

THE NEW TIMES

"Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" - John 8:31.

VOL. 60, No. 2.

Registered by Australia Post -Publication PP481667 100259

FEBRUARY 1996.

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

A PHONEY AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL ELECTION

by Eric D. Butler

It may have only been a coincidence, but Prime Minister Paul Keating's announcement of a Federal Election on March 2 immediately followed a highly successful rally for sacked West Australian Labor M.P., Graeme Campbell, on Australia Day. It is no secret that Keating's arrogant sacking of Graeme Campbell caused concern, not only in Labor Party circles, but also in the Opposition coalition parties.

With his outspoken criticism of the internationalist policies which all the major political parties support, and his refusal to be dictated to on which groups he could address, particularly the League of Rights, Graeme Campbell has been emerging as a Federal politician with whom the great majority of people could readily relate. As Sir Joh Bjelke Petersen has said, Graeme Campbell is becoming popular because he is addressing the issues people are concerned about.

The sacking of Graeme Campbell, for which the Zionist-Jewish lobby had been calling ever since Campbell first appeared on a League of Rights platform, resulted in the Western Australian politician announcing that he would re-contest the electorate of Kalgoorlie as an Independent, and would support a team of Senate candidates. This resulted in a wave of media speculation with enormous national publicity. But as the political realists stressed, Campbell's greatest problem was in having sufficient time to organise a national movement. It was grudgingly conceded that a "Graeme Campbell Factor" was starting to emerge. Some even wrote Campbell off as a successful Independent candidate in Kalgoorlie. But this type of thinking ignored the fact that Campbell has an enormous personal following in the West Australian Labor movement, as witnessed by the fact that it has been shattered by the sacking of Campbell, with large numbers now campaigning for Campbell. Although strongly opposed by John Howard and his colleagues, the West Australian Liberals have decided that their Kalgoorlie candidate's second preferences should go to Graeme Campbell. There is little doubt that the majority of the big Aboriginal community will continue to support Campbell. They distrust the white lawyers.

However, the Campbell agenda extends far beyond merely surviving in Kalgoorlie, important though this is, to the creation of a national movement, which will shift Australia off its present internationalist course. While it was theoretically possible for him to establish and register a new party, this would take time. Keating has drastically reduced the time available to Campbell. With several smaller parties, already properly registered, proving unacceptable as a vehicle for his movement, Campbell has sought to extend his relationship with Australians Against Further Immigration. At the Heidelberg Australia Day rally, which even the media was forced to report

OUR POLICY

To promote service to the Christian revelation of God, loyalty to the Australian Constitutional Monarchy, and maximum co-operation between subjects of the Crown Commonwealth of Nations.

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 all 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.

as a success, Graeme Campbell said he was endorsing Denis McCormack and Robyn Spencer of Australians Against Further Immigration. He looked forward to working with Denis McCormack in the next Commonwealth parliament.

A grassroots movement essential

While the Australians Against Further Immigration provides Campbell with a legal entity through which he can work, he has the problem of how to publicise the fact that AAFI candidates he endorses are in fact Campbell candidates. He cannot expect the mass media to enthusiastically assist, although sections of the media have had to admit that a "Campbell Factor" has emerged. Campbell has to rely upon a grassroots movement, adequately financed, to overcome the problems resulting from a lack of time. Campbell has wisely selected a relatively few policy issues on which to campaign, including the introduction of a constitutional mechanism which can be used by electors to veto legislation they do not like. Campbell wants a more restricted and balanced immigration policy, an end to public funding of multiculturalism, the rebuilding of Australia's ravished manufacturing industries, an increase in defence spending, appropriate policies to preserve and strengthen the traditional family, and the use of a Commonwealth Development Bank designed to finance both primary and secondary industries. The slogan for his campaign is **PUT AUSTRALIA FIRST.**

Campbell has wisely declined to become involved in technical discussions, rightly stressing that the first and most immediate objective must be to mobilise electors behind a set of policy objectives, which will move Australia off its present disaster course. In his Australia Day address he talked of a "new beginning" for Australia. Clearly his vision for the future extends far beyond the coming Federal Elections. These must be seen as the first steps towards long-term re-generation. All that is required is that Graeme Campbell retains his political base in the House of Representatives and that the candidates he has endorsed receive strong votes. The election of only one Campbell Senator would be like an atomic blast on the Australian political scene.

Shakespeare said that *"There is tide in the affairs of men which taken at the flood leads on to victory . . ."* Under pressure from the Zionist Jewish lobby, the ALP has expelled Graeme Campbell, proscribed the League of Rights, while John Howard and Tim Fischer, claiming to speak for their respective parties, have joined with the ALP in smearing the League. The 1996 Federal Elections provide League of Rights supporters with the opportunity to play a role in demonstrating that the major political parties no longer represent traditional Australia.

