

# THE NEW TIMES

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

VOL.58, No.2

Registered by Australia Post- Publication PP481667 100259

FEBRUARY 1994

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

## THE STAMPEDE OF THE GADARENE SWINE ACCELERATES

*by Eric D. Butler*

What is left of Western Christian Civilisation is like the Gadarene swine of the New Testament, hurtling at an increasing rate towards an abyss. Even while the reports from Japan, Russia, China and other parts of Asia, reveal increasing turmoil and instability, Western developed nations like Australia are being urged to see their future as being tied to increasing investments and exports to those parts of the world which allegedly offer "unlimited" scope for development. Euphoria broke out when President Clinton announced that economic sanctions against Communist Vietnam were to be lifted. Australian businessmen were urged, "not to miss out on the action. Australians are being urged to seize the opportunity to export to a "reformed" South Africa controlled by Nelson Mandela and his Communist colleagues.

The programme of trying to build Australia's future by attempting to export to an increasingly unstable world is like trying to build a house on shifting sands. No one can now dispute that Japan, at one time held up as an example of brilliant economic management, is in deep crisis - economic, political and social. As we write, the Hosokawa coalition government, which came to office in the wake of an economic slump and revelations of widespread corruption, is threatened with disintegration. Australian coal exporters have been bluntly told that because of the state of the Japanese economy, Japanese steel mills will require less of their coal and that prices will be drastically reduced. Australians have been told that if they do not like what is being offered, coal exporters from other countries like Canada, driven by the same finance-economic policies which force all countries to strive to overcome their domestic economic problems by bigger exports, are willing and ready to take Australia's place.

Like Japan, South Korea has growing economic problems. Under orthodox debt finance, these problems must become more acute. Communist China has been portrayed as offering a vast and almost "unlimited" market for the West. International investments have been poured in with deluded economic gurus holding out the suggestion that a relatively under-developed huge Chinese market offers

### 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, either 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) Law, against policies of rape and waste.

To oppose all policies eroding national sovereignty, and to promote a closer relationship between the people of the Crown Commonwealth and those of the United States of America, who share a common heritage.

a glowing prospect for Western economies to solve their current problems. The reality is that already the much-publicised Chinese boom is running into increasing problems, a major one being rising inflation. This was predictable. A spokesman for the Reserve Bank of China is quoted as saying that an "overheated economy must be corrected through a financial "restraint" policy. Social disintegration is growing while there is growing regional conflict. Civil war appears extremely likely.

## Asian disasters ahead

Driven by the same finance-economic policies as those disrupting Western nations, all Asian nations are following the same disastrous path taken by the West. The same economic, social and ecological disasters afflicting the West are inevitable.

When the Soviet Empire disintegrated, the "restructuring" of the Eastern European nations and the former Soviet Union itself was hailed as a new and hopeful development in the world drama. International peace and stability were now within sight. Generally overlooked was how swarms of International Monetary Fund and World Bank officers moved in to preside over the "restructuring", along with major International Banks. The much-publicised "shock-therapy" has been denounced by a number of authorities, including the famous Alexander Solzhenitsyn, who has specifically criticised Western based International Banks. Even Boris Yeltsin, who has had the backing of the Monetary Fund and its representatives, was driven by events late last year to revoke the licences of a number of foreign banks, including Rockefeller's Chase Manhattan. The Russian backlash at the recent elections brought extreme nationalists like Vladimir Zhirinovskiy into the new Russian parliament. It is now certain that there will be growing instability throughout all parts of the old Soviet Empire, with increasing violence. Military conflict between Russia and the Ukraine looks increasingly certain.

The overall situation throughout Russia, the Ukraine and Eastern Europe is such that it is criminal folly for Western policy makers to insist that massive Western exports and investments will avert the disasters ahead. Western leadership is at an all-time low. It has been unable to make any constructive contribution to resolving the tragedy gripping what was formerly Yugoslavia. The "peace-keeping" activities of the United Nations have become a dangerous joke, as have the policies of the European Community. There are no signs of the "unity" which the EEC would allegedly produce. Attempts to bring the Eastern European nations into NATO as part of a programme for increasing the size of the European community, are seen by Russian nationalists as further evidence of an attempt by Western financial imperialism to impose an international programme. In an interview in Germany on September 27, Solzhenitsyn said that the situation in Russia was the worst since the 17th century that Gorbachev had made every possible mistake and that Yeltsin was to blame for the process of disintegration of the country and its institutions. He specifically named Yeltsin's principal adviser Gaidar as having been "hypnotised by the dictates of the International Monetary Fund". The Nationalist upsurge has resulted in Gaidar and other Western trained advisers being forced to resign.

