of course, all right for the creators of debt to obtain something for nothing — merely with the stroke of a pen!

A realistic study of history requires a study of the history of debt. The first thing to grasp is that financial debt is unknown in Nature. It is not without significance that, according to St. Matthew's Gospel in the original Greek, Christ taught people to pray that debts should be forgiven. The Greek word *ophellemo*, meaning debts, indicated that Christ regarded debt as a sin, which should be forgiven. Matthew was a tax collector and was

obviously aware of the destructive nature of debt. "Forgive us our debts" was changed to "Forgive us our trespasses" in the King James translation of the New Testament, an understandable and acceptable change in a nation which believed that "a man's home was his castle", and that trespass was a sin. However, debt is a much more specific term than trespass and that is the word which St. Matthew heard used by He who whipped the money-lenders of the day out of the Temple. Christ said that it was "impossible to worship both God and Money (Mammon)", while St. Paul said that "the love of money is the root of all evil".

While it is easy to understand the views of those who in 1988 are celebrating the tri-centenary of what is known as the "Glorious Revolution" in England, which resulted in the deposing of the Stuart James II in favour of William of Orange, the alleged despotic policies of the Stuarts were then replaced with an even more dangerous despotism, that of Debt Finance. England was not only invaded by the Prince of Orange, but also by the representatives of "Dutch Finance", who had mastered the technique of enslaving governments with debt. All money issued was with the authority of the Crown. But the first major result of the deposing of James and his replacement with King William was the establishment of the Bank of England in 1694.

THE START OF THE DEBT SYSTEM

The result of this development has been outlined by William Cobbett, described by Douglas as the greatest Englishman of last century. Himself a Protestant, Cobbett wrote in his *History of the Protestant Reformation in England and Ireland*: "An Act of Parliament was passed in the year 1694, being the fifth year of William and Mary.... Thus arose loans, funds, banks, bankers and a national debt: things that England had never heard or dreamed of before the war for preserving the Protestant religion as by law established. The sum first borrowed was a mere trifle. It deceived by its seeming insignificance.... The thing soon began to swell at a great rate, and before the end of the 'glorious' no-popery war, the interest alone on debt, the annual interest, amounted to 1,310,492 pounds a year, which, observe, was a greater sum than the whole of the taxes had yearly amounted to in the reign of the Catholic James II!! . . . The scheme, the

crafty, the cunning, the deep scheme has from its ominous birth been breeding and fattening on the vitals of the country till at last it has produced what the world never saw before — starvation in the midst of abundance".

The explosion of financial debt is a feature of today's convulsed world. It is mathematically impossible to halt the growth of debt under present policies. Those in debt know it is impossible to borrow themselves out of debt. An alcoholic cannot cure his problem by progressively increasing the consumption of alcohol. Neither can nations borrow themselves out of debt. Those institutions, now operating internationally, which are responsible for the creation of debt, show no signs of repenting of what is the biggest crime in the history of mankind: the claim to own the money symbols created against the real wealth of the world. They are now openly exploiting the very debts they have created by advocating programmes designed to bring the

whole world under some type of World Government.

There is no evidence that the Debt Merchants are genuinely moving towards a forgiveness of debt; any writing down of debts is part of a programme of consolidating power. What is required is the equivalent of Christ's approach to the Debt Merchants of His day: He whipped them out of the Temple, which they had been defiling with their ungodly activities. Today's Debt Merchants must be stripped of their power to create and to manipulate debt. That power must be placed firmly under the control of the individuals in society, enabling them to freely decide how they will use their heritage.

Christians should be in the forefront of the movement demanding that debt be eliminated. Those Church leaders who refuse to give a lead should be bluntly told that they are disloyal to He who said that His followers should pray that debt be forgiven.

“... NEITHER DO THEY SPIN...”

by Bryan W. Monahan.

The following essay by the late Dr. Bryan W. Monahan, first appeared in 1956, thirty-two years ago. During this period of growing convulsions and social disintegration there has been an amazing technological revolution with a flood of gadgetry. There has been growing mechanical perfection, but has the quality of life improved?

I

The psychological damage inflicted on the peoples of Great Britain and other countries by the financial depression of 1929 and the following years probably exceeded even the psychological catastrophe of either of the 'great' wars. Senseless and wanton as modern war is, there is yet something in it to which the ordinary man and woman can respond. The purpose of defeating an enemy, regardless of what made him an enemy, is understandable; heroism, sacrifice of one's life that others may live, are demonstrations of the priority of spirit over matter.

There was nothing understandable about the 'great' depression. It was absurd. Even the explanations of economists, like that which attributed the phenomena to unusual sunspot activity, were absurd. The suicides from sheer despair had nothing whatever in common with heroism or sacrifice. They were the index of unbearable suffering.

The result of this frightful experience — only terminated by the employment generated by provision for renewed war — was to create in the minds of almost everybody a virtually obsessional belief in the necessity for 'employment'. If the only access to food, clothing and shelter is through money, the only access to money is through employment, then unemployment means starvation. This sequence is not logic; it is what the Russian psychologist Pavlov called "conditioning". It applies to animals just as effectively as to man, the place of employment being taken, for example, by jumping through a hoop. We can well believe that if some animals think, they think that the chief end in life is jumping through hoops, even a flaming hoop. In the case of man, the hoop is represented by employment, and the flaming hoop by employment now matter how degrading.