THE TRUE PURPOSE OF PRODUCTION

"The true purpose of production is consumption."
- C.H. Douglas.

Amidst all the appeals for "greater production" and economic expansion, allegedly necessary to provide "full employment", the fundamental truth enunciated by C.H. Douglas must be constantly proclaimed.

TWEEDLEDUM AND TWEEDLEDEE

It was the famous English author of *Alice in Wonderland* and other delightful stories, Lewis Carroll, who described the famous phoney battle between Tweedledum and Tweedledee. If Carroll were writing today, he could update his famous description of the Mad Hatter's Tea party, with present-day politicians, economic "experts" and others all present. The Mad Hatter of *Alice in Wonderland* was relatively sane compared with some of those engaged in today's politics. One cynic, commenting on the first week of the Federal election campaign remarked, *"If someone doesn't do something, we could end up with the government we deserve!"*

The former radical Federal Labor MP, Mr. Peter Steedman, was reported as commenting on John Howard's environmental policy, *"The Lib's environment policy is a very Keating-like policy - very clever in the way it puts deals together."* John Howard, who has described the Prime Ministership as "a glittering prize", has constantly complained that Paul Keating was stealing his policies. This is not quite correct; both want to be in the forefront of the political stage, and in pursuit of that goal are determined not to offend those who exercise real power through the control of centralised finance. Both Paul Keating and John Howard are dedicated internationalists. Both support the de-regulation of the banking system, the internationalisation of the Australian economy, economic rationalism and, while occasionally mentioning Australia's soaring foreign debt, both carefully avoid saying what they propose to do about it. Although there is overwhelming evidence that a majority of Australians are opposed to the present immigration and multicultural programme, the major parties have agreed that this must not become a matter of public debate. Anyone who dares to discuss the matter is promptly described as a "racist".

For a very short period, John Howard did raise the question of whether the rate of Asian immigration was running ahead of public opinion and could lead to social friction. After having been torn to pieces by the mass media and ethnic leaders, John Howard beat a pathetic retreat and has not stopped apologising ever since. There is no evidence that a Howard-Fischer government would be any different than a Keating government. Electors who vote for the Howard Liberals "as the lesser of two evils" are in reality voting for the Keating programme. The genuine alternative is to vote for any Graeme Campbell-sponsored candidate, particularly in the Senate.

THE BASIC FUND - NEARLY THERE

The League of Rights' Basic Fund for 1995-6, with a target of \$60,000, has nearly been filled. A final "push" from the majority who have not yet contributed, will not only make success certain, but will ensure that there is a healthy surplus. Every extra dollar will help to ensure that the League makes a maximum contribution to the election campaign. Rush your donation in today - to Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne, 3001.

B.A. SANTAMARIA HITS THE TARGET

A story is told of how many years back when distinguished Roman Catholic commentator Bob Santamaria was challenged after a big meeting about his apparent failure to deal with the subject of banking and the debt question, he said that he would deal with the issue when it was opportune. Obviously Bob Santamaria now feels that the time is opportune, with the result that in recent times he has written a number of articles in *The Australian* dealing with financial policy and its impact on politics. In his article in *The Weekend Australian* of February 3-4, Santamaria concludes by quoting the famous statement by Pope Pius XI at the beginning of the Great Depression:

"It is patent that in our days not only is wealth accumulated, but immense power and despotic economic domination are concentrated in the hands of the few, and that those few are frequently not the owners, but only the trustees and directors of invested funds, which they administer at their pleasure.

"This domination becomes particularly irresistible when exercised by those who, because they hold and control money, are able to govern credit and determine its allotment, for that reason supplying, so to speak, the life blood to the entire economic body . . .

"This accumulation of resources and power, the characteristic of the modern economic order, is a natural result of limitless free competition which permits the survival of those only who are strongest, which often means those who fight relentlessly, who pay least need to the dictates of conscience."

From a Social Credit point of view, this statement indicated that the Pope either had a defective understanding of how the banking and debt system operates, or he and his colleagues were restrained from going too far. At the time the statement was made, in the Encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno*, there were a number of Roman Catholic clergy and several theologians who had thoroughly analysed Social Credit, observing that it did not conflict with the Church's social teachings. Attempts were made to influence the Vatican. In Australia, as elsewhere, many Roman Catholic priests became strong supporters of Social Credit and *The New Times*. It

would not be correct to describe the famous Melbourne Archbishop Daniel Mannix as an informed Social Creditor, but he was a regular subscriber to *The New Times* from the beginning and publicly endorsed the work of Eric Butler on the Communist question. He was aware that the Communist question was related to the financial issues.

