

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 43 No. 17

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 23, 1963

6d. Fortnightly

### To See the Invisible

By REVILO P. OLIVER

(Reprinted from *American Opinion*\*, October, 1962)

[SECOND INSTALMENT]

Thus in the past few months, with something of the dramatic suddenness of a spotlight shifting in a dark theatre, a flood of light has been thrown upon the hitherto umbratile Council [on Foreign Relations] by four new books that we reviewed or noticed in our issues for June and September: Mary M. Davidson, *The Secret Government of the United States* (The Greater Nebraskan, Omaha, \$1.00); Col. Victor J. Fox, *The Welfare Staters* (Freedom Press, New York, \$4.95); Dan Smoot, *The Invisible Government* (Dan Smoot Report, Dallas, \$5.00 cloth, \$3.00 paper); Kent and Phoebe Courtney, *America's Unelected Rulers* (Conservative Society of America, New Orleans, \$2.00).

The four books, which we list in the order of publication, necessarily overlap and reach substantially the same conclusion. But each author has made his investigation from his own standpoint, and each book contains valuable material not found in the others. It is no disparagement of the other authors to say that Mr. Smoot's long established and unquestioned reputation for accurate research and sound judgment will make his carefully documented and lucidly objective book an indispensable work of reference.

As is inevitable, there remain some details to be filled in. And, a concise compilation of the public records of all the members of the Council on Foreign Relations and its various subsidiaries and affiliates would make a very useful, though bulky, volume. But so far as the basic data are concerned, the four books give as complete a picture of the web as is likely to be available until such time as the aroused American people force disclosure and examination of the records of the various organisations involved, and compel the responsible members either to give testimony under oath or seek safety in flight from American soil.

The implications of the recent disclosures concerning the Council on Foreign Relations are so drastic and will seem so shocking, even to many Americans who are generally aware of our national peril, that it behoves us to distinguish clearly between (a) ascertained fact, (b) conclusions reached in the way in which honest courts and historians arrive at their verdicts when the evidence does not include a confession of guilt, that is to say, by reasoned and logical deduction from clear and cogent evidence, and (c) suspicions based on evidence of a quality or quantity that would, in our courts, warrant an indictment but not a conviction.

The evidence against the Council on Foreign Relations is of two kinds: its membership and its activities.

### The Members

The Council on Foreign Relations now has about 1307 known members. Its own official list of members is reproduced in each of the four books. Mr. and Mrs. Courtney particularly raise the question whether there may not be some members whose names are not published in the annual lists. And Colonel Fox quotes from the Council's own publication a statement which seems to imply that some members are temporarily dropped while they occupy conspicuous governmental posts. It is noted that the name of President Kennedy no longer appears on the list of members. Although, no one seems to know whether or not he actually resigned, Nixon's name did not appear until after the election in 1960.

There appears to be no complete list of the persons who once were members of the Council but whose names do not appear on the current lists. Mr. Smoot mentions some of them in the course of his study, and Miss Davison has compiled an alphabetical list that is admittedly incomplete, but suggestive. Of the persons she lists, some are dead, some have fled from the United States to escape prosecution, and some still reside in this country.

An examination of the lists of members suffices for two preliminary inferences, viz.:

(1) There is *some* connection between the Council and the Communist Conspiracy. No less than forty members of the Council (listed by Mr. and Mrs. Courtney) presided over the activities of its most famous affiliate, the Institute of Pacific Relations. That organisation became quiescent after it was exposed as a nest of Soviet spies and officially identified by the McCarran Committee of the Senate as a major transmission belt for Soviet propaganda in the United States. Among the leading members of the Council in the past were such distinguished traitors as Alger Hiss, Lauchlin Currie, and Harry Dexter White. Professor Owen Lattimore, identified in 1952 as a "conscious, articulate instrument of the Soviet international conspiracy", is still a member in the best of standing. We may take it for granted that many other Soviet agents would be exposed and identified, if Congress were to resume investigation of the middle and upper echelons of the Communist Conspiracy. But obviously a searching investigation will be necessary to determine the number, identity, and influence of those agents and hence their degree of control over the Council and its activities.

