

THE NEW TIMES

\$20 per annum.

Box 1052J, Melbourne.

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

VOL. 61, No. 12.

Registered Australia Post - Publication PP481667 100259

DECEMBER 1997.

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

THE HOPE OF THE WORLD

by Jeremy Lee

Christmas is with us once more. Millions round the world will attend carol services in churches and parks. People will sing traditional carols, some hundreds of years old, about the Babe born in a Bethlehem stable, heralded by choirs of angels.

Sadly, for the increasing number in Australia who have never heard about the coming of the Messiah; or have never hung a Christmas stocking at the end of their own bed, in their own room, in their own home within a loving family, the Christmas songs increasingly sound like advertisements. In every department store Christmas carols drone from loudspeakers to the din of cash registers. The commercial world measures Christmas not by its message, but by the volume of sales. The *Hallelujah Chorus* from Handel's *Messiah* has been used to sell a brand of coffee and as a logo for the ABC. Other sacred songs have been used, believe it or not, to promote plastic money-cards!

Once the "selling season" is over, and the last Christmas dinner plate washed up, every man and his dog (not to mention an increasing number of women) is directed back into the "real" world of wages, salaries, profits and prices; unless, of course, you've been 'down-sized' and have no job, in which case you have apparently lost any validity for living.

Yet Advent, the Nativity, Christ's ministry and the Easter story are the central point of human history and the hope of a desperate world at the end of the twentieth century.

Advent anticipated

The coming of a Messiah had been long anticipated, and was a central expectation among the tribes of Israel. From *Genesis* on, a series of remarkable prophecies concerning the nature, place and circumstances of the coming of a Deliverer are recorded. The town of His birthplace, the unusual circumstances of the Nativity, together with a singular accuracy about His subsequent ministry were all recorded in advance. Most startling of all was the warning, recorded more than once, that although this Messiah would fulfill exactly all the prophecies concerning His coming, He would not be believed and would "be despised and rejected of men."

Douglas Reed, in his *Controversy of Zion*, said:

"When Jesus was born the vibrant expectation that a

marvellous being was about to appear was general among the Judeans . . . The 'Targams', the rabbinical commentaries on the Law, said: "How beautiful he is, the Messiah king who shall arise from the house of Judah. He will gird up his loins and advance to do battle with his enemies and many kings shall be slain."

With such a misconception about the Good News that was to come, it is easy to see why the Gospel of Peace was subsequently rejected. As Reed added:

"The idea of a lowly Messiah who would say 'love your

OUR POLICY

To promote service to the Christian revelation of God, loyalty to the Australian Constitutional Monarchy, and maximum cooperation 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.

enemies' and 'be despised and rejected of men, a man of sorrows' was not present in the public mind at all and would have been 'despised and rejected', had any called attention to these words of Isaiah (which only gained significance after Jesus had lived and died)."

Nevertheless, the yearning for a Deliverer was there, expressed in the ancient Latin hymn VENI EMMANUEL, rendered later:

*"O come, O come, Emmanuel,
And ransom captive Israel,
That mourns in lonely exile here,
Until the Son of God appear. . ."*

The Nativity

The New Testament contains details of three visitations by emissaries (or angels) before and during the time of the Nativity. The first was to Zacharias, father of John the Baptist; the second to Mary, the mother of Christ; and the third to "shepherds abiding in the fields, keeping watch over their flocks by night.."

Each of these angelic announcements referred to the birth of a promised Deliverer who would release both individuals and nations from the captivity of evil, by the establishment of an alternate Kingdom in which there would be peace "on earth as it is in heaven". The frightened shepherds, indeed, heard "a multitude of the heavenly host praising God, and saying:

*Glory to God in the highest, and
on earth peace, good will toward men.'*

To Mary the angel forecast of her Son: '*... Of His Kingdom
there shall be no end. . .*'

Zacharias prophesied that his own son John would prepare the way for such a Deliverer, Whose coming had been foreseen by "His holy prophets which have been since the world began."

These events, told and retold countless times across the face of the earth since then, have inspired the words of, perhaps, the best known of all carols:

*'Hark! the herald-angels sing
Glory to the newborn King,
Peace on earth, and mercy mild,
God and sinner reconciled.
Joyful all ye nations rise,
Join the triumph of the skies . . .'*

The lost Gospel

Tragically, many who sing these words have lost sight of their implications. The idea of a Kingdom, with peace on earth, has been lost in the concentration on the gospel of salvation, which is only a part of the whole. The rebirth of the individual through faith in Christ is for many the whole extent of the Gospel. In consequence, it is often taken as an escape from responsibility for what is happening to the world. Thus, a world-changing association of believers with sufficient dynamic to change evil policies in the social order for enlightened ones is notable by its absence. Too often modern evangelists claim that social change is outside the scope of Christian activity - that this

world is doomed, and that only Christ's second coming will rectify the tragedy of world events.

How such a situation arose in view of Christ's instruction to "preach the gospel of the Kingdom unto all nations" is past any scope of such a short article. By any events, however, it must be admitted that the Christian Church has no influence over the outcome of insane, destructive policies pitting nations and economies against each other in this, the most devastating of all centuries.

In the worst case it has been taught that any anticipation of God's kingdom on earth is a heresy - even though Christ taught His disciples to pray for just such a thing. It is not hard to see, in consequence, how the Church 'has lost its savour' where it comes to the governance of men.

A legal transaction

The prelude to Christ's short ministry was the temptation in the wilderness. Included was the temptation of material power over "all the kingdoms of the world". It has been said that the Devil's claim that this was his to offer was a lie. But Christ never contested the claim, and the temptation would not

have been real if such power had not been Satan's to offer. His dominion was real enough, holding all those who lived therein captive. It was from this very captivity that deliverance had been sought for so long. It is easy to see how the Church establishment of Christ's time

CHRISTMAS GREETINGS

*We take this opportunity to extend Christmas
Greetings to all our readers and their families. The
Joy of Christmas can never be eliminated by the
forces of Darkness.*

imagined a deliverer with a sword who would smite, kill and avenge. The idea that a new kingdom would supplant an old one through grace, mercy and love would have been held to derision.

With such a temptation resisted and behind Him, Christ's first statement was that all things pertaining to the old order had been fulfilled.

(Mark 1:14, 15): "*Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of the Kingdom of God, and saying 'The time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye and believe the gospel'.*"

In fact, the imminent Kingdom had a mere three and a half years until its inauguration.

Forthwith, Christ handpicked His first disciples, and commenced an intense teaching period, interspersed with His public ministry of healing and deliverance. It seems clear that the twelve He chose had but the haziest idea of what He was talking about. Their heritage had become a melting-pot of contesting notions; that of the Sadducees, who rejected any belief in an afterlife; that of the Pharisees, whose overriding preoccupation was with the law and all its possible and improbable computations; and the pervading belief that the Messiah, if and when He came, would lead an avenging army to the sound of his trumpets.

Into this the Sermon on the Mount came like drought-breaking rain from a clear sky. It replaced the policy of revenge, which underscored much of the Old Testament, with the injunction to "love your enemies, and do good to them that hurt you". It taught purity, humility and the love of God, a Father who loved His children.

To simple folk dying of thirst, the drought-breaking rain was enough. To those steeped in the intellectual mores of their history it was immediately the subject of suspicion and the source of a previously unsuspected guilt. It had to be eradicated at all cost.

Teaching and Parables

The four Gospels record the intensity of Christ's teaching. He must have been conscious of the limited time for this task, and the immense difficulty of transposing a new and different form of thinking and behaviour over anything that had existed before. It was not until after His murder that His disciples grasped what He had been teaching them. He was far more than a prophet exhorting them back to the Law. He was the Innovator of an entirely new way of living.

Why, they asked Him, did He teach in parables? He immediately referred them to one of the most extraordinary and controversial passages in the Old Testament in the sixth chapter of Isaiah, in which, apparently, the prophet is ordered to deceive the people:

"Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and convert, and be healed. . . " (Isaiah 6:10).

Three times did Christ refer to this passage to explain why different steps were being taken against His work.

He used it to explain why He needed parables to convey concepts to which the people had been blinded by previous doctrines.

Each parable is devoted to a facet of Christ's promised Kingdom.

"I appoint unto you a kingdom, as My Father hath appointed Me..." (Luke 22:29).

"And Jesus went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing all manner of sickness, and all manner of disease among the people." (Matt. 4:23).

A matter of choice

It is often assumed that an approaching Kingdom, to be instituted by Christ at the Second Coming, will be imposed on humans. The assumption is close to that described by Douglas Reed at the time of Christ's birth, and expected by the establishment. But such a view conflicts with the very nature of Christ's advocacy and promise of freedom. The Kingdom He talked about started in the hearts of men and women. It was a voluntary allegiance, not imposed. There was only one matter to which Christ took violent objection - the misuse of money as a mechanism of theft and enslavement. The money-merchants received the whip, and their tables were scattered.

Christ did not describe the choice for individuals as between two kingdoms - His own and that of Satan. He knew that within a few months, with His own Ascension, one would have been replaced by the other.

The future choice was between materialism and spirituality. Each had a choice of hedonism in an earthly existence, or the preparation of aesthetic talents and the expansion of human personality in harmony and towards its Creator, Almighty God.