The sequence "unemployment means starvation" is a convention, just as the sequence "a ringing bell means salivation" in a dog is a convention. This is easily seen. As remarked above, the depression was terminated by the employment associated with preparation for war. Preparation for war means the construction or conversion of factories, the manufacturing of armaments and arms, the stockpiling of materials, and the employment of a proportion of the population in doing these things. Of itself, clearly, it contributes nothing to the standard of living. But it does distribute money, allowing access to whatever standard of living is available through the efforts of those not diverted to the production of munitions.

When a maniac in charge of the world's most powerful military organisation is threatening to make war, production of munitions to meet the threat is a necessity. But insofar as war, under modern conditions, involving the mass slaughter of non-combatants, is an incarnation of evil, employment in the production of the means of this slaughter is degrading employ-

ment. But it still distributes incomes, virtually the only access to the means of life.

The production and distribution of pornography also distributes incomes; so does the production of essentially useless gadgets. Employment of any kind, useful, neutral, useless or vicious, is paid for in the same way, by means of money. What enhances the standard and quality of life is remunerated indifferently with what degrades life and despoils the earth. We pay, of course, for this indifference. Wasted effort dilutes the value of useful effort; this is the reality underlying the financial phenomenon of inflation.

II

In a matter of some two hundred years, the main burden of maintaining life has been transferred from men to machines. That this is so is not immediately obvious, because so much else is done besides the maintenance of life. Appearances, notoriously deceptive, suggest that the maintenance of life is a hard and continuous struggle. Jungle struggle has become the class war.

The appearance, however, has to be assessed in relation to the activity involved in the struggle, and this, as we have seen, is a very mixed activity. Only part of it, and a minor part at that, is concerned with the real burden of maintaining existence — the production of food, clothing and shelter, and of the essential amenities which modern technology makes possible.

Suppose that the whole resources of modern harnessed power and applied technology were devoted *primarily* to the production of a sufficient supply of basic requirements. Since even at present an *almost* sufficient supply is forthcoming from the employment of a small fractional part of the total resources of men and machines, it is evident that a policy directed to ensuring a full sufficiency by the most suitable methods would leave surplus immense resources of power, material and men. That is to say, that without a further policy to utilise those resources, they would be unemployed.

The potentially unemployed resources *are* immense. Their magnitude may perhaps most easily be grasped by considering the state of affairs during the war. Then, virtually the whole population of the belligerent countries were maintained in a state at least of adequate sufficiency by the efforts of a fraction of the population and resources of those countries, while millions of men were under arms producing nothing (the 'unemployed' in another guise) and millions more were engaged in the production of almost unimaginable quantities of complex, precision-built equipment destined for rapid destruction.

That is a measure of the magnitude of the potential 'unemployment' problem. There is, of course, a further policy to

deal with it: Full employment.

At this point it is essential to observe that Full Employment is a fundamental *policy*, not an economic theory. Financial and economic policies derive from the pursuit of the objective of full employment of all persons physically and mentally capable of employment. It would be perfectly possible to set as the objective the minimum of human employment, in which case economic and financial policy would follow a quite different set of maxims. Except for the decreasing few, in modern industrial nations, who can support themselves by their own efforts on the land, money is a licence to live; and again, except for the decreasing few in receipt of independent incomes, the price of that licence is employment — and employment, let it once more be emphasised, in the main without regard to its inherent value. Employment in the mass-slaughter and physical devastation of war was accepted as entitling the individual to the licence to live, so long as he could evade the physical hazards of his employment. Leaving aside what justification or necessity there may be for war, the physical effort is equivalent to any form of waste, one of which is the scramble for export markets.

Here it should be noted that it is impossible in any realistic physical sense for a country to prosper by an excess of exports over imports. It appears to do so, just as there is a monetary prosperity in war: it disposes of production in excess of real internal needs, just as war does. War, in fact, is an unlimited export market, and the logical and ultimate extension of the idea of trade 'war'.

III

It is so much a commonplace to say that the majority of modern occupations are soul-destroying that the reality underlying the observation is hardly ever examined. But is it not a fair part of the explanation of contemporary materialism?

Paintings and other relics of pre-historic peoples bear witness still to the fact that in some way, appropriate to the understanding of their age, the pursued their lives "to the greater glory of God." Throughout recorded history the evidence is far greater and plainer. Whole civilisations were developed and inspired by some one or other application of that idea. But not our present civilisation.

Yet if we subtract from our present power-mechanical civilisation its mass amusements and its gadgets how much higher is the standard of living than it was in civilised communities in pre-mechanical times? Is the life of the contemporary wage-slave, with his repetitive part in a mass-production process which he does not comprehend in its entirety, with his beers, his gambling (this, surely, in the hope of escaping his lot in life?); with his fear that the fecundity of his wife will outstrip his economic resources; with his only idea of Heaven derived from the synthetic standards of the movies — is his life *in any sense* superior to the life of a native in living communion with an un-despoiled Nature, living in symbiosis with his environment, and participating in the mystic rites of his tribe? Again: one can only ask *how much worse* is his life than that of a craftsman of the Middle Ages? And where now are our Socrates, our Chaucers, our Shakespeares, our Beethovens, and our Rembrandts? Are there now as many *craftsmen* in the world as there were three hundred and more years ago? Technicians, yes. But a craftsman is concerned with the whole of a thing, a technician with a process only. The life of a craftsman is creative, that of a technician repetitive.

