

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 53. No. 2

MAY, 1973

About Killing The Unborn*

By MEDFORD EVANS

The Supreme Court January 22, 1973, ruled that state laws forbidding abortion are unconstitutional because they interfere with the right of privacy. Not only did seven of the nine men decide to absolve women of the first duty of motherhood—to keep the child alive—they also absolved physicians of the oath of Hippocrates which had previously, for some twenty-four centuries, guided the profession. Supreme Court decisions are supposed to end controversy, but this decision will deepen, if possible, the controversy over legalizing abortion.

For the Court did not *merely* legalize abortion. It prohibited laws intended to prevent abortion. A woman and her physician are not simply *permitted* to agree upon disposing of the unborn child, states are *forbidden to interfere* with the right of the two of them to kill the unborn child. Such an agreement, says the Court, is a private matter, and any interference by law unconstitutional. Whether the woman's husband has any right to object is a point the Court avoided. He is plainly enough of less importance than her physician.

It will be said that I have already begged the question on the main point at issue—which is whether an embryo or fetus prior to the seventh month of gestation is a human being, a person susceptible of being "killed." The Court avoided deciding when life begins (a question which is difficult only for those who do not like the obvious answer), contenting itself with the observation that "the unborn have never been recognized in the law as persons in the whole sense." Neither have minor children long out of the womb. Webster defines *majority* as "the age at which full civil rights are accorded"; yet the right to life—being accorded not by the state but by God—is, or has been, in our society recognized as belonging to infants. Indeed, if there is a difference, the infant's right to life is felt to be superior to that of the adult, certainly to that of the adult male. "Women and children first" into the lifeboats. The right to life has also been accorded to unborn children. That is why the states have *had* anti-abortion laws. The denial of the unborn's right to life is what makes the Court's decision so hideously revolutionary.

Naturally uneasy about the possible reception of its decision, the Court declared that it was *not* granting women the right to "abortion on demand." (It is customary, in such cases, to declare that you are not doing what you evidently are doing.) But the only limitation it has placed on satisfaction of such a demand is agreement of a licensed physician. Anticipating that such agreement might be regarded as generally contrary to the oath of Hippocrates, Justice Harry

A. Blackmun, who delivered the Court's decision, said that the oath "originated in a group representing only a small segment of Greek opinion and that it certainly was not accepted by all ancient physicians." Which is no doubt literally true, but irrelevant and misleading — irrelevant because, whatever the prevalence of the teachings of Hippocrates in ancient times, modern physicians *have subscribed* to the Hippocratic oath; misleading because those "ancient physicians" who did not follow Hippocrates were in general, though quite possibly a majority, superstitious quacks. The rival school of Cnidus, according to the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, consisted of physicians who "were apt to confuse symptoms and diagnosis" and "were not concerned with prognosis, nor with causes."

The oath of Hippocrates as given in the *Britannica* includes the words: ". . . and especially I will not aid a woman to procure an abortion." The *Columbia Encyclopedia* gives what it calls an "abridged version," which binds the physician "to give no drug, perform no operation, for a criminal purpose, even if solicited." Possibly the seven Justices relied on such a version, and reflected that they had the power to change what had been a criminal purpose to an exercise of the right of privacy. (Do not criminal purposes generally require privacy?) The Supreme Court transformed the Hippocratic oath to the hypocritical oath.

It will be objected that I am guilty of some kind of anthropomorphic fallacy when I refer to an embryo or a fetus as "an unborn child," or speak of the right to life of "unborn children." Children, I shall be told, are little darlings playing joyfully on the grass, or at worst little monsters smearing crayons on the wallpaper. A *fœtus* (unpleasant word, don't you think?—but so scientific!) is not a *child*, for heaven's sake!

You are entitled to your own opinion, but *Webster's Third New International Dictionary* (the unabridged) gives the following definition:

child . . . 1 a: *an unborn or recently born human* •
being: FETUS, INFANT, BABY . . .

Webster's Seventh New Collegiate is briefer, but almost equally embarrassing to Mr. Justice Blackmun: "child . . . 1 a: an unborn or recently born person." According to Webster, then, the unborn are not only "human beings" but also "persons." And a fetus is a child, is a baby.

* From *The Review Of The News*, February 14, 1973. *The Review Of The News* is published weekly from Belmont, Massachusetts, U.S.A. 02178.

According to the Associated Press, the Court's opinion was "supported with medical, religious, and philosophical as well as legal references." We should expect that—except for "religious" references. The Court has a well-established precedent for relying on social science rather than the law; yet one wonders how it reconciles *religious* references with its recent interpretations of the doctrine of the separation of church and state. I for one am glad to hear that the Court will now consider religious authority. I call its attention to a Biblical passage which it may possibly have overlooked, since its attention seems to be only recently turned to such considerations. The first chapter of the Gospel according to Saint Luke gives the story of the Annunciation of Jesus, preceded by the annunciation and conception of John the Baptist. We read how the angel Gabriel, having foretold to Mary the most blessed event which awaited her, continued:

And, behold, thy cousin Elisabeth, she hath also conceived a son in her old age: and this is the sixth month with her, who was called barren.