Never at any time did Christ present his listeners with the choice of two Kingdoms. Satan had been stricken and defeated.

The choice was between different masters:

"No man can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one and love the other; or else he will hold to the one and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon." (Matt. 6:24).

The future barrier to the Kingdom of God would be the expropriation by individuals or groups - whether from fear, hedonism or the will to power - of the abundance, which God intended to be shared by all.

It is significant that Christ's warning about mammon was immediately followed by His description of the abundance in the animal world; among the "birds of the air"; and the vegetable world, where the lilies of the field *"toil not, neither do they spin"*. In these arenas the will-to-power did not exist, any more than for those who sought the Kingdom of God.

A completed transaction

As Christ's earthly ministry drew to a close He was increasingly beset by the frantic efforts of those rejecting Him. It culminated in a rigged court, followed by the crucifixion.

His followers, terrified, confused and demoralised, scattered, only to reassemble when the most startling news was heard - that the crucified Christ had risen. Christ's first words on reappearing to the disciples were:

"All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations. . . ." A legal transaction had taken place. The kingdoms of the world, which had previously been under satanic dominion, had, in effect, seen their title deeds transferred to a new Authority -the unfolding Kingdom of God.

The implications of this are enormous. It eradicates the fatalism of a Church, which believes Christ Himself will inaugurate His Kingdom at some future date, when no other hope remains.

The Kingdom of God was inaugurated at the Ascension. It is an unending Kingdom, unfolding as the parable of the mustard-seed describes:

"It is like a grain of mustard-seed, which, when it is sown in the earth is less than all the seeds that be in the earth: But when it is sown, it groweth up, and becometh greater than all the herbs, and shooteth out great branches; so that the fowls of the air may lodge under the shadow of it."

A mystical body

Nor did Christ suggest that the transition from one Kingdom to another would be either instantaneous or peaceful, it would expand under the most fearful conditions. It would be opposed and persecuted, deceived and misrepresented.

He laid on those who had caught the vision and committed themselves to its fulfilment some enormous responsibilities. Their faith meant nothing if it was not evident in the extension of Christ's will. There was to be a mystical connection between all believers, which bound one to another, and all to the direction of Christ, *"In Whose service is perfect freedom."*

This association of believers constituted the Body of Christ. Each of those involved had a purpose. Despite many difficulties this Body would prevail over evil, expanding a Kingdom that would have no end, and which would be consummated by Christ Himself on His return.

Among the barriers to be overcome along the way, by far

the biggest historically has been the misuse and love of money. The enslavement of debt has pitted nation against nation, and divided all sectors of society against each other. The merchants of debt now control individual and nation alike. The system itself contains the seeds of its own destruction. That destruction is breaking around us. It is likely to produce complete anarchy and breakdown.

Such a moment was tailor-made for the Body of Christ, the Church, if it can muster sufficient faith and fortitude to show how even the money system itself could be used in the service of God, rather than an instrument of violent oppression.

The 1611 Authorised version of the Bible uses the following text for the prayer which Christ taught His disciples:

*"Our Father, which art in Heaven,
Hallowed by Thy Name.
Thy Kingdom come, Thy Will be done
On Earth as it is in Heaven.
Give us this day our daily bread,
And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors..
And lead us not into temptation, but deliver Us from evil.
For Thine is the Kingdom, and the power and the glory,
for ever. Amen.*

Every word of this remarkable, universal prayer needs our scrutiny, our contemplation and our commitment this Christmas.

FINE WORDS ARE NOT ENOUGH

A Response to "The Common Good"

by Anthony Cooney in "The Social Crediter" - May-June 1997.

Social Credit - The power of human beings in association to produce the result intended, measured in terms of human satisfaction:

The Common Good, a statement drawn up by a working party for the Catholic Bishops' Conference of England and Wales, has been adopted and endorsed. The document is now presented for discussion and responses. This response trusts the Bishops will address themselves to the absence in The Common Good of any consideration of the key role of the monetary system in our present discontents.

C.H. Douglas defined Social Credit as "The Policy of a Philosophy" and amplified this by saying that the Philosophy was Christianity, and Social Credit "Applied Christianity." In this regard the section Morality in the Market Place (paras. 76-80) presents fairly the theory of laissez-faire: namely, that where a demand exists, someone will work to supply it, so that if these two forces are allowed free interplay and competition, then all demands will be satisfied at the lowest possible (and therefore economically efficient) price.

The Common Good acknowledges, as Douglas pointed out, that no central plan can even know, let alone take account of, all the myriad day-to-day interactions of supply and demand, and the attempt to do so in socialist countries has been catastrophic in its results. Nevertheless a valid criticism of laissez-faire does exist, and the document puts its finger squarely upon it: namely that to regard the theory as "a God-given natural law, is a view which can amount to idolatry or a form of economic superstition."

A problem facing the critic of laissez-faire is that its theory is presented as "scientific" and disallows any refutation not couched in its own terms - "Do not," it commands at the outset of the debate, "bring into this matter questions of morality, religion or sentiment, for they have no more part in it than questions of beauty or ugliness." Ruskin demolished the "scientific pretensions" of "Your common Political Economist."¹

The Common Good makes a fair fist of its criticism by insisting, like Ruskin, that, on the contrary, the question of morality is primary and the "technical economic method" is not only secondary, but must be measured against the "world view" of Christianity. As Douglas put it, "Society is primarily metaphysical."

The next section, Option Against the Poor (paras. 81-98) gives no consideration to the monetary system. Is it not just possible, one must ask the authors, that the key to the operations of a monetary economy might be its monetary system Paragraph 84 for example argues that The search for profit must not be allowed to override all other moral considerations. For instance the creation and stimulation of markets by advertising . . ." Is it not possible that both are a necessity of a monetary system, which makes 'growth' mandatory? Paragraph 85 argues, "The idea that the individual is primarily to be considered as a consumer" is contrary to the Gospel; further (a pragmatic touch here) "It gravely disadvantages those who do not have wealth to spend." *Ah, but they do!* They have the common inheritance of wealth to spend. What they do not have is MONEY to spend. Whilst we agree that the individual is not merely a "consumer", that is not to say that the individual, in his function as consumer, should not be sovereign. Douglas once illustrated this point with a play on the word 'sovereign'. I paraphrase, since the passage is uncollected - "When a man went into a shop and proffered a sovereign to justify his demand for an article on the shelf, he issued a chain of orders. For him ships sailed, farmers farmed, carriers carried, machinists machined, all to replace the article on the shelf."

There is no need to assume, as the authors of The Common Good sometimes seem to assume, that this work is done miserably and grudgingly, simply because it is paid for by some fraction of the 'sovereign' which set in motion the chain of commands. Might not some at least of those who worked to fill the demand have taken moral pleasure in doing so because they were "governed by moral considerations, not least the demands of justice"? To deny this possibility seems to me to concede absolutely the laissez-faire case. Douglas ends his illustration however with this observation - "The defect of laissez-faire was that not enough people had a 'sovereign' to make their demand for goods and services effective."

It is clearly not beyond the remit of The Common Good to consider the possibility that the monetary system is working unjustly nor to ask if it might have some bearing upon the working of the production/consumption cycle. Is it claimed that whereas the Free Market System is not "God-given natural law" the monetary system is, and must not be questioned nor examined by impious minds?

Let us suppose that Douglas was right when he stated that production generates prices at a *faster rate* than it distributes income to meet those prices. ⁽²⁾ It will follow that some people (e.g. the unemployable) will have insufficient money to buy their needs and that, *although surrounded not merely by sufficiency, but by an abundance of goods*, they will sink into that "underclass" The Common Good rightly warns against and deplores. It will also follow that manufacturers will not recover their costs, unless they maintain 'growth' paid for by bank debt *and by unceasing effort to create an artificial demand for that growth*. It will also follow that that 'growth' will necessitate the stripping of our land (and many other lands) of grass and grain and covering it with steel and concrete. Finally it will follow that total indebtedness will always increase, not only in the home markets, but in the Third World to which the debt is transferred by means of export "drives."

It is not merely that the questions of money and credit, their origin and ownership, cannot be avoided but that they are equally and pressingly relevant to the problems of Third World destitution and environmental destruction. Yet The Common Good discusses The Global Common Good (paras. 102-105) with only one reference to the debt burden, and The Environmental Common Good (paras 106-108) without any reference to it at all.

No one can reasonably deny that the conditions described above are now extant, yet the section *The World of Work* (paras. 90-98) is weakened by the absence of any consideration of how a JUST WAGE may be paid if the monetary system does not in fact reflect the TRUE COST of production, namely all consumption during the same period. For example paragraphs 90-93 examine the nature of human work in terms, which call to mind Ruskin's observation that the reward of work is not in being paid, but in being chosen. Nevertheless all work of a kind must be paid at the same rate - the just rate - for only under that condition will the good worker be chosen - "*Friend, I do thee no wrong. Didst thou not agree with me for a penny? Take that thine is, and go thy way, I will give unto this last even as unto thee.*"

In *Economic Democracy* Douglas draws a comparison between the enthusiasm and energy, which may be put into a home and that which is put into "work". The reason for the dichotomy is that men are most usually obliged by economic necessity to do work they dislike. How then can men be set free to do the right work and paid a just wage? Paragraph 98 rightly says that State welfare is not a desirable substitute for the just wage. However, such an objection does not apply to a *Dividend*. Douglas has argued that a percentage of production is attributable to "The Cultural Heritage" - the legacy of knowledge from the past, and that this is common property. However no monetary equivalent of this wealth exists anywhere. If this percentage were "monetised" by the state, all individuals, as heirs, would be entitled to a share of it. In short, the work a man does entitles him to a wage; the work his forefathers have done entitles him also to a *Social dividend*, irrespective of whether he is industrious or idle, a good worker or a poor one. It needs something of a leap of faith to accept the idea of all families having a private income. Social Crediters have made that leap. Can the authors of The Common Good?