The apparatus of modern civilisation is highly impressive. Yet — how much of it is to enable us "to have life more abundantly," and how much to enable us to do more business? Full employment, in fact? How many women overload the transport system going to work to help pay for the labour-saving devices to enable them to go to work, and thereby create employment for thousands in enlarging the transport facilities? And what employment do they give in the chemical industry, by their demand for contraceptives so that their unwelcome fecundity shall not inhibit this 'expanding economy?' "Work," as described, is Moloch.

IV

Work, the curse of Adam.

WHY BASIC FUND MUST BE FILLED

The on-going attack on The League of Rights through the Federal Parliament leaves no doubt that a coherent anti-League strategy is starting to emerge with both Government and Opposition Members involved.

On September 29 Queensland Labor Member Keith Wright proposed that an all-party inquiry be established to investigate the League. In what has been described as "a passionate speech", Mr. Wright said that the League was a "sinister" organisation exercising enormous national influence. The major role of the League in the defeat of the government's referendum proposals has obviously stung the government and its backers. This is understandable. But the Wright attack on the League was seconded by a senior member of the National Party, Mr. Ralph Hunt.

Mr. Hunt said that although the Opposition had received support from the League on issues such as the Bill of Rights, he believed that the League was "a despicable and divisive movement."

Following the Senator Boswell attack in the Senate, with the co-operation of the Labor Party, the developments in the House of Representatives confirm that there is an all-party programme being developed.

Immediately responding to the parliamentary move for an inquiry into the League, National Director Eric Butler despatched a registered letter to Mrs. Joan Childs, Speaker of the House of Representatives, offering to appear before the parliament at any time to answer any questions concerning the League.

Mr. Wright said that the financial resources of the League should be investigated, claiming that the League spends a million dollars a year on salaries, cars and travel. If the League operated like the political parties, it might cost a million dollars to achieve the national impact which is unnerving the party politicians. But the League consists of an army of volunteers who give liberally of their time to circulate information. Anyone who has seen the vintage cars used by the League, and those who know that League speakers rarely use expensive aeroplanes, often travelling by bus or train, and that private hospitality is extended to all League campaigners, will be highly amused to hear of the Wright allegations.

The key to the growing success of the League is an annual Basic Fund which provides an assured base from which to operate, this being augmented by collections at meetings. The League's 1988 Basic Fund is set again at the moderate figure of \$60,000, and already there has been a strong initial surge of support. But much more is required.

The best answer to the party politicians is to ensure that the Basic Fund is filled as quickly as possible. This will enable the League to further expand an influence, which the power lusters fear. All contributions to Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne. In order to save postage, receipts only sent upon request.

Is there any point in labour-saving machinery, and if so, what is the point?

In the most fundamental sense, work may be defined as the activity necessary to support life. This definition at once raises the question, why live? And this question points to a beyond to life as such.

Even the most cursory acquaintance with history shows the striving of man to rise above "life as such". It is what a man can do after he has satisfied his personal necessity for food, clothes and shelter that, in the last resort, counts with him. It is what he can make of himself and do with himself, which matters. It is in the extent to which he must devote himself to the mere

provision of necessities that work is the curse of Adam; the more closely he is bound to this necessity, the less he is free to fulfill that destiny, the evidence of which lies in the art treasures of history.

This, then, is the point of labour-saving machinery: to set men free to find and achieve their individual destinies.

It has often been calculated that in a modern industrialised community the basic needs for an adequate material standard of living could be satisfied by the employment of a few man-hours per head *per week*. In fact, these basic needs *are* met by the employment of a few man-hours per head per week, but the fact is almost completely obscured because those few hours are entangled with a far greater volume of employment in other industrial activity. It may assist in clarifying the situation to classify economic activity in general.

1. Primary production.
2. Processing of primary production.
3. Distribution of raw and processed materials.

These three items comprise the production and distribution of 'food' and 'clothing'.

4. Production of raw materials of building.
5. Processing of building materials.
6. Building units of domestic housing.

Items 4, 5 and 6 comprise 'shelter'.

7. Building of factories for production of consumer goods.
8. Building of factories for production of capital equipment.
9. Public works
 - (a) of immediate utility;
 - (b) of potential utility;
 - (c) of remote utility.
10. Production for a surplus of exports over imports ('favourable' balance of trade).
11. Production of munitions.
12. Services — armed forces etc.
13. Administration.
14. Advertising.

It is obvious at once that such a classification as the above is inexact and not comprehensive. There is overlap between one category and another, and doubtless there are omissions. But it may also be noticed that the lack of precision becomes more marked as the classification moves from the earlier items, which represent the interests of individuals, to the later. The production, in some form, of food, clothing and shelter is an immediate and comprehensible necessity. But the further we move from that sort of production, the more a case has to be made out to justify further activities.

By and large, some sort of a case can be made out for everything included in the classification. But what of the enormous activity represented by administration, advertising, and deliberate artificial obsolescence — *i.e.*, of manufacturing articles to have a deliberately limited 'life,' so as to ensure the necessity for their continuous replacement?

The omnibus answer is Full Employment.