\* Published monthly except July by Robert Welch, Inc., 395 Concord Avenue., Belmont 78, Massachusetts, U.S.A.

(2) The Council on Foreign Relations is *not* simply a gang of conspirators. Not all of the 1307 known members can be fully aware of, or in sympathy with, its activities. The membership includes two distinguished opponents of the Council's policies; several members are reported to be acting as observers; many are said not to have attended even a single one of the numerous sessions in which members are given "off-the-record" briefings under a pledge of secrecy. And it is highly probable that many who attend the secret briefings by governmental officials and other "authorities" are so delighted to be the recipients of "inside information" that they do not ask themselves what must be the ultimate consequences of the policies thus partly disclosed. At the present time many highly intelligent people appear to have been equipped with conditioned reflexes which make them assume, without thinking, that (a) high or responsible position is *per se* incontrovertible proof of both intelligence and integrity, (b) a profession of good intentions absolves men of responsibility for the logical consequences of their acts or proposals, and (c) dogooders are by definition innocuous.

We shall have to use reason instead of reflexes in considering such matters, if we intend to survive. We had best start with the third of the three propositions, which is also the root of the other two. We shall have to face the fact that human experience has repeatedly shown that, as the distinguished American analyst, Holmes Alexander, has put it with blunt emphasis, *both* "the spoliators and the dogooders are public enemies. . . . All history raises the question of which type of malefactor is worse for society—the robber baron or the reformist." So long as we assume that fuzzy sentimentality is nobler than reason, it will be possible to drum up influential support for the most irrational and potentially noxious schemes.

The mere fact of membership cannot be taken as proof of active or conscious participation in any or all of the Council's activities. The organisation must accordingly be thought of as analogous to a high-grade front, which seeks to induce as many influential people as possible to join it from innocent motives, rather than as a conspiracy cell from which all but members of the conspiracy are excluded. To determine the purpose and function of the Council as an organisation, therefore, it will be necessary to examine its activities, as we shall endeavour to do below.

The Council operates regional subsidiaries, called Committees on Foreign Relations, in cities throughout the nation, from Portland, Maine, to Portland, Oregon. It admits that there are thirty of these; Colonel Fox believes that at least forty-five are in operation. The membership of twenty-nine is listed by Miss Davison. Her lists should be used with the reservations that (1) it is probable that much of the membership in the various branches will be found to be composed of business men who, although astute enough not to endorse an unidentified stranger's cheque, endorse organisations they have never investigated and take pride in being "on the inside" of movements they do not understand; and (2) the light recently thrown on the Council will probably provoke—if it has not already done so—a flood of resignations.

The Council on Foreign Relations operates as subsidiaries, or more or less openly controls through interlocking directorates, the now notorious Foreign Policy Association, the

Committee for Economic Development, the Business Advisory Council, the Advertising Council, and several others. It is financed by contributions from great American corporations and by grants from the large tax-exempt foundations that have long been noted as centres of subversion and which are in turn controlled by members of the Council. (It so happens that on the day on which I write these lines, the *New York Times* inconspicuously announces that the Ford Foundation has given the Council another nine hundred thousand dollars—a figure chosen, perhaps, because a cool million might be enough to attract attention; according to Mr. Smoot's list, ten of the fifteen Trustees of the Ford Foundation are members of the Council.) Members of the Council hold controlling positions in a wide variety of odd organisations, such as Americans for Democratic Action, Sane Nuclear Policy, Radio Free Europe, American Committee on Africa, and the like. And prominent members of the Council lend "respectability" to Communist-front operations, such as the Southern Conference for Human Welfare and the Ad Hoc Committee to Abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee.

#### *Cui bono?*

To judge the Council on Foreign Relations as a body we must examine its corporate activities. But before we do so we may note that the membership list alone suffices to suggest that the Council is the instrumentality or cover of a group of a few hundred members among whom will be found the majority of the architects of disaster who have presided over the foreign and domestic policies of the United States for the past thirty years. They obviously form a closely-knit inner circle whose members, when not in government, are always in positions in which they can exercise indirectly as great or greater influence over our economic and political life. Their agility is marvellous. They leap with the greatest of ease from one trapeze to another—from executive positions in mammoth corporations to tax-free foundations to cabinet posts to great banking houses to famous law offices and so on, in a never ending round. What is more significant, when one has so exposed himself in a governmental position as to be less useful than before, he leaps to another trapeze and is almost always replaced by another member of the CFR.