With the final sections Ownership and Property (paras. 109-112) and Crisis in the Social Dimension (paras. 113-120) no Social Crediter would disagree. Ownership and Property

welcomes the spread of ownership in capital assets rather than in land, workshops and homes, but again shows no sign of recognising that if the monetary system is flawed then ownership of capital assets is particularly precarious. Further, well-distributed property cannot long be maintained in a system of monetary creation as *debt*, which is responsible for the concentration of ownership in the first place. These weaknesses in this section arise directly from the failure to critically examine the monetary system in the first place.

However, much in these sections reads like Douglas. For example compare "*The economy exists for the human person, not the other way round*" with Douglas: "*Society exists for the individual, not the individual for society.*" Or contrast "*The British have always had a feeling for 'the common good' even if they have not expressed it in those terms. They are no longer sure that that principle can be relied upon. . . . The loss of confidence in the concept of the common good is one of the primary factors behind the national mood of pessimism.*" With Douglas: "*The root problem of civilisation - not the only problem, but that which has to be disposed of before any other - is the problem of the provision of bed, board and clothes, and this affects the ordinary man in terms of effort. If he has to work hard and long hours to obtain a precarious existence, then for him civilisation fails.*" (C.H. Douglas, "*The Control and Distribution of Production*")

Both passages are concerned with the loss of confidence (Credit) in Society - the negation of the Social Credit. The authors supply, as an appendix, some extracts from Papal encyclicals. For reasons not apparent (surely not fear) they quote only a truncated version of one of the most powerful condemnations of the money system, made by a Pope. The full quotation is:

"In the first place, then, it is patent that in our days not wealth alone is accumulated, but immense power and despotic economic domination are concentrated in the hands of a few, who for the most part are not the owners, but only trustees and

STUDIES IN WORDS

"Verbicide, the murder of a word, happens in many ways. Inflation is one of the commonest; those who taught us to say *awfully* for 'very', *tremendous* for 'great', *sadism* for 'cruelty', and *unthinkable* for 'undesirable' were verbicides. Another way to verbiage, by which I here mean the use of a word as a promise to pay which is never going to be kept The use of *significant* as if were an absolute, and with no intention of ever telling us what the thing is significant of, is an example. So is *diametrically* when it is used merely to put *opposite* into the superlative. Men often commit verbicide because they want to snatch a word as a party banner, to appropriate its 'selling quality'. Verbicide was committed when we exchanged *Whig* and *Tory* for *Liberal* and *Conservative*. But the greatest cause of verbicide is the fact that most people are obviously far more anxious to express their approval and disapproval of things than to describe them. Hence the tendency of words to become less descriptive and more evaluative, while still retaining some hint of the sort of goodness or badness implied; and to end up being purely evaluative - useless synonyms for *good* and *bad*....

"I am tempted to adapt the couplet we see in some parks - Let no one say, and say it to your shame, That there was meaning here before you came."

- C.S. Lewis, in the introduction to *Studies in Words*
(Cambridge University Press)

directors of invested funds, which they administer at their own good pleasure.

"This domination is most powerfully exercised by those who, because they hold and control money, also govern credit and determine its allotment, for that reason supplying, so to speak, the life-blood, and grasping in their hands, as it were the very soul of production, so that no one can breathe against their will." (*Quadragesima Anno*, paras. 105/106 C.T.S. London 1960).

Finally, a word on paragraphs 62-65, grouped under the heading *SPECIFIC ISSUES IN A GENERAL ELECTION*. The content is largely the conventional wisdom of the party system. The authors indeed seem to accept the party system, unlike *laissez-faire*, is part of a God-given natural order. It is this section to which most objection has been made, not least among Catholics active in the political field.

Two faults among a tangle of many: A party 'platform' is determined by a small caucus of policies acting as a package to be accepted in full, however unacceptable individual items therein might be to the individual. Thus good policies 'carry' bad, the latter often taking over in the end. Douglas is relevant

here - "Freedom is the ability to choose or refuse one thing at a time."

Secondly, in a General Election few seats may change hands. Even if representatives change, most MP's are NOT democratically elected by voters forced to select the choice of a caucus or pressure group. In such circumstances, only a candidate binding him/her self to find and pursue the policy of the constituency at large can be justified. Currently this would be "a single issue" candidate - one eminently necessary if the electorate rather than a party hierarchy is to win the election. As it stands, a few minds mould the mass and party loyalty is placed above conscience and constituency concerns. Seeking this single issue, *The Common Good* would thus have been more correctly named. We still await sighting of the Kingdom of God within.

Anthony Cooney.

Notes:

1. cf. *UNTO HIS LAST*: The Roots of Honour.
2. Douglas' major books are all relevant but attention is drawn to *RECONSTRUCTION*.

A.R. ORAGE'S LECTURE

Described by C.H. Douglas as the man "*who rose out of the ranks of the talented into those of the great literary genius*," A.R. Orage gave the following brilliant BBC address on Social Credit just before he died.

Broadcast in the BBC series "Poverty in Plenty" on 5th November 1934.

Originally published in *The New English Weekly*. Thursday, 15th November 1934. Vol . 6. No. 5.

Though most of you, I understand, are students of economics, I shall try to use only simple and everyday words.

For instance, instead of the abstract terms, Plenty and Poverty, I shall contrast Britain as Producer with Britain as Consumer, or Britain as Manufacturer and Shop keeper with Britain as Shopper.

Imagine a plate-glass window stretching from John O' Groats to Land's End; and, on the inside of it, all the goods that Britain makes, and, on the outside, the 40 or 50 millions of us still flattening our noses against the pane, just as we did when we were children.

As it costs us nothing, let us enter the shop and have a look round.

The first thing that strikes us is the staggering variety of the goods on sale. Nature is prolific in having created about half a million species of living creature; but the British genius has invented even more kinds of goods, and is still going on inventing. A collective sales-catalogue of all our shops would probably run to a million items. I happened to see that 200 different kinds of English apple were put on the market this year; and one London store - you may be glad to hear - stocks no fewer than 43 varieties of lip-stick.

If we ask the shop-keeper whether, and for how long, he can undertake to keep up the supply of three million varieties of Goods, he may show us, first, a line of warehouses all bulging with goods ready for the shop-window; and, behind the line of warehouses, a line of factories and workshops; and, behind those, quarries and mines and farms; and, behind these, laboratories and research schools; and finally, behind them all, the British people themselves, with their character, industry, genius and history. With these resources, our shopkeeper says,

he can undertake to keep up a practically unlimited supply for a practically unlimited future. And we can take his word for it.

As we stroll round the works, we notice how relatively few work-people there are about. This relative, and, as we know, progressive depopulation of industry is due, of course, to applied Science. Applied Science seems to have made it its mission in life to lift the curse laid on Adam and to transfer work from the backs of Men to the broader backs of Nature's other forces - steam, electricity and ultimately, perhaps, to atomic energy. For an ever-increasing output of Goods - both in variety and in quantity - the brains of the Few are dispensing more and more with the brawn of the Many.

Before leaving the premises we must remark one very important detail. All the Goods on Sale bear a price-label. And it appears that two processes of manufacture are carried on in Britain's workshop simultaneously. One is a visible stream of real Goods, and the other is an almost invisible stream of figures in the form of Prices. These two streams, though independent, flow side by side, and, in the shop-window, they unite as real Goods with their Price-labels on.

As a matter of curiosity, let us ask the shopkeeper what is his estimate of the collective Price-value of all the Goods in the window.

Without vouching for the exact figure, he says he reckons their collective value at not less than £500 million. And he adds that the collective Price-values created in a fair year of Production might be as much as £10,000 million; and that, working to capacity, it might be double that in a single year.

Feeling both terribly rich and terribly poor, let us now leave the shop of Plenty, and join the rest of the 40 or 50 million would-be shoppers outside.

What a change of scene! In contrast with the Productive system we have just left, where all is cooperation, reason and applied Science, we find a struggling mob in place of a disciplined army of technicians. Everybody seems to be fighting everybody else; and most of us seem to be getting the worst of it.

What is the trouble about?

Let us not be self-deceived, you and I know very well, It's about Money. If 98 per cent of the legal crime of Britain is admittedly due to Money, we may safely assume that a very large proportion of the crime of which the law takes no notice is due to the same cause.

Now what is this Money we are all quarrelling about? If you will stick to your own experience you will realise that Money is only a ticket authorising you to go shopping in the emporium we have just left. The only difference between, say, a railway-ticket and a Money-ticket is that a railway ticket is good only for transport, while a Money-ticket is universal and good for anything in the whole shop, up to its stated value in Prices.