From his *Weekend Australian* article, Bob Santamaria touches upon the power of centralised banking, quoting from article 107 of the Maastricht Treaty which the governments of Western Europe are expected to sign in the interests of a united Europe. The Treaty reads, "*Neither the European Central Bank, nor a national central bank, nor any member of their decision-making bodies shall seek or take any instructions from government or any other body.*" Comment is superfluous. Here is the outline of the blue print for a totalitarian Europe in which the individual could exercise no influence whatever. What is planned is an Orwellian nightmare.

Bob Santamaria raises the question of whether Paul Keating or John Howard might face up to the issues he has raised. Clearly he does not see that happening, which means that, as Douglas said, in the contest for power at elections, there is only one party, which wins -The Financial Party. The dynamics of the present situation are such that there can be no stability if present finance-economic policies are persisted with. The first essential for Australians is to break free from the internationalists and, as Graeme Campbell says, *Put Australia first*.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH

"The peculiar evil of silencing the expression of an opinion is that it is robbing the human race; posterity as well as the existing generation; those who dissent from the opinion, still more than those who hold it. If the opinion is right, they are deprived of the opportunity of exchanging error for truth; if wrong, they lose, what is almost as great a benefit, the clearer perception and livelier impression of truth, produced by its collision with error."

John Stuart Mill, *On Liberty*

"Open discussion of many major public questions has for some time now been taboo. We can't open our mouths without being denounced as racists, misogynists, supremacists, imperialists or fascists. As for the media, they stand ready to trash anyone so designated."

Novelist Saul Bellow.

"A liberal society stands on the proposition that we should all take seriously the idea that we might be wrong. That means we must place no one, including ourselves, beyond the reach of criticism (no final say); it means that we must allow people to err, even where the error offends and upsets, as it often will. In other words, liberal science is built in two pillars. One is the right to offend in pursuit of truth. The other is the responsibility to check and be checked."

Jonathan Rauch:

Kindly Inquisitors: The new Attacks on Free Thought.

George Orwell said "anyone who challenges the prevailing orthodoxy finds himself being silenced with surprising effectiveness. A genuinely unfashionable opinion is almost never given a fair hearing." J.S. Mill said, "Unmeasured vituperation, employed on the side of prevailing opinion, deters people from expressing contrary opinions, and from listening to those who express them."

HITLER RE-EMERGES IN GERMANY

German Chancellor Kohl has, in his recent speech at the Louvain University, Belgium, warned the European people that unless they accept a programme of further integration, including a centralised banking system and a common currency, they are threatened with war in the future. He said, "*The policy of European integration is in reality a question of war and peace in the 21st century.*" The philosophy under-girding what Kohl and his fellow Federal Unionists are advocating, is the same as that of Leon Trotsky, the Communist leader who was one of the first to advocate the establishment of a United States of Europe.

Hitler took over the highly centralised Germany created by Bismark and his Marxist allies. Referring to his Socialist allies, Bismark made his famous statement, "*We march separately but we march together.*" Hitler maintained and extended the centralised power he had inherited. Any challenge to financial orthodoxy did not extend to challenging the philosophy undergirding orthodox finance-economics, with the insistence on "full employment" and the "struggle for markets". C.H. Douglas attempted to warn Hitler that his philosophy was similar to that of the Judaic philosophy, which he was allegedly fighting. Hitler's programme for moving eastwards was based not merely on attempting to break Communist power, but to obtain bigger markets, more living space, and raw materials.

As C.H. Douglas pointed out in his famous BBC address on the causes of war, printed in his *Monopoly of Credit*, the basic causes were not nationalism, but a finance-economic policy, which requires every industrialised nation to "fight" for markets. Military war is the extension of economic war. To the extent that Hitler consciously sought military conflict, it was influenced by the perception that the British were militarily weak. And why were they weak? Because financial orthodoxy imposed during the Great Depression dictated that they could not afford to maintain their military strength. The much-maligned Neville Chamberlain was painfully aware of Britain's almost defenceless military situation when he declined to go to war in 1938. Most of those urging the British "to stand up to Hitler" were living in New York.