## West must control own destiny

It is now certain that the New World Order drive is resulting in growing disasters everywhere. All attempts to pursue further the internationalist programme can only increase the scale of disasters and convulsions now sweeping the world. Western nations like Australia should reject internationalism and take the necessary financial and economic steps to take control of their own destinies. It is probably now too late to halt the process of disintegration in countries like Russia. But it is not too late to take steps to ensure that Western countries do not get sucked down by disasters elsewhere.

---

## ENLIST NOW FOR SOCIAL DYNAMICS SEMINARS

Those attending the recent up-dated and professionally produced video presentations of the League's Social Dynamic Seminar in Southern Queensland and Northern New South Wales, presented by Mr. Eric Butler, were most impressed. For an investment of only \$50 those interested in the future of Australia, and in widening their own understanding now have something unique. All those doing this Seminar, which takes from 6-7 hours, will be listed on a national register and may do repeat Seminars as often as they see fit, for only a nominal financial charge. **"This Seminar has completely changed my life"**, has

been the comment of several participants. The League is building up a panel of qualified and accredited presenters of the Seminar. All students are supplied with a set of comprehensive notes. Those who wish to make immediate bookings and wait until they can be fitted into a Social Dynamics Seminar, can do so by sending \$10 only to the **Brisbane Conservative Bookshop, 460 Anne Street, Brisbane, Queensland, 4000**, which is both financing and administering the Social Dynamics programme. This is another major step forward in the history of the League of Rights.

# CALLING DR. GARY NORTH'S BLUFF

In our issue of October 1993, we devoted a major part of our issue to a limited analysis of the manuscript of a book on Social Credit by Dr. Gary North of the USA. The result of this analysis was the receipt of a letter from Dr. Gary North, which merely provides further evidence of a philosophical blind spot concerning Social Credit. But the extremely self-opinionated Dr. North concludes his letter by challenging us to publish his reply to our analysis. We are pleased to publish Dr. North's complete letter, primarily because it highlights the problem which some professed Christians have with the philosophical base of Social Credit as a policy. Religion has to do with a binding back to reality. Clearly Dr. Gary North has a faulty perception of reality, which explains his persistent misrepresentation of Social Credit. It has been said that God often works in strange and mysterious ways. We are publicising Gary North's views because they contribute, indirectly, to a better understanding of Social Credit by those Christians who have grasped that Social Credit is "practical Christianity".

Dr. Gary North's letter, dated October 14, 1993, reads as follows:

Dear Mr. Butler,

It is nice to see that *The New Times* has responded to my book, *Salvation Through Inflation* (Institute for Christian Economics, P.O. Box 8000, Tyler, Texas, U.S.A., 1993, U.S. \$12.95). As I said in Appendix B, it was the October 1992, accusation by *The New Times* that I was intellectually incapable of responding to Mr. Chas. Pinwill's attack on me that motivated me to write my book.

As you know, having read Appendix B of my book, I have now issued a challenge to any Social Credit leader on earth: join with me in a published, book-length debate. We will now see who "scurries away" from the debate, as *The New Times* said of me earlier this year, before my book appeared.

You write in your response to my book that "**A major problem with Gary North's book is that he makes so many blatantly false or misleading statements that it would take a number of books in an attempt to deal with them.**" (*The New Times*, August 1993, p.5.)

Do I understand correctly the implication that you are personally capable of writing at least one of these books? I hope so, because that is why I issued my challenge in Appendix B of my book; to persuade some representative Social Credit leader to write half of a debate book on the economics of Social Credit, and why I agreed to finance its publication. If you think that many books can be written to refute me, then please accept my challenge to write just half a book - but one in which I will have the opportunity to reply.