And the reason, why Money is important, and, so to say, worth quarrelling about, is that Money-tickets are just as indispensable to our shopping as our shopping is indispensable to our lives. The Aladdin's Cave we have just left will open to other password. Money is the accepted and legal tender to life today in modern society.

What air was to the unhappy people shut up in the Black Hole of Calcutta money-tickets are to the 40 or 50 million of us shut up in the present financial system.

Now where do these indispensable Money-tickets come from? And how do we get hold of them? And why are there just so many of them about, sometimes more and sometimes less?

You will remember that in the shop we visited we found two streams in flow, a stream of real Goods and a parallel stream of Price-figures.

We have now to add a third and last stream; a stream of Money-tickets. And we can now say that just as all the real Goods and Price-values come out of the Productive system, so all the Money-tickets with which to buy the Goods come out of the Productive system also. And they come to the shopping public in one of three forms: Wages, Salaries and Dividends; the sum of which forms the Monetary Income of the nation. This Money-Income of the nation, derived from the Productive system for services rendered, is the only shopping fund the nation, as shopper possesses. It is all the Money-tickets the nation receives with which to buy the Price-values the nation has created. These shopping-tickets are more when the works are busy, and less when the works are slack; but less when the works are slack; but their number is always regulated by the activity of the

Productive system.

How these Money-tickets that come out of the Productive system get into the Productive system is a simple matter. They are put in, in the form of loans, by private Money-ticket factories called Banks, which have an exclusive monopoly of Money-ticket manufacture. We must surely have noticed in our tour of Britain's work-yard a number of elegant buildings to which some producers were always running to borrow tickets and others were running to return them. They are the Banks, where the Money-tickets come from, and to which they return.

Our immediate interest, however, is to compare the number of Money-tickets, *not* that are poured into industry, but that trickle to the shopping nation *out* of industry, with the Price-values created in the shop in the same period.

Obviously if the Money-tickets issued to shopping Britain were the exact equivalent of the Price-values created by shop-keeping Britain, the collective Monetary Income of the nation would be able to buy the collective Price-value of the Goods produced. We might dispute about the distribution of the tickets, but collectively, at least, there would be enough of them to buy our total Production.

The problem of equating the nation's means of Consumption with the nation's means of Production would be solved if every addition to Price-value resulted in an equal addition to Income.

But what we find, in fact, is that the Monetary Income of the nation, derived from the Productive system in the form of Wages, etc., is *not* equivalent to the Price-values created in the same period. The two streams of Prices and Income do *not* move at the same rate and volume. The stream of Price-values to the shop-window moves much faster than the stream of Money-Tickets to the shopping public, with the result that the annual collective shopping tickets of the nation, called its Income, are insufficient to meet the collective annual Price-values created in its shop.

Now this is a matter of fact and not of theory; and it can be proved by simple arithmetic. Our shopkeeper, for instance, has told us that, at a rough estimate, our annual output of Price-values is £10,000 million and probably more. And our taxing officials tell us, more accurately, that our annual Monetary Income is about £2,500 millions. As 4 is to 1, so is our output of Price-values to the Money-tickets with which to meet them. The nation's means of Consumption measured in Money-tickets, in short, is at least no more than a quarter of its means of Production measured in Prices.

Here, I believe, in this gap between Income and Prices, is the root-cause of our present difficulties. On the two provable

COLLECTIVISM

"If we then describe the deadly danger which threatens our whole Western civilisation as Collectivism we do not doubt that we shall be fully understood by everyone. We are surely within our rights in speaking of Collectivism as the fundamental and mortal danger of the West and in describing it as nothing less than political and economic tyranny, regimentation, centralisation, the despotic organisation of every department of life, the destruction of personality, totalitarianism and the rigid mechanisation of human society. And we do not doubt that we can count upon general agreement when we say that this resulting insect State would not only destroy most institutions and values which comprise a development of three thousand years and which, with a conscious pride, we designate Occidental civilisation. It would not only rob society of that organic structure, and internal support which gives it its stability, but above all it would take from the life of the individual just that essential purpose which only freedom can bestow; and with the loss of individual liberty every vestige of intrinsic worth and dignity would perish from the earth. In speaking thus we are expressing convictions which comprise the very core of Christian thought and which must perish with it."

- Wilhelm Ropke in *Civitas Humana* (William Hodge & Co Ltd.)

assumptions: (a) that the Money-tickets distributed as Income to shoppers are our only title to go shopping - that is, to live; and (b) that the total number of tickets distributed among us is only enough to meet a quarter of the Price-values of the Goods in our shop - we can easily understand why we have to fight each other for tickets; why everybody looks for employment in the factory or, alternatively, for somebody to give tickets to him; why there are always more Goods than Buyers; and finally, why no Socialist scheme for taxing the rich, no "Communist" or Fascist scheme for administering the workshop and no amount of Planning of Production can be of the least use so long as this Gap between Prices and Incomes remains.

And when we add that this gap is constantly widening with the progressive relative depopulation of the Productive system you will realise that our progress is towards the absurdity of a Maximum of Production and a Minimum of Consumption. Only, long before then, something will happen; something will break, as, in fact, it is breaking all around us.

Now while the fact of the Gap is the important thing, the explanation of the gap offered by C.H. Douglas appears to me to be convincing. He says that much of the money put into the Productive system as bank-loans never, in fact, gets out as Income during the same period in which it is put in. It is used simply to transfer capital Goods from one factory to another, and thus while it adds to the Price-stream, it does not add to the income of us shoppers.

If you ask, quite naturally, how in that case the Goods are ever sold at all, the answer is that there are more ways of killing a cat than choking it with butter. The Gap can be artificially bridged even if it is not actually closed.

For instance, Goods can be wilfully destroyed. Or they can be practically given away under the compulsion of bankruptcy. Or they can be disposed of in return for acknowledgment of debt, that is to say, by mortgaging our future Income of Money-tickets. Incidentally, every single one of us is in debt at this moment to the tune of about £500 apiece. But the most effective means of all is to distribute shopping-tickets on account of the production of Goods that never get into the shop-window at all, by Exports on Credit, by Capital Construction, and by Public Works such as roads - all of which provide incomes without simultaneously adding to the Goods on Sale. By receiving Wages, in short, for the production of Goods we can't buy, we acquire the tickets with which to buy the Goods that can be bought.

But whatever the explanation, the fact of the ever-widening gap remains; and the vitally important question is what are we to do about it?

Without discussing, merely to dismiss them, proposals that are either irrelevant to the real problem, or would only make it worse, it ought to be clear that our aim must be to close the gap between total Prices and total Incomes. And this can be effected only by either reducing Prices or raising Incomes till they are equivalent.

But this clearly necessitates a change of policy in regard to our whole Price and Money system. It involves the restoration to the community of control over its whole Money-ticket system. And it involves the institution of what we may call a National Credit Account, in which the Price-values created in the shop and the Money-tickets distributed for shopping would be kept constantly balanced.

The institution and keeping of such a National Credit Account would not necessarily require the nationalisation of the administration of the present Banks. On the contrary, it is only their policy we need to put under national control. The present Banks could just as efficiently carry out a National policy as they now carry out a private policy.

Then we have to find another means than direct Employment for the distribution of money-tickets to the nation as shoppers. Employment for everybody is increasingly impossible in a Productive system that is becoming increasingly technical; and, again, since Employment automatically increases Price-values faster than it increases Incomes, Employment widens rather than narrows the gap.

Social Crediters believe that as the Wage-system becomes obsolescent, thanks to the progressive depopulation of Industry, Dividends should gradually take the place of wages; so that as the Machine displaces Men, the wage-income previously paid to the displaced men, continues to be paid to them by the Machine that has displaced them. If the Machine does the work of 100 men, its production is obviously enough to pay 100 men's wages. The Dividend is the logical successor of the Wage.

Lastly, we need a scientific Pricing-system that shall automatically, so to say, ensure the fall of prices with the rise in Production, and, conversely, the rise of Prices with the fall of Production. At present, retail prices come to us laden with the charges for the depreciation of capital plant, but never offset and compensated by the appreciation of capital plant that has also taken place. Retail prices, credited with the difference between Total Appreciation and Total Depreciation, would, we believe, give us the scientifically Just Price.

I need not say that I do not expect you to accept these suggestions all at once. You will find them explained in books by C.H. Douglas.

But in conclusion, and by way of giving zest to your studies, I would only remind you of this historic date, and warn you that in the gap disclosed between Price-values and Income is enough gunpowder to blow up every democratic parliament.

WILL THE LEAGUE BE READY?

Events, both national and international, are sweeping ahead at an ever-increasing tempo. Regular readers of this journal should not be surprised. 1998 will be one of the most decisive years in Australian history. The most important event will be a Federal election at which, hopefully, the dominance of the major political parties can be fragmented. There will be a vitally important Queensland State election. And the Republican issue will be moving towards a climax. The influence of the League of Rights will be decisive over a wide battlefield

But will the League be fully equipped to influence the course of events? Only if the League's annual Basic Fund is filled. As we break for the Christmas recess the Fund has moved past the halfway mark of the objective of \$65,000. Unless the target is reached the League will have to seriously re-assess its strategy. We confidently look forward to a flood of support after the Christmas break. Please do not destroy our confidence. All contributions to Box 1052J, Melbourne, 3001.

