

# THE NEW TIMES

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

VOL. 54, NO. 9.

Registered by Australia Post-Publication No. VBH 1001.

SEPTEMBER 1990.

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

## THE ZIONIST FACTOR IN THE MIDDLE EAST DRAMA

*by Eric D. Butler.*

**Anyone with even the most elementary understanding of Middle East realities must be appalled by the dangerously superficial view of the current Middle East crisis being presented by most of the world's mass media. It is all so simple: Saddam Hussein, formerly described as a "moderating" influence in the Middle East, is now the "Baghdad Butcher", who has brutally taken over a small defenceless nation, a member of the United Nations and unless destroyed will finish up dominating the whole of the Arab world and could wreck Western economies by forcing up the price of the oil they depend upon. But there are some puzzling features about President Bush's decision to place massive military forces in Saudi Arabia and his almost frenzied efforts to involve as many other nations as possible, with the clear intention of establishing a United Nations military police force. Is there a hidden agenda?**

On August 29, President Bush said that the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait was a "ruthless assault on the very essence of international order and civilised ideals." This statement can only be regarded as an example of breathtaking hypocrisy when it is recalled that not so long ago Saddam Hussein was being provided with massive US and other Western military aid to enable him to pursue his long and bloody conflict with Iran, a conflict which Iraq initiated. There was no suggestion then that Saddam Hussein was violating the "essence of international order". There was no denunciation of the Soviet Union because of its massive military support for Iraq along with thousands of military advisers. While Gorbachev claims that these military advisers are now being withdrawn, and condemns Iraq's annexation of Kuwait, it is not without significance that he has been reluctant to commit any Soviet military forces to the Middle East. Gorbachev may have a better understanding of Middle East realities than President Bush, and knows why the Arabs generally hate the West, particularly the USA.

### **"WHY THE ARABS HATE THE WEST SO MUCH"**

Occasionally an authority on Middle East realities is permitted to shed some light on the situation. While recently in New Zealand, I noticed that at least two provincial dailies ran an article, by Sir Anthony Parsons, former British Ambassador to the UN who also served extensively as a British diplomat in the Middle East. Sir Anthony Parsons says that many people in the West are "puzzled and angry" that not all Arabs share the view that Saddam Hussein is such a threat to the whole Arab world that he must be forced to retreat from Kuwait. While 12 of the 20 Arab states which attended the Cairo conference, agreed to provide military forces to help halt any further expansion moves by Saddam Hussein, only two of them, Syria and Egypt, are capable of making more than token contributions. The Cairo conference merely demonstrated the deep divisions inside the Arab world, with even those agreeing that Hussein had to be stopped, being reluctant to be seen as welcoming the Americans. A British report states that even Saudi Arabia's leaders had to be

subjected to several days of arm-twisting by the Americans before

## 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.

they reluctantly agreed that American forces should be stationed inside Saudi Arabia.

### MIDDLE EAST BACKGROUND

Sir Anthony Parsons' article, which does not appear to have been used by the Australian media, provides essential background history concerning the establishment, after the First World War, of quite artificial Arab States from an Arab world previously dominated by the Turks. The Parsons article is so important that it is republished elsewhere in this issue of *New Times*. Sir Anthony raises the all-important question of the Zionist factor. This is the factor, which must be carefully assessed, in attempting to come to any meaningful conclusion about developments. While the Arab world is currently manifesting the type of disunity which has prevented the development of any coherent strategy to deal with what all detest, the Zionist penetration of the Middle East, Zionist strategists have what one Zionist leader described as a "far-reaching plan", the establishing of Israel being but a major key to that plan.

Writing in *The Brief for the Prosecution*, C.H. Douglas commented on Political Zionism as follows:

"To the uninterested, Zionism is a slightly romantic semi-religious cult of much the same character as the Crusades, which, equally misunderstood, are regarded as a symptom of the rudimentary intelligence of our forefathers. The real force behind the Crusades was probably very different to that we are asked to accept in standard history: Zionism is something very different to a simple scheme for the return of the Jews to Palestine. That is incidental to the moulding of events and Governments to procure a World Dominion for 'Israel'. The objective involves a perfectly clear, coherent, and continuous policy on the part of the Zionists. The conditions for successive and major crises must be created and maintained in the world; the means required to deal with each crisis as it arises must be in the hands of Zionist Jews, directly or indirectly; and the use of these means must only be granted to the highest bidder in the surrender of power or the guarantee of its use in the interests of Jewry."

It is instructive to examine what Zionist spokesmen are saying about the crisis precipitated by the Iraqi takeover of Kuwait. Whether by accident or design, the West's media has over the past few years drawn attention to the continuing problems of the Palestinian refugees, and, while there was no weakening of USA financial, economic and military support for Zionist Israel, there was growing disquiet among American Congressmen concerning the Palestinian question. Weary of constant conflict with the Palestinians, sizeable minorities of Israelis were openly starting to argue that Israel's best long-term future would be served by coming to some agreement with the Palestinian Liberation Organisation. Prominent Zionist spokesmen around the world were openly upset by these developments, and urged support for former terrorist President Shamir of Israel. Doubts about Israel's expansionist policy concerning the West Bank, occupied militarily since 1967, were starting to emerge among Jews around the world.