* * *

And Mary arose in those days, and . . . entered into the house of Zacharias, and saluted Elisabeth.

And it came to pass, that, when Elisabeth heard the salutation of Mary, the babe leaped in her womb . . .

Saint Elisabeth certainly had no doubt that the child she was carrying was a live person. She told the Virgin Mary, "As soon as the voice of thy salutation sounded in mine ears, the babe leaped in my womb for joy." The unborn child not only leaped, but felt the emotion of joy.

The question whether an unborn child is a person within the meaning of the law is the crux of the decision in the anti-abortion case. The Court correctly recognized this fact, but incorrectly reasoned regarding the legal meaning of *person*, and thus answered the question wrong. I speak as a friend of the court of public opinion. If it be asked how I, a non-lawyer, can dispute the correctness of the reasoning of the Supreme Court regarding a constitutional matter, my reply is:

First, the Constitution is not what the Supreme Court says it is, the Supreme Court is what the Constitution says it is. Second, the Constitution itself is the basic law of the land, and the Constitution is a document written in the English language. It is too important a law to be left to the lawyers. Third, the final word on the meaning of such a document is not to be left to *any* small group of persons, but is to be approached (possibly never achieved) by the serious consideration of all reasonable men who understand English and are loyal to the United States. Fourth and finally, I am a Ph.D. in English from a reputable university (Yale) and a loyal citizen of the United States.

The significance of the degree is simply that it does qualify me to say that in itself it has no bearing on this argument; neither does Mr. Justice Blackmun's law degree. My opinion is worth no more, and no less, than its inherent reasonableness makes it worth. The same thing is true of the opinion of the majority of the present Supreme Court. I speak of logical correctness of opinion; obviously, my opinion has at present no legal weight, while theirs is for the time being

unfortunately binding. But, as the "Liberals" say, we live in a changing world; so hold on.

Here is the Court's opinion as to what constitutes the crux of the case:

The appellee [State of Texas] and certain amici [friends of the court] argue that the foetus is a "person" within the language and meaning of the 14th Amendment. In support of this they outline at length and in detail the well-known facts of foetal development. If this suggestion of personhood is established, the appellant's case, of course, collapses, for the foetus' right to life is then guaranteed specifically by the Amendment.

Exactly. We shall return to emphasize what the Court here admits, that if personhood is established the easy-abortion case collapses, and to reinforce the argument that the right to life is guaranteed, by reference other than that to the Fourteenth Amendment. But because the matter is so important, and because we do not wish to be too far out of context, let me quote further from the Court's opinion, as excerpted in the *New York Times* of January 23, 1973:

The Constitution does not define "person" in so many words. The use of the word is such that it has application only postnatally.

All this, together with our observation that throughout the major portion of the 19th century prevailing legal abortion practices were far freer than they are today, persuades us that the word "person," as used in the 14th Amendment, does not include unborn.

I suppose the *New York Times* excerpt must here be incomplete. Surely Mr. Justice Blackmun, speaking for the majority, would not say "All this," referring to the two brief sentences of the preceding paragraph. Yet if he did actually go through the Constitution accumulating instances of the use of the word *person*, the paragraph would be less, not more, impressive. Mr. Justice Blackmun's sentence, "The [constitutional] use of the word [person] is such that it has application only postnatally," actually is, if it was not intended to be, equivocation. The word *person* is used in the Constitution only to specify who is not eligible to hold specified offices, or to define immunities, such as the provision that no person shall be convicted of treason without the testimony of two witnesses to the same overt act or confession in open court, and the provision that the migration of persons whom the states at the time thought proper to admit (euphemism for slaves) should not be prohibited before 1808. There is no use of the word *person* in the Constitution which has any relevance to the question of whether an unborn child is a person when abortion of the unborn child is at issue. Yet the question can be resolved logically, as follows:

The primary meaning of the word *person* in English is a *human being*, as distinguished from an animal, plant, or thing. The etymology of the word is from Latin *persona*, meaning an actor's mask in a play, and this meaning is reflected in the fact that *person* normally refers to a human being considered in relation to other human beings or to his environment. A person is observable, or capable of acting or being acted upon. *Person* is plainly not a synonym for *any human being who has full civil rights and liberties*. The

original Constitution twice refers to slaves as persons (Article I, Section 9, Clause 1, and Article IV, Section 2, Clause 3). The Fourteenth Amendment itself indeed begins with the statement, "All persons born or naturalized in the United States . . . are citizens." *Born* and *naturalized* are both restrictive modifiers, and do *not* mean that aliens not naturalized, or children not born, are not persons—simply that they are not citizens. But the Constitution nowhere provides that noncitizens may be freely deprived of life.