The centralised European structure urged by Chancellor Kohl and his spiritual bedfellows will not solve the basic problems confronting the European nations. There are now at least 11 million unemployed in Western Europe. All that Kohl and his fellow politicians can call for is an "expansionist" programme, with the Eastern European nations and the Russians being invited to join. It is as certain as the sunrise that the "unity" so stridently advocated by the Euro-crats will intensify social frictions. Kohl says that he fears that unless a dominant Germany is contained by Common Market rules, this could fuel nationalism among its neighbours. As C.H. Douglas said, a highly centralised Germany had been a curse to itself and the rest of Europe since the days of Bismark. Decentralisation is the only effective answer to the threat of centralised power. Any suggestion of decentralising Germany back into its original States was strongly resisted by those International Bankers whom British Prime Minister Lloyd George said had dominated peace negotiations after the First World War.

By spelling out clearly what he and fellow centralists want, including more power for the European Parliament, Kohl has provided more ammunition for the anti-Marketees, not only in the U.K., but also throughout European nations. The Kohl

address gives the impression that Kohl and those who support him are becoming a little desperate and fear that the centralist programme may be losing momentum.

ONE POLICY DIFFERENCE

It appears that there is at least one clear policy issue, which divides Labor and the Coalition. The Coalition has promised that the newsagent cartel will be preserved against the present national move towards greater competition in all fields. The Labor Party says there will be no exceptions to the Hilmer process. Originally the publishers backed the newsagents, but it appears that they are now shifting their position.

MULTICULTURALISM IN SRI LANKA

Australian cricketers who have played cricket in Sri Lanka have enjoyed their visits to that Asian country. But they are relieved that the World Cup game scheduled for February 17 has been cancelled by the Australian cricketing authorities. The recent bomb attack in the capital, Colombo, right in the heart of the city, with enormous damage and a big loss of life, dramatically demonstrates that the Tamil separatists have not been crushed. The Tamil Tigers, as they are known, have demonstrated that no part of Sri Lanka is safe from their destructive attacks. Multiculturalism has not been a shining success in Sri Lanka.

Should the cancelled Sri Lankan cricket cup matches be moved either to Pakistan or India, they will be played in two Asian nations where multiculturalism has resulted in violence and friction. But in spite of the worldwide evidence of the failure of multiculturalism, the ideologues, exploiting the genuine but unrealistic idealists, push forward with their attempted programme. Hopefully, young Australian cricketers are learning something from what has been happening in Sri Lanka.

THE LEAGUE'S BIG YEAR

Even in the midst of a hectic Federal election campaign, League planning for the commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the League during the 1996 National Weekend, is taking shape. The National Weekend starts with the Annual *New Times* Dinner on Friday October 4. Indications are that there will be strong international representation and from interstate. The organisers are at present reasonably confident that the Melbourne venue for the Dinner and Seminar will be adequate for the numbers attending. However, if the numbers exceed present assessments, adjustments will have to be made. This is why it is essential that the organisers have, as soon as possible, an indication of who wants to attend. In the near future a formal application form will be sent to all League supporters and those eligible to attend. Firm bookings with money will be required. The cheapest accommodation available in Melbourne at the time can also be arranged in advance.

"DON'T TALK ABOUT THE MONEY QUESTION (IF YOU WANT TO BE ELECTED)"

Cheryl Kernot, leader of the Democrats, has announced she'll block the sale of Telstra in the Senate. Most Australians, dismayed at the extent of foreign ownership, would endorse her position.

Many Australians also see the need for a massive repair job on ecological degradation. The Australian Conservation Society has asked the Liberals to break the 'conditionally' of selling Telstra to finance the green agenda.

No one, so far, has asked: "How come we can only pay for one improvement in Australia by selling something off?"

Imagine if Cheryl Kernot went the whole hog, with this sort of statement:

"Mr. Howard, I welcome wholeheartedly the idea of reforestation, soil and water regeneration and reduction in pollution. I agree it is going to cost a lot of money - in fact, we should be spending more than you have suggested, which is itself a big improvement on Mr. Keating's programme. But there is no way I'm going to agree that such a programme can only be undertaken by selling even more of Australia. There are ways this much-needed repair job could be financed without additional sell-offs, taxes, or borrowing. Although it is a hard and controversial issue, it must be tackled if Australia is to regain its freedom and integrity.

"I refer you, Mr. Howard, to the fact that during 1995 Australia's money-supply grew by about \$24 billion dollars - an increase that was factored into the nation's cost structure as an interest-bearing debt, with deteriorating social consequences.

"Instead of looking for alternatives to this destructive policy which, applied unquestioningly over many years by all governments, has resulted in a debt-ridden, cost-driven state of affairs, Australia has succumbed to the belief it can only stay afloat by selling an increasing number of assets, industries and land. This shortsighted policy, which must disinherit future Australians, has not even reduced the debt-structure.

"I refer you to the fact, Mr. Howard, that the Constitution specifically empowers the Commonwealth to exercise authority over banking and money-creation; and that Royal Commissions established to examine the parameters of this power have made it clear that this means the money-supply can be created interest-free, or even debt-free if required.