If you are confident that I am wrong, as you said in your review, then you should be willing to accept my challenge. I hope that your peers in the Social Credit movement will all agree for you to serve as their official representative in challenging me to a public debate in print. I cannot tell you how much I hope they agree.

But, of course, you have gracefully bowed out in advance. You wrote: "**I cannot speak for the Social Credit movement.** ..." (p.5). (Then why should your readers take seriously anything you say, especially your newsletter response to me?) I think you really mean this: "**I am a Social Credit spokesman whenever I control access to the forum so that Social Credit's critics cannot reply to my assertions, but I am not a spokesman in a truly open forum where they can reply.**"

You also say that you will not debate Gary North "**until he corrects the many unverifiable statements he made in his book.**" Mr. Butler, let me point out that it is through

public debate that those who insist that their opponents have made unverifiable statements should provide the evidence proving this accusation, subject to cross examination by their opponents.

You are saying in effect: "**I will debate Gary North only after he admits in print that he was wrong. I do not have to prove this point in open debate. I merely have to say in a newsletter that he was wrong. And until he admits that I am right, I will not debate him publicly.**" You will debate me only if I concede in advance that I am wrong. Sir, it is your task to prove that in our debate. That is what a debate is all about.

My belief is this: no Social Credit leader on any continent will respond. This is why I issued my challenge: to end your collective assertion that no one can answer Douglas' economics. I have answered it, line-by-line, point-by-point. It's dead.

If none of you responds to my challenge, then the debate is over. The corpse is in the coffin, and your silence will lower the coffin into the grave and cover it with dirt. It is now up to one of you to prove me wrong. I will wait patiently. I can afford to wait; none of you has accepted the challenge so far, and I predict that no one will. My September 1993, deadline is now passed. No one has accepted it. But I shall still wait. It is up to one of you to accept my challenge - in a debate format book, not some in-house newsletter article.

You seem to have adopted the "newsletter water torture

## BASIC FUND REACHES \$50,000

As we go to press the League of Rights basic fund appeal for 1993-94 has passed \$50,000, leaving just over \$9,000 to be subscribed over the remaining time before the fund closes. With the League constantly planning ahead, and expanding its activities, it is essential that those who have not yet subscribed do so immediately. Failure to do so lets down those who have already set such an inspiring example. All donations to Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne, 3001.

strategy" that I mentioned on page 272. You write only for the already persuaded band of the faithful inside your assembly. You refuse to accept my challenge, just as I predicted.

In any published debate, I shall debate the specifics of the *economics* of Social Credit - the topic that your reply failed to address. My book is on the economics of Social Credit. Your reply was not. Your reply was on the publishing history of Social Credit, and on the supposed fact that Douglas was not an anti-Semite. (But you carefully ignored my evidence that Social Credit was the preferred economic system of the pro-Mussolini poet Ezra Pound and the pro-Communist, pro-Stalinist Anglican clergyman, Hewlett Johnson, the infamous Red Dean of Canterbury.)

Naturally, I assumed that one or more of his disciples would deny Douglas' published anti-Semitism, which is why I quoted the man, paragraph by paragraph: to show that he was a Jew-baiter. My citations of his Jew-baiting at the end of my book bothered you, for you placed your reply to this section of my book at the beginning of your reply, calling it "**The 'Anti-Semitic' Smear**". A smear, sir is a pejorative lie; an analysis, in contrast, is a detailed summary of a position, with accompanying citations from the primary source evidence. I have provided analysis. It hurts, doesn't it? You called my summary "**the old 'anti-Semitic' smear**". No; it is just a summary of Douglas' old anti-Semitic writings.

Your defensive strategy is the only one available, given the fact that the truth is such a terrible embarrassment to you. You pretend that Douglas was merely anti-Zionist, not anti-Semitic. But the word "Zionism" does not appear in the offensive passages, the word "Jews" does. You say, "**Douglas was not novel in what he said on the Jewish Problem**". In the 1930's, the whole world was rabidly anti-Semitic, so your statement is no doubt true. It doesn't change the fact that Douglas was an anti-Semite; rather, it confirms it.