A person is a human being considered in external relations. That is why the baby in the womb seems to its mother to be a person, but hardly seems so to others until after it is born. Yet when other people deal with an unborn child, it becomes a person. It becomes a person to the physician, which is doubtless why Hippocrates proscribed abortion.

The law is concerned with external relations. Even though intent is vital to the law, intent is judged by overt acts. Thus it is true that the protection of the Fourteenth Amendment, or other law relevant to the whole issue, is meaningless in regard to an unborn child as far as most privileges and immunities, civil rights and liberties, are concerned. The unborn child cannot vote, therefore cannot be deprived of the right to vote. No one has a right to do something he cannot do.

The Fourteenth Amendment also forbids any state to "deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law," or to "deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." It should be noted that aliens within the jurisdiction of a state are entitled to equal protection of the laws—obviously, as far as the laws apply; laws concerning voting rights would not apply. The same principle should hold regarding unborn children; they are entitled to equal protection of the laws as far as the laws apply to their case.

The Constitution does not enumerate all individual rights, but it assumes at least those of the Declaration of Independence, and covers, as does the Declaration, a multitude of rights with the general terms *life* and *liberty*. The Declaration speaks of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness"; the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments of the Constitution restore the earlier Lockean formula of *life*, *liberty*, and *property*. Liberty, being a political term, has little or no relevance to the case of an unborn child. As for pursuit of happiness, who can say? That is indeed a private, not to say a subjective, matter; the unborn child may or may not have resources of his own. So many people want to retreat to the womb, they must believe they were happy there. (But they should be careful; they might get killed.)

Regarding *property*, I should suppose (not being a lawyer, I do not know, and language and logic alone will not solve this one) that a posthumous child can inherit property, which would seem to imply rights as a person at the time of his father's death, when the child itself was yet unborn. I have heard, too, that welfare mothers have claimed benefits for unborn children.

Life and the right to life are another matter entirely. The child in the womb cannot have civil liberty, and cannot be deprived of it; he may or may not have property rights and may or may not be deprived of them; but he certainly *does*

have life and *can* be deprived of it. Let us consider that for just a moment.

No one has a right to what in the nature of things he cannot possess, and not possessing cannot lose. No one has a right to that which belongs to another, or to no human being. A *right* is a just claim to possession, which may or may not be enforced, either by him whose right it is, or by his protector. Rights may in general be conferred or taken away by higher authority. Certain rights are unalienable as rights, but unfortunately quite alienable by usurpation of authority in a wicked world. It has never been said better than in the Declaration of Independence:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed . . .

With regard to other rights the status of the unborn child may be moot or ambiguous. But to life he has the unalienable right with which his Creator endowed him. He has this right more perfectly than he will ever have it again, for so long as he is unborn he will not be able to forfeit it through crime or other error of his own.

That the unborn child may be deprived of life by other persons puts him into relationship with these persons, and it is this relationship which makes him not only a human being, but also a person. If the unborn child were not in society, his mother and her physician could not remove him from society. Fœtal death is not possible without fœtal life, but if the fœtus has life he has a right to it.

The Constitution is the supreme law of the land; the Declaration of Independence, ratified by the Treaty of Paris of 1783, is the basis of the Constitution. There would have been no "We, the people of the United States" with the Declaration. The Constitution itself was ordained and established to "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." Thus, Constitutional rights belong to the unborn, and become real as soon as the unborn can be identified. (If a woman knows that she is pregnant—and she would have to know this to want an abortion—she knows that she ought not to have an abortion, she knows that the duty of motherhood has already begun, that someone is alive within her body, someone who has a right to life—no greater than her own but the same. As a rule, the two rights are not irreconcilable; if they were, the human race wouldn't be here.)

"All men are created equal." If they are created equal, they are equal when they are created. When is that? The Supreme Court pretends that this is a difficult question. Difficult indeed if you expect to know in a particular case the precise microsecond when the particular life began—though even here husbands and wives who think back in some cases figure out pretty well when it must have been. (Yes, I know that there are said to be islands in the South Seas where the natives do not believe that sexual intercourse causes pregnancy, but hold that it is caused by the flight of birds or passage of the sun, but I had not thought the Supreme Court

(continued on page 7)

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 £2.60 (52/-), Six months £1.30 (26/-).

Offices—

Business: 245 Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone, London, E.11. Tel. 01-534 7395
Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1. Tel. 01-387 3893

IN AUSTRALIA—

Business: Box 2318V, G.P.O., Melbourne, Victoria 3001
Editorial: Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001 (Editorial Head Office)

THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Personnel—Chairman: Dr. B. W. Monahan, 4 Torres Street, Red Hill, Canberra, Australia 2603. Deputy Chairman: British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1. Telephone: 01-387 3893. Liaison Officer for Canada: Monsieur Louis Even, Maison Saint-Michel, Rougement, P.Q., General Deputy Chairman and Secretary, H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001.