### A "DIVINE BLESSING"

But President Bush's response to Saddam Hussein's move in to Kuwait, has dramatically changed the situation, with one Zionist paper, the *Washington Jewish Week* of September 8 describing the Iraqi move a "divine blessing". The *Washington Jewish News* quotes the views of a Democrat Congressman, Les Aplin, who says that "the invasion will strengthen Israel's claims that.....don't get on our backs about domestic situations because we have real national security concerns", Aplin is also quoted as saying that pro-Zionist lobbyists in Washington had

reported that Congressmen had been calling to ask if Saddam Hussein was on the Zionist payroll! While these requests were being made in a humorous vein, they do pose some questions concerning what type of influences are being brought to bear on Saddam Hussein. What type of advice were the Soviet military advisers inside Iraq giving Saddam Hussein? What discussions took place between the Soviet leaders and the Iraqi foreign minister when he visited Moscow just prior to the invasion of Kuwait?

Zionist leaders have always seen the rank and file of the Jews as a conditioned force to be used to serve objectives, which individual Jews do not fully understand. Casualties are regarded as necessary from time to time. Just as the big movement of Jews out of Russia to the USA before the First World War, provided enormous support for the many collectivist movements, including the Marxists, which sapped the USA from within, the current

## STAGE IS SET FOR LEAGUE NATIONAL WEEKEND

With the finalising of speakers for "The New Times" Annual Dinner on Friday, October 5, and the arrangement of the impressive panel of speakers for the National Seminar on Saturday, October 6, the stage has been set for a League National Weekend reflecting the seriousness of the national and international situation.

Mr. Bruce Ruxton, O.B.E., will launch the central theme of the National Weekend, opposition to a policy of multiculturalism, which is undermining defence of traditional Australia, as guest of honour at "The New Times" Annual Dinner. Seats for the Dinner are still available, but those intending to attend must pay their \$25 in advance. The Dinner will be held at the YWCA banquet hall, Elizabeth Street, Melbourne. Pre-dinner drinks will be served from 6.15 onwards. Guests must be ready to sit down to dinner at 7 p.m. sharp.

The Seminar will also be held in the YWCA banquet hall. Entrance \$6. The first Paper will be presented by Dr. Fred Toben, of German background, who will speak of how he developed in a non-multicultural Australia, becoming extremely proficient in the English language. Dr. Toben has been a teacher in all parts of the world, including Germany and Rhodesia. Dr. Toben will be exposing the claim that non-British migrants cannot join mainstream Australia and make valuable contributions to Australia.

The second Paper will be presented by Mr. Nigel Jackson, well-known English teacher, poet and commentator on public issues such as war crimes legislation. Mr. Jackson's Paper will charge that multiculturalism has been used to prevent freedom of research and speech. His Paper will be explosive, with some criticism of well-known Australian public figures.

The final Paper will be delivered by Mr. Barry Tattersall, presenting a Christian defence of Australia's traditional immigration policy.

There will be a tremendous display of books and adequate time for questions and discussion. A coffee lounge will be available for guests, with the provision of a moderately priced dinner.

Readers are urged to let as many people as possible know about this outstanding Seminar, at which a national campaign will be launched to provide the Australian people with a say on immigration and multiculturalism.

For further information contact The Australian League of Rights, 145 Russell Street, Melbourne. Phone: (03) 650-9749.

movement of tens of thousands of Jews from the Soviet to Israel are providing what Zionist Israel desperately needs to sustain itself and to expand. The New Zealand *Sunday Star* (Auckland) of August 26 carried a report from a London correspondent, Douglas Davis, who wrote that Israel's leaders wanted the complete military destruction of Iraq, and that if the USA was not willing to strike, Israel was. The report also said that "it is being loudly whispered in Jerusalem that Israel's right-wing government under the cover of the war would face overwhelming pressure to remove simultaneously the demographic threat facing the Jewish state and solve the 33-month intifada (the rebellion of the Palestinian refugees) by 'transferring' the 1.3 million inhabitants of the West Bank and Gaza Strip to Jordan."

### **DANGER OF MILITARY FORCE**

But the destruction of Iraq by military force, with Israel further expanding its borders at the expense of the Palestinians, can only have one major result: the inflaming of the whole Islamic world from Morocco in North Africa, to Indonesia and Malaysia in South-East Asia, against the West. A worldwide revival of the Islamic Faith is taking place at a time when the Christian Faith, which was the major generating force behind Western Civilisation, has been weakened to the point where it has little effect on the course of events. There is no guarantee that Western technological superiority will ensure the West's survival. Some of the more perceptive Islamic scholars have observed that it is ironic that so many of the Christian Faith have allowed themselves to be subverted by the spiritual descendants of the Pharisees to the point where they fail to see that they have lost even the respect which the followers of Islam once accorded to them.