The active membership of the Council represents an aggregate control over American life that is simply frightening. For example, members of the Council control the *New York Times*, *New York Post*, *New York Herald-Tribune*, *Washington Post*, *Denver Post*, *Louisville Courier-Journal*, *Minneapolis Star*, *Des Moines Register*, *Christian Science Monitor*, and many smaller newspapers. They control *Time*, *Newsweek*, *Life*, *Look*, *Saturday Review*, and others. This is, as everyone will see at first glance, a list of the major daily and weekly lie-sheets engaged in the business of spreading misinformation to paralyse the American mind. And it is noteworthy that the list also includes the major journals not overtly Communist which have recently been directing their poisonous venom at all patriotic Americans. Coincidence? What do you think?

Consider another area. Mr. Smoot points out that members of the Council control, in most cases by simply forming an absolute majority of the officers and trustees, eleven very wealthy foundations, which he lists, including the various Rockefeller, Carnegie, and Ford establishments, and the list

could probably be extended. The great foundations, ostensibly established for "the advancement of education" and similar vague purposes, conciliate public favour by subsidising hospitals or making contributions to raise the salaries of teachers or providing scholarships for research. This is a very effective device, for academicians seem to be so unworldly that they become fanatically convinced of the transcendent nobility of anyone who gives them a few bucks. But, as Mr. Smoot notes, "every significant movement to destroy the American way of life has been directed and financed, in whole or in part, by tax-exempt organisations, which are entrenched in public opinion as benefactors of our society". So powerful are the foundations that they have defeated two Congressional committees that tried to pry into their unsavory secrets. But to be convinced of their real function, you need only review the copious information assembled by René A. Wormser in his *Foundations* (Devin-Adair, \$7.00).

One has only to label members of the Council to see an astonishing pattern of activity in the government that we fondly suppose to be ours. For example, since 1944 the office of Secretary of State has been successively held by Edward R. Stettinius (CFR), James F. Byrnes, General George C. Marshall (CFR), Dean G. Acheson (CFR), John Foster Dulles (CFR) Christian A. Herter (CFR). It is now held by Dean Rusk (CFR), who is bearing the burden with the aid of his two Under Secretaries, George W. Ball (CFR) and George C. McGhee (CFR), his Chief of Protocol, A. B. Duke (CFR), his Chairman of Policy Planning, W. W. Rostow (CFR), his Representative to the "UN", Adlai Stevenson (CFR), the President's Special Representative, Chester Bowles (CFR), and a flock of Assistant Secretaries, half of whom are also CFR. The affiliated Central Intelligence Agency is headed by John A. McCone (CFR), and the US Information Agency by Edward R. Murrow (CFR).

Mr. Rusk distinguished himself long ago while doing a turn as Assistant Secretary, when he discovered that the Chinese Communists of Mao Tse-tung were "agrarian reformers" just like George Washington only more so. Rusk again distinguished himself while doing a turn as Chairman of the Rockefeller Foundation in 1952, when he subsidised the notorious Institute of Pacific Relations *after* it had been officially exposed as a Communist instrumentality. He is now reported in the press to be tickled pink by the appointments of General Lyman Lemnitzer (CFR) as head of NATO and General Maxwell D. Taylor (CFR) as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. General Lemnitzer, the hero who in 1950 saved the lives of many thousands of North Korean Communists by seeing to it that the South Koreans did not receive the military equipment that the silly old Congress of the United States had ordered sent them, presumably knows whose orders are to be obeyed. He may be counted on to co-operate cordially with John J. McCloy (CFR), who is in charge of plans for disarming the United States. And it is to be presumed that there will be no friction between General Taylor and the Secretary of Defence, Robert S. McNamara (CFR according to Miss Davison, but not on other lists), who is the successor in that office of General Marshall (CFR), Robert A. Lovett (CFR), Charles E. Wilson (of the BAC interlocked with CFR), Neil H. McElroy (BAC), and Thomas S. Gates (CFR). Mr. McNamara, with the able help of the Deputy Secretary, Roswell L. Gilpatrick (CFR), and his Special

Assistant, Adam Yarmolinsky (fresh from the Ford Foundation's Fund for the Republic), is busily purging our armed forces of officers like General Walker and Major Arch E. Roberts, who are so reactionary as to believe in loyalty to the United States and so tactless as to say so.