Vol. 52. No. 7.

May, 1973

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

One Jeremy Campbell contributes to the *Evening Standard* of April 4, 1973, a rather light-hearted article quoting New York stock exchange analysts as predicting "a money panic that will bring about the greatest crash in history" — ". . . the crash will spill into the general economy and create a very, very nasty recession. I can see small companies going bankrupt and some banks closing" — ". . . we may soon see the start of a world-wide deflation that eventually could make the great depression of the 1930s seem like a summer festival".

John Vaizey contributes to *The Sunday Telegraph* of April 8, 1973 an article entitled *Don't ask the economists for the answers*. "At the moment those who have the temerity to call themselves economists are in a strange way. We know—but the public do not—how insecure our knowledge is, first because the facts themselves are exceedingly vague and secondly the theories to interpret the facts are in an exceptional state of disarray". Mr Vaizey lists "several main strands of economic thinking" and adds ". . . it is important to realise that throughout Europe the Marxists are the dominant group of intellectuals." And he ends: "One day there will be a disaster of thalidomide proportions as their [some commentators' and civil servants'] credulity and our ignorance join together in some prescription that will do great harm." Phase III?

Marxian theory — *and practice* — is predicated on the eventual collapse of the 'capitalist' system. But Marxism is only one aspect of a much deeper and continuing conspiracy designed to achieve world-government by a self-perpetuating minority of the world's population. Financial manipulation and Communist organisation—on an international scale—are the complementary aspects of this Conspiracy. Built-in inflation is progressively potentially dispossessing individuals of their property—the great prototype of the mechanism being the great depression of the 1930s. This inflation—which is quite deliberate—creates mounting unrest, but also an increasing inability to resist ever more totalitarian government to restore 'law and order'. At the same time Communist

activity is assaulting traditional Society on every available front, to bring about a state of anarchy in which the organised Communist Party, *backed by the Red Army*, can seize control when the predicted (but carefully engineered) economic disaster occurs. "The Red Army stands ready to shake the tree when the rotten fruit is ready to fall". *That*, and not a conventional nationalistic confrontation, is the essential military strategic situation; and in conventional terms, it has gone beyond the point of no return.

Permissiveness (which has led to an epidemic of venereal disease), subsidised pornography, drug-pushing (Red China is the major source of supplies of opium and its derivative heroin), abortion on demand, student protest and riots, the adulteration and subversion of religion, massive brain-washing through the mass media, the corruption of genuine learning and the use of tertiary education for indoctrination to make "the dominant group of intellectuals" Marxist, and mounting industrial strife fuelled by inflation—all are so many weapons, carefully co-ordinated, aimed at the collapse of Christian civilisation. And a plainly ridiculous 'science' of economics disguises the part played in all this by sheer conspiratorial financial power. The key to the situation is deliberately maintained inflation in the face of a known but suppressed remedy.*

Years ago, we suggested that a patriotic Government should institute genuine financial reform. This would undoubtedly have provoked external sanctions—even the threat or actuality of war. But it would have afforded a *chance* of survival as against the certainty of cultural extinction, now almost accomplished. The idea that the military situation in Europe can be repaired in the face of the officially proclaimed Soviet superiority of about three to one is on a par with current economic theory, as described by John Vaizey. Economic theory and military strategy are equally tools of Finance-Communist Conspiracy; and if a way out of threatening disaster remains, the first requirement is a full and explicit recognition of that fact, and its exposure. By whatever means, the Conspiracy must be forced into the open so that the enemy may be seen; and financial reform still appears to be the best means to that end. Party politics is a dead loss and frightful danger; but an informed public opinion could conceivably turn the tide.

Notice

For the present the size of *The Social Crediter* in its monthly appearance will vary with the useful material available. Since there can no longer be any doubt that the state of the world is the outcome of conspiracy, a commentary on events that admits of any speculative point of view, or proceeds from a Party political premise, is merely divisive. The Heath Administration came to power on the premise that the Wilson Administration was "incompetent"; but things have got worse just as rapidly under Heath.

The subscription rate—which for a long time has been 'compensated' to a price below the cost of production and distribution by the use of funds donated to the Secretariat's support—will remain the same.

* See *Alternative to Disaster*, by Bryan W. Monahan: K.R.P. Publications and Tidal Publications.

Crystallised Policy

The Social Crediter since its inception forty years ago has always been a journal of policy, not of opinion. It has been concerned continuously with political and economic realism, so far as reality can be perceived.