V

The fundamental idea of Full Employment is that everybody *ought* to be constrained by necessity, and remote control, to be occupied fully in the pursuit of food, clothes and shelter. The necessity for remote control arises, of course, from the introduction of labour-saving machinery. To the extent that labour-saving machinery is applied to the provision only of food, clothes and shelter, men must correspondingly be left "at a loose end". Hence the need for gadgets, obsolescence and advertising. The question is, is the possession of a household full of gadgets a better thing than the pursuit of a vocation?

It is very probable that under modern economic conditions the construction of, for example, the old beautiful cathedrals would be a financial (or economic?) impossibility. Yet how were they ever built?

Yet this problem of being "at a loose end" is a very real one. The cathedrals *were* built *because* even before the introduction of modern labour-saving machinery, and the harnessing of power many times greater than the total manpower of a given community, men were free of the necessity of devoting themselves entirely to the provision of food, clothes and shelter. Out of this freedom arose the sense of vocation.

The contemporary problem should be stated, not as one of Full Employment, but of Full Vocation.

VI

There is abroad a great fear of idleness. Not for oneself, but for the other fellow. The man who wins a lottery or football pool is not worried by the prospect of idleness. He thinks that now he will be able to do all the things he has always wanted to do. Others, it is true, may disapprove of what he does; but still they envy him his good fortune.

It is doubtless the case that vast numbers of people, educated but little above illiteracy, dulled by years in narrow routine employment, misinformed and conditioned by propaganda and advertising, entertained by commercialised sport and lowest common denominator films, canned jazz and nationalised broadcasting, would be at a loss if faced with much leisure. But is this any reason for persistence in a policy, which produces such caricatures of human beings? Charles Curran (*Spectator*, January 20, 1956) describes them thus:

"From September to May one or more members of the household will devote an evening every week to filling in football coupons with forecasts of match results. The private daydream of winning a large sum of money in this way is all but universal. You can start a conversation on any doorstep by asking, "What would you do if you won the pools?" It is a question that almost every adult has pondered in detail.

"But even more than the football coupon, it is the reading-matter of the New Estate that gives me the key to its state of mind. It buys newspapers and weekly periodicals in large numbers; and nearly all of them (the main exception is the *News of the World*) displays one characteristic in common. They exploit the tabloid method of presentation that has become more and more popular with the British public since the war — and nowhere more than on the New Estate...

"The skilled technicians of the tabloid press are giving the New Estate something that it wants urgently and desperately; a refuge from nuclear nightmares and threatening chaos and a world of baffling problems for which nobody can provide slogan solutions. The tabloids are not pornographic, as some inexact critics suppose. They offer a simple, cheerful, manageable universe, a warm cosy place of sex, excitement, triviality, and fantasy. They supply the New Estate with an art form of its own in the comic strip — a psychologically accurate device for providing selected strata of readers with wish-fulfilment picture patterns in which they can see themselves as potent young men or sexually irresistible young women.

"The psychological hunger of the New Estate is exhibited also in its preoccupation with the shadow personalities of radio, television, the cinema and the gramophone record — and in the large amount of space which the tabloids devote to them. Some of these personalities have now acquired a three-dimensional existence in the minds of their devotees. (Last month, for example, large numbers of people sent postal orders to Mr. Dan Archer, an imaginary character in a B.B.C. serial story about a farm, asking him to supply them with Christmas poultry.) These figures, some of them real, some mythical, are the gods and goddesses of the New Estate. They inhabit the daydream heaven of wealth luxury and sexual attraction to which the football coupons will one day provide a ticket of admission.

"An interior life of this kind, and on this scale, is something that has not previously existed in England..."

To see what alternative policy is possible, it is necessary to be clear as to the fundamental facts. The chief of these is that it is possible now, and has been for very many years, for a small decreasing fraction of the population of an industrialised country to produce all that is required for a high physical standard of living for the whole community. The second is that the *apparent*

complexity and difficulty of obtaining and maintaining a 'standard of living' is due to the persistence at all costs in the policy of "if any would not work, neither should he eat."

The alternative policy, then, is that men, having discharged their small obligations for their basic standard of living, should be free to decide for themselves how they shall spend the rest of their time.

Suppose, for example, that one-fifth of a country's resources of men, utilising machinery and power, is sufficient to supply the basic needs of the population for a satisfactory standard of food, clothing and shelter. Then a man is under a natural obligation to make available for this purpose one-fifth of his time. This does not mean that working hours should be reduced to a fifth of what they are; a fifth of a man's working life might be given to this necessity, working normal hours, or some other combination, or variations to suit particular cases, might be suitable.

Nor does this mean that all production other than that entailed in providing a basic standard of living should cease. But it does mean, as the late C.H. Douglas enunciated it, that "every individual can avail himself of the benefits of science and mechanism; that by their aid he is placed in such a position of advantage, that in common with his fellows he can choose, with increasing freedom and complete independence, *whether he will or will not assist in any project which may be placed before him.*" (*Economic Democracy*, 1919; my italics).

If a man is glad (or thankful) to 'get a job' (or 'any sort of job') he is not likely to be too particular as to what that job is, and even less likely to be concerned with the ultimate consequences of his, with others, taking that job. But if he has obtained an adequate standard of living by the expenditure of only a part of his available working-time, and thus is free to decide for himself whether he will undertake a further 'job', he will approach the matter from quite another angle.