This is but a specimen of what one finds when he examines any vital area in which the policies that the United States is made to follow are formulated. One is tempted to suggest that if the Council ever conducts a drive for membership, it might use posters bearing the legend, "Join the CFR and rule the world".

(to be continued)

## SLAVERY

The letter which follows is from *The Times*, September 18, 1963:

Sir,—The real issue of the American Civil War was between the respective economic and moral virtues of the blatant chattel slavery of the agricultural South, where black human beings were treated like draft animals, and the more subtle wage-slavery of the industrial North, where those in power wanted cheap, mobile labour, whether black or white, which need be maintained only when required, under the emotive and misleading banner of liberal democracy.

In that light the present policy of Full Employment for ever may be seen as an attempt to compromise between the security of the chattel slavery of the past and the insecurity of the wage (and salary) slavery of the present. Most people support that irrational, and basically immoral, policy without question as though it were an unavoidable Act of God—or Nature. With the giant serfs of Horsepower, Kilowattage and Automation ready to bring universal emancipation from both muscular and mental toil, should we not be discussing the future rather than the past? Whether Christians or unbelievers, should we not begin, in the cause of civilisation, to consider the lilies?

Yours faithfully,

ERIC DE MARE.

3 Stanley Crescent, W.11. Sept. 16.

### THE BRIEF FOR THE PROSECUTION

By C. H. DOUGLAS

This book is the last of the contributions to the understanding of world politics written during the war of 1939-45 by the author of *Social Credit*. The series began with *This 'American' Business* (August, 1940) and continued and expanded with *The Big Idea* (1942), *The 'Land For The (Chosen) People' Racket* (1943), and *Programme For The Third World War* (1943).

8/6 (plus postage)

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.  
9 Avenue Road, Stratford-on-Avon

## THE SOCIAL CREDITER

### FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat which was founded in 1933 by Clifford Hugh Douglas.

The Social Credit Secretariat is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

**SUBSCRIPTION RATES:** Home and abroad, post free: One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.  
Offices—Business: 9 AVENUE ROAD, STRATFORD-ON-AVON. Telephone: Stratford-on-Avon 3976.

Editorial: PENRHYN LODGE, GLOUCESTER GATE, LONDON N.W.1. Telephone: EUSon 3893.

#### IN AUSTRALIA—

Business—Box 2318V, G.P.O., Melbourne.  
Editorial—Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, Australia (Editorial Head Office).

### THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

**Personnel**—Advisory Chairman: Dr. Tudor Jones. Chairman: Dr. B. W. Morahan, 36 Melbourne Avenue, Deakin, Canberra, Australia. Deputy Chairman, British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London N.W.1 (Telephone: EUSon 3893). Liaison Officer for Canada: Monsieur Louis Even, Maison Saint-Michel, Rougemont, P.Q. Secretary: H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O. Sydney, N.S.W.

## FROM WEEK TO WEEK

*The Times* on October 8, 1963, chose extraordinary language to describe in its leading article the present condition of the Congo. It is all the more extraordinary in that we have not been given a continuous account of the accelerating run-down in that tragic land. The leader is entitled **THE CONGO IN DECAY**, and the opening sentence reads: "The decomposition of the Congo is now far advanced", and a few lines further on it refers to the "morbid process". It sees no hope save in "a strong government which knows exactly what it wants to do and has the disciplined military force to do it throughout the country. But later we read that "the army is little more than a rabble and liable to become a mutinous rabble the moment the restraint [?] of the United Nations forces is withdrawn". So far as reported news goes, the major role played by the United Nations forces has been to ensure that Katanga is involved in the putrefaction.