"If your government is prepared to grasp this nettle, discounting any vested-interest in the 'status quo' and apply required money-supply increases to cost and tax reductions, and to infrastructure repairs and maintenance, you could depend on the whole-hearted support of the Democrats in the Senate to pass the necessary legislation."

There is a carefully devised patter, wilfully followed by conformist politicians to distort or evade such a proposition. There is the usual claim that "resorting to the money-printing machine would be wildly inflationary."

When it is pointed out that money creation, borne out by Reserve Bank figures, is a daily occurrence, the next argument is that "this is the old 'funny-money' social credit idea which was tried and failed in Alberta." This has been used by people who didn't even know where Alberta is - or the fact there is not one iota of truth in the claim! Such mindless denial used to be merely irritating. Now it is increasingly evasive and destructive. It leads to a sort of George Orwell double-speak which leaves the listener breathless and baffled about the

motives of those to whom such lies come so readily. An obvious example is Prime Minister Paul Keating's irrational claim that the size of the huge Australian debt is in itself a sign of recovery!

So we are to endorse as L-A-W a global debt system, in which Australia has chosen to be an uncritical participant whatever the consequences, that pits nation against nation in an insane export war demanding of its citizens starvation in the name of efficiency, unemployment in the name of cost-cutting, destruction of proven industries and businesses in the name of economies-of-scale, and dispossession in the name of debt-repayment!

Consider, for instance, the latest from the Third World. A recent report from the Debt Crisis Network, a consortium of 40 British charities, churches and campaign groups working in developing countries, pointed out that more than half of all aid given to African countries goes straight back to banks in interest payments without helping the African people. The current debt-total for sub-Saharan countries is about \$A263 billion, more than double their combined exports.

Think about it! Exports from one African country to another in reality only shifts the burden from one part of the African continent to the next; it does not diminish it. Only exports to another continent can alleviate the African position; and even then debt-service comes before debt-reduction, which in turn comes before starving people are allowed to eat!

However, as the same conditions prevail on each continent and sub-continent no economies really want to help Africa by importing African goods because they need to export themselves to satisfy the money-merchants!

What about Australia, cited in September by the World Bank as "the richest country in the world"? Presumably, they were talking in natural rather than monetary terms; or did they, like our Prime Minister, measure "richest" by the size of the debt?

Add together Australia's foreign debt and the value of foreign equity in Australian companies, and you have a figure of approximately \$270 billion. That's about \$15,000 for each Australian, man woman and child. In 1995 we chalked up our biggest-ever current account deficit of \$24 billion - a mere \$1,600 additional debt for each Australian. There was jubilation when the January 1996 figures appeared at a modest \$1.6 billion -an increase of a paltry \$53 million a day, or \$2.2 million every hour. What a glorious sign of recovery!

About three-quarters of the deficit goes in interest and dividend repayments to foreigners. So we look around rather anxiously for something else to sell. Like Old Mother Hubbard, Australia's cupboard is increasingly bare. Most of our water and electricity facilities have been auctioned. Our airports are being sold, as well as the airlines, which use them. So it is time to start on our ports and harbours, the Port of Geelong first on the list.

Now can you see why John Howard wants to sell part of Telstra to repair environmental damage?

Cheryl Kernot has touched a sympathetic nerve in saying she'll halt the sale; she may not have the chance. Just as the Coalition supported the A.L.P. policy of 'privatisation', it is hardly likely that Labor will block the Liberals in the Senate when it comes to the pinch. But Cheryl Kernot would get a

much louder round of applause if she really bearded John Howard in his den, making Australian ownership and sovereignty a real issue, and the retrieval of Australian control over its own money-supply the way to realise it.

Australia would have a real election, rather than the foreign-owned 'Claytons' apology going on at the moment.

This is the only hope. If Labor, Coalition or anyone else who gets onto the government benches in Canberra persists in trying to run the nation with borrowed money, there is nothing ahead but disaster on disaster. The taxation system will have to extort ever more viciously. Companies will continue to crash, go overseas, or surrender to foreign, multinational ownership. The finale is the auction of Australia itself - advertised on foreign-made billboards.

There have been a few mild hints that the Democrats perceive foreign ownership to be a 'sleeper' in this election. They're right. But any attempt to focus on the issue without offering an alternative method of financing Australia out of its debt crisis will return to haunt the Democrats and betray Australia.