This aspect, though, is probably of less practical importance than the fact that men like doing things. Practically every child quite early in life starts to make things. Some drop this practical activity in favour of intellectual pursuits; but in principle the activity is the same. When, however, the grim necessity of 'working for a living' becomes paramount, it absorbs the energy, which previously displayed itself in spontaneous creative activity.

With a feeling of leisure, as opposed to Full Employment, this creative activity could well find one expression, amongst others, in furnishing the home with articles built from the point of view of a craftsman, instead of with the shoddy products of mass-production. And as a corollary to this, it is desirable to consider the aims and effect of modern education.

VII

I had occasion not long ago to write a letter of protest to the Headmaster of the Church school where one of my children is being educated. The boy, aged twelve, had brought home a questionnaire form seeking detailed and intimate information on the lad based on my private domestic observations of him. The form came from a State Vocation Guidance organisation, and was to be used to assist vocational guidance officers in quizzing the child.

My protest was that I had deliberately sent the boy to a Church school in the belief that its concern would be in assisting him in unfolding his personality, as opposed to the increasing concern of State schools in 'fitting boys for employment'. The Headmaster, after explaining that his school was not responsible for the form or the quizzing admitted the validity of the protest, and thanked me for bringing to his attention an aspect of the matter which he had not considered.

This incident illustrates how modern education is becoming more and more simply a process of conditioning. The present policy of education is to provide the right 'types' in the right proportions to increase 'production' for export to earn the foreign exchange to buy the raw material of production for export... So far from education's seeking to bring a child's personality to fruition, it is becoming more and more a matter of arranging curricula in accordance with the economic needs of the

moment, aided by the efforts of vocational guidance experts in selecting likely candidates for specialised training in a narrowly functional activity.

But a child is someone of infinite potentialities, and to select one of the more obvious of these and develop it to the atrophy of the others, is a crime against the spirit in man. This is particularly so in the case of technical education, which is precisely where the emphasis in current education lies. Technique, the mechanical, is fundamentally simple, as is shown by the rapidity with which young children grasp the principles of "how things work"; and an education almost exclusively technical leads to simple-mindedness — not in the sense of simplicity of mind, but of shallowness. The consequence is that more and more adults are becoming carburetor or equivalent 'experts', and for the rest devotees of the films and the tabloids.

Science too seems to have a stultifying effect on the development of a whole and wholesome personality, as is evidenced by the pronouncements of Famous Scientists on matters outside their specialities.

There are excellent reasons for believing that before the days of universal 'education' there were more men with more practical wisdom and with a more balanced outlook on life than ever there have been since.

But an educational policy of assisting the natural unfolding of a child's and adults unknown potentialities as far as possible in each case might produce a very different position. The objective would be not to fit the young man for employment but to assist every personality to find its best possible expression. To me, the most fruitful conception of what one's life is, is that it is, or could be, a work of art; and this leads to a conception of education as subserving the artist's non-material needs.

The 'medium' of the work of art is the vocation — vocation in the devotional sense, not that of the industrial psychologist.

VIII

Particularly since the end of the war, with the enthronement of Full Employment and the Welfare State, the fundamental relationship of the inhabitant to his country has become that of an employee. The Government has become increasingly little else but a gigantic Works Office. The 'market' for this sprawling factory is, of course, the international market, and 'profit' is international exchange (but mainly dollars or gold).

If this conception is grasped, it is fairly easy to see why the money cost of living is steadily increasing. The basic physical requirements of the population in food, clothing and shelter, and basic amenities, are, broadly, fixed, and are provided by a diminishing proportion of the population. But the total output of the Work State is constantly increasing, because of constantly expanding industrial power, and technological improvement. Now, as was observed earlier, all 'employment' is remunerated indifferently; but 'costs' — *i.e.*, wages and salaries — are recovered through the prices of consumer goods, and taxation. A rising cost-of-living, therefore, in financial terms, is a correct reflection of the fact that the population gets delivery, or possession, or control, of a decreasing *proportion* of its total production.

That of an employee is not, however, the only possible relationship of an inhabitant to his country; it is, in fact, only the penultimate consequence of the theory that men ought to be made to work. (The ultimate consequence is disaster).

Fundamentally, a community is an association of members for their mutual benefit. There is an unearned increment in association; a profit. To whom does it belong? It is impossible that it could belong to anyone but the people forming the association. But as things are, the people get only a fraction of it.

If, however, we look on a country as a company, with the people as shareholders, and the Government as a Board of Directors, we have a true conception of the situation, as it ought to be. It then becomes evident that the proper function of Government is to guide the affairs of the country so as to achieve the best possible 'profit' consistent with prudent management. And it should recommend and arrange for the distribution of a periodic cash dividend.

This is not the place to discuss the technical details of

such a procedure; it is beyond question that it could be done, and equally beyond question, in my opinion, that it is not done because of the determined pursuit of the policy of employment at any cost, because it is 'good' for people.

IX

It is, perhaps, not very generally recognised even in responsible quarters how very costly this policy of employment for its own sake really is, or what the further consequences are likely to be.

In the first place, it is highly wasteful, and has a low efficiency. A tremendous effort goes into the production of goods, a demand for which would not exist in the absence of skilled advertising to create it. Then there is sabotage of all descriptions, from a deliberate policy on the part of workers to go slow to make the job last, to the equally deliberate policy of manufacturing articles to wear out so that they must be replaced, again with the same end in view, even if on a different plane.