The perception of reality is always a matter of insight—not of reason. It is a direct vision of the whole which underlies the parts; of the pattern which underlies apparently disconnected events. What we call history (*Definition*: "Continuous methodical record, in order of time, of important or public events . . .") the late C. H. Douglas, the author of the conception of Social Credit, characterised as "crystallised policy", meaning that the events recorded as history were to be understood only in terms of the policies which brought them about—or the conflict of opposing policies.

Douglas also perceived that there were only two fundamental policies operative in the world of events—policies deriving in their turn from two opposing philosophies, or conceptions, of the nature and purpose of Man. One conception is that the individual is simply an interchangeable component of a larger unity, like the spare parts of a motor-car. This is the Collectivist-Materialist view—the philosophy of which Socialism is the policy. But to paraphrase George Orwell: even in this view, some men are more interchangeable than others. The characteristic of the Collectivist society is *centralisation*—a pyramidal power-structure, with those at the apex of power replaceable, as a rule, only in the event of death, from violent or natural causes. In other words, the car has a driver.

The second, and opposed philosophy—of which Social Credit is the policy—regards the uniqueness and increasing differentiation of the individual as of supreme importance, so that, in consequence, social organisation should be such as to enable each individual to fulfil his personal destiny (whatever it might be) with increasing ease and certainty.

For a full understanding of Social Credit the study of Douglas's original works is indispensable, and of course underlies the relevant commentaries on events which have appeared in *The Social Crediter*. Several years ago a selection of such commentaries, written by Douglas, was published as a book under the title *The Development of World Dominion*. Later, two other selections of commentaries by B. W. Monahan were published under the titles *The Moving Storm* and *The Survival of Britain*. All these volumes were largely prophetic—that is to say, they forecast the probable outcome of persistence in certain economic and political strategies current at the time of writing the commentaries. But with the passage of time, the prophecies have almost all become history.

We feel now, though, that the momentum of events is so great that this present generation will witness the greatest tragedy in human history—the culmination of a centuries-old Conspiracy. But just as medical practitioners preserve the lives of sufferers from 'incurable' cancers, lest research suddenly produces a near-miraculous cure (as happened in the case of infectious diseases), so we may hope that a widespread understanding that the evils that beset us are the outcome of conspiracy may yet give the Conspirators ultimate defeat.

George Pratt Shultz

In his article, "Second Term—The New Nixon and Agnew Circus", in American Opinion, March, 1973, Mr. Gary Allen surveys President Richard Nixon's appointments to his new cabinet. We reprint the section dealing with Mr. George Pratt Schultz.*

The man in charge of both national and international economic policy during Nixon II is George Pratt Shultz, a member of the Pratt family of the Standard Oil fortunes. Shultz has the dual job of Secretary of the Treasury and, more important, Assistant to the President. The press has called him Nixon's "economic czar," and Shultz has admitted that his duties in this field "are similar" to those of Henry Kissinger in foreign policy.

Before being appointed "czar" over the economy, he first served as Mr. Nixon's Secretary of Labor. When the President announced the appointment of Shultz to head the Labor Department, prominent labor columnist Victor Riesel commented:

It is certain that President-elect Nixon is moving the Republican Party to the left of its old center. Of this there is living evidence in the [appointment of] "genial genius" George Shultz, the insider's insider . . .

Mr. Riesel's judgment was quickly vindicated as five of Shultz's first six appointments went to "Liberal" Democrats. The *Chicago Tribune* of February 15, 1969, reported that when Republican Senators began screaming about the Shultz appointments, the Secretary of Labor replied: "Why, I've been clearing them . . . with Senator Javits! He approved them all." Asked by the *Wall Street Journal* why he chose to work so closely with so many "Liberals," he responded curtly: "I didn't ask people about their politics."

It was Shultz who created the notorious Philadelphia Plan, which required that construction firms with government contracts hire "minority" employees to meet racial quotas dictated by federal bureaucrats—even though the U.S. Comptroller-General had issued an opinion that the scheme was in flagrant violation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which specifically forbids making race a condition of employment. The President overcame this objection by issuing an Executive Order to give the plan the force of law.

When Mr. Nixon reshuffled top officials in his Administration during the summer of 1970, he made George Shultz director of the newly created Office of Management and Budget. The move prompted *Human Events* to observe in its issue for June 20, 1970:

The President's naming of Labor Secretary George P. Shultz underscores the belief that the Nixon Administration will continue to move in a liberal direction on domestic affairs . . . While Shultz cannot be considered a liberal firebrand, he has consistently favored expanding the domestic side of the federal budget. Along with Finch and several others, for example, Shultz was a prime mover in getting the President to push for the radical, multi-billion dollar welfare reform bill.

* *American Opinion* is published monthly except July, from Belmont, Massachusetts, U.S.A. 02178.