A BANNED MUGGERIDGE BOOK

Reviewing Richard Ingram's biography of Malcolm Muggeridge, Peter Coleman writes in *The Weekend Australian* of February 3-4:

"Muggeridge never forgot his ordeal in Moscow in the 1930s and his experiences of the horrors of the Ukrainian famine and the fatuities of the fellow-travellers. When I met him he was still distressed that of all his major books, the only one he could not get re-printed was *Winter in Moscow* (1934), the most famous of early exposures of 'The Evil Empire' from the Left, where he was then.

"The problem was that writing in pre-Holocaust times, he had placed what was later seen as an insensitive emphasis on Jewish involvement in the Ukrainian events. Even his friend Leonard Shapiro, who had admired the book, was unwilling to write a new preface for it. Muggeridge claimed he was only reporting facts, but for once the great communicator had missed the point. . . ."

It would be instructive to learn from Peter Coleman what point Muggeridge had missed. Re-writing, or suppressing history, to fit in with the Holocaust Myth, demonstrates that the Holocaust must be regarded as a new religion, calling for uncritical faith from its devotees.

Voting is NOT compulsory

The widespread view that voting is compulsory in Australia is not true. Those who wish to avoid the risk of being prosecuted must attend a polling booth. They can, if they choose, deliberately make their vote informal by, for example, writing on their voting form, "*None of the applicants seeking to be my paid servant are regarded as suitable.*" Radical Marxist activist Albert Langer is in trouble with the Electoral Commission because of his ingenious suggestion that electors register a valid vote by putting "1" against the candidate of their choice and then putting identical numbers in the other boxes. Optional preferential voting would meet the objections of those who do not want to allocate any preferences.

REACTIVITY? OR CREACTIVITY?

Doesn't it seem strange that, from the moment they leave school every young person is desperate to score a job, knowing there is a perpetual 'shortfall' between the number of jobs and the number of applicants? T.V. compere Liz Hayes, reflecting on her early years, recently advised ambitious young people to batter every door down and never take no for an answer.

But, if lucky or able enough to find this job in the musical chairs employment stakes, the majority then spends the rest of their lives reacting against their occupation! They hate what they are doing.

A recent Industry Week survey in America found sixty three percent of those surveyed without job satisfaction. Thirty three percent answered simply "*I hate what I do and I can't stop doing it.*"

"*When work is a pleasure,*" wrote Russian author Maxim Gorky, "*Life is a joy! When work is a duty, life is slavery.*"

Instead of "reactivity" against wage-slavery, we need a new word describing the release from such compulsion into self-chosen creativity.

There is a perverted recognition of the dilemma among the planners. The industry of the future according to many of the pundits is "the leisure industry." Why don't they call it the "leisure employment system"?

What on earth are we going to say when a job-satisfaction survey in a few years' time finds the majority in the "leisure industry" hates what they're doing? Or will we suppress those particular statistics so we can concentrate on the fact that we have "full employment"?

What we really need is a new word to describe the release from hated work to a self-chosen alternative. What about "Creative?" And how about an education system that teaches self-realisation on becoming a "creative person"?

The fear of considering this newfound possibility leads to some tragic incongruities. Surveys have shown that many mothers of young children would prefer to be at home while they are growing. But they cannot afford to. So our reactive planners build child-minding centres where mothers can deposit their children, so that they can spend their time doing things they would prefer not to do and sometimes hate!

The statistics boast, of course, "*We now have more women in the workforce than ever before.*"

The most "creative" occupation is raising children. Mothers are designed to do it better than anyone else. If they would prefer to do it, the compulsion to transfer it to the state is a form of cruelty no statistics can hide.

Let's introduce "creativity" instead.

Can we define it further? Creativity means the opportunity to discover what each individual is best equipped to spend his (or her) life doing with his (or her) God-given talents, and enabling him (or her) to do it. Education should help the discovery process. But the final choice for creativity belongs to the individual alone.

The mechanisms for this transformation depends on breaking the compulsion of job-dependency, replacing it with "occupation choice". It involves a total re-think about money and the provision of income. Those who have grasped the distinction between serving God or Mammon should apply their understanding to discover the changes needed to make "Creativity" a reality.

THE RETURN OF THE COMMUNISTS

Both in Russia and Eastern Europe Communists, now known as social Democrats, are gaining increasing electoral support. The explanation is very simple: The introduction of Western "capitalism" along with what is called the "free market economy", has not improved the conditions of the majority of the people. In a physical sense, many are worse off than they were under Communism. The minority who have benefited are seen by the majority as having benefited at their expense. There was little or no unemployment under Communism, with everyone working under direction. Although often helped with food exports from the West, basic food was available at subsidised prices. Life was dull and monotonous. Now there is large-scale unemployment and an escalating crime rate as desperate people try to sustain themselves.

