THE NEW TIMES SURVEY

Vol. 24 No. 05 | Registered Australia Post - Publication PP343214 / 00016 | May 2023

CONTENTS

What Can Douglas Social Credit Contribute to the Solution of Poverty? by M. Oliver Heydorn 1
A Review of *Making Sense of Nonsense: Navigating the West's Current Quagmire* by Peter Brüning 7
Don't Cry for me Argentina by Ken Grundy 8

WHAT CAN DOUGLAS SOCIAL CREDIT CONTRIBUTE TO THE SOLUTION OF POVERTY? by M. Oliver Heydorn

Douglas Social Credit – not to be confused with the far more recent totalitarian surveillance/reward and punishment system that has been instituted by the Chinese Communist Party – was an extensive body of philosophical, economic, political, and historical thought developed by the British engineer, Major C.H. Douglas (1879-1952). Of these four main areas of inquiry, the term 'Social Credit' became primarily associated with Douglas' financial analysis and proposals. During the Great Depression, Douglas' ideas for monetary and economic reform were so popular in some parts of the British empire that a Social Credit government was elected in the Canadian province of Alberta in 1935. This was followed by the election of a second Social Credit government in Canada in the province of British Columbia 17 years later, the year that Douglas died. Together, these Social Credit parties held the reins of power in their respective provinces for several decades. Unfortunately, given their status as regional governments, they were not permitted to implement any of Douglas' proposals. Every attempt that was made was thwarted by various higher authorities within the Canadian political structure. So what is Douglas Social Credit all about? And what can it contribute to the elimination, or at least the alleviation, of poverty and the threat of poverty?

For the sake of this exercise, 'poverty' may be defined as doing without some of the key goods and services that are necessary to survive and to attain a basic degree of human flourishing. To not have enough healthy food, potable water, suitable clothing consonant with one's social milieu, sufficient space in which to live and work that is properly protected from the elements, or to lack healthcare, educational opportunities, transportation facilities, etc., is to be poor. To possess these things but to possess them in an insecure way, where they could be taken away suddenly through no fault of one's own, is to live a life that is threatened with poverty. Billions of people on this planet live either in poverty to one degree or another, or are, at the very least, constantly threatened with joining the ranks of the poor. Douglas recognized that poverty and the threat of poverty were very great evils indeed: "It is poverty and economic insecurity which submits human nature to the greatest strain...."[1]

To put his views regarding the origin of poverty in the most simple of terms, C.H. Douglas claimed that the single greatest cause behind poverty in both the developed and the developing worlds had to do with the way in which the current financial system is designed and the way in which it functions, or rather malfunctions, in consequence. In other words, poverty in the modern world is not due, in the main, to alleged faults in human nature, or to administrative or organisational problems involving the relationship between owners and workers, etc., or to an inability to produce. Instead, it is chiefly due to the nature of the financial software on the basis of which we run our economies:

> **[T]he modern production system can meet every possible need of society without any stress or strain, if only it is freed from the fetters imposed upon it by the existing financial system.**[2]

Douglas could assert this claim with such confidence as early as the end of the First World War because production, as a physical problem, had been solved by the development of new technologies in the course of the industrial revolution:

> **[O]ne-tenth of the available labour, working short hours but with the whole of its attention directed solely to the objective of the most efficient production, could supply all the general demands of the population of this country, either by direct production, or by exchange of proper methods for the production of other countries, in respect of articles which cannot reasonably be produced at home; in other words, production, as a problem, has been solved long ago.**[3]

Human beings had learned to effectively harness solar energy in its myriad forms as a means of powering the operation of various kinds of machines and these machines were able to do more work (and in many cases better work) than any number of human beings could do by working to produce the same goods and services by hand. Mass production meant that the end of poverty was in sight. One hundred years on from the First World War, the actual rate of production, as well as the potential rate of production, are both many, many times greater now than they were then, especially considering the advent of things like automation, artificial intelligence, and information transfer, storage, and processing technologies.