George Shultz delights in using the rhetoric of Conservative economists. But it is only rhetoric. The editors of *Newsweek* took note of the phenomenon in their issue of November 15, 1971, describing Shultz as "a deeply conservative economist with an almost religious belief in the glory of free markets and the evils of government interference." The propaganda out of the way, *Newsweek* explained that Shultz became a closer confidant of Mr. Nixon after the imposition of dictatorial wage and price controls on August 15, 1971. And *Newsweek* then quoted Shultz regarding the President's drastic interference in the economy as follows: "I was in full support of the idea of the freeze and an effort to follow. This is a form of shock treatment and I think it is working." So much for his religion. The "Conservative" Mr. Shultz, described by *Dun's* as a "dedicated free-enterpriser," also presided over the biggest federal deficits since World War II. He covered this for the Nixon Administration by promoting what he called the "Full Employment Budget"—just the type of monetary finagling the Republicans used to decry as witch-doctor economics. And, in October of 1969, George Shultz was the first top official to urge publicity that the Federal Reserve loosen its money policy. This, combined with the huge Nixon deficits, produced the skyrocketing inflation which was used to justify totalitarian wage and price controls.

As Mr. Nixon's "economic czar," Shultz will administer Phase III of the President's New Economic Policy. Typical of the reaction to the announcement of Phase III was the response of *Newsweek*, which headlined its coverage: "Phase Three Means Phase-Out." Actually, the program is another tyranny wrapped in a typical Nixon-Shultz ambiguity. As George Shultz puts it: "The program is hard to describe in a single word. You can't call it wholly 'mandatory,' and you can't describe it as wholly 'voluntary.'"

Shultz admits that he is keeping a "stick in the closet" with which to punish those whose wage or price activities do not meet with his pleasure. He adds that he "might find some ways to make life unpleasant for companies that raise prices higher than the guidelines." Virginia Knauer, Mr. Nixon's special assistant for consumer affairs, provides details: "We've found that a visit from the I.R.S. has a beautiful effect on anyone who is even thinking about raising something—prices or wages." Supercrat Shultz is also pretty blunt about it. He says of Phase III: "There is the knowledge that people who don't cooperate are going to get clobbered."

In short: Mr. Nixon's Phase III gives Shultz and his underlings awesome power to decide whom to favor and whom to penalize. It is the power of economic dictatorship.

Back in the days when Richard Nixon was saying that he would never impose wage and price controls on the economy, he used an analogy about such controls acting like a lid on a boiling cauldron while the fire is being stoked. Eventually, Mr. Nixon pointed out, you either have to take off the lid or the kettle will blow up. His analogy was accurate. But President Nixon has continued to stoke the fires with tremendous deficits during Phases I and II. Now he must let some of the steam out before the kettle explodes. Later he will use the ensuing wage-price spiral to justify a return of formal wage and price controls—this time controls with real teeth. When the new controls are applied, Mr. Nixon's supporters

will shrug their shoulders and rationalize that the President tried freedom, but it just didn't work.

Meanwhile, the dollar is in serious trouble. When Dr. Shultz was promoted to "economic czar," the *Wall Street Journal* commented: "President Nixon's elevation of George P. Shultz to super-cabinet status as economic policy chief signals Mr. Nixon's intent to move international economic problems to the front burner in his second administration." Financial writer Hobart Rowan said that "Treasury Secretary George Shultz electrified the last I.M.F. meeting with a dramatic series of proposals to revamp the international monetary system." A Reuters dispatch for November 27, 1972, elaborated on that speech as follows:

The United States is also proposing a far more controversial plan to stop countries building up vast reserves of funds or, alternatively, huge deficits. The United States is urging internationally-agreed standards to determine whether a country with a surplus or deficit must correct its payments position.

All of which translates into a step toward international control of the economics of individual nations—a major step toward the sort of World Government plotted for years at the Harold Pratt House in New York City—headquarters of the Council on Foreign Relations.

Former Congressman John G. Schmitz properly described George Pratt Shultz's proposals at that I.M.F. meeting as a "blueprint for giving full control of the value of the American dollar to a few men Anyone empowered to set the value of money can, and almost certainly will, manipulate its value to his own profit and advantage. Our balance of payments deficit is the excuse given for surrendering control over our currency to an international body. In the same breath, Secretary Shultz admits this deficit is primarily due to our gigantic outlay of foreign aid since World War II. Since this is the case, the solution is not to turn over the control of our money to international financiers, but to cut out the economic foreign aid which has brought us down to this position."

Of course Shultz and his *Insider* friends at Standard Oil and the Council on Foreign Relations don't see it that way. And Mr. Nixon is playing the game their way.

Servitude — or Freedom

The article *Servitude — or Freedom* which appeared in *The Social Crediter*, January 6, 1973, is now available as a four page pamphlet. This article surveys B. W. Monahan's *Alternative to Disaster*, a sort of companion book to *None Dare Call It Conspiracy*, by Gary Allen, showing in more detail the financial aspects of the Conspiracy, and how an understanding of this aspect points the way to an alternative to Communist slavery.