The return of the Communists in Poland has dramatised what is happening. The defeat of Solidarity hero Lech Walesa at the hands of the Communists was a stinging reverse for the anti-communists. While real history is, as Douglas said, "crystallised politics", there sometimes emerges some unexpected person or unrehearsed event, which can help shift the course of events. This is certainly the case regarding billionaire Sir James Goldsmith, the man who escalated his fortune by defying the views of his fellow speculators before the 1987 stock market crash. Goldsmith was selling when everyone else was still buying. One of the few who heeded his views was Australian Kerry Packer, who greatly enhanced his own fortune by doing so.

Having made a huge fortune out of corporate raiding, Goldsmith suddenly started to emerge as some type of transformed figure. He started to challenge the gospel of growth and internationalism. He started to warn about the dangers of international free trade. He was elected to the European Parliament. With his Referendum Party he proposes to contest every seat at the next British Elections. He is insisting that the British people must be permitted by referendum to have a say on whether they wish to belong to the type of Europe the centralists are planning.

A Visit to Poland

Late last year Sir James Goldsmith visited Poland to warn

the Poles against what the Western economic rationalists were advocating. Goldsmith pointed out that it was folly to try to intensify and mechanise agriculture in order to move people from the country to the cities; unlike the period of the industrial revolution there was no shortage of labour in the cities and it was far preferable to have people stay in rural communities instead of flocking to the cities and creating more slums. Even if this meant slightly higher food prices, this was the best type of investment Poland could make. Polish agriculture is generally depicted as primitive and backward, but Polish peasants on their small farms produce, without artificial fertilisers, organic and nourishing vegetables. Villages are generally self-sufficient.

The Western experts are recommending intensive mechanisation of Polish farming, and the introduction of the type of artificial fertilisers used in Western countries. Goldsmith, the agnostic, found himself basically in agreement with the Roman Catholic Church in Poland, which has warned that entry into the European Union, was "no gateway to heaven". A study of what the remarkable billionaire advocates reveals him to be a decentralist. He is not against privatisation as such, but warns that it is not good if it leads to social instability, enriching the few at the expense of the many. The man who has been married a number of times, is a strong advocate of the economy supporting traditional families. More surprisingly, Goldsmith finds himself on common ground with the Polish Solidarity movement, which will fight to oppose a programme, which, while it has resulted in a rapidly expanding economy, produced a corrupt new wealthy class linked to former Communists who were dominating government. What is happening in Poland has been happening elsewhere. The Communists understand power, irrespective of what the label. Developments in former Communist nations are demonstrating how an amalgamation of power between the Marxists and Big Business, now international, is emerging.

There is no evidence that Sir James Goldsmith knows anything about Social Credit. But his emergence suggests that there is considerable truth in the old saying that God works in strange and mysterious ways. Goldsmith clearly has broken ranks with billionaires and their philosophy.

"BUT HE THAT IS GREATEST . . . "

by J.M. McNamara

John McNamara was one of the pioneers of Social Credit in Australia. The following article appeared in *The New Era* of March 31, 1958. It is an indication of the calibre of the Social Credit pioneers.

Social Power arises in the individual. When it is left free to expand itself it does so with a minimum degree of disturbance, and is directed by the individual towards the achievement of his personal satisfaction. But when it is gathered up and skilfully directed, social power can become the most disturbing force in the world. It is this force, which has its origin in the individual, which is now shattering the world before our eyes.

It has ever been the aim of ambitious men to gather social power into large aggregations, and to direct it towards the achievement of their own ambitions. Just as a tiny rill at the head of a watershed, when gathered together with others of its

kind, yields the constituents which form the mighty river, so does the individual yield the constituent power which cleaves continents, fractures the atom, explores the deepest space.

But before the rills can form the river, THEY MUST BE GATHERED TOGETHER. So must social power be gathered together before it can become the potent instrument for good or ill, which it is capable of becoming according to how it is accumulated.

There are two motives, which may serve to consolidate social power into a useable cohesive mass: -

- (a) the desire to "Exploit"
- (b) the desire to "Serve"

Desire for "service" is undoubtedly a desire only appearing among a people who have attained some maturity.

Consequently during the infancy of the race, of the two motives, there is only one operating, i.e., THE DESIRE TO EXPLOIT. '

Under the heavy hand of the "exploiter", mankind went to school, and learned by bitter experience the early lessons of social cohesion. Tyranny flourished. This school was necessarily a hard one, because the social cohesion learned at the hand of the "exploiter" was a social cohesion based on COMPULSION. Fundamentally there is only one emotion that can serve in relation to compulsion, i.e.: "FEAR".