If we were to consider the matter merely from a physical point of view, we certainly possess the material resources and other means necessary to physically deliver more than enough food, clothing, and shelter, as well as educational, transport, and health services for the 8 billion people who currently inhabit the planet. In other words, there is no longer any physical reason for poverty. Either there is no real scarcity, as in actual scarcity (as a matter of fact), or if there is actual scarcity, there need not be any such scarcity because there is none existing as a matter of principle (as an inherent feature marking our economic potential). And yet, significant poverty continues to exist; this is the paradox of 'poverty in the midst of plenty'. The paradox can be resolved once one understands that the scarcity we face in the modern world is very largely artificial in origin, and, as was explained earlier, had been traced back by Douglas to the financial system. If poverty is an artificial problem, in the sense that it has a man-made origin, then it is not somehow inherent to the nature of life on this planet. This is a key part of the good news announced by Douglas Social Credit.

More specifically, Douglas held that poverty, or the lack of goods and services relative to legitimate need, was due either to the failure to catalyze sufficient production, or to the failure to adequately distribute the production that had been made available. Both of these occurred because of a lack of sufficient monetary tokens. These tokens Douglas likened to tickets. In the modern economy, production does not generally take place, nor can it be distributed, without the application of sufficient money to effect both processes.

As far as production is concerned, money is needed to acquire the raw materials, the real capital (machinery and equipment), the energy, and the labour necessary to initiate and carry out the production process. Without payment nothing can be set into motion and production facilities lie underemployed, idle, or are never built in the first place. As far as consumption is concerned, money is needed as a tool of exchange which, when passed from consumer to retailer, allows the consumer to obtain the good or service that he desires while parting with his money on the one hand, and simultaneously allows the retailer to earn money with which his own costs and profit can be met on the other. Again, without money, the distribution does not, cannot, take place. Money is the great limiting factor:

> **I have no hesitation in saying that this situation I have attempted to outline to you is absolutely the core of the world crisis through which we are passing. To condense the situation into a paragraph, what the population of the world wants, and is determined to get, is a sufficiency of goods and services; there is no lack of these goods and services, either actual or potential, but they cannot be obtained except through the agency of money of which there is a lack. This lack of money is, in no sense, natural, in the sense of being unavoidable, but is wholly artificial, and is the result of a deliberate policy in the operation of the money system, although that policy may not perhaps be wholly conscious.**[4]

While the monetary or financial stifling of production and distribution can and does occur in both developing and developed countries, the problems money (or rather the lack of it) imposes on production are perhaps the more obvious and immediate concern in developing countries, while the problems imposed by the lack of sufficient money (in the right form and in the right hands) for the purpose of effecting distribution are more obvious in developed countries.

Now, one of the key axioms elucidated by C.H. Douglas was: "Whatever is physically possible and desirable should be financially possible". In other words, whenever there exists, on the one hand, a legitimate need for certain goods and services amongst the population of a country, and there is, on the other hand, the raw materials, labour, technology, etc., to meet those needs *via* appropriate production (or the elements in question could be easily acquired or manufactured), then the financial system should be designed in such a way that it will automatically supply a sufficient flow of producer credit to catalyze the required production. If it can't do that, then the system should be redesigned and re-deployed until it can. In no way should finance or money serve as the limiting factor in our economic lives. Rather, finance and money should be subordinated to the needs of the real, or physical economy. Since money is merely symbolic and informational in nature, there can't be, or there ought not to be, any artificial limitation of the quantity of money that can be created, or the volume of money that can be issued. The only limitations that should actually matter are those that are inherent to the society's real credit, i.e., its ability to produce in conjunction with the need/desire to consume on the part of its members. Provided that there is both the need and the ability to answer to that need, there is an adequate basis upon which money can be created and

then issued to catalyze the desired production. Money should be automatically forthcoming to make the wheels of production turn.