THE NEW TIMES

\$20 per annum.

Box 1052J, Melbourne.

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

VOL. 61, No. 12.

Registered Australia Post - Publication PP481667 100259

DECEMBER 1997.

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

THE HOPE OF THE WORLD

by Jeremy Lee

Christmas is with us once more. Millions round the world will attend carol services in churches and parks. People will sing traditional carols, some hundreds of years old, about the Babe born in a Bethlehem stable, heralded by choirs of angels.

Sadly, for the increasing number in Australia who have never heard about the coming of the Messiah; or have never hung a Christmas stocking at the end of their own bed, in their own room, in their own home within a loving family, the Christmas songs increasingly sound like advertisements. In every department store Christmas carols drone from loudspeakers to the din of cash registers. The commercial world measures Christmas not by its message, but by the volume of sales. The *Hallelujah Chorus* from Handel's *Messiah* has been used to sell a brand of coffee and as a logo for the ABC. Other sacred songs have been used, believe it or not, to promote plastic money-cards!

Once the "selling season" is over, and the last Christmas dinner plate washed up, every man and his dog (not to mention an increasing number of women) is directed back into the "real" world of wages, salaries, profits and prices; unless, of course, you've been 'down-sized' and have no job, in which case you have apparently lost any validity for living.

Yet Advent, the Nativity, Christ's ministry and the Easter story are the central point of human history and the hope of a desperate world at the end of the twentieth century.

Advent anticipated

The coming of a Messiah had been long anticipated, and was a central expectation among the tribes of Israel. From *Genesis* on, a series of remarkable prophecies concerning the nature, place and circumstances of the coming of a Deliverer are recorded. The town of His birthplace, the unusual circumstances of the Nativity, together with a singular accuracy about His subsequent ministry were all recorded in advance. Most startling of all was the warning, recorded more than once, that although this Messiah would fulfill exactly all the prophecies concerning His coming, He would not be believed and would "be despised and rejected of men."

Douglas Reed, in his *Controversy of Zion*, said:

"When Jesus was born the vibrant expectation that a

marvellous being was about to appear was general among the Judeans . . . The 'Targams', the rabbinical commentaries on the Law, said: "How beautiful he is, the Messiah king who shall arise from the house of Judah. He will gird up his loins and advance to do battle with his enemies and many kings shall be slain."

With such a misconception about the Good News that was to come, it is easy to see why the Gospel of Peace was subsequently rejected. As Reed added:

"The idea of a lowly Messiah who would say 'love your

OUR POLICY

To promote service to the Christian revelation of God, loyalty to the Australian Constitutional Monarchy, and maximum cooperation 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.

enemies' and 'be despised and rejected of men, a man of sorrows' was not present in the public mind at all and would have been 'despised and rejected', had any called attention to these words of Isaiah (which only gained significance after Jesus had lived and died)."

Nevertheless, the yearning for a Deliverer was there, expressed in the ancient Latin hymn VENI EMMANUEL, rendered later:

*"O come, O come, Emmanuel,
And ransom captive Israel,
That mourns in lonely exile here,
Until the Son of God appear. . ."*

The Nativity

The New Testament contains details of three visitations by emissaries (or angels) before and during the time of the Nativity. The first was to Zacharias, father of John the Baptist; the second to Mary, the mother of Christ; and the third to "shepherds abiding in the fields, keeping watch over their flocks by night.."

Each of these angelic announcements referred to the birth of a promised Deliverer who would release both individuals and nations from the captivity of evil, by the establishment of an alternate Kingdom in which there would be peace "on earth as it is in heaven". The frightened shepherds, indeed, heard "a multitude of the heavenly host praising God, and saying:

*Glory to God in the highest, and
on earth peace, good will toward men.'*

To Mary the angel forecast of her Son: '*... Of His Kingdom there shall be no end. . .*'

Zacharias prophesied that his own son John would prepare the way for such a Deliverer, Whose coming had been foreseen by "His holy prophets which have been since the world began."

These events, told and retold countless times across the face of the earth since then, have inspired the words of, perhaps, the best known of all carols:

*'Hark! the herald-angels sing
Glory to the newborn King,
Peace on earth, and mercy mild,
God and sinner reconciled.
Joyful all ye nations rise,
Join the triumph of the skies . . .'*

The lost Gospel

Tragically, many who sing these words have lost sight of their implications. The idea of a Kingdom, with peace on earth, has been lost in the concentration on the gospel of salvation, which is only a part of the whole. The rebirth of the individual through faith in Christ is for many the whole extent of the Gospel. In consequence, it is often taken as an escape from responsibility for what is happening to the world. Thus, a world-changing association of believers with sufficient dynamic to change evil policies in the social order for enlightened ones is notable by its absence. Too often modern evangelists claim that social change is outside the scope of Christian activity - that this

world is doomed, and that only Christ's second coming will rectify the tragedy of world events.

How such a situation arose in view of Christ's instruction to "preach the gospel of the Kingdom unto all nations" is past any scope of such a short article. By any events, however, it must be admitted that the Christian Church has no influence over the outcome of insane, destructive policies pitting nations and economies against each other in this, the most devastating of all centuries.

In the worst case it has been taught that any anticipation of God's kingdom on earth is a heresy - even though Christ taught His disciples to pray for just such a thing. It is not hard to see, in consequence, how the Church 'has lost its savour' where it comes to the governance of men.

A legal transaction

The prelude to Christ's short ministry was the temptation in the wilderness. Included was the temptation of material power over "all the kingdoms of the world". It has been said that the Devil's claim that this was his to offer was a lie. But Christ never contested the claim, and the temptation would not

have been real if such power had not been Satan's to offer. His dominion was real enough, holding all those who lived therein captive. It was from this very captivity that deliverance had been sought for so long. It is easy to see how the Church establishment of Christ's time

imagined a deliverer with a sword who would smite, kill and avenge. The idea that a new kingdom would supplant an old one through grace, mercy and love would have been held to derision.

With such a temptation resisted and behind Him, Christ's first statement was that all things pertaining to the old order had been fulfilled.

(Mark 1:14, 15): "*Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of the Kingdom of God, and saying 'The time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye and believe the gospel'.*"

In fact, the imminent Kingdom had a mere three and a half years until its inauguration.

Forthwith, Christ handpicked His first disciples, and commenced an intense teaching period, interspersed with His public ministry of healing and deliverance. It seems clear that the twelve He chose had but the haziest idea of what He was talking about. Their heritage had become a melting-pot of contesting notions; that of the Sadducees, who rejected any belief in an afterlife; that of the Pharisees, whose overriding preoccupation was with the law and all its possible and improbable computations; and the pervading belief that the Messiah, if and when He came, would lead an avenging army to the sound of his trumpets.

Into this the Sermon on the Mount came like drought-breaking rain from a clear sky. It replaced the policy of revenge, which underscored much of the Old Testament, with the injunction to "love your enemies, and do good to them that hurt you". It taught purity, humility and the love of God, a Father who loved His children.

CHRISTMAS GREETINGS

We take this opportunity to extend Christmas Greetings to all our readers and their families. The Joy of Christmas can never be eliminated by the forces of Darkness.

To simple folk dying of thirst, the drought-breaking rain was enough. To those steeped in the intellectual mores of their history it was immediately the subject of suspicion and the source of a previously unsuspected guilt. It had to be eradicated at all cost.

Teaching and Parables

The four Gospels record the intensity of Christ's teaching. He must have been conscious of the limited time for this task, and the immense difficulty of transposing a new and different form of thinking and behaviour over anything that had existed before. It was not until after His murder that His disciples grasped what He had been teaching them. He was far more than a prophet exhorting them back to the Law. He was the Innovator of an entirely new way of living.

Why, they asked Him, did He teach in parables? He immediately referred them to one of the most extraordinary and controversial passages in the Old Testament in the sixth chapter of Isaiah, in which, apparently, the prophet is ordered to deceive the people:

"Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and convert, and be healed. . . " (Isaiah 6:10).

Three times did Christ refer to this passage to explain why different steps were being taken against His work.

He used it to explain why He needed parables to convey concepts to which the people had been blinded by previous doctrines.

Each parable is devoted to a facet of Christ's promised Kingdom.

"I appoint unto you a kingdom, as My Father hath appointed Me..." (Luke 22:29).

"And Jesus went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing all manner of sickness, and all manner of disease among the people." (Matt. 4:23).

A matter of choice

It is often assumed that an approaching Kingdom, to be instituted by Christ at the Second Coming, will be imposed on humans. The assumption is close to that described by Douglas Reed at the time of Christ's birth, and expected by the establishment. But such a view conflicts with the very nature of Christ's advocacy and promise of freedom. The Kingdom He talked about started in the hearts of men and women. It was a voluntary allegiance, not imposed. There was only one matter to which Christ took violent objection - the misuse of money as a mechanism of theft and enslavement. The money-merchants received the whip, and their tables were scattered.

Christ did not describe the choice for individuals as between two kingdoms - His own and that of Satan. He knew that within a few months, with His own Ascension, one would have been replaced by the other.

The future choice was between materialism and spirituality. Each had a choice of hedonism in an earthly existence, or the preparation of aesthetic talents and the expansion of human personality in harmony and towards its Creator, Almighty God.