There, therefore, arises in the mind a conception of the earlier social structures, as being built by exploiters, using for their purpose the emotion of "fear."

Now this social structure had this grave defect, i.e., it was apt to disintegrate at any time of crisis; for when society encountered some other "fear", greater than the "fear" induced by the exploiter, the centripetal force of social cohesion was overcome by the centrifugal force of the "fear" emanating from the crisis, and the social structure was shattered.

The social structure erected on compulsion, by the exploiter, using the emotion of fear, had another grave defect. To the degree that the individual was subordinated by fear, to that degree the flow from him of social force began to dry up. So that the successful exploiter who had placed himself at the apex of a pyramid of power-yielding units, found that these units became sterile, and that the power available for his direction receded in direct ratio as his exploitation advanced.

At last, after long and bitter experience, man learned with some degree of thoroughness, the elementary lessons to be learned at the hand of the exploiter; and he became qualified to be built into a higher form of social structure than that built on the basis of exploitation, i.e., a social structure based ON THE DESIRE TO SERVE.

The most serious attempts to build on this basis of "service" have been made by the Anglo-Saxon people; *"Ich Dien"*, i.e., *"I Serve"* is the motto of our Prince of Wales.

When the desire to "exploit" gives place to the desire to "serve", the social structure takes on an entirely different complexion.

The emotion of "fear", used for motives of "exploitation", gives place to an emotion akin to love, commonly called "loyalty", when the motive of social aggregation is SERVICE.

In such a social structure the individual flourishes, his initiative is stimulated, as a source of social power he is increased a thousand-fold.

Instead of being shattered in times of crisis, the social structure, whose WEB AND WOOF ARE SERVICE AND LOYALTY, finds its units drawn together in closer cohesion and the initiative of each individual stimulated to its utmost.

THIS IS THE SECRET OF THE GREAT COHESIVE STRENGTH OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE.

In times of crisis it is ever greater. In the person of the Sovereign, all loyal citizens and their point of cohesion and co-ordination. In him the people find a symbol of their own sovereignty.

The objection may be raised, "But surely we British people are not free from exploitation?" It must be admitted that we are

not free, but it may be urged that exploitation is not the web and woof of our social structure; it is something which has been grafted up it; it is parasitic, and has grown to its dangerous dimensions particularly since the year 1644.

All the great legal authorities, from Dicey onwards, agree that the greatest British Institution is the Office of Sovereign.

We hear a great deal of propaganda these days, under the title of Federal Union and other aliases, endeavouring to condition us to the idea of accepting some international authority to exercise a power superior to the power of Our Sovereign.

To accept such a power is to subordinate His Majesty the King. To subordinate His Majesty the King is to deny our own sovereignty; it is to tear to tatters our web and woof of service and loyalty; it is to destroy the finest social structure, which has yet been built. NO ONE CAN DO A GREATER DISSERVICE TO US THAN TO ASSAIL THE THRONE AND THE ROYAL HOUSE. Anyone who dares so to do, should be recognised for what he is - an implacable enemy of the British People. No matter who he is, he should be placed where he can do us no further harm.

And if our Ministers, our Servants of the Crown, are not false to their Oaths of Allegiance and loyalty to the person of His Majesty, we will not hear the air fouled and press soiled by policies, which imply the subordination of His Majesty the King, the Chief Corner-Stone upon which our British Empire is built.

Since service and loyalty are the web and woof of our social structure, what may we as individuals do to strengthen these? The Nazarene has answered this question in the injunction: -

"But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant. . . ." (St. Mathew, ch. 13, v.11).

This is surely a "mandate" that we are to honour and esteem those who give "service". This "mandate" may also surely be stated negatively, i.e. that we are to hold in contempt and to spurn the exploiter, and in every way to show our disapproval of him. To the extent that we tolerate or fawn on the exploiter, to that degree we are false to the "mandate" given us, to that extent we make of ourselves fertile seedbeds, stimulating the production of exploiters to that extent we indicate that we ourselves are potential exploiters.

If the exploiter were shunned as the enemy of our social structure, he and his kind would quickly disappear.

The injunction was not addressed to him "who aspired" to greatness; it was addressed to US, the common people. So long as we ourselves are potential exploiters, our social structure will be weakened by this parasitic growth. It is only us who can eliminate it, and the method by which this may be achieved is set out by the Nazarene.

There is no other method. Are we prepared to carry out this injunction and thus SUPPORT OUR SOCIAL STRUCTURE -BUILT ON "SERVICE AND LOYALTY"?

"Service" from those who would aspire to greatness, and a consequent "loyalty" to them and to Our Sovereign King.

"But he that is greatest among you shall be your servant."