Every developing country in the world should therefore take an inventory of itself and inquire: 1) what are the people lacking in terms of goods and services? and 2) do we have the means or could we easily acquire the means to produce the goods and services that are lacking? If the answer to the second question is 'yes' then it is crucial to understand that money is just a contrivance. If the institutions, laws, etc., do not yet exist that can be relied on to create and issue the necessary producer credit in a responsible manner, then they can and should be introduced. There is no need to import money in the form of foreign loans or investments (unless there is some need for foreign exchange to obtain the means of production from outside the country – but then that would presuppose a qualified 'no' as the correct answer to the 2nd question posed above). In principle, every country can create as much money as its physical economy can absorb for the sake of catalyzing needed production.

Another key axiom of Douglas was the idea that 'Whatever is produced should be capable of being paid for in full without the necessity of increasing debt'. In other words, the financial system should, at all times, provide the body of consumers with sufficient money in the form of income so as to clear the market of whatever desirable goods and services are on offer at any given point in time. The rate at which costs and prices are built up in the productive system should be equal to the rate at which consumer income is being distributed. So long as the additional producer credit is mirrored by additional consumer production with remunerative costs and prices attached, there would also be no danger of demand-pull inflation. Money and production will move forward in sync, step by step, preventing any kind of situation in which there would be 'too much money chasing too few goods'.

Through his careful analysis of the costing system (of which his famous A+B theorem was an important part) [5], Douglas established that the existing financial system did not automatically supply sufficient money in the form of wages, salaries, and dividends to offset or complement the costs and prices that were simultaneously being built up in the course of production. Wages, salaries, and dividends lagged behind the flow of corresponding prices. The saving and re-investment of incomes made this situation even worse. Naturally, this deficiency in consumer buying power had to be made up under pain of bankruptcies, job losses, recessions, or worse. Sometimes the price-income gap would not be adequately filled, and economic slowdown, recession or depression would be the inevitable result. Whatever poverty existed previously in the society would then be amplified as more and more people were thrown out of work, were obliged to sell assets, lost benefits, or were otherwise forced to join the ranks of the poor.

The main method that the existing financial system employed and continues to employ in order to fill the gap was to induce someone to borrow more money into existence from the banking system to directly supplement the flow of consumer buying power (via the issuance of consumer loans and lines of credit, including mortgages, car loans, student loans, credit cards, installment buying plans, etc.) or else to induce governments and/or businesses to borrow additional money into being for the purpose of expanding public or capital production. This latter approach would distribute additional wages, salaries, and dividends, i.e., additional consuming buying power, without, in the same period of time, increasing the rate of flow of consumer goods and services. In order to properly appreciate this reliance on increasing debt as a method of compensating for the gap, one must already understand that under the existing debt-money system every bank loan creates money *ex nihilo* in the form of bank credit and every repayment of a bank loan destroys bank credit. The vast majority of the money supply exists in the form of bank credit (rather than notes and coins) and most of that bank credit is issued in the form of a repayable debt.[6]

In order to avoid further indebtedness, another alternative was to seek the establishment of a 'favourable balance of trade'. By exporting in monetary terms more than what one imports, it becomes possible to narrow the gap in both directions, i.e., by a) getting rid of some of the surplus production that is not otherwise sellable and by b) distributing additional wages, salaries, and dividends *via* the activities of the exporting companies.

The conventional methods of filling the gap, while enabling the economy to hobble along, cause all sorts of economic, social, environmental, political, cultural, and international problems. Since the gap is not always filled, there can be recessions. There can also be demand-pull inflation if too much compensatory money is issued and the gap is overshot. This is what occurs in a boom and the economy 'overheats'. The tremendous increase in public and private debts which accompanying the filling of the recurring price-income gap also leads to periodic financial crises as the aggregate debt can become too large and the economy incapable of carrying it. Banks then cease to lend as confidence declines, a credit crunch ensues, and bankruptcies and economic slowdown/contraction follow. This does allow, however, for some of the debt to be rewritten off and for the economy to return to a path of growth once the pain subsides.