It was obvious to, and frequently stated by, informed observers of the African scene that the withdrawal of the Belgian nerve-centre of a slowly but organically advancing civilisation in the Congo would necessarily bring that civilisation to an end. So far as we recollect, *The Times* did not say so, though its present gruesome complacency suggests that it knew what would happen.

There is no merit in having forecast the present disaster. It is the published strategy of Communism to bring about the downfall of European civilisation by the destruction of its colonies, and only natural that the destruction should be carried through with all the deception concerning its real aims implied by the accompanying slogans and party-lines: 'Democracy', where the institutions of even such ballot-box 'democracy' as we ourselves endure do not exist; 'Freedom', where the economic basis of freedom has hardly been so much as sketched; 'Equality' in a predominantly tribal society whose tribes know only equal rights to butcher neighbouring tribes.

The extirpation of 'colonialism', however, is also the objective of so-called Dollar Diplomacy, being realised in the main by programmes of foreign aid, a Communist strategy expounded *in advance* of its occurrence by Earl Browder, the

American Communist leader in his book *Teheran: Our Path in War and Peace*\*. It was but a few weeks ago that President Kennedy earnestly stated that the loss of South Vietnam to Communism would mean the fall of the whole of South-east Asia; and on October 8 *The Times* reported that "United States economic aid to South Vietnam has come to a virtual standstill, but American officials here [Saigon] say they do not exactly know why. Authorisations for imports of goods paid for by the United States have been refused to importers since late August. . .". *The Guardian* (October 9) reports that the State Department "was more than usually coy" concerning this. *The Times* (October 8) reports that President Diem told the National Assembly on October 6 that "South Vietnam's Buddhist problem was already settled and the Vietcong communists were facing inescapable defeat". According again to *The Guardian*, the \$100 million commercial aid so surreptitiously ended "have been used by the Diem Government to pay for its armed forces".

C. H. Douglas often pointed out, with an increasing urgency, that the rapidly worsening state of the world could be attributed to either of two things only: sheer ineptitude on the part of our politicians and other managers, which he characterised as the "village idiot" theory (and which leaves us with no practicable alternative to resigning ourselves to the ghastly fate which lies, all too obviously now, ahead); or to recognise and deal with the existence of a world-wide conspiracy which aims at bringing about the collapse of European-type civilisation, with a view to its replacement by global tyranny enforcing the enslavement of man in the pursuit of ultimate objectives beyond his comprehension. As Douglas said, the stakes being played for in this conspiracy are the highest in the world, and the fate of the peoples of a continent mean no more to the conspirators "than the death of a sparrow". *Vide* the Congo.

To us, the evidence of conspiracy is conclusive, and has been detailed over many years in these pages. But in the past few years the conspiracy has become almost open, as the means of dealing with it have progressively been neutralised.

The British, in particular, do not like the idea of conspiracies, even when confronted with such minor evidence as was provided by the Vassall and Profumo 'affairs', as they are quite characteristically called. The evidence of contrivance in the pursuit of far more complex designs was somewhat sedulously overlooked in favour of an attitude of disgusted morality. But we close our eyes at extreme peril.

Not only is the conspiracy more apparent, its working mechanisms are becoming more open to inspection; and thus our politicians appear as either blindly ignorant, or as compliant. If the latter, how is such complicity to be explained?

It appears to us probable that our politicians and managers at the so-called 'policy-making' level have been partially let into the 'secret' that our present society is 'non-viable', and that our only hope of survival lies in a radical re-organisation of our institutions in directions which the public would not tolerate were they openly proposed. There is nothing more flattering than to be made privy to the secrets of the

\* For further details see *The Last Chance*, a reprint of an article which appeared in T.S.C. three years ago, and available from our publishers.

highly affluent and influential, and vanity thus engendered will work miracles—usually of the wrong kind. It is said that every man has his price; but it is not always a cash price.

“Then the devil taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain, and showeth him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them; And saith unto him, All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me.”  
(Matthew IV, 8 and 9.)

At an address given some time before the second world war, Douglas warned his audience that not one of those present was secure in his way of life as he then knew it. The situation is incomparably graver now.

### NOTICE

For a limited period the size of *The Social Crediter* will be increased to six pages to cope with the large quantity of material in hand.