### **CHRISTIANS SIDE WITH THE FORCES OF ANTI-CHRIST**

Islam sees Political Zionism, represented by an aggressive Israel, as its major enemy. It sees the West as having failed to seek any justice for the Palestinian victims of Israel, with large numbers of Christians, particularly in the USA, believing that it is God's will that they support Zionist Israel in every possible way. Desperate people often resort to desperate measures in an attempt to alleviate their problems. Under Western pressure, mainly from the USA, PLO leader Yasser Arafat eventually moved to a position where he agreed that Zionist Israel, although created at the expense of the original owners, the Palestinians, had the right to live in security, providing that the Palestinians were permitted to establish their own State. Terrorist tactics were renounced. Although bitterly criticised by extremist elements among the Palestinians, Arafat and other Palestinian leaders believed that with Western, primarily American, support they could move towards their objective. But after nearly three years, they find themselves no closer to independence and, not surprisingly, have come to the conclusion that the Washington policy makers are afraid to apply the necessary sanctions to force Israel to hand back what they took by force. But they note that sanctions are applied in an attempt to force Saddam Hussein to retreat from Kuwait. Not surprisingly, the Palestinians are supporting Saddam Hussein, believing that he may help them to reach their objective.

### **THAT "NEW WORLD ORDER"**

Moral posturing by President Bush sounds hollow when it is recalled that the "emerging new world order" now being stressed by the American leader contains some strange bedfellows. There is, for example, Communist China, now giving lip service at least to the anti-Iraq campaign. The blood of the murdered Chinese students was hardly dry before the Bush Administration was quietly moving to do more business with the Chinese totalitarians. Presumably it is regarded as bad taste to ment-

NEW TIMES - SEPTEMBER 1990.

tion the Chinese policy of genocide in Tibet. President Bush's new friend, Gorbachev, has made it clear that the three Baltic States of Latvia Estonia and Lithuania, annexed by the Soviet as a result of Stalin's secret agreement with Hitler, should not expect to re-gain their independence. Criminally murderous regimes in "liberated" Africa are readily accepted at the United Nations, the foundation of the projected new World Order. And it should be remembered that in any major military conflict with Iraq, President Bush's fellow Americans will be killed with the sophisticated weaponry provided by the USA, Britain, France and other Western nations.

Saddam Hussein is no better, or worse, than the dozens of other bloody-handed dictators strutting the world stage. Hussein is a product of a volatile Arab world reflecting a value system, which is the antithesis of traditional Western concepts. He came to power through a bloody military coup and runs a police State. Ethnic minorities, such as the Kurds, have been massacred or suppressed. But in spite of all this, Saddam Hussein's Iraq has remained a member of the United Nations. There has been no suggestion that it should be expelled.

### **DIPLOMATIC OFFENSIVE NEEDED**

Irrespective of how the current crisis ends, there can be no permanent peace in the Middle East until the question of Zionist Israel and the Palestinian issue is constructively resolved. Saddam Hussein has said he is prepared to negotiate an Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait if there is an Israeli withdrawal from the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. If there were any semblance of genuine statesmanship left in the Western world, President Bush and Mrs. Thatcher should seize upon this offer to test Saddam Hussein's sincerity. Such a diplomatic initiative would have a dramatic effect in restoring Western prestige throughout the whole Islamic world. It would put Saddam Hussein on the defensive and effectively isolate him if he failed to react positively. But President Bush has left little doubt that he is prepared to act as the front-runner for International Political Zionism, helping to create the conditions, which will be used to justify still greater centralisation of power everywhere.

However, as the situation unfolds, there could be some unrehearsed events throwing the whole Zionist strategy off course. One thing is certain: The Zionist Factor in international affairs is going to be highlighted as never before.

## **THE HOMOSEXUAL REVOLUTION**

Whatever is felt about homosexuality, it is a reality, which has continued over the centuries. But it has never been a major problem as long as practising homosexuals accepted the fact that they were a small minority engaged in what the overwhelming majority saw as an unnatural activity. But when a homosexual minority starts to flaunt its activities, particularly at a time when the AIDS issue has become a major concern, the stability of the whole of society is threatened.

The outrageous perversion of the truth concerning AIDS and homosexuality is striking evidence of the strength of the homosexual lobby groups. The homosexual lobby becomes progressively more brazen with demands about social security, inheritance, child custody and even homosexual "marriages".

English writer Mary Kenny makes the following comment:

"All minorities depend upon the goodwill of the majority. All minorities are tolerated only so long as they do not start making too heavy cultural demands on the majority. What is true for homosexuals is also true, for example, about Muslims in Britain: there will be tolerance so long as the minority in question retains the profile at a certain level of discretion, and, in some areas, indeed, actual deference to the majority. This may seem bitterly unfair,

but it's the way things are.

"Rights within family law — marriage, the adoption of children, social security rights which recognise the bereaved half of a homosexual couple as the 'widow', — these things are just not on.....

"Begetting children is at the centre of the family, since family life cannot continue without the begetting of children: and the child is *ipso facto*, the harvest of the heterosexual union. That is the way the traditional moral philosophers..... phrase it, and that is precisely how the general public wants to keep it; and why so-called 'marriage', children and family rights will never

be accorded to gays in heterosexual society."

Minorities must have rights, but those rights can only be sustained if they do not threaten the rights of the majority. It is time for this elementary truth to be firmly pointed out to the homosexual minority, stressing that just as a healthy organism will eventually reject an alien intruder, so the majority members of a society will react strongly if they feel that a homosexual minority has reached threatening proportions. Members of the homosexual minority will be the main victims of a violent backlash from a majority whose tolerance has reached breaking point.

---

## WHY THE ARABS HATE THE WEST SO MUCH

Under the above heading, the following article by Sir Anthony Parsons appeared in "The Daily News", New Plymouth, New Zealand, of August 30. Sir Anthony was former British Ambassador to the UN, and previously also served extensively as a diplomat in the Middle East.