The steady increase in debt also drives another kind of inflation, known as cost-push. The more debt there is, the more income is diverted to servicing repayments and interest charges, and the more income is diverted the more difficult it becomes to maintain the standard of living on the basis of existing incomes. This leads to

demands for wage and salary increases to compensate. But since wages and salaries must eventually be recovered in costs and hence prices, this causes prices to increase. Cost-push inflation is one of the ways we try to relativize the size of the ever-increasing societal debt load that is a by-product of conventional methods of filling the price-income gap.

The contemporary methods are also inefficient in a physical sense because it means we have to work harder and longer than would otherwise be necessary on things that no one really wants or would not want under a saner system (which implies a tremendous amount of waste and sabotage) in order to obtain the additional buying power necessary to distribute the surplus of those goods and services that are desired and needed.

For the same reason, the existing system is unjust insofar as it does not automatically enfranchise the consuming public with the sufficient buying power which should be theirs by right. You see, whatever has been paid for in physical terms (and everything that has been produced and is waiting for purchase must have been paid for already in physical terms, otherwise it would not exist), should, if the financial system accurately reflected reality, be capable of being purchased in full in financial terms while leaving no residue of debt. To deny the consuming public the consuming power to match their producing power, is to fail to give the public their due; it is a gross injustice.

Beyond that, filling the gap with debt-money combined with the need for constant economic growth plays a huge role in the heavy and often increasing taxation under which we labour, installs servility in the form of wage and debt-slavery, centralizes economic wealth, privilege, and power in fewer and fewer hands (i.e., in the hands of those who own the financial system or otherwise profit from its operations), induces forced migration, cultural dislocation, unnecessary stresses and strains, social conflict, environmental degradation, and can provoke international economic conflict (since not all countries can simultaneously enjoy favourable trade balances) which can then lead to war, etc., etc. We pay a very heavy price in dysfunction at all levels of our human existence for the running of the financial system as a private monopoly that alone possesses the means of alleviating the price-income gap. Poverty, as bad as that is, is merely one of the more salient features of our dysfunctional financial and economic system.

Douglas suggested that, *in lieu* of all of the conventional methods of filling the gap, an organ of the state – call it the "National Credit Authority" – should be instituted to regulate a country's financial system in line with the physical economic realities. This would make the financial system structurally honest. In the case of consumption, the National Credit Authority would measure the size of the gap in each economic period and monetize it via the creation and issuance of 'debt-free' credit (i.e., credit that would not need to be repaid to the National Credit Authority by its recipients). All of this 'debt-free' credit would be distributed to or on behalf of consumers in order to supplement their buying power (i.e., their regular incomes composed of wages, salaries, and dividends) and to thereby bring it into alignment with the flow of costs and prices.

The direct payment was termed a National Dividend and would be issued in equal payments to all citizens (who would be considered as shareholders in their economies) on a periodic basis:

> **It is quite possible to conceive of Great Britain in the light of what financial experts call a "holding company," that is to say, an undertaking which, without interfering with the numerous smaller undertakings that it controls, yet issues additional purchasing power on the credit of all of them and distributes this as dividends to its shareholders. Let us call this holding company Great Britain, Ltd., and let us suppose that Great Britain, Ltd., takes back from the Bank of England, which is a private company controlled by financiers, probably not English, the power of actually creating money, which it has surrendered.**
>
> **Then, without interfering with the management of industry in the country, it is possible for Great Britain Ltd., to issue purchasing power in the form of a national dividend, not by taxing its shareholders, but by creating the money in exactly the same way that the banks create it at the present time, and to such an amount as will ensure that all goods which are produced can be bought.** [7]

The indirect payment was the National Discount or compensated price discount. This was based on the observation that since the true cost of production is consumption (i.e., the cost of what was consumed in the process of bringing a good or service into being is its true cost) no good or service should be priced at a level that exceeds its real or true cost. By multiplying the official financial cost by the financial value of consumption divided by the financial value of the corresponding production or the C/P ratio, we can arrive at the real or true cost of that production. In order that the retailers would not lose any money, the National Credit Authority would issue sufficient 'debt-free' credit to them in order to make up for the cost of the discount in the lowered prices that would made available to consumers. If the C/P ratio was ¾, then prices would be discounted by 25% to the consumer. The National Credit Authority would then issue a rebate to the retailer that would be equivalent to that 25% so that he would not be out of pocket. The end result would be to increase the buying power of the consumer and to contribute something to the narrowing of the price-income gap.