Apart from the additional charges involved our normal printing costs have been substantially increased.

To meet these added commitments we are hopeful that each of our supporters can find at least one new subscriber during the next three months.

### INTERDEPENDENCE ?

“The American presence in Iran had long been felt in the devoted efforts of missionaries conducting schools and operating hospitals, in the work of archaeologists, in the activities of financial advisers W. Morgan Shuster and Dr. Arthur C. Millsbaugh, and in the interest of American oil companies in obtaining concessions in the country. Occasionally, the United States made diplomatic protests against active British and Russian interference in Iran’s affairs.

“... Then, at the end of November, 1943, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Winston S. Churchill and Josef Stalin met in the Teheran Conference. At its conclusion, President Roosevelt outlined to an associate a tentative policy towards Iran which might set a pattern for post-war American efforts to develop and stabilise backward areas. Specifically, the objective was to make Iran sufficiently strong and healthy to discourage foreign intervention, while promoting American interest in sharing Iran’s commerce and resources. In raising the American Legation to the rank of an embassy and in intimating that the American missions to the Iranian Army and gendarmerie would remain for some time, the United States gave a clear indication that it was moving against the established British position in the country. To many Persians this indication was very welcome. . . .”

—From *Contemporary Iran* by Donald N. Wilber  
(Thomas and Hudson, 1963, 35/-).

### MONEY FOR THE MOON

The following is the substance of a letter published by *The Times* on October 4:

Sir,—Criticism (September 26) of the statement in a *Times* leading article that “the cost of getting to the moon is so great that no power . . . can bear it without skimping many social services” is based on the common misconception that our financial machinery cannot distribute enough purchasing power to buy the full product—that there is a chronic shortage of purchasing power inherent in the system. The correspondent writes: “An industrialised community . . . can today produce goods and services at a rate which is far above that at which the individual purchasing power generated during their production can acquire them.” It is, of course, a commonplace that, if we are to have anything like stable prices, the authorities must increase the money supply to keep pace with rising production. But the correspondent apparently sees total production as inevitably in excess of total income. His fears are groundless. Basically—see any national income blue book—the price paid for total production provides total income for individuals and their representatives sufficient to buy the full product. There is no inevitable shortage of purchasing power. Nor is there an inevitable excess. If we spend more slowly the national income falls; if we spend faster the national income rises, with inflation or without.

It is true that “total income” includes the undistributed profit of companies; but even undistributed profit may be spent directly or indirectly. The company may itself invest part of it and any part deposited in a bank may be borrowed and spent on investment or borrowed and spent on consumption by the customer of a hire-purchase finance house.

Although there is no inherent shortage of purchasing power it is possible to have too high a proportion of investment spending so that there is an insufficiency of consumption goods to be bought with the wages, etc., earned in making investment goods: but this is the opposite of the difficulty adduced by the correspondent. Unrequited exports make a similar situation.

The increasing efficiency of industry needs no moon-outlet for its production: as poverty diminishes leisure can increase; but in order that the fruits of productivity may be garnered as wealth and leisure and not as frustration and unemployment it is urgently necessary for the government and the trade unions to spare no effort in ensuring maximum mobility of labour.

Yours faithfully,

P. E. BUDGEN.

12 The Close, Reigate, Surrey.

Written from London to the Editor of *The Times* on October 7, the letter given below was not published.

Sir,—I understand very well the argument of your correspondent Mr. P. E. Budgen (*Times*, October 4). However, I think it is possible to state his argument in terms which bring out more clearly its implications.

The producers of these islands are paid, in the main, for everything they produce, and these payments constitute the gross cash income of the community. Through payments for services, and redistribution by taxation, this gross income is

diffused over virtually the whole community, and becomes purchasing-power in the hands of the community. What does the community get in exchange for this purchasing-power?

The bulk of personal spending-power goes on the provision of food, clothes and shelter; a much smaller proportion on the acquisition of mechanical contrivances—cars, household appliances, and so on (though it must be borne in mind that a large proportion of such purchases are financed by hire-purchase). This is all the personal consumer does get, and it absorbs practically the whole of his income: the growth of *personal* savings is a small fraction of total income, as may be ascertained by consulting reference books, blue or otherwise.