What *was* different about Major Douglas was that he placed the Jews and their supposed control over banking at the heart of his economic and social analysis - a conspiracy theory. This theory was not common in the 1930's, nor is it common now except among pro-Nazi and other extreme right-wing organizations.

My book is 300 pages long because I quoted Douglas at considerable length. That is its offense. This is why the standard "misrepresentation" accusation - which you dutifully bring up - will fall flat on those who read my book. I predicted that this would be a tactic adopted by one of you (p.273), and you have proven my point.

Because of its moderate length, fewer people will read my book than those who only read newsletters, but most of those who do read it will be persuaded. They are my chosen audience: serious readers. My book will convince most of those who read it, assuming they have not already sunk their lives and dreams in Douglas' system for four decades, as you have.

You, of course, are not persuaded, but I did not write the book to persuade you, as I said on page ix and page 268. I wrote it to persuade intelligent Christians who have mistakenly adopted Social Credit in the name of the Bible.

You say that I have erected straw men. Well, you can now prove this accusation in print, where I shall have an opportunity to reply, and your readers will have an opportunity

## LEGACIES AND THE FUTURE OF THE LEAGUE

**The development of the League of Rights has become a central feature of the national drama surrounding the attempts to preserve traditional Australia. The future of traditional Australia will be determined by the future of the League of Rights. League supporters who would like to invest in the future of Australia by leaving legacies to the League are assured that the League has taken appropriate steps to ensure that all legacies are adequately safeguarded for the future. Any supporter interested may obtain relevant information concerning legacies by writing to Mr. Eric Butler, Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne, 3001.**

to compare. As I say, I am dearly looking forward to our published exchange. Can you provide the written confirmation from other Social Credit leaders that they accept you as their spokesman? When can I expect your essay?

I shall say it one more time: I have refuted Social Credit economics as Douglas set forth the original position. You and your colleagues are incapable of answering my book because my book is correct regarding the inflationary, welfare State economics of Social Credit as Douglas presented the position. Because you cannot answer me, none of you will respond to my challenge.

My assertion here is easily disproved *if you are ready to take me on in public in open written debate*. Just accept my challenge. Send me your manuscript. But you won't. None of you will. That is my prediction. (I hope I'm wrong. I'd like to put the final nail in the coffin.)

One more thing: If you personally choose not to accept my challenge, please send me the name and address of one or more of the supposed Ph.D.-holding economists who you imply are ready and willing to defend Social Credit. I shall say it again: such people do not exist, and never have.

Please send me the book list of all the available books by Major Douglas that your organization sells. I am willing to buy a photocopy of Major Douglas' *The Land for (The Chosen) People Racket*!. That sounds interesting! Do you make it available? If not, why not? After all, the copyright has lapsed. If you cannot supply this photocopy, will you tell me who can? Thanks. (By the way, you neglected to say in your review why this book, among the supposedly easily available books written by Major Douglas, is out of print. What exactly is its thesis? I wish you had summarized it in your review. Does it have something to do with Judaism? Zionism? Banking?)

One last thing: you ended your refutation of my book by arguing that money is not "the most marketable commodity" because there is no money with value in a desert. You invite me to take money on a trip with you to the Simpson Desert. I respond; the most marketable commodity inevitably becomes money. That commodity in a desert is water. It is divisible, durable, and has a highly marginal utility. It is also transportable if you have a water

bag. In a desert, a water bag will serve as "silver" to water's "gold". So, I will carry the *future* money - a bag full of water - and you carry anything else you choose except a weapon.

Warning: if you were to journey to the Simpson Desert with a thief willing to commit murder, and he had a deadly weapon while you were unarmed, you would soon learn just how valuable a water bag filled with water is. "Your money or your life," the murderer would say. He would not be asking you for pieces of Australian currency.

Mr. Butler, please, please agree to submit a manuscript refuting me. Please get the other Social Credit leaders to agree to have you represent them. Your followers deserve to see the book the two of us could produce. And so do mine.

By the way, your review referred to my "lack of modesty". Let me counter with an assertion regarding your lack of intellectual integrity and your lack of moral courage in refusing to take up my challenge to a public debate in print. Take up my challenge, sir, and prove me wrong. That is to say, *put up or shut up*. Debate me in print, or else stop talking and writing about me and my book.