It is difficult to underestimate the effect that the introduction of these two mechanisms would have on the phenomenon of poverty, as well as the threat/fear of poverty. The National Dividend, since it would be issued independently of employment status, would mean that every individual would have a secure source of income that, in developed countries at any rate, should be large enough to meet their basic needs. So long as people are to be accorded the means to buy some of the goods and services which, thanks to the nature of modern production capacity, can be so easily produced in such abundance, poverty (understood in the sense of doing without needed goods and services) must cease to exist or at least be severely attenuated. When one considers the further enhancement of consumer buying power that would be effected *via* the introduction of the National Discount, the expectation that poverty could finally be vanquished by an application of the Social Credit monetary reform proposals can only be strengthened:

> **The practical effect of a National Dividend would be, firstly, to provide a secure source of income to individuals which, though it might be desirable to augment it by work, when obtainable, would, nevertheless, provide all the necessary purchasing power to maintain self-respect and health. By providing a steady demand upon our producing system, it would go a long way towards stabilising business conditions, and would assure producers of a constant home market for their goods.[8]**

The financial facilitation of consumption *via* a Social Credit monetary reform would have one further impact where poverty is concerned: it would break the shackles on the rate of production. When producers are assured of a market so long as they are producing a desirable good or service, they can produce as much as the market will bear. There need be no sabotage or the artificial limiting of production rates. Thus, production geared for consumer use can proceed freely with no artificial financial constraints interrupting the production and distribution of consumables. The volume of production will increase and the unit costs of each individual item produced will tend to decrease. In the same way, a guaranteed sufficiency of real consumer buying power (as opposed to compensatory debt-money) will support the expansion or extension of production facilities as, when, and where required by the existence of real consumer demand that has been duly enfranchised with financial buying power. With the consumption system ricocheting on the production system in such a positive manner, it is virtually guaranteed that, so long as an economy has the physical capacity to meet the needs of the people for goods and services, no one will go without. Poverty will be relegated to the history books.

One of the interesting implications of the Douglas Social Credit analysis and proposals with respect to poverty is that it also demonstrates the falsity of the socialist contention that the primary reason why the poor are poor must be because the rich are rich and that therefore the solution to poverty must reside in making the rich poorer. But if what has been termed 'Say's law' is actually inapplicable to the modern, industrial world, then the fundamental problem is not inequitable distribution of income (without denying that this can be and often is a problem due to its sheer magnitude) but has rather to do with the initial distribution of income which, in the aggregate, is insufficient to meet the corresponding flow of costs/prices that need to be liquidated. You cannot make an insufficient flow of consumer buying power sufficient by redistributing its allocation. Instead, you must add a supplementary flow of consumer credits in order to equate the flow of prices with the flow of incomes. If these supplementary credits are distributed on an equitable basis, you can alleviate if not also eliminate poverty without 'robbing Peter to pay Paul':

> **The Socialist complaint against so-called capitalism is that money has been distributed inequitably, that is to say, that some people, the "Capitalists", get too much and some, the "Workers", get too little. Hence the Socialist is permanently committed to a policy of "soak the rich".**
>
> **It is a primary tenet of Social Credit theory that though this inequitable distribution may exist, it is a secondary consideration to the fact that not enough money is distributed to buy the goods that are for sale, and that in consequence redistribution is not an economic remedy, whilst being a political irritant of a high order.[9]**