On the other hand, the productive system produces a great deal more than personal consumers consume—Factories, plant, offices, armaments, space-probes, and so on. These items do not reach the consumer; they pass into the control of institutions, private or governmental, and as such are expected to return a dividend on capital and carry a charge in respect of depreciation or obsolescence (modern transport aircraft are a prime instance of this); or serve as a basis of taxation, both to increase government revenue and to cover depreciation charges. In an expanding economy, this institutional property is in ever-increasing proportion to the production of ordinary consumers' goods, since the 'life' of such property is considerably in excess of the 'life' of goods for personal consumption. Its servicing, therefore, is an ever-increasing subtraction from the purchasing-power of the gross cash income of the community.

To summarise the matter: if, as Mr. Budgen asserts, "the price paid for total production [or does he mean 'the wages and salaries paid?'] provides total income for individuals and the representatives to buy the full product", it is certain that individuals do not *obtain* the full product, though it is true that they pay for it. If "their representatives" get the remainder, then the individual as consumer is charged a second time, *via* either depreciation charges or taxation, for its use in further production. The products even of nationalised undertakings, though bought out of taxpayers' money, are not distributed free, nor even at the price which would represent the mere labour-component in further production.

This process generates inflation, and thus gives rise to the inevitable "wages chasing prices" phenomenon which accelerates the dilution of purchasing-power of the unit of money throughout the economy.

Yours faithfully,

BRYAN W. MONAHAN.

Canberra, A.C.T.

Reprinted 1963

**THE NATURE OF DEMOCRACY**

by

C. H. DOUGLAS

1/6 (plus postage)

from K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.

9 Avenue Road, Stratford-on-Avon

## THIS MONEY BUSINESS

Most of the problems facing families and governments today are money problems. In other words, people find themselves continuously short of money, and are compelled to give an increasing amount of time, energy and emotion in trying to limit their activities to fit into a rigid and antiquated framework which is purely financial.

When a shortage of money results in families and governments being unable to obtain the goods and services necessary to meet their legitimate requirements, and if money in circulation has any realistic relation to the productive power of a country, then a shortage of money must mean a shortage of resources, *i.e.* that the population and their resources are being used to their full capacity, and no further production is possible. This in turn would mean that there could be no such thing as a surplus of goods for sale, no unemployment problem, no such thing as hire-purchase, and that producers were under no necessity to seek customers by advertising their wares.

As all these conditions are exactly the reverse of what exists today in the Western World, we are forced to the conclusion that a shortage of purchasing power has nothing whatever to do with a shortage of productive power.

We must assume that the financial system is being used for some purpose other than that of giving people access to goods and services; we must assume that the system is being used as in war-time, as a rationing system for preventing people from having any control over the labour and resources of their country.

It should be noticed that in war-time most of our wealth was exported and given to our enemies for nothing. We believe that the same policy is still being pursued in peacetime, and that the export trade has been used to destroy Great Britain and the U.S.A. and is now being used to destroy Australia. The British people have had no control over their financial system for many years; nor have they had any statement of accounts to show them whether or not they have had the value of one bag of potatoes for each motor car exported.

Science, invention and modernisation are lauded as the great gods of the modern world, but if anyone has the temerity to ask the pertinent question, "Why do all these marvels not produce something marvellous in the form of purchasing power for the ordinary family?" he is met with complete silence. The complete silence, maintained by officialdom about this very obvious discrepancy between the almost unlimited powers of modern industry and the poverty-stricken standard of purchasing power of the ordinary family, requires a great deal of explanation.

This great silence is strange enough when found among the political parties which pretend to be very hostile to each other, but when this strange silence is found in the universities and among B.B.C. and A.B.C. commentators we begin to realise that there is a very rigid and powerful control being exercised and that our news services, like our finance, are centrally controlled, which means internationally controlled; which means controlled, by the declared enemies of the British people.

—JAS. GUTHRIE.

Published by K.R.P. Publications Ltd., at 9 Avenue Road, Stratford-on-Avon, and printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton, Liverpool 25.