Yet, even so, fully industrialised countries like the U.S.A., where the physical standard of living for practically everybody is very high, are faced with an immense surplus of production, both primary and secondary, which can be disposed of only by, in effect, giving it away, even if the process is disguised as "aid to underdeveloped countries," and insurance against Communism.

To other countries some of this aid and insurance is 'dumping', or unfair trade practice.

In any case, the more power is harnessed and applied to the processes of production, the more technology advances — and it is advancing at an accelerating rate — the greater becomes the difficulty of disposing of the output; and the greater the absolute waste of mineral and biological resources. Except that human life is merely wasted instead of destroyed, the effect is the same as war; and, of course, trade competition leads to war.

X

Finally, let us look at the possibilities of a more fruitful policy and more wholesome and abundant life.

First of all, there is a need as never before for the proclamation on the highest level of what life is — *religion*, a binding back to Reality. The end of man, and the means to the end, need re-stating in terms of this new and unprecedented Technical Age.

And in the light of this educational policy needs to be reorientated. But since the State has become the great exponent of the policy we are challenging, and since its schools are more and more adapted to buttress that policy and produce the human raw material of ever-mounting 'production,' it is to the Church schools we must first look for this re-orientation. It seems to me impossible that our present wrong condition can be changed; but it can gradually be replaced. For our present condition is the outcome of a false philosophy, from which it has grown; and the new condition also must grow.

To this end, it seems essential that these schools should consider primarily what their pupils are to become "in the sight of God." If these schools believe that every individual has a supernatural destiny, then it must be their task to provide the right guidance to that end in the formative years.

The possible world into which these children might grow up is, as we have seen, one where a relatively small part of their time need be devoted to the maintenance of life, so that the problem is to help them to develop into independent personalities able to employ a predominant leisure to perfecting their lives. Thus they need to be shown how to develop towards a vocation through which they can express themselves — not to earn a living, since power and technology can provide the greater part of that, but because destiny is achieved through, in its broadest sense, vocation.

Once the need to provide 'employment' was gone, technology would be free to devote itself to the greatest possible elimination of dreary, routine, and soul-destroying 'work' — a development, indeed, already in train (to the alarm of 'employers') in the extension of automation.

Particularly when men are free to choose, individually, whether they will, or will not, assist in any project, which may

be placed before them, technology and craftsmanship will provide ample opportunity for self-development through vocation. But perhaps, as time goes on, more and more will feel drawn to the arts and humanities.

The basis of this freedom to choose is, of course, an independent income sufficient to support life adequately, although not, perhaps, at first, luxuriously.

XI

There is no doubt that large numbers of people find the idea of universal independent incomes startling. Yet the only reason why independent incomes are not almost universal by now is the existence of a policy against them and the mechanism of this policy is taxation (including high prices) and death duties.

In any given accounting period, almost the whole of the money paid out for production of *every* description is withdrawn through the medium of prices of consumer goods, and taxation. But if only so much money were withdrawn as represented the actual cost of consumer goods — that is, if the public as a whole were allowed to retain the money paid out for all that which it had produced, but not received — it would acquire over a period of time enormous savings. The progressive investment of these savings then would produce 'independent' incomes; and this situation would correctly reflect the actual technological situation.

But this has not been done; and it has not been done, let me emphasise, as a matter of *policy*. And equally, a new policy could restore the situation to what it might have been.

What has happened over the period of time represented by the industrial era has been the involuntary re-investment of income receiving in exchange 'shares' to represent the investment. The physical reality achieved by that investment however exists, in the form of the whole of the capital development of the country. That capital development could, and should, pay a dividend to all individuals, *representing each one's share of the labour saving that has been achieved*.

There is available a large technical literature on the practical application of this policy. There is not the slightest doubt of its practicability; but its practicability is of no consequence until a clear decision on policy is arrived at.

As a result of distorted education, continuous propaganda, and the effect of a debased daily Press, and other factors, the contemporary electorate is almost certainly incapable of judging this issue. In any case, however, the issue is primarily a moral one, and should be considered and pronounced upon by the Church, and by the Lords Spiritual and Temporal. The times we live in derive, in large part, from the pronouncements of earlier men of science, who, 'priests' of a new order destroyed the foundations of the old.

To see what is needed now, consider the following from the Introduction to *Fathers of the Western Church*, by Robert Payne (Wm. Heinemann, London, 1952).

" . . . We forget that there were great philosophers, great Psychologists, even great poets among the Church Fathers, and that they sometimes understood better than we do the complexities of the human soul. We forget they are a part, perhaps the greater part, of all we mean by Western civilisation, for they laid the foundations. They were the mediators between the Renaissance and the civilisations of Greece and Rome, and they were perfectly conscious of their high role in history as they called upon people to live dangerously...

"As we see them now, through dark mists, they are larger than life, superbly assured of themselves as they thunder against the barbarians or set in order the conflicting loves of men . . . As we see the Fathers in Italian paintings of the Renaissance, we see their dignity, their immeasurable wisdom, their solemnity even, but their stature is absent. Against a Tuscan sunset Jerome with his lion or Francis amid his circling larks looks almost human, almost ordinary. El Greco painted them better, with the smoke and the mist and the air quivering from the lightning-stroke, in darkness and battering thunder. In such a landscape, they looked like what they were, heroes who drew strength from danger . . .