Now, it may be objected that the Douglas Social Credit proposals, envisaging as they do the creation and issuance of a supplementary flow of debt-free consumer credits, would be inflationary. The first thing to be noted in response to this objection is that these consumer credits are to be issued *in lieu* of all of the conventional methods of filling the gap. Borrowing for increased government or private production, especially capital production, when this production is not really desired or needed in itself, but is merely desirable as a way of keeping the economy afloat, would have to come to an end. Similarly, consumers would have to be prohibited from borrowing money into existence in order to facilitate consumption. Finally, trade balances would become equal or balanced in a Social Credit world because there is no merit in exporting more than you import (which actually constitutes a physical loss) when you can access as much money as is necessary to bring consumer incomes into alignment with consumer prices.

What the Douglas Social Credit measures seek to achieve is to balance the flow of prices with the flow of incomes in a one-to-one correspondence; the supplementary consumer credits would be carefully calculated to achieve this objective. Under such a set-up, one that cannot be upturned by the employment of

conventional debt-filling methods on top of the Social Credit adjustments, there is no possibility of there being too much money chasing too few goods.

From this point of view, what Social Credit seeks is not so much more money as a different kind of money, i.e., an input of 'debt-free' consumer credits vs. debt-money derived from various sources and issued for various purposes. Once it is recognized that both consumers and the economy as a whole require a steady stream of 'debt-free' consumer credits for the purpose of making the financial system self-liquidating, the economy can grow and/or retool itself as necessary so as to increase the flow of desired production to whatever level consumers wish in the assurance that there will necessarily and automatically be enough consumer buying power to balance out the flow of remunerative consumer prices that are coming on to the market. ***

References:

[1] C.H. Douglas, *The Monopoly of Credit,* 4th ed. (Sudbury, England: Bloomfield Books, 1979), 99.

[2] C.H. Douglas, *Warning Democracy,* 3rd ed. (London: Stanley Nott, 1935), 10. In consequence, Douglas once defined poverty as a "lack of sufficient purchasing power accompanied by economic need." C.H. Douglas, The Use of Money (Liverpool: K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 1934), 9.

[3] C.H. Douglas, *The Breakdown of the Employment System* (Vancouver: The Institute of Economic Democracy, 1979), 4. This statement was made by Douglas in 1923.

[4] C.H. Douglas, *The Breakdown of the Employment System* (Vancouver: The Institute of Economic Democracy, 1979), 7. Compare C.H. Douglas, *The Monopoly of Credit,* 4th ed. (Sudbury, England: Bloomfield Books, 1979), 89-90:

> "Yet no economic training is necessary to assess the meaning of the existing situation. On the one hand we have an enormous and increasing capacity to produce the goods and services which are the primary objective of civilisation and which probably form the material basis on which alone a cultural superstructure can be reared. On the other hand we have an immense population not only unable to obtain from the shops, which are so anxious to sell, those goods which they are unable to buy, but are, by the miscalled unemployment problem, prevented from producing still further goods. Ordinary common sense alone seems to be required to recognise that only one thing stands between this practically unlimited capacity to produce, and what is in fact a definitely limited capacity to consume, and that is the money system, the bottle-neck which separates production and consumption."

[5] The classical statement of the A+B theorem runs as follows:

> "A factory or other productive organisation has, besides its economic function as a producer of goods, a financial aspect – it may be regarded on the one hand as a device for the distribution of purchasing power to individuals, through the media of wages, salaries, and dividends; and on the other hand as a manufactory of prices – financial values. From this standpoint its payments may be divided into two groups.
> *Group A* – All payments made to individuals (wages, salaries, and dividends).
> *Group B* – All payments made to other organisations (raw materials, bank charges, and other external costs.)
> "Now the rate of flow of purchasing power to individuals is represented by *A,* but since all payments go into prices, the rate of flow of prices cannot be less than *A* plus *B.* Since A will not purchase *A* plus *B,* a proportion of the product at least equivalent to *B* must be distributed by a form of purchasing power which is not comprised in the description grouped under *A*."