To Western governments and peoples, it is simple: Saddam Hussein is a bullying, megalomaniac dictator, who has attacked and annexed a small, defenceless neighbour.

He must be stopped in his tracks and forced to disgorge before he threatens to dominate the Arab world and to control the supply and price of the oil on which the industrialised world depends.

Many people are puzzled and angry that not all Arab governments share this view, still more so that vocal elements in Arab public opinion outside Iraq, particularly Palestinians, regard Saddam as a hero and the Western powers who have rushed in to help their friend Saudi Arabia defend itself, as villainous interlopers with ulterior "imperialistic" motives.

How can this be?

The memories of the people of the Islamic Middle East are long and crowded with a past of European and latterly American military and other forms of interference in their affairs. They tend to think all these intrusions were designed to serve outside interests, not theirs.

Did Napoleon invade Egypt in 1798 to bring to the Egyptians the glories of French civilisation, or to threaten Britain's communications with India?

Did Britain establish "protectorates" on the Arabian peninsula in the 19th century to introduce the inhabitants to the benefits of Westminster democracy, or to safeguard the Indian Raj?

Did Britain occupy Egypt in 1882 to promote the economic benefits of the people, or to recover debts and protect the Suez Canal?

Why did France colonise Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia and the Italians Libya?

What did the Arabs think when they found out that Britain, while promising them independence if they rose against the Ottoman Empire in 1916, was simultaneously negotiating with the French a carve-up of the Eastern Arab world?

The Arabs exchanged Muslim rule from Istanbul, not for independence, but for a pattern of states created and ruled by London and Paris. Still less did they expect to have a Jewish "national" home implanted in their heartland.

Broadly speaking, the Middle Easterners saw the Second World War as a quarrel between Europeans and Europeans, Americans and Japanese, nothing to do with them.

But huge European armies fought over and garrisoned their lands, made and unmade governments and generally threw their weight about. Why? Because they had oil the European war machines needed.

Then, after the war, the Europeans and Americans expiated their guilt over the mass murder of European Jews by supporting the creation of the state of Israel, and championing it through thick and thin ever since. Now, all Palestinians in the world live

either under Israel's occupation, in exile or in refugee camps. Was this, the Arabs say to themselves, what Britain intended in 1917 when stating that a Jewish national home would not be allowed to prejudice the civil and religious rights of "existing non-Jewish communities" (at the time 90% of the population) in Palestine?

What crime did President Nasser of Egypt commit to deserve invasion by British, French and Israeli forces in 1956? Had he not offered compensation for the nationalised Suez Canal Company and guaranteed freedom of navigation?

Was the Suez invasion not really a plan to topple him because he was trying to unite the Arabs and rid the region of foreign domination, i.e. because he would not go along with Western policies?

There are many more such questions in Arab minds. Why is Saddam Hussein — the only Arab leader in the eyes of many Palestinians who is prepared to stand up to Israel and its champion, the US — branded by the Security Council as an aggressor when the Israeli invasion of Lebanon in 1982 is not even characterised as a threat to peace?

Why have sanctions been imposed on Iraq when Israel has been occupying Arab land for 23 years without any international action being taken against it?

Why does the United States, the apostle of self-determination, not grant that right to the Palestinians?

The Western view of these events is of course quite different and I can deploy plausible answers to most if not all these questions.

But particularly to the younger Middle Easterners, the fact is that the West is seen as having taken advantage, over more than a century, of their weakness in order to exploit their resources and dominate them militarily and politically for Western ends.

They cherish a litany of broken promises and hypocrisy cloaking ulterior motives. In addition a strong thread running through Islamic revivalism is fear that Muslim societies are in danger of being corrupted and destroyed by the homogenising force of Western mass culture.

All this means that, when the chips fall and Western armies move back into the region, however pure their motives, there is fertile ground for the propagation of conspiracy theories and the presentation of Arab governments either as "stooges" or as "victims".

Is the real motive to defend Saudi Arabia, or to control the oilfields? Where does Israel come into the equation? Will the Americans and their friends, once installed, find endless pretexts for staying put and replicating the years of occupation of the old "imperialists", Britain and France?

With our history of avoiding foreign occupation for 1000 years, these fears must seem ludicrous. But, given the history of the Middle East, they are not irrational, however misguided they may be.

# WHAT IS SOCIAL CREDIT?

by Eric de Mare

The following article appeared in the spring issue of the British conservation journal, "*Green Drum*". In publishing the article, the editor says, "We feel that the ideas underlying the Social Credit movement may be of interest to Greens striving for an understanding of the gross inequities of the present world economic scene." Without Social Credit no genuine conservation movement is possible. Author of the excellent book, "*A Matter of Life or Debt*", Eric de Mare has had a long interest in both Social Credit and conservation. Eric de Mare has travelled extensively throughout Europe and the United States, and has some twenty books to his credit, mostly on architectural and topographical subjects.

IT WAS THE CRAZY ECONOMICS OF THE HUNGRY THIRTIES that began to give real credence to the ideas of the 'Social Credit' movement. Those were the days when "they burned the wheat we wanted to eat", just for the maintenance of price levels and profitability. Yet the economics of today are no less crazy.