Never at any time did Christ present his listeners with the choice of two Kingdoms. Satan had been stricken and defeated.

The choice was between different masters:

"No man can serve two masters; for either he will hate the one and love the other; or else he will hold to the one and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon." (Matt. 6:24).

The future barrier to the Kingdom of God would be the expropriation by individuals or groups - whether from fear, hedonism or the will to power - of the abundance, which God intended to be shared by all.

It is significant that Christ's warning about mammon was immediately followed by His description of the abundance in the animal world; among the "birds of the air"; and the vegetable world, where the lilies of the field *"toil not, neither do they spin"*. In these arenas the will-to-power did not exist, any more than for those who sought the Kingdom of God.

A completed transaction

As Christ's earthly ministry drew to a close He was increasingly beset by the frantic efforts of those rejecting Him. It culminated in a rigged court, followed by the crucifixion.

His followers, terrified, confused and demoralised, scattered, only to reassemble when the most startling news was heard - that the crucified Christ had risen. Christ's first words on reappearing to the disciples were:

"All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and teach all nations. . . ." A legal transaction had taken place. The kingdoms of the world, which had previously been under satanic dominion, had, in effect, seen their title deeds transferred to a new Authority -the unfolding Kingdom of God.

The implications of this are enormous. It eradicates the fatalism of a Church, which believes Christ Himself will inaugurate His Kingdom at some future date, when no other hope remains.

The Kingdom of God was inaugurated at the Ascension. It is an unending Kingdom, unfolding as the parable of the mustard-seed describes:

"It is like a grain of mustard-seed, which, when it is sown in the earth is less than all the seeds that be in the earth: But when it is sown, it groweth up, and becometh greater than all the herbs, and shooteth out great branches; so that the fowls of the air may lodge under the shadow of it."

A mystical body

Nor did Christ suggest that the transition from one Kingdom to another would be either instantaneous or peaceful, it would expand under the most fearful conditions. It would be opposed and persecuted, deceived and misrepresented.

He laid on those who had caught the vision and committed themselves to its fulfilment some enormous responsibilities. Their faith meant nothing if it was not evident in the extension of Christ's will. There was to be a mystical connection between all believers, which bound one to another, and all to the direction of Christ, *"In Whose service is perfect freedom."*

This association of believers constituted the Body of Christ. Each of those involved had a purpose. Despite many difficulties this Body would prevail over evil, expanding a Kingdom that would have no end, and which would be consummated by Christ Himself on His return.

Among the barriers to be overcome along the way, by far

the biggest historically has been the misuse and love of money. The enslavement of debt has pitted nation against nation, and divided all sectors of society against each other. The merchants of debt now control individual and nation alike. The system itself contains the seeds of its own destruction. That destruction is breaking around us. It is likely to produce complete anarchy and breakdown.

Such a moment was tailor-made for the Body of Christ, the Church, if it can muster sufficient faith and fortitude to show how even the money system itself could be used in the service of God, rather than an instrument of violent oppression.

The 1611 Authorised version of the Bible uses the following text for the prayer which Christ taught His disciples:

*"Our Father, which art in Heaven,
Hallowed by Thy Name.
Thy Kingdom come, Thy Will be done
On Earth as it is in Heaven.
Give us this day our daily bread,
And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors..
And lead us not into temptation, but deliver Us from evil.
For Thine is the Kingdom, and the power and the glory,
for ever. Amen.*

Every word of this remarkable, universal prayer needs our scrutiny, our contemplation and our commitment this Christmas.

FINE WORDS ARE NOT ENOUGH

A Response to "The Common Good"

by Anthony Cooney in "The Social Crediter" - May-June 1997.

Social Credit - The power of human beings in association to produce the result intended, measured in terms of human satisfaction:

The Common Good, a statement drawn up by a working party for the Catholic Bishops' Conference of England and Wales, has been adopted and endorsed. The document is now presented for discussion and responses. This response trusts the Bishops will address themselves to the absence in The Common Good of any consideration of the key role of the monetary system in our present discontents.

C.H. Douglas defined Social Credit as "The Policy of a Philosophy" and amplified this by saying that the Philosophy was Christianity, and Social Credit "Applied Christianity." In this regard the section Morality in the Market Place (paras. 76-80) presents fairly the theory of laissez-faire: namely, that where a demand exists, someone will work to supply it, so that if these two forces are allowed free interplay and competition, then all demands will be satisfied at the lowest possible (and therefore economically efficient) price.

The Common Good acknowledges, as Douglas pointed out, that no central plan can even know, let alone take account of, all the myriad day-to-day interactions of supply and demand, and the attempt to do so in socialist countries has been catastrophic in its results. Nevertheless a valid criticism of laissez-faire does exist, and the document puts its finger squarely upon it: namely that to regard the theory as "a God-given natural law, is a view which can amount to idolatry or a form of economic superstition."

A problem facing the critic of laissez-faire is that its theory is presented as "scientific" and disallows any refutation not couched in its own terms - "Do not," it commands at the outset of the debate, "bring into this matter questions of morality, religion or sentiment, for they have no more part in it than questions of beauty or ugliness." Ruskin demolished the "scientific pretensions" of "Your common Political Economist."¹

The Common Good makes a fair fist of its criticism by insisting, like Ruskin, that, on the contrary, the question of morality is primary and the "technical economic method" is not only secondary, but must be measured against the "world view" of Christianity. As Douglas put it, "Society is primarily metaphysical."

The next section, Option Against the Poor (paras. 81-98) gives no consideration to the monetary system. Is it not just possible, one must ask the authors, that the key to the operations of a monetary economy might be its monetary system Paragraph 84 for example argues that The search for profit must not be allowed to override all other moral considerations. For instance the creation and stimulation of markets by advertising . . ." Is it not possible that both are a necessity of a monetary system, which makes 'growth' mandatory? Paragraph 85 argues, "The idea that the individual is primarily to be considered as a consumer" is contrary to the Gospel; further (a pragmatic touch here) "It gravely disadvantages those who do not have wealth to spend." *Ah, but they do!* They have the common inheritance of wealth to spend. What they do not have is MONEY to spend. Whilst we agree that the individual is not merely a "consumer", that is not to say that the individual, in his function as consumer, should not be sovereign. Douglas once illustrated this point with a play on the word 'sovereign'. I paraphrase, since the passage is uncollected - "When a man went into a shop and proffered a sovereign to justify his demand for an article on the shelf, he issued a chain of orders. For him ships sailed, farmers farmed, carriers carried, machinists machined, all to replace the article on the shelf."

There is no need to assume, as the authors of The Common Good sometimes seem to assume, that this work is done miserably and grudgingly, simply because it is paid for by some fraction of the 'sovereign' which set in motion the chain of commands. Might not some at least of those who worked to fill the demand have taken moral pleasure in doing so because they were "governed by moral considerations, not least the demands of justice"? To deny this possibility seems to me to concede absolutely the laissez-faire case. Douglas ends his illustration however with this observation - "The defect of laissez-faire was that not enough people had a 'sovereign' to make their demand for goods and services effective."

It is clearly not beyond the remit of The Common Good to consider the possibility that the monetary system is working unjustly nor to ask if it might have some bearing upon the working of the production/consumption cycle. Is it claimed that whereas the Free Market System is not "God-given natural law" the monetary system is, and must not be questioned nor examined by impious minds?

Let us suppose that Douglas was right when he stated that production generates prices at a *faster rate* than it distributes income to meet those prices. ⁽²⁾ It will follow that some people (e.g. the unemployable) will have insufficient money to buy their needs and that, *although surrounded not merely by sufficiency, but by an abundance of goods*, they will sink into that "underclass" The Common Good rightly warns against and deplores. It will also follow that manufacturers will not recover their costs, unless they maintain 'growth' paid for by bank debt *and by unceasing effort to create an artificial demand for that growth*. It will also follow that that 'growth' will necessitate the stripping of our land (and many other lands) of grass and grain and covering it with steel and concrete. Finally it will follow that total indebtedness will always increase, not only in the home markets, but in the Third World to which the debt is transferred by means of export "drives."

It is not merely that the questions of money and credit, their origin and ownership, cannot be avoided but that they are equally and pressingly relevant to the problems of Third World destitution and environmental destruction. Yet The Common Good discusses The Global Common Good (paras. 102-105) with only one reference to the debt burden, and The Environmental Common Good (paras 106-108) without any reference to it at all.

No one can reasonably deny that the conditions described above are now extant, yet the section *The World of Work* (paras. 90-98) is weakened by the absence of any consideration of how a JUST WAGE may be paid if the monetary system does not in fact reflect the TRUE COST of production, namely all consumption during the same period. For example paragraphs 90-93 examine the nature of human work in terms, which call to mind Ruskin's observation that the reward of work is not in being paid, but in being chosen. Nevertheless all work of a kind must be paid at the same rate - the just rate - for only under that condition will the good worker be chosen - "*Friend, I do thee no wrong. Didst thou not agree with me for a penny? Take that thine is, and go thy way, I will give unto this last even as unto thee.*"

In *Economic Democracy* Douglas draws a comparison between the enthusiasm and energy, which may be put into a home and that which is put into "work". The reason for the dichotomy is that men are most usually obliged by economic necessity to do work they dislike. How then can men be set free to do the right work and paid a just wage? Paragraph 98 rightly says that State welfare is not a desirable substitute for the just wage. However, such an objection does not apply to a *Dividend*. Douglas has argued that a percentage of production is attributable to "The Cultural Heritage" - the legacy of knowledge from the past, and that this is common property. However no monetary equivalent of this wealth exists anywhere. If this percentage were "monetised" by the state, all individuals, as heirs, would be entitled to a share of it. In short, the work a man does entitles him to a wage; the work his forefathers have done entitles him also to a *Social dividend*, irrespective of whether he is industrious or idle, a good worker or a poor one. It needs something of a leap of faith to accept the idea of all families having a private income. Social Crediters have made that leap. Can the authors of The Common Good?