C.H. Douglas, *The Monopoly of Credit,* 4th ed. (Sudbury, England: Bloomfield Books, 1979), 142-143.

[6] Cf. https://www.bankofengland.co.uk/-/media/boe/files/quarterly-bulletin/2014/money-creation-in-the-modern-economy.pdf

[7] C.H. Douglas, *Major C.H. Douglas Speaks* (Sydney: Douglas Social Credit Association, 1933), 14.

[8] C.H. Douglas, *The Monopoly of Credit,* 4th ed. (Sudbury, England: Bloomfield Books, 1979), 102.

[9] Ibid., 1. Cf. also C.H. Douglas, *Warning Democracy,* 3rd ed. (London: Stanley Nott, 1935), 126:

> "The poor are poor not because the rich are rich, but because there is not enough *money,* or, more correctly, purchasing power, to make the poor rich, or even comfortably well off, even if the whole of the money possessed by the rich were taken from them and equally divided amongst the poor."

It should also be pointed out that in practice, the socialist policy of taxing the wealthy in order to 'redistribute the wealth' usually means disproportionately taxing the middle classes (who lack the resources of the upper class to take advantage of loop holes in the tax system alongside other opportunities, i.e., off-shore banking, etc., in order to lessen their tax burden), that very often the 'poor' do not benefit to the greatest possible extent from this taxation, as much of it is employed in the servicing of public debts and sustaining government bureaucracy, and that the taxing of the financially 'wealthier' segments of the population often prevents them from purchasing the luxury goods and services which may have kept many of the poorer individuals employed. By contrast, the Social Credit remedy for poverty is not to make the 'rich' 'poorer', but to make everybody richer in real terms.

A Review of *Making Sense of Nonsense: Navigating the West's Current Quagmire* Edited by Scott D.G. Ventureyra. Ottawa: True Freedom Press, 2022. by Peter Brüning

One of the first things to strike the reader of *Making Sense of Nonsense* is the great breadth of topics that are addressed or at least touched upon in the course of its pages. Unfortunately, the manifestations of nonsense in our contemporary society are legion. From gender theory to climate ideology, from legalized abortion to unjustified and indeed dangerous restrictions on free speech, the book's many essays make it clear that what is, in fact, nonsense and demonstrable nonsense at that, has become ubiquitous in the contemporary West, albeit in many variations and gradations. In approaching the hot topics or key issues that mark the on-going battles we are made to endure and the progressive retreat we made to suffer from anything resembling traditional, Christian civilization, we are simultaneously introduced, or re-acquainted as the case may be, with the various -isms that stalk us: naturalism, materialism, scientism, Marxism, socialism, Darwinism, Freudianism, deconstructionism, post-modernism, and the very latest – ism, "wokeism". This is the book's first achievement: an outline or adumbration of the various points of conflict between the traditional conception and practice of Western civilisation and its prospective post-Western replacement in combination with an exploration of the chief ideologies which have been developed and then marshalled as weapons in favour of the latter's anticipated triumph.

At the same time, the book recognizes that nonsense policies and their nonsense ideologically underpinnings are not just accidental or adventitious nonsense, or nonsense that has spontaneously developed, 'evolved', or emerged out of the ether. Rather, a good deal of the nonsense (or at least a large part of it) exists because it is actually part of a conscious agenda on the part of powerful forces that are active in the world today. Rather than shying away from what critics and proponents alike have termed "The New World Order", *Making Sense of Nonsense* boldly acknowledges the existence of this project, this attempt to centralize power on a global scale, head-on. For example, certain contemporary events and developments such as the controversies surrounding the Covid-19 phenomenon and its accompanying experimental jabs are discussed at length in some of the essays, as is the emergence of the World Economic Forum as a political force seeking to implement its sinister 2030 agenda.