Speaking of modesty, or lack thereof, you referred to my citation from the Russian mathematician and historian Igor Shafarevich. You state - with intemperate rhetoric - "**Only an historical illiterate would accept Shafarevich's view of what happened in the Soviet Union**" (p.4). It would have helped if you had read the context of his remarks. He was not writing about the Soviet Union in the passage you cited. He was writing about 18th-century revolutionary movements.

Please, do me the favor of ceasing to chatter about my lack of Christian spirit (p.5). Coming from a man who dismisses as "an historical illiterate" the courageous and brilliant scholar Igor Shafarevich who risked his life and suffered imprisonment for his opposition to the Soviet tyranny in the 1970's, such accusations against me ring hypocritical.

You state that I have a patronizing attitude (p.5). Yet you have called me an historical illiterate for having believed Shafarevich. Wouldn't that language be regarded as patronizing? I ask you sir did you ever earn a Ph.D in history? I did. Was one

of your fields modern European history? One of mine was. A suggestion: if you are going to be patronizing, be sure you target your victim better than you targeted me.

Having read your published response to my book, I suspect that you will not gain the written support I require from other leaders in your movement to serve as their representative in a book-length debate with me. You are what is referred to in the vernacular as a "loose canon". Your colleagues are unlikely to acknowledge you as their agent in this debate. But I surely hope they do.

Let me point out the last time: my book was designed to prove three primary points: (1) Social Credit economics as C.H. Douglas set forth his system was inflationary in its fiat-money prescriptions; (2) his system was socialist-fascist in its view of ownership; and (3) Douglas himself was self-consciously not a Christian in his philosophical and theological views, and he said so in print, which I cited verbatim. It is time for your and your colleagues to respond to the book's three main theses, not just to a few peripheral issues on the inside history of your movement, even though I have the footnotes to prove my case here, too. The history of your movement is not the issue. The issue is the fiat money inflationism represented by Major Douglas.

In my book, I challenged my readers to read Douglas' books if they can find them. If I could get access to them, I would challenge your newsletter's readers to read my book as well as all of Douglas' books. Finally, I challenge you to debate me in print. Then readers should decide who is telling the truth.

I give you (and everyone else) permission to reprint all of this letter in *The New Times* or anywhere else, so long as you reproduce all of it. In fact, I implore you to do so. But I predict you won't, for obvious reasons - the same reasons why you refuse to submit a manuscript for the debate. You are willing to attack me publicly in an in-house newsletter only because you know that your readers cannot read my reply. But please prove me wrong. Publish all of it. Soon.

Sincerely yours,  
(signed) **Gary North.**

---

## PRINCE CHARLES SCORES IN AUSTRALIA

In two major interviews, one with top TV interviewer Ray Martin and the other with Paul Kelly of *The Australian*, Australia's only national newspaper, and with his cool behaviour when threatened with a gun by a deranged young man of Asian background. Prince Charles demonstrated during his Australian tour that he is a man of real substance. By coming out strongly in favour of mature debate on the Republican issue, he has indirectly assisted the case for the preservation of the Constitutional Monarchy. The further the debate proceeds, the deeper the understanding of their true constitutional heritage by growing numbers of Australian people. The Australian League of Rights has, through its specialist division, the Australian Heritage Society, once again demonstrated its capacity to provide effective leadership. Those who helped to finance the welcome to Prince Charles in *The Weekend Australian* of January 22-23 will be pleased to know that there was a magnificent response with many new contacts already making use of the Loyalty Pledge being sent

to London. Prince Charles and his staff are clearly monitoring the Australian response to this Australian tour. Every Australian can have a "vote" on the issue by writing to Prince Charles, St. James Palace, London, U.K., informing him of loyalty to the constitutional monarchy as personalised by the Queen. As the great Edmund Burke said, "**All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing.**" As increasing numbers come to grasp the far-reaching implications of a system of constitutional government of which the Crown is a central feature, the tide is turning against the Socialist Republican drive. But appropriate *action* must be taken.