It was in the questioning mind of an engineer by the name of Major C.H. Douglas that Social Credit was born. During the First World War he was appointed Assistant Director at the Royal Aircraft factory at Farnborough to reorganise production and resolve its financial confusion. It was there that he first grasped his main idea and its world importance. One day it suddenly occurred to him that at the end of each week, the wages and salaries paid out added up to less than the total costs of what had been produced at the factory during the week. If this was true of every factory, then a serious but unrecognised flaw existed in our monetary system. It meant that the rate of flow of effective purchasing power in the hands of the public could never equal the rate of flow of prices of goods for sale.

Douglas first published his conclusions in an article in the *English Review* for December 1918, in which he declared "we are living under a system of accountancy which renders the delivery of the nation's goods and services to itself a technical impossibility". Douglas then expanded his ideas in Orage's '*New Age*' and in a number of books, the first being '*Economic Democracy*' of 1920. So began the Social Credit movement.

He predicted that the prevailing monetary system would generate disaster — and so it did, and continues to do. The Great Depression of the thirties arrived, followed by the Second World War, to prove his point. Wars, said Douglas, are always economic in origin. Today, they are mainly the result of international struggles for export markets on which to dump the goods that cannot be distributed at home owing to this universal shortage of purchasing power.

Most people believe that banks make their profits by lending the money deposited with them at a higher rate than they pay their depositors. But how and where does money originate?

The fact is that the joint stock banks of the world create credits (debts, to us) up to some thirteen times the value of their deposits. On these they charge considerable interest. The results are universal indebtedness, which cannot be redeemed, demoralising taxation, inflation, and poverty in the midst of plenty. In this way, the banks manage to hold most of the world's real wealth in pawn and wield power over individuals, industries and governments.

They make nothing, yet they own and control the world by monetary abstractions created out of nothing but ink and paper and now, increasingly, through electrical impulses in computers.

This confidence trick was instituted centuries ago by the Lombardy goldsmiths who found they could issue more receipts for gold than the actual gold they held in their vaults. These receipts were, in effect, the earliest form of paper money. It was a confidence trick then, and so it remains. Unknowingly, we are ruled by a monetary mafia holding power without consent or responsibility operating a system that inevitably produces wars, poverty and mass enslavement.

Supporting this ramp is the public's continuing, unthinking faith in the Gospel of Toil, produced by the brainwashing of centuries; the puritan belief that only the wage or salary paid for 'work' entitles the individual to a claim on goods and services.

In that respect, Capitalism and Communism are opposite sides of the same coin, and so the Money Power maintains its unquestioned world dominion. The ideas of Social Credit can now provide a third way, a way to resolve the unreal Left-Right conflict. As Douglas pointed out in his '*Economic Democracy*', "It is a fallacy that labour produces all wealth, whereas the simple fact is that production is 95% a matter of tools and process which form the cultural inheritance of the community — not as workers, but as a community, and as such the community is clearly the proper (though far from the legal) administrator of it."

It follows that enforced toil for all is a foolish aim and one that will soon become an impossible one. The self-chosen activities of leisure should become our objective and this can only be achieved by distributing the as-yet-unpaid 'wages of the machines' equitably to human beings. As Socrates, like many other intelligent men in history, believed, "Leisure is the best of all possessions". Paid leisure is indeed the only method of achieving true personal freedom.

In the past, the leisure of the few who depended on slaves or serfs for their independence, created civilised living. Today, thanks to applied science lately developed in the microchip and automation, ever-growing leisure is becoming a practical possibility for everyone. The wage and salary need no longer dominate and degrade our lives and our environment. Purchasing power additional to the wage and salary (and to a minor degree, incomes from investments) must be issued if nations are to be allowed to consume what, with ever less muscular effort, they can produce in abundance. Social Credit can thus be seen as a philosophy, as an analysis of the present unworkable system, and as a set of remedial proposals. As a philosophy, it maintains that:

1. *the purpose of life is self development;*
2. *the individual is more important than any organisation;*
3. *modern labour-saving technology is the latest and most remarkable addition to our cultural inheritance; this belongs to the whole human race and all men have a right to a share in its fruits;*
4. *the purpose of a sane economy is not to provide work for all, but to produce and distribute available wealth to the full;*
5. *money - a wonderful invention if not abused - is not wealth; it should be regarded as no more than a convenient ticket system that avoids the clumsy method of barter by fully representing real wealth; it has no value in itself and should not be regarded as a rare and valuable commodity as it is now. What is possible in physical and practical terms must therefore always be possible in financial terms.*

The analytical aspects of Social Credit have already been demonstrated, so what of its remedial proposals? These can be summarised in the following Three Demands;

1. *Open the National Credit Office.*
2. *This shall apply Scientific Price Adjustments by making newly created state payments to retailers to allow them to*

*sell their goods below cost prices, so increasing the community's purchasing power without causing inflation and precisely equating production and consumption.*

3. *After eliminating all taxes and financing all state services with new debt-free and interest-free state credits, issue the extra purchasing power required as National Dividends (a form of private incomes) to every citizen, to grow in relation*

*to wages and salaries as technology tends to eliminate human beings in the production of consumable wealth.*

This is the only way towards a happier, more peaceful and more civilised world. As Dryden wrote:

*"Tis well an old age is out  
And time to begin a new."*

---

## THE SURVIVAL OF THE UNFITTEST BY UNNATURAL SELECTION *(continued)*

*by James Guthrie B. Sc.*

James Guthrie of Tasmania was one of the pioneers of Social Credit in Australia. A man with a brilliantly analytical mind, James Guthrie contributed articles of permanent value to Social Credit journals. Under the above heading, he contributed a series of articles to *"The Social Crediter"* during April, May and June of 1959. We reprint a selection from them primarily for the benefit of new readers of *"The New Times"*.