With the final sections Ownership and Property (paras. 109-112) and Crisis in the Social Dimension (paras. 113-120) no Social Crediter would disagree. Ownership and Property

welcomes the spread of ownership in capital assets rather than in land, workshops and homes, but again shows no sign of recognising that if the monetary system is flawed then ownership of capital assets is particularly precarious. Further, well-distributed property cannot long be maintained in a system of monetary creation as *debt*, which is responsible for the concentration of ownership in the first place. These weaknesses in this section arise directly from the failure to critically examine the monetary system in the first place.

However, much in these sections reads like Douglas. For example compare "*The economy exists for the human person, not the other way round*" with Douglas: "*Society exists for the individual, not the individual for society.*" Or contrast "*The British have always had a feeling for 'the common good' even if they have not expressed it in those terms. They are no longer sure that that principle can be relied upon. . . . The loss of confidence in the concept of the common good is one of the primary factors behind the national mood of pessimism.*" With Douglas: "*The root problem of civilisation - not the only problem, but that which has to be disposed of before any other - is the problem of the provision of bed, board and clothes, and this affects the ordinary man in terms of effort. If he has to work hard and long hours to obtain a precarious existence, then for him civilisation fails.*" (C.H. Douglas, "*The Control and Distribution of Production*")

Both passages are concerned with the loss of confidence (Credit) in Society - the negation of the Social Credit. The authors supply, as an appendix, some extracts from Papal encyclicals. For reasons not apparent (surely not fear) they quote only a truncated version of one of the most powerful condemnations of the money system, made by a Pope. The full quotation is:

"In the first place, then, it is patent that in our days not wealth alone is accumulated, but immense power and despotic economic domination are concentrated in the hands of a few, who for the most part are not the owners, but only trustees and

STUDIES IN WORDS

"Verbicide, the murder of a word, happens in many ways. Inflation is one of the commonest; those who taught us to say *awfully* for 'very', *tremendous* for 'great', *sadism* for 'cruelty', and *unthinkable* for 'undesirable' were verbicides. Another way to verbiage, by which I here mean the use of a word as a promise to pay which is never going to be kept The use of *significant* as if were an absolute, and with no intention of ever telling us what the thing is significant of, is an example. So is *diametrically* when it is used merely to put *opposite* into the superlative. Men often commit verbicide because they want to snatch a word as a party banner, to appropriate its 'selling quality'. Verbicide was committed when we exchanged *Whig* and *Tory* for *Liberal* and *Conservative*. But the greatest cause of verbicide is the fact that most people are obviously far more anxious to express their approval and disapproval of things than to describe them. Hence the tendency of words to become less descriptive and more evaluative, while still retaining some hint of the sort of goodness or badness implied; and to end up being purely evaluative - useless synonyms for *good* and *bad*....

"I am tempted to adapt the couplet we see in some parks - Let no one say, and say it to your shame, That there was meaning here before you came."

- C.S. Lewis, in the introduction to *Studies in Words*
(Cambridge University Press)

directors of invested funds, which they administer at their own good pleasure.

"This domination is most powerfully exercised by those who, because they hold and control money, also govern credit and determine its allotment, for that reason supplying, so to speak, the life-blood, and grasping in their hands, as it were the very soul of production, so that no one can breathe against their will." (*Quadragesima Anno*, paras. 105/106 C.T.S. London 1960).

Finally, a word on paragraphs 62-65, grouped under the heading *SPECIFIC ISSUES IN A GENERAL ELECTION*. The content is largely the conventional wisdom of the party system. The authors indeed seem to accept the party system, unlike *laissez-faire*, is part of a God-given natural order. It is this section to which most objection has been made, not least among Catholics active in the political field.

Two faults among a tangle of many: A party 'platform' is determined by a small caucus of policies acting as a package to be accepted in full, however unacceptable individual items therein might be to the individual. Thus good policies 'carry' bad, the latter often taking over in the end. Douglas is relevant

here - "Freedom is the ability to choose or refuse one thing at a time."

Secondly, in a General Election few seats may change hands. Even if representatives change, most MP's are NOT democratically elected by voters forced to select the choice of a caucus or pressure group. In such circumstances, only a candidate binding him/her self to find and pursue the policy of the constituency at large can be justified. Currently this would be "a single issue" candidate - one eminently necessary if the electorate rather than a party hierarchy is to win the election. As it stands, a few minds mould the mass and party loyalty is placed above conscience and constituency concerns. Seeking this single issue, *The Common Good* would thus have been more correctly named. We still await sighting of the Kingdom of God within.

Anthony Cooney.

Notes:

1. cf. *UNTO HIS LAST*: The Roots of Honour.
2. Douglas' major books are all relevant but attention is drawn to *RECONSTRUCTION*.

A.R. ORAGE'S LECTURE

Described by C.H. Douglas as the man "*who rose out of the ranks of the talented into those of the great literary genius*," A.R. Orage gave the following brilliant BBC address on Social Credit just before he died.

Broadcast in the BBC series "Poverty in Plenty" on 5th November 1934.

Originally published in *The New English Weekly*. Thursday, 15th November 1934. Vol . 6. No. 5.

Though most of you, I understand, are students of economics, I shall try to use only simple and everyday words.

For instance, instead of the abstract terms, Plenty and Poverty, I shall contrast Britain as Producer with Britain as Consumer, or Britain as Manufacturer and Shop keeper with Britain as Shopper.

Imagine a plate-glass window stretching from John O' Groats to Land's End; and, on the inside of it, all the goods that Britain makes, and, on the outside, the 40 or 50 millions of us still flattening our noses against the pane, just as we did when we were children.

As it costs us nothing, let us enter the shop and have a look round.

The first thing that strikes us is the staggering variety of the goods on sale. Nature is prolific in having created about half a million species of living creature; but the British genius has invented even more kinds of goods, and is still going on inventing. A collective sales-catalogue of all our shops would probably run to a million items. I happened to see that 200 different kinds of English apple were put on the market this year; and one London store - you may be glad to hear - stocks no fewer than 43 varieties of lip-stick.

If we ask the shop-keeper whether, and for how long, he can undertake to keep up the supply of three million varieties of Goods, he may show us, first, a line of warehouses all bulging with goods ready for the shop-window; and, behind the line of warehouses, a line of factories and workshops; and, behind those, quarries and mines and farms; and, behind these, laboratories and research schools; and finally, behind them all, the British people themselves, with their character, industry, genius and history. With these resources, our shopkeeper says,

he can undertake to keep up a practically unlimited supply for a practically unlimited future. And we can take his word for it.

As we stroll round the works, we notice how relatively few work-people there are about. This relative, and, as we know, progressive depopulation of industry is due, of course, to applied Science. Applied Science seems to have made it its mission in life to lift the curse laid on Adam and to transfer work from the backs of Men to the broader backs of Nature's other forces - steam, electricity and ultimately, perhaps, to atomic energy. For an ever-increasing output of Goods - both in variety and in quantity - the brains of the Few are dispensing more and more with the brawn of the Many.

Before leaving the premises we must remark one very important detail. All the Goods on Sale bear a price-label. And it appears that two processes of manufacture are carried on in Britain's workshop simultaneously. One is a visible stream of real Goods, and the other is an almost invisible stream of figures in the form of Prices. These two streams, though independent, flow side by side, and, in the shop-window, they unite as real Goods with their Price-labels on.

As a matter of curiosity, let us ask the shopkeeper what is his estimate of the collective Price-value of all the Goods in the window.

Without vouching for the exact figure, he says he reckons their collective value at not less than £500 million. And he adds that the collective Price-values created in a fair year of Production might be as much as £10,000 million; and that, working to capacity, it might be double that in a single year.

Feeling both terribly rich and terribly poor, let us now leave the shop of Plenty, and join the rest of the 40 or 50 million would-be shoppers outside.

What a change of scene! In contrast with the Productive system we have just left, where all is cooperation, reason and applied Science, we find a struggling mob in place of a disciplined army of technicians. Everybody seems to be fighting everybody else; and most of us seem to be getting the worst of it.

What is the trouble about?

Let us not be self-deceived, you and I know very well, It's about Money. If 98 per cent of the legal crime of Britain is admittedly due to Money, we may safely assume that a very large proportion of the crime of which the law takes no notice is due to the same cause.

Now what is this Money we are all quarrelling about? If you will stick to your own experience you will realise that Money is only a ticket authorising you to go shopping in the emporium we have just left. The only difference between, say, a railway-ticket and a Money-ticket is that a railway ticket is good only for transport, while a Money-ticket is universal and good for anything in the whole shop, up to its stated value in Prices.