The scurrilous propaganda against Prince Charles can be offset by the distribution of his major addresses, *A People's Prince*, with an Introduction by Sir Walter Crocker. \$15 posted from all League addresses. It is highly significant that this work, which enables the reader to read the Prince's views on a variety of important issues, has been given the silent treatment by the mass media.

# WHAT DEMOCRACY IS NOT

by C.H. Douglas

"It is a fact that human beings do tend to form nations. Why? The answer is, I think, quite simple, Human beings associate together originally in order that each individual may benefit by association. The simplest example is pulling on a rope.

"Men don't pull on a rope for the benefit of the rope; they provide the rope for the benefit their associated effort brings to each of them.

"Now there is definitely a form of government which is associated with this conception - genuine democracy. No one takes seriously the verbiage prevalent about the struggle between Democratic and Totalitarian Governments - there are no democratic governments. But there might be. Perhaps I might be permitted to touch upon a few of the things Democracy is not.

"While it is inconsistent with arbitrary special privilege, economic or otherwise, it does not mean equalitarianism. It would be just as sensible to say, without amplification, that everyone had a right to a place in the Eleven. So they have, if they have the qualifications, and it is recognised that the number of places is by general consent limited.

"Neither does Democracy mean a referendum or an election on every detail of day-to-day national management. On the contrary, a realistic conception of democracy insists that a community is sovereign, but it is not technical. It has a right to demand results but not to dictate methods, the word 'right' being used in the pragmatic sense. But if the results

are not being obtained, it has a right to an explanation and, if necessary, the replacements of its administrators.

"So far as Great Britain is concerned, I am inclined to think that the divergence from Democracy is not difficult to indicate. Easily the most glaring feature is our money system, which is indefensible. The information it affords us is illusory, and no security is possible until it is drastically modified.

"The Parliamentary system has been perverted to purposes for which it was not intended, and all real power has been taken from it by the Cabinet. Finally, our legal system has been exalted to a semi-divine omnipotence, and invested with sanctions, which make it a Master and not a Servant. Obviously it would take much too long to examine each of these aspects of our decadence at length. I do not believe that any of them will really be put right until there is a much wider consciousness of the natural relationship between the individual and his institutions.

"If that can be obtained, and not until it is obtained, we shall dispense with a type of statesman who, in spite of Abraham Lincoln's warning, will hopefully rise to fool all the people some of the time and some of the people all of the time, and instead, obtain men who recognise that the advice, *'If any would be the greatest among you, let him be your servant'*, was not sentimentalism, but a brilliant maxim of social and political organisation."

- In *Persons and Nations*, 1938

---

## A CANADIAN VICTORY FOR FREEDOM

Unreported by the Australian media was the historic decision by the New Brunswick, Canada, Court of Appeal on December 20, which overturned a decision by a Human Rights one-man Commission two years ago banning New Brunswick school teacher Malcolm Ross from teaching. An outstanding teacher for twenty years, Ross incurred the wrath of the Zionist Mafia with a number of well-researched books, which pinpointed the identity of those primarily responsible for the Bolshevik and subsequent revolutions. Malcolm Ross never at any time took his political views into the classroom. But this did not prevent Jewish groups from conducting a massive campaign against him, with sections of the media playing a despicable role. As did some Christian Church leaders.

The charges against Malcolm Ross concerning his alleged

teaching, were initiated by a Mr. David Attis whose daughter, allegedly threatened by Ross, did not even attend the school at which Ross taught. Attis expressed his disappointment with the Court ruling in favour of Ross, while Irving Abella, national president of the Canadian Jewish Congress, complained that "It's an astonishing decision" and said that the Jewish Congress was asking the New Brunswick Attorney General to appeal the decision to the Canadian Supreme Court.

Hopefully, Malcolm Ross can now return to the classroom and continue his chosen vocation in life. The Malcolm Ross case highlights once again the vindictiveness of far too many Jewish leaders, who seem to be determined to encourage the very "anti-Semitism" they then seek to exploit against Christians.