"We tend to believe that the life of mediaeval man was hard and brutish. It is doubtful whether it was hard and brutish as the life of our own time. His faith was real; he knew he could move mountains; and the Church, which ruled his inmost faith, consecrated his family, prohibited him from usury, set aside by inviolable law weeks when no man could lift his voice or his knife against another, and saw that no man starved. In the dark plague-ridden cities light came blazing from the soul of man, and by this light men saw themselves among the elect, for every man by virtue of God's grace contained within himself a part of the living God. Today science is power. In mediaeval times power came from God and the simple offering of the bread and the wine.

"If the test of a civilisation lies in its arts, then mediaeval civilisation remains among the greatest there have ever been, comparable with that of the T'ang Dynasty in China or with Periclean Athens....

"In the high Renaissance men began to believe that they shone with their own independent light, but by that time the work of the Fathers was already done. They had no successors. ...

"Compared with the mechanical perfection of the twentieth century, the perfection of the Middle Ages belongs to another order. They strove for perfection of man, not for perfection of machines, or rather, since man was an indescribably

divine machine operating according to heavenly laws, he needed only a little more of the oil of grace to proceed smoothly along the heavenly way...

"One of the advantages of living in an age of disbelief is that the necessity for belief is more clearly demonstrated.

"We have learned by hard experience that all Caesars (by which we mean all politicians) go to Hell. It would seem more profitable to believe in a merciful God who loves human justice, and then to go quietly about our tasks.

"In all this the Church Fathers have an appointed place...'

"At a time when faith is weak and survival of itself is hardly worth fighting for, it would be well if we remembered the Church Fathers who shored up the ruins, and 'in a time of awakening fed honeycombs to our mouths...."

It does seem that our materialist hell with its brutish policy of work for employment's sake, and its degradation of man into a mere functionary, is the triumph of anti-Christ. But beyond it lies the promise of a renewed spirituality, the promise, in one sense at least, of a second coming of Christ, the age of the Holy Ghost; an Age of Devotion, when "they toil not"

Canberra 1956.

ZIONISTS ATTEMPT TO SMEAR ANGLICAN DEAN

The annual W.A. State Seminar of the League of Rights was opened by the Very Rev. Dean Robarts of Perth. The Seminar was an outstanding affair at which three speakers, the Rev. Dallas Clarnette the Rev. Cedric Jacobs, and Mr. Eric Butler presented Papers in defence of Australia's Christian heritage. The Seminar was professionally video taped and may be obtained from the League's Heritage Bookshop in Bible House, St. George's Terrace, Perth.

This Seminar is going to continue to have a growing national influence. But Zionist leaders do not like this and they launched a smear campaign against the man who opened the Seminar, Dean Robarts. A Rabbi Levi was one of those leading the smear campaign. One of those present at the Seminar, Mr. E. Bennett, who points out that he has never been a member of the League, was moved to write the following letter, dated 23 September, to the *West Australian*, in response to Rabbi Levi's allegations:

Dear Sir,

Rabbi Levi of the Australian-Israel Review "hopes that most Anglicans would be shocked at the patronage of the League of Rights by the Very Rev. Dean Robarts", and says that the Dean has for many years been an apologist for the P.L.O. (21st inst.).

An appreciative reader of the Dean's newsletters for some time I would say, rather, that he presents the problems of many groups, including dispossessed Palestinians, not, per se, the P.L.O. His views are formed after considerable application to all sides of an issue.

I was present at the seminar referred to. The Dean's address was excellent. It was also saddening in its recognition of the almost lost treasures of our inherited Christian traditions. The God of both Dean and Rabbi could have found no fault in His son's appeal that we, as a nation, return to and preserve the moral values laid down by Him.

On what grounds, therefore, should Rabbi Levi have criticised him?

There was no hint of bias against other religions or cultures, unless an appreciation of one's own can be called so. Indeed, the Dean always has been ready to bring to us the gems from other streams of thought.

Sponsorship of the seminar by the League of Rights was not apparent. However, that should not be seen as relevant: though it seems to have been the very point, which rendered the address so unacceptable to the Rabbi, irrespective of content.

The League, like other organisations which have dared to question the good intent of a government, or has sought simply

to maintain the traditional base of our people, has had a thorough hatchet job done on it by our largely controlled media, and, under Parliamentary privilege, by Senator Boswell. When an argument cannot be discredited it seems it is fair game to attack the person making it. I will happily arrange for a tape of Jeremy Lee's answer to Sen. Boswell to be sent to the Rabbi, should he wish to judge by hearing rather than by assumption.

Australians in general respect and encourage by funding and other support, the right of minority groups to preserve their own national identities and religious customs.

I ask that the Rabbi extend to the majority people of Australia at least the courtesy of recognising that we too have beliefs worthy of the same consideration, and an equal right to express them. It seems to me that, under the ascendancy of this present system, we alone of the peoples sharing this continent are forced to defend this right. I would remind him that, over many years, representatives of the Jewish and other faiths have been welcomed into the Cathedral by the Dean, that we might honour together the Higher Authority we each acknowledge.