### DEMOCRACY

School children are taught that in a "democracy" people elect their representatives, and that those representatives elect the cabinet and the prime minister who are to govern the country. Actually, what happens is just the reverse of this. No prime minister, or president, has the remotest chance of being known to many people, let alone being elected, unless his photograph and his name is publicised for years; this demands control over publicity costing millions of pounds. The only people capable of doing this is the financial monopoly; no man can rule unless he has the consent of those who control publicity and party funds. Every man in caucus is carefully screened before he reaches the first few steps in the ladder; similarly, candidates for election are preselected. The few who "beat the machine", and squeeze into parliament, find themselves in a hopeless minority, and relegated to the backbenches to be removed on a suitable occasion.

Any backbencher that tries to force the "leaders" to implement their "Party Platform" soon finds what the real position is; the backbencher is treated with more hostility than the alleged Opposition. The rule of the majority, therefore, is a mere trap, set by knaves to catch simpletons. The rule of the majority never has existed.

It is under cover of this definition, however, that unscrupulous men in every country are enabled to evade the consequences which anti-social intriguing would bring upon them by working up a spurious, because ill-informed, public opinion, which is the greatest barrier to effective and rapid progress known to the hidden hands of finance and politics.

Those in power say they represent the majority, and immediately start to penalise mercilessly every minority. Power belonging to millions of people has been taken from each individual and concentrated in the hands of a few; the majority and the minority have no protection against this dictatorship. The legal machinery grinds relentlessly on, centralising all power in fewer hands. The ever-increasing power of large stale organisations makes the individual completely powerless to call a halt to the liquidation of his natural rights; he has no redress because he has no means of sending his own representative to parliament. The opposition party, which also believes in the centralisation of power never cuts the bonds forged by the previous administration. In large "democratic" governments we have something more difficult to fight than an open dictatorship; always between us and the controllers of policy stands a government official with a legal document in his hands, which is used to smash our every argument.

When the Australian government acquired the right to collect taxes on behalf of the States, the backbone of the Australian constitution was broken, and that independence of the States

which the constitution was specially designed to preserve intact, was lost. The States became very junior partners of the all-powerful centralised government, and with the continuous devaluation of the pound the States fight for the right to exist is continuous. This is an interesting illustration of how power can be removed from the people to the State, and thence to the Federal government on its road to a World government. Each move seems perfectly harmless, "reasonable" and "logical" and in this case each move had the backing of the universities.

It is said that there are two reasons for everything men do — a good reason and the real reason.

Every State government and every municipal council is ridiculously short of money to carry on necessary services and urgent maintenance of a vast road structure, the funds for which has been misappropriated by the Federal government.

That the power exercised by any centralised authority is the power of the purse, or cheque book, is well-known, it is seen from the expression used by party officials, instead of saying "when we control parliament" they say "when we capture the treasury benches."

Although the State governments have the men and the machines to build new roads, they cannot use them without permission. Finance i.e. money, is the starting point of every action, which requires either the co-operation of the community or the use of its assets.

Unless the banks issue the necessary tickets the community is powerless to start any new project. Although the community supplies the labour and materials and all services for road building, the bank, which parted with neither its own savings nor those of its clients, claims that the community is in debt to it for using its own labour.

The ever-increasing use of hire purchase i.e. the payment of last year's production with next year's wages, shows that the community cannot buy back its own production, and obviously is not in a position to finance any capital construction.

How many roads are to be built; how much our debts have to be increased; how much foreign capital is to be imported, how long a severe credit restriction is to last, and which firms are to be

### MESSAGES FOR "NEW TIMES" DINNER

Readers unable to attend "The New Times" Dinner are invited to send an appropriate message. Messages are read at the Dinner and published in the special Dinner issue of "The New Times".

allowed to survive is decided not by parliament nor by the Treasurer, but by the governor of the Central bank.

At the present time all the universities are short of money and they are expecting help from the commonwealth government i.e. from the Commonwealth Bank. No money is given without conditions attached to it — what these conditions will be is not in any doubt.

The international tie-up between nations is important. When loans are made between nations, and loans are always being made between nations, the international banks, which can monetise the nation's wealth can also export to where they like.

The British people are going to trade with China; they are going to send millions of pounds worth of high-class machinery, but what are they going to receive in return? Perhaps a few very ancient eggs. In this case, as in many a previous occasion, the British people will get nothing, but they won't know anything about it of course. The International banks, which parted with nothing when they financed the loan, will achieve what they planned — control over China.

The British people have exported their wealth to every country in the world; they have exported it to countries, which had no possibility of paying for it. In these transactions they have lost thousands of millions of pounds, but the international banks lost nothing; on the contrary they gained tremendous powers. When the British left India the Internationalists remained in complete control, without any supervision from white men. It is now the turn of the Americans to have their wealth plundered and exported by the International Fraternity. This process started in a big way in the 1914—1918 war when the New York bankers took complete control of the conquered people (all the people were conquered).