# SOCIAL CREDIT VERSUS JUDAISM

It is clear that no meaningful discussion with Dr. Gary North is possible in the absence of precise definitions of the terms used. Gary North obviously believes that the most damaging comment he can make about the author of Social Credit, C.H. Douglas, is that he was *"anti-Semitic"*, and that Hitler and Mussolini used Social Credit policies. There was nothing even faintly resembling Social Credit in either the philosophies of Fascism in Italy or National Socialism in Hitler's Germany. Douglas aptly described Mussolini's Fascism as Bolshevism *"wintering in the Mediterranean"*. The central feature of both Hitler's Germany and Mussolini's Italy was the subordination of the individual to the State, the very antithesis of Social Credit. Monetary policy in both countries was used to centralise power.

As the writings of C.H. Douglas make clear that he rejected all forms of totalitarianism, whether labelled Communism, National Socialism or Fascism, and as Gary North makes much of its scholarship, his falsification of Douglas's views raises serious questions about his integrity. As a professing Christian he is well aware of the warning about being a false witness.

While it is understandable in this day and age that the term *"anti-Semitism"* is generally used whether as a political swearword, or by shallow journalists and others to describe anyone, including some Jews, who are critical of any aspects of Jewish activities, Gary North's loose use of the term suggests an irrational and purely emotional response to any mention of the "Jewish Problem". Alexander Solzhenitsyn was charged with "anti-Semitism" because his list of those operating the Soviet slave camps indicated that large numbers of them were Jews. Defending himself, Solzhenitsyn said that the term *"anti-Semitism"* had become so de-valued and meaningless that it should no longer be used.

The fundamental issue stressed by Douglas was philosophical. It is not a question of *"anti-Semitism"* or *"pro-Semitism"*. As Gary North stresses that he possesses a Doctorate in history, he should know that the overwhelming majority of Semitic people are Arabs,

and that the racial background of the majority of people termed "Jews" is non-Semitic, these being the Askenazim. They, of course, support Judaism, whose roots are in Pharisaism, as a number of eminent Jewish scholars have pointed out. There can be no question about what Christ thought of the Pharisees and their philosophy.

How can a Christian support the philosophy of Judaism? Douglas, who stressed what he termed *"practical Christianity"*, directed his attention to this question. For the benefit of Gary North and any others who may accept his criticism of Social Credit as *"anti-Semitic"*, their attention is directed to a comment by C.H. Douglas in *The Social Crediter* of March 13, 1948:

**"That the antagonism between Judaism and Social Credit is fundamental and religious could hardly be better expressed than in the following quotation from a review of Wernher Sombart by Dr. Jacob Fromer in *Die Zukunft* for October 28, 1911, p.113:**

*'Nothing in the Jewish religion is done for nothing; everything has its reason and object. This original trait of cool-headed piety runs from the Patriarchs by way of Mosaism and Talmudism uninterrupted down to the present day. There are no essential differences between the service of Abraham to Jehovah and the religiosity of the pious men who predominate in the Ghetto. Both are based on a do ut des system, and are diametrically opposed to the Christian Doctrine of unearned grace.'*

**"Now graft a national dividend, or the theory of unearned increment, on that stem... Most of us, because we have been conditioned to think that way, have a natural reluctance to accept 'occultism' as a considerable force in world affairs. There could hardly be a greater error - it is the primary adversary of Christian civilisation. The forces of which it disposes are probably amoral; but the intention of those most evidently in possession of them is Satanic. The Jewish Cabala is one of its main roots."**

## ERIC BUTLER TO VISIT THE U.K.

Accompanied by his wife, Mr. Eric Butler will be visiting the United Kingdom during this coming April. He will be visiting old Social Credit friends and meeting with any *New Times* readers who wish to exchange viewpoints concerning current affairs. He will bring an up-to-date picture of the ferment of Social Credit activities throughout Australia, with particular reference to the Prince Charles visit and Social Credit-inspired activities concerning the defence of Constitutional Monarchy.

## LEAGUE HQ SEEKING PART-TIME STAFF

The progressive expansion of the League, with further expansion planned, makes it imperative that a part-time (for a start) employee be engaged at the Melbourne headquarters of the League. It is envisaged employing a suitable person for two days per week. Financial arrangements can be negotiated. It is essential that the person engaged have some knowledge of computers. The co-operation of League supporters is sought.