Servitude — or Freedom and also the leaflet on *None Dare Call It Conspiracy*, which was issued as a Supplement to *The Social Crediter* for November 11, 1972, are free, on request, from K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 245 Cann Hall Road, London, E.11. Contributions towards costs and postages will be appreciated.

About Killing the Unborn *(continued from page 3)*

would be influenced by such after all rather exotic concepts of conception.) In general terms, there is no other rational answer to the question when men are created than: *at the time the sperm fertilizes the ovum*. When else? Mr. Justice Blackmun, writing for the majority of the Court, assumes a curious know-nothing position:

We need not resolve the difficult question of when life begins. When those trained in the respective disciplines of medicine, philosophy and theology are unable to arrive at any consensus, the judiciary, at this point in the development of man's knowledge, is not in a position to speculate as to the answer.

If that phony-sounding intellectual modesty were genuine, the judiciary would not be revolutionizing laws of the states of the Union, suborning violation of the Hippocratic oath, treating fatherhood with scarcely disguised contempt (the Texas case didn't raise the question of the rights of fathers, said the Court), and inciting mothers—rightfully the most revered of human beings—revered *because* they sacrifice themselves for their children—to quasi infanticide.

Actually, "those trained in the respective disciplines" mentioned have a pretty practical consensus regarding "when life begins." I hold no great brief for the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, but it is not exactly eccentric in such matters, and its article "Pregnancy" reads in part as follows:

Life has its beginning in the egg cell or ovum . . . During healthy reproductive life one ovum is shed each month from one or the other ovary (ovulation) . . . there is only a short critical interval in the cycle during which fertilization is possible. . . . If the ovum is not fertilized, it escapes in the next monthly loss of blood. If it is fertilized by a sperm cell (spermatozoon), pregnancy has begun.

Dr. Henry E. Garrett, former head of the psychology department at Columbia and president of the American Psychological Association, says in his book *Psychology And Life*: "When the egg of the female parent has been fertilized by the sperm of the male parent, life of the new individual begins." He then describes the contribution of chromosomes from each parent. When the genetic composition of an individual is determined, his life begins. Do we have to assume a know-nothing attitude about that?

True, there are theosophical and other religious beliefs about the pre-existence and/or reincarnation of the soul; there are racist beliefs about the Aryan or other group soul; there are concepts of "Man" and the "Oversoul" which indeed raise doubts as to when life began—but they nearly all put the beginning earlier than conception of the individual, not later. There may be religious mystics who contend that God does not breathe the soul into the child's body until it is born—or for that matter until it begins to speak or can understand the *Bible*—but these are eccentric beliefs beyond the reach of rational criticism. It would be strange for a Court committed to separation of church and state to be guided by such doctrines. Certainly for the vast majority of religious persons, and for all materialists, there is no possible answer to the question (When is a person created?) except the time of conception.

It follows that every person from the time of conception has the right of equal protection of the laws, which includes the right not to be deprived of life without due process of law. Such due process might logically enough hinge upon a determination whether continuing the life of the embryo will critically endanger the life of the mother. Killing in self-defence or in defence of another is justifiable. It is difficult to imagine any other legitimate reason for abortion. If illegitimacy were a reason, it would follow that illegitimate children not aborted before birth should be destroyed after birth.* Similarly with deformed children. Indeed, infanticide for these or lesser reasons has been practised in the history of mankind, but seldom if ever in the civilized world in the Christian Era.

"Spontaneous abortion," says the *Columbia Encyclopedia*, "may occur after the death of the foetus and hemorrhage in the uterus." According to the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, the World Health Organization in 1950 established the following classification to account for events less precisely known as stillbirth or abortion:

. . . group I, early foetal death—pregnancy of less than 20 weeks; group II, intermediate foetal death—pregnancy from 20 to 28 weeks; group III, late foetal death—pregnancy of more than 28 weeks; group IV, foetal death with length of pregnancy unknown.

Consider the simple but powerful significance of the expressions "death of the foetus" and "foetal death" which are precise medical and legal language. The noun *death* is defined as, the end of life, the intransitive verb *die* as, to end life. The transitive verb *kill* is defined as, to cause the end of life, to deprive of life.

Accident or disease may cause death, may kill. Human action may cause death, or kill. When foetal death occurs as a result of human action, killing occurs. Killing is not necessarily murder, not necessarily manslaughter, but it is killing. If a foetus is a human being, causing the death of a foetus is homicide.

Is a foetus a human being? It is a being, it is real. If the mother is human, the foetus is human. To cause the death of a human foetus is homicide. There is no basis for asserting the contrary.