Many books have been written giving documentary evidence showing how the international fraternity dominated Presidents of America and Prime Ministers of Great Britain; suffice here to indicate where lies our present peril. "At a Presidential enquiry in America in 1912 when it was disclosed that one, Jacob Schiff, controlled 112 banks and financial institutions, had sole control of no less a sum than 22,245,000,000 dollars." (*The Mysterious Protocols*, p. 12).

"In April 1927 Jacob Schiff made a public declaration that it was thanks to his financial help that the Russian revolution had succeeded." (*Ibid*, p. 99).

Since 1927 the credit monopoly has become more centralised and better organised; and the liquidation of the British Empire goes on apace according to plan. And it is hard to tell whether the Jacob Schiff Fraternity operates from Moscow or New York, or from both together.

We do know that the stranglehold of essential raw materials, especially oil, is tighter now than ever and the elimination of the British from the Middle East has been a consistent policy of Moscow and New York.

When we survey the visible and tangible side of our cultural inheritance in the form of Churches, schools, roads, railways, factories, etc. we see an investment worth thousands of millions of pounds. Most of this is the work of our forebears — a gift from the past; but, like all such gifts, the Credit Monopoly says: "This is our property, and you must pay us for its use." (The fact that a few people originally held shares in some of these undertakings is merely a smoke screen to hide the origin of all loans). *Accordingly, we are compelled to pay, per medium of rates, taxes and prices, for this vast capital equipment built by people long since dead. We are also compelled to pay for new capital equipment built by us for people not yet born.*

I think the representatives of the Christian Churches should ask the professors of the universities to explain to us why the financial system is organised in such an obviously unchristian manner. The leaders of the churches cannot all be

blind to what is happening; they cannot always shelter behind the excuse that finance is the sole province of experts.

Much has been written about the narrowness and shallowness of highly trained technicians, and in these days when men are being trained to "know more and more about less and less" society is becoming a collection of robots incapable of understanding what the other man is doing, or why. Such a society is dangerous and has no natural cohesion, and it falls an easy prey to those who understand where lie the control points of organised society.

One of the most desperate needs of our civilisation is that at least a small section of the population should be able to drag their noses out of technical journals, raise their heads above the exigencies of day-to-day living and take time to find out why our Christian civilisation is disappearing so rapidly. Concentration on technological development is an insidious form of materialism, which has removed from the direction of community affairs some of our best brains. What we need is not more science, but more intelligence.

It is commonly known that our universities, where they have not degenerated into glorified technical colleges, have been very efficient mouthpieces for the official policy of centralisation. Whether all the faculties of a university have to submit rigidly to the policy of centralised finance, we don't know; all we know is that when it comes to the criticism of the Monopoly of Credit, and of the financial control over governments, professors of economics and of political science have been remarkably silent. If economists know that "Banks lend money by creating the means of payment out of nothing" they must know that this gives banks tremendous power in any community — power to select those who are to survive during periods of "credit restrictions". If professors of Economics know these things they are careful to leave their students in almost complete ignorance of the terrible consequences.

I think it would be a great help if a few people kept on asking a few intelligent questions of those who are supposed to be training our future administrators: ask, for example, some such questions as these: —

Why should all advances in science, technique and management; why should the increasing use of power-driven machinery; and why should every new invention increase the price of every article manufactured by automatic machinery? Or, to put the question in another form: If the issue and cancellation of credit actually reflects the actual production of goods and services, should not increasing industrial efficiency enable us to buy a progressively increasing amount with each One Pound?

Is the decreasing purchasing power of the Pound over the last hundred years, which robs people of their savings, a flaw in the financial system, or a deliberate policy of confiscation? Whatever it is, do you think that it is realistic, i.e., in keeping with the nature of things?

Perhaps one of the most important questions that can be asked is this: *If those in control of financial policy are so certain that their methods are rigorously correct, why are they determined, at all costs, to prevent any alternate experiment? This does not seem to be very scientific in a "progressive age".*

The financial policy, about which the above questions have been asked, because of the fact that it does not fit the realities of modern life at any point, has disrupted society from top to bottom.

We are interested in the Financial Monopoly because we believe that this monopoly has been mainly responsible for destroying that mental and spiritual environment which makes what remains of our Christian civilisation possible. Because of the over-riding control which Finance exercises over every institution, the real government of a country is removed from its natural leaders and placed in the hands of an anonymous, un-

elected, irremovable international clique. Any university, which ignores this vital problem, has refused to present the "facts of life" to our future administrators; it has aided and abetted the severing of links between one generation and another, and so robbed the people of the most important part of their cultural inheritance — that which gives a nation a means to control its own destiny.

The university's professors can take their place among the members of other British institutions who watched without any useful comment one of the most inventive and virile people in history, after two "successful" wars, lose by fraud, in the matter of a few years, the greatest empire the world has ever known.