And the reason, why Money is important, and, so to say, worth quarrelling about, is that Money-tickets are just as indispensable to our shopping as our shopping is indispensable to our lives. The Aladdin's Cave we have just left will open to other password. Money is the accepted and legal tender to life today in modern society.

What air was to the unhappy people shut up in the Black Hole of Calcutta money-tickets are to the 40 or 50 million of us shut up in the present financial system.

Now where do these indispensable Money-tickets come from? And how do we get hold of them? And why are there just so many of them about, sometimes more and sometimes less?

You will remember that in the shop we visited we found two streams in flow, a stream of real Goods and a parallel stream of Price-figures.

We have now to add a third and last stream; a stream of Money-tickets. And we can now say that just as all the real Goods and Price-values come out of the Productive system, so all the Money-tickets with which to buy the Goods come out of the Productive system also. And they come to the shopping public in one of three forms: Wages, Salaries and Dividends; the sum of which forms the Monetary Income of the nation. This Money-Income of the nation, derived from the Productive system for services rendered, is the only shopping fund the nation, as shopper possesses. It is all the Money-tickets the nation receives with which to buy the Price-values the nation has created. These shopping-tickets are more when the works are busy, and less when the works are slack; but less when the works are slack; but their number is always regulated by the activity of the

Productive system.

How these Money-tickets that come out of the Productive system get into the Productive system is a simple matter. They are put in, in the form of loans, by private Money-ticket factories called Banks, which have an exclusive monopoly of Money-ticket manufacture. We must surely have noticed in our tour of Britain's work-yard a number of elegant buildings to which some producers were always running to borrow tickets and others were running to return them. They are the Banks, where the Money-tickets come from, and to which they return.

Our immediate interest, however, is to compare the number of Money-tickets, *not* that are poured into industry, but that trickle to the shopping nation *out* of industry, with the Price-values created in the shop in the same period.

Obviously if the Money-tickets issued to shopping Britain were the exact equivalent of the Price-values created by shop-keeping Britain, the collective Monetary Income of the nation would be able to buy the collective Price-value of the Goods produced. We might dispute about the distribution of the tickets, but collectively, at least, there would be enough of them to buy our total Production.

The problem of equating the nation's means of Consumption with the nation's means of Production would be solved if every addition to Price-value resulted in an equal addition to Income.

But what we find, in fact, is that the Monetary Income of the nation, derived from the Productive system in the form of Wages, etc., is *not* equivalent to the Price-values created in the same period. The two streams of Prices and Income do *not* move at the same rate and volume. The stream of Price-values to the shop-window moves much faster than the stream of Money-Tickets to the shopping public, with the result that the annual collective shopping tickets of the nation, called its Income, are insufficient to meet the collective annual Price-values created in its shop.

Now this is a matter of fact and not of theory; and it can be proved by simple arithmetic. Our shopkeeper, for instance, has told us that, at a rough estimate, our annual output of Price-values is £10,000 million and probably more. And our taxing officials tell us, more accurately, that our annual Monetary Income is about £2,500 millions. As 4 is to 1, so is our output of Price-values to the Money-tickets with which to meet them. The nation's means of Consumption measured in Money-tickets, in short, is at least no more than a quarter of its means of Production measured in Prices.

Here, I believe, in this gap between Income and Prices, is the root-cause of our present difficulties. On the two provable

COLLECTIVISM

"If we then describe the deadly danger which threatens our whole Western civilisation as Collectivism we do not doubt that we shall be fully understood by everyone. We are surely within our rights in speaking of Collectivism as the fundamental and mortal danger of the West and in describing it as nothing less than political and economic tyranny, regimentation, centralisation, the despotic organisation of every department of life, the destruction of personality, totalitarianism and the rigid mechanisation of human society. And we do not doubt that we can count upon general agreement when we say that this resulting insect State would not only destroy most institutions and values which comprise a development of three thousand years and which, with a conscious pride, we designate Occidental civilisation. It would not only rob society of that organic structure, and internal support which gives it its stability, but above all it would take from the life of the individual just that essential purpose which only freedom can bestow; and with the loss of individual liberty every vestige of intrinsic worth and dignity would perish from the earth. In speaking thus we are expressing convictions which comprise the very core of Christian thought and which must perish with it."

- Wilhelm Ropke in *Civitas Humana* (William Hodge & Co Ltd.)

assumptions: (a) that the Money-tickets distributed as Income to shoppers are our only title to go shopping - that is, to live; and (b) that the total number of tickets distributed among us is only enough to meet a quarter of the Price-values of the Goods in our shop - we can easily understand why we have to fight each other for tickets; why everybody looks for employment in the factory or, alternatively, for somebody to give tickets to him; why there are always more Goods than Buyers; and finally, why no Socialist scheme for taxing the rich, no "Communist" or Fascist scheme for administering the workshop and no amount of Planning of Production can be of the least use so long as this Gap between Prices and Incomes remains.

And when we add that this gap is constantly widening with the progressive relative depopulation of the Productive system you will realise that our progress is towards the absurdity of a Maximum of Production and a Minimum of Consumption. Only, long before then, something will happen; something will break, as, in fact, it is breaking all around us.

Now while the fact of the Gap is the important thing, the explanation of the gap offered by C.H. Douglas appears to me to be convincing. He says that much of the money put into the Productive system as bank-loans never, in fact, gets out as Income during the same period in which it is put in. It is used simply to transfer capital Goods from one factory to another, and thus while it adds to the Price-stream, it does not add to the income of us shoppers.

If you ask, quite naturally, how in that case the Goods are ever sold at all, the answer is that there are more ways of killing a cat than choking it with butter. The Gap can be artificially bridged even if it is not actually closed.

For instance, Goods can be wilfully destroyed. Or they can be practically given away under the compulsion of bankruptcy. Or they can be disposed of in return for acknowledgment of debt, that is to say, by mortgaging our future Income of Money-tickets. Incidentally, every single one of us is in debt at this moment to the tune of about £500 apiece. But the most effective means of all is to distribute shopping-tickets on account of the production of Goods that never get into the shop-window at all, by Exports on Credit, by Capital Construction, and by Public Works such as roads - all of which provide incomes without simultaneously adding to the Goods on Sale. By receiving Wages, in short, for the production of Goods we can't buy, we acquire the tickets with which to buy the Goods that can be bought.

But whatever the explanation, the fact of the ever-widening gap remains; and the vitally important question is what are we to do about it?

Without discussing, merely to dismiss them, proposals that are either irrelevant to the real problem, or would only make it worse, it ought to be clear that our aim must be to close the gap between total Prices and total Incomes. And this can be effected only by either reducing Prices or raising Incomes till they are equivalent.

But this clearly necessitates a change of policy in regard to our whole Price and Money system. It involves the restoration to the community of control over its whole Money-ticket system. And it involves the institution of what we may call a National Credit Account, in which the Price-values created in the shop and the Money-tickets distributed for shopping would be kept constantly balanced.

The institution and keeping of such a National Credit Account would not necessarily require the nationalisation of the administration of the present Banks. On the contrary, it is only their policy we need to put under national control. The present Banks could just as efficiently carry out a National policy as they now carry out a private policy.

Then we have to find another means than direct Employment for the distribution of money-tickets to the nation as shoppers. Employment for everybody is increasingly impossible in a Productive system that is becoming increasingly technical; and, again, since Employment automatically increases Price-values faster than it increases Incomes, Employment widens rather than narrows the gap.

Social Crediters believe that as the Wage-system becomes obsolescent, thanks to the progressive depopulation of Industry, Dividends should gradually take the place of wages; so that as the Machine displaces Men, the wage-income previously paid to the displaced men, continues to be paid to them by the Machine that has displaced them. If the Machine does the work of 100 men, its production is obviously enough to pay 100 men's wages. The Dividend is the logical successor of the Wage.

Lastly, we need a scientific Pricing-system that shall automatically, so to say, ensure the fall of prices with the rise in Production, and, conversely, the rise of Prices with the fall of Production. At present, retail prices come to us laden with the charges for the depreciation of capital plant, but never offset and compensated by the appreciation of capital plant that has also taken place. Retail prices, credited with the difference between Total Appreciation and Total Depreciation, would, we believe, give us the scientifically Just Price.

I need not say that I do not expect you to accept these suggestions all at once. You will find them explained in books by C.H. Douglas.

But in conclusion, and by way of giving zest to your studies, I would only remind you of this historic date, and warn you that in the gap disclosed between Price-values and Income is enough gunpowder to blow up every democratic parliament.

WILL THE LEAGUE BE READY?

Events, both national and international, are sweeping ahead at an ever-increasing tempo. Regular readers of this journal should not be surprised. 1998 will be one of the most decisive years in Australian history. The most important event will be a Federal election at which, hopefully, the dominance of the major political parties can be fragmented. There will be a vitally important Queensland State election. And the Republican issue will be moving towards a climax. The influence of the League of Rights will be decisive over a wide battlefield

But will the League be fully equipped to influence the course of events? Only if the League's annual Basic Fund is filled. As we break for the Christmas recess the Fund has moved past the halfway mark of the objective of \$65,000. Unless the target is reached the League will have to seriously re-assess its strategy. We confidently look forward to a flood of support after the Christmas break. Please do not destroy our confidence. All contributions to Box 1052J, Melbourne, 3001.