# WORSHIPPING THE FALSE GOD, EFFICIENCY

Under the above heading the following article by well-known American conservative columnist and Republican Presidential candidate, Patrick Buchanan, appeared in the conservative Roman Catholic journal, "*The Wanderer*" of November 27, 1993.

In his foreword to Wilhelm Roepke's *The Social Crisis of Our Time*, Russell Kirk, founding father of modern conservatism, tells of a meeting between Roepke and the great Austrian, Ludwig Von Mises.

It was during the Second World War, in Geneva, where Roepke fled from Hitler. As Dr. Kirk put it: "**The city ... had allotted garden plots, along the line of the vanished city walls, to citizens wishing to grow their own vegetables in a time of food shortage ----** "

"Roepke heartily approved of the undertaking, which both enabled people to obtain independently part of their own sustenance and offered the satisfactions of healthy achievement outside factory walls. Utilitarians thought otherwise."

Invited to inspect those garden plots, Mises shook his head sadly: "A very inefficient way of producing foodstuffs!"

"But perhaps a very efficient way of producing human happiness," Roepke replied to his visiting friend.

Roepke's insight touches on one of the great divides in post-Cold War conservatism, a division, manifest in the NAFTA war, that may not be easy to bridge - for it is about who we are.

To some on the right, economics seems the be-all and end-all of existence. If in their econometric studies of jobs lost and jobs gained NAFTA comes out of a computer a net winner for the U.S., then it ought to be approved - and where is the argument?

To these conservatives, the jobs lost, like communities that become ghost towns when factories depart, are the price of progress. This attitude was epitomized by the Bush cabinet officer quoted as saying of some U.S. computer companies failing in the face of foreign competition, "*If our guys can't hack it, let 'em go!*"

For these economics *uber alles* conservatives, the editorial page of *The Wall Street Journal* is a beacon, yet that same page has called for the U.S. Army to march on Baghdad to set up a "MacArthur Regency". It has called for "open borders" and an ally-ally-in-free immigration policy. It champions a New World Order where America intervenes endlessly in foreign wars.

When did this become conservatism in America?

To conservatives of the heart, NAFTA should be defeated, even if it did mean an uptick in U.S. GNP. For the asking price of NAFTA is a loss of our national sovereignty.

NAFTA opens up U.S. factories to foreign inspection, subjects the U.S. to sanctions by transnational bureaucrats, supersedes state laws. It is the blueprint of a hemispheric Maastricht. To approve NAFTA, just for a cut in Mexican tariffs and investment guarantees for Big Business, is to surrender a share of that liberty for which Americans once sacrificed their lives, fortunes, and sacred honour.

If we truly care for our countrymen, how can we throw them into rat-race competition with \$1-an-hour Mexican workers? For what? So we can all buy cheaper goods?

All conservatives believe in a market economy. The difference is where, in one's hierarchy of values, we place that belief.

In *A Humane Economy*, Roepke wrote: "The market economy is not everything. It must find its place in a higher order of things, which is not ruled by supply and demand, free prices and competition. It must be firmly contained, an all-embracing order of society in which the imperfections and harshness of economic freedom are corrected by law and in which man is not denied conditions of life appropriate to his nature."

This is a sentiment of the paler conservatives fighting NAFTA; and would seem more consonant with Christian tradition.

"I have regarded with some suspicion many practitioners of the Dismal Science," states Dr. Kirk. "I have found economists a blinkered breed, worshipping the false god. Efficiency." Both he and Roepke decried the "Cult of Efficiency" into which have fallen so many of the best and brightest of the conservative young.

Like some Harvard MBAs who help run America's Fortune 500, and focus only and always on maximum PhDs, in foundation-fed think-tanks, spend too much time on memos and monographs, and not enough considering the consequences of their abstract theories on lives, communities, even countries.

In a splendid tribute in November's *Crisis*, Gregory Wolfe writes that Russell Kirk's great achievement is his celebration of the moral imagination. "What, then, constitutes the moral imagination? Burke believed it involved the ability to see the bare facts of life in the context of moral, historical, and spiritual significance. The moral imagination stood against the reductionist mindset of the 'sophisters, calculators, and economists' who viewed man as nothing more than an acquisitive animal."

True conservatism is at war with that "reductionist mindset".