We have now indicated the big deal behind the financial policy, i.e. Monopoly of Power. This policy in turn is maintained by the policy of Full Employment, which prevents men and women looking after their own affairs, and by artificial credit restriction which creates cut throat competition, continuous crises and threats of war. These policies are effective in keeping the best sections of the community, and their clergy, cluttered up by day-to-day living so that they have neither the time nor the energy to raise their heads above the daily tasks to watch their civilisation rapidly disappear.

These conditions may, or may not provide an excuse for the majority of the population dodging every problem as it arises. But for the tiny minority, which we may call the "Elders of the Tribe", in whose charge lay the guardianship of our Cultural Inheritance, there is no excuse. They have betrayed their trust. It was their duty to warn the British people that the vital controls of the nation were in alien hands; that our institutions had become what Douglas Reed called "Faked antiques", which meant that the ancient facades of our institutions indicated a background of continuity and tradition and purpose which did not, in fact, exist; that such institutions as Parliament, Universities, the Bank of "England" were being consistently used to undermine that which they were supposed to strengthen and support.

Parliament, in the name of Democracy and Reform, instead of raising the proletariat to the status of economic independence, which the Industrial Revolution had made easily possible, had used the mob to back vindictive laws to reduce the entire population — outside the Chosen Few — to the status of the proletariat. In this manner Parliament has been used to eliminate the independent minority, which alone could challenge the Monopoly of Power. The people in Great Britain and U.S.A. are being rapidly reduced to the same condition as the people in Russia — a dumb, highly organised, brainwashed proletariat *vis-à-vis* a small all-powerful elite in charge of the police force.

The professors of our universities were so busy debunking their forefathers that they did not appear to have noticed the vast wealth of knowledge which their forefathers had entrusted to their care, and their students did not seem to know they had been left any heritage to hand on — and naturally it was not very long before there was no heritage left to hand on.

The professors in our universities, in the name of "Science", "Enlightenment" and "Progress", challenged every authority — well almost. They did not challenge the Money Monopoly, which challenged them at every turn in their own universities.

These great men enhanced their own and their students ego when they described, in lurid detail, the evil men of by-gone days; but about the evil which haunted every page they wrote, and which stalked them round their own cloisters they were silent.

## ORGANISATION

" . . . A constitution is either an organism or an organisation. All organisation is what used to be called magic — and a good deal of it is black magic — the manipulation of metaphysical forces for

questionable materialistic purposes. We all know what happens if you put copper wires into a wrong relationship with a powerful electric current, and there is ample evidence to show that our ignorance or disdain of everything but materialism is causing a spiritual 'short circuit'. . . ." (C.H. Douglas: *Realistic Constitutionalism*, p.7).

" . . . I am confident that the Devil is backing every horse in the race, at the moment. There is too much drive for similarity in organisation to leave any doubt about that, and too much deception about results.

"That our present plight is due to organisation *per se*, is not I think, open to discussion. Clearly there could be no war without it " (C.H. Douglas: *The Big Idea*, pp.19,20).

Deep in the heart of every man is a hatred of being organised. Instinctively men know that most organisations are of the Devil; they dimly recognise that they are being degraded like dumb animals in a circus, and they feel humiliated. This degradation and humiliation is seen at its worst in large organisation, where there is little sign of loyalty and instead of co-operation, merely dull resignation to overwhelming force.

If there is to be any future for an intelligent individual in what remains of our civilisation then the individual, instead of being a conscript in an organisation, must be there as a volunteer with the power to decide for himself which organisation, if any, he will use, and for how long. Unless the individual is able to decide for himself whether he will, or will not, take part in any activity he is not a free man, and therefore not a moral man; he is one of those strange, unhappy things they call a functionary — a cross between an animal and a robot. He is the logical result of an "efficient" materialistic organisation operating in defiance of the fundamental beliefs of the community; he is a victim of a deserted society where those who are supposed to speak with Authority have retired in safety to their cloisters, and have left a few hard-pressed veterans to fight alone against the reign of Brute Force and Fraud.

If a man were merely a well-trained animal with a larger cranium than an ape, then he ought to be quite happy in his present environment, and there could be no future for rebels. But man is not happy because he has something more than a mind enclosed in an enlarged cranium — he has a Spirit, which fills him with that divine discontent which will not let him rest. Unlike the animals, for him food and shelter do not suffice. He cannot be made to tolerate the humiliation of seeing all around him evidence of the continuous degradation of the minds of his fellow-men — he cannot tolerate it, even if these men are Americans with houses full of gadgets, and pockets full of drugs.

Everywhere we are witnessing the struggle of the Spirit of man trying to escape from those who would organise him; trying to escape from the degeneration of the organised ant-heap to the regeneration of the man who becomes what he really is — an unique individual.

A man cannot free himself unless he knows the truth; that is, has access to the "facts of life." Animals know where their own interests lie, but civilised man does not. The primitive tribes are taught how to protect themselves from their enemies, but civilised man does not know who are his enemies. His greatest gift from the past, that on which all progress depends — language — has been used to destroy him; he is bewitched by words, words such as Progress and Evolution, Equality and Democracy. In the chaotic state of his mind he has been induced to believe that organised chaos is progress.

In the worldwide struggle for the mind of man, which we are witnessing today, the Devil seems to be in complete control of all the instruments of propaganda; and behind the legal powers of the "majority" we are seeing unscrupulous men eliminating all opposition by rendering impotent the intelligent minority. We are witnessing the survival of the unfittest by unnatural selection.