Lastly, I am not a member of the League of Rights, nor have I been. However, on examination of their aims and policy I find a commitment to the proper interpretation and preservation of the Law given to us as the Ten Commandments, which became the Common Law of England, inherent in which is the God-given freedoms of the common people, and which was adopted by Australia from the Motherland. Those freedoms were protected under oath by the Monarch, until the destruction of the Constitution, enshrining them was accomplished by the Australia Act, 1986, illegally, because it was passed without the consent of the people.

No wonder this power hungry, atheistic and republican government seeks to discredit the League of Rights and all who dare to become even loosely associated with it.

Perhaps we may hear directly from the Rabbi his reasons for doing so."

THE UN AND "WORLD OPINION"

"The overwhelming majority of UN delegates represent dictatorships that have never had the remotest test of public opinion. But this fact does not prevent the General Assembly from claiming to speak for the 'world community' and much of the world from accepting it."

— Charles Krauthammer, American commentator in
The New Republic, U.S.A.

JAPAN A "PREDATOR" NATION

In conventional economic terms, Japan is an outstanding success, piling up massive export surpluses, these enabling the Japanese corporate sector to invest heavily in other countries like Australia. Japan is a major factor in the developing globalisation programme, which is why it is a member of David Rockefeller's Trilateral Commission.

What the Japanese have demonstrated is that a highly disciplined labour force, specially *trained* — education is not the correct description — to regard economic activities as ends in themselves, and to measure success by the volume of production for export, can be used to bring in raw materials from all over the world and to use enormous energy, much of this imported in the form of coal, to convert those materials into motor cars, machinery or electronic equipment.

But not everyone regards the Japanese "economic miracle" as a success story to be emulated by other countries. At the last ANZAS Conference in Australia, Professor David Suzuki of the University of British Columbia, Canada, himself of Japanese background, charged that Japan was one of the greatest predators on the planet. It had developed its economy by despoiling the earth, the air, and the sea. Professor Suzuki said that if Japan had to exist on its own, it would soon decline to the level of a Third World country.

Professor Suzuki said that the global economic system caused nations to put emphasis on the wrong things and did not make ecological sense. The problem was that every politician said it was essential to maintain growth at all costs. But like so many conservationists, Professor Suzuki has not pointed out that the growth dogma is a reflection of a power philosophy, which manifests itself by insisting that conventional financial rules must be maintained at all costs. Any suggestion that the genuine require-

ments of individuals, starting with adequate food, clothing and housing, could easily be met without a feverish global economy with the equivalent of nations taking in one another's washing, by passing the major factor of modern production — the cultural heritage — directly to the individual in the form of a social dividend, is rejected by both Communists and anti-Communists.

Presumably when planet earth is turned into one vast slagheap man will have to reach out into space to find somewhere else to export!

And what is happening back in Japan? While the Japanese government has recently issued an optimistic report on the nation's economy, officials admit that the gap between the rich and the poor is growing and urged the country to extend economic benefits to all its people. The Annual White Paper, issued by the Economic Planning Agency, said that while Japan had achieved much economically, the "general public had yet to feel a solid sense of prosperity... not everything is rosy. Land prices have skyrocketed as the domestic financial markets have been deregulated."

Relatively high domestic prices, long working hours and poor housing conditions were among the main factors leading many people to think they were not benefiting enough from the expanding national economy. The report said that the government had to adopt an emergency economic package in May to bring Japan out of a slump. Obviously internal consumer demand had to be stimulated to offset a slack in global demands as a result of the U.S.A. attempting to narrow its trade deficit.

Under debt finance, the Japanese are no closer to solving the growing problem facing all industrialised societies: how to keep economies operating without major social and ecological disasters.

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 politics 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.

SIR REGINALD SHOLL

The Hon. Sir Reginald Sholl, former Victorian Supreme Court Judge, who recently died in Queensland at the age of 85, officially opened the 1971 National Seminar of the League of Rights at which the Australian Heritage Society was launched.

In opening the League Seminar, Sir Reginald pointed out that he had known Mr. Eric Butler for many years and advised his listeners to take with the proverbial grain of salt criticism about the League of Rights. Three of the Papers presented at the 1971 Heritage Seminar were prepared by three distinguished Australians, Sir George Reid, Attorney-General in the Victorian Bolte government, the late Sir Stanton Hicks, responsible for Australian food supplies during the Second World War, and the late Sir Raphael Cilento, a former senior official with the United Nations. Sir Raphael became the first Patron of the Australian Heritage Society.

Along with the late Sir Edmund Herring, one-time Chief Justice of the Victorian Supreme Court, and Lieutenant Governor of Victoria, Sir Reginald Sholl played a major role in supporting Mr. Eric Butler's controversial motion on Communism passed at the 1959 Melbourne Anglican Synod. Sir Reginald had, before being appointed to the Supreme Court, been the QC assisting the Victorian Lowe Commission's investigations into Communism. Former senior Communist, Mr. T.C. McGillick, was one of the witnesses before the Lowe Commission. Mr. McGillick later worked closely with Mr. Eric Butler and has been a strong supporter of The League of Rights.

Those responsible for the "research" which Senator Boswell used in his Senate smear of the League, make no reference to the above information.

"A DEMOCRACY OF CONSUMERS."

"The essential nature of a satisfactory modern co-operative state may be broadly, expressed as consisting of a functionally aristocratic hierarchy of producers accredited by, and serving, a democracy of consumers."

C.H. Douglas, in *Credit Power and Democracy*.