What is generally called abortion is, then, homicide. That is not to say that abortion must never be performed. Sometimes homicide is justified. But it is not justified unless it is recognized for what it is, and the action taken only under the most severe circumstances.

* The Court indicated that factors which could, under its ruling, be weighed by a woman and her physician in determining whether to produce an abortion, include her status as married or single. The Court, like the pro-abortion lobby, seems much concerned over the "stigma of illegitimacy." One would have thought that such advanced thinkers would have rejected the idea that there is any stigma to illegitimacy, would have shared the sarcasm of Edmund in *Lear*, who sneers, "Fine word, legitimate!" Is this concern for legitimacy real or affected? Perhaps it is genuine. After all, Supreme Court justices know how it feels to be called bastard.

NONE DARE CALL IT CONSPIRACY

By GARY ALLEN

"After reading this book you will never look at national and world events in the same way again"

—John G. Schmitz, United States Congressman

"This book concerns the way in which our nation and other nations are actually governed. As Benjamin Disraeli said, this is not the way in which most people think nations are governed. The whole subject of the **Insiders** who so largely control our political and economic lives is a fascinating mystery.

"For the reader who is intelligent but uninitiated in the literature of superpolitics, I can think of no better introduction to the field than **None Dare Call It Conspiracy**".

1 copy 50p 3 copies £1 10 copies £3 25 copies £6
100 copies £18

ALTERNATIVE TO DISASTER

By BRYAN W. MONAHAN

Examines the economic foundations of the Conspiracy and points the way to an alternative to Communist slavery

1 copy 30p 3 copies 75p 10 copies £2 25 copies £4.25p

THE DEVELOPMENT OF WORLD DOMINION

By C. H. DOUGLAS

The post-war years in Great Britain under the Attlee Socialist Administration were critical, for in those few years Britain, victorious in war, lost the peace. Throughout that period the late C. H. Douglas wrote a series of penetrating commentaries dealing with the politics, economics and conflicting philosophies of the times. He warned the British of the fate being prepared for them—the fate which has now befallen them. Once-Great Britain has been derisively referred to as the Sick Man of Europe. This did not "just happen", nor was it, as it appeared to be, mere incompetence. It was the maturation of long-prepared conspiracy, preparing the ground for the *coup de grace* under the Wilson and Heath Administrations. The selection of commentaries comprising this very important book make it unique among Douglas's works, and highly relevant to the current situation.

Paper cover 68p

Cloth £1.35p

BOOK LIST

A comprehensive list of books on the conspiracy and allied matters is available. Free on request.

THE MOVING STORM

Contemporaneous commentaries on linked events 1964-1968, with an Introduction on historical significance

By BRYAN W. MONAHAN

The Twentieth Century A.D. has witnessed a transformation of the world more profound and extensive than in any period in the existence of the globe. In its beginning it seemed to promise such a flowering of Christian Græco-Roman civilisation as had never appeared possible, for now the Curse of Adam would be borne by the magnificent complex of machines, setting free the Spirit of Man.

Instead, the Twentieth Century has seen the death, despoliation and torture of hundreds of millions of men, women and children. The destruction of mankind has become a technical possibility, whose threat is employed to impose a universal slavery. The beneficial use of the miracle of modern technology has been centralised in the hands of would-be World Rulers, seeking to perpetuate a dynasty over a permanently enslaved mankind.

The Moving Storm is a companion volume to *The Development of World Dominion*, bringing comments on events up to the present situation.

Paper cover 73p

Hard cover £1.35p

THE SURVIVAL OF BRITAIN

Contemporaneous Commentaries on linked events of 1968-1970

By BRYAN W. MONAHAN

Edited and arranged by T. N. MORRIS

"This volume is a sequel to *The Moving Storm* which, together with its companion volume, *The Development of World Dominion*, traced the emergence of a long term policy in contemporary political and economic developments. *The Moving Storm* carried the story to late 1968, by which time the predicament of Europe—virtual encirclement by Soviet forces—was plainly visible to anyone not blinded by the episodic view of history. Since then, developments have been catastrophic. . . ."

Part I is a collection of notes and comments which appeared in *The Social Crediter* during 1968-70. Individual notes cover a wide range of observation and argument, but have been grouped under roughly appropriate headings, numbered for reference and the date of publication of each note is given. All the extracts demand urgent attention.

Part II aims at introducing some realism into economic thinking. It contains proposals of prime importance which, although intended in the first instance for South Africa, could be applied in principle in Great Britain as a first step towards preventing inflation and even putting it in reverse, thus bringing speedy and progressive amelioration to all concerned.

The Appendix, entitled *The Trap*, describes the financial trap in which Britain is not so much 'struggling to survive' but which is being prevented by the traitors in its midst from dismantling. This was published separately as a pamphlet in July 1969.

Clothbound £1.10p

Prices include postage

K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 245 Cann Hall Road, London E.11 3NL