The recognition of the NWO and its key players, institutions, strategies, and tactics is of crucial importance. There is indeed a conscious, organized movement to create or otherwise take advantage of public crises in order to elicit a certain collective response to those crises. Those responses can then be cited as the necessary justifications for moving society in the direction of tyrannical policies that will further increase the centralization of power in all of its various forms. As centralized power increases, individuals necessarily become more and more disenfranchised. The state becomes all-powerful as both God and the human being are overshadowed. Without understanding this factor of conscious, intelligent action in our present discontents, we cannot hope to effectively respond to or to neutralize those who would wish to undermine and pervert our civilization. What is ultimately at stake is power, i.e., control over policy, and the menace of the anti-Christian 'philosophy' (the word philosophy is to be understood here in the broadest sense, i.e., as a vision of how the world is, could be, and should be) that animates those power-seekers who would wish to impose their views on the rest of us in order to advance their own benefit narrowly conceived. The nonsense ideologies that are invoked to justifying the adoption of nonsense policies in reference to nonsense issues are just tools in the pursuit of power. Once this is understood, it becomes a little easier to 'make sense of all the nonsense'. Various essays in the book explore the economic, political, and cultural agenda of the world's anti-freedom power-mongers from this precise angle.

But there is yet a third aspect to our contemporary situation – it may even be regarded as the most important aspect – which is extensively touched on in *Making Sense of Nonsense* by two of its essays: "The Great Reset and the New World Order" by Phil Fernandes and "A Message to All Humanity, All Governments, All Royal and Financial Elites (One Percent Group)" by Ton Laurijssen. This has to do with the role which the reigning financial system plays as the underpinning and driving force behind the whole NWO project. To remake the world by remaking identity, gender, religion, the economy, politics, culture, and philosophy, etc., is a grandiose project which could never have been conceived, let alone pursued with such apparent efficacy and superficial success, had it not been for two things: 1) the financial, economic, and hence personal dissatisfaction which is caused by the structurally dishonest and dysfunctional financial software on which we attempt to run our economies and 2) the overwhelming power, wealth, and privilege which the same system unjustly centralizes in the hands of a few, namely those who own the system and/or otherwise benefit from its operation. I submit that it is the financial system (i.e., the banking, cost-accountancy, and taxation systems) which is the very engine that is powering the NWO and is responsible for the conceptualisation, propagation, and application of so much nonsense in our world as a means to that end. Were it not for the illegitimate power which money has acquired under the existing credit monopoly and its deployment in the

pursuit of anti-social policies there would be a lot less nonsense about and the need for books attempting to make sense of it all (as brilliant as these may be) would be greatly diminished.

Based on my own extensive research, I would suggest that it is in an analysis of the financial system along the lines provided by the British engineer, Major C.H. Douglas, and the original Social Credit (his brainchild), that one may find the ultimate explanation, at least on an earthly or natural level, for the existence of so much nonsense. If we adopt the adage "follow the money" in approaching the phenomenon of nonsense, we can make as much sense of the nonsense as nonsense will allow and thereby discover that making sense of finance is the one thing necessary *par excellence* for making sense of the nonsense. ***

DON'T CRY FOR ME ARGENTINA by Ken Grundy

100 years from when Argentina was very prosperous. Its resources like fertile agricultural land was equal to that of the US. Due to varying political parties and leaders, the whole nation declined to be near a third world status presently. Along the way there was wholesale corruption and social unrest.

Unfortunately countries like the US, Australia, Canada, Britain and all western nations where freedoms and good standards were the norm; we note a crumbling of society values with advocacy for anti-Christian values are forthcoming from prominent leaders in the field of sport and commerce. Even from church pulpits in some cases. Our economy ranges from not too bad to pretty worrying. We are heavily taxed; industry is moving to centralized structures bordering on monopoly. Every step in farming or manufacturing is highly regulated with plenty of filling out compliance papers.

My point here is that many nations are following the Argentinian pattern - the only difference is that we have not travelled as far down the road as Argentina. Do not be complacent. Take note of the events and rules around you. See the similarities of the Argentine policies.

We have plenty urging a one-world-government (total centralization of power) through bodies like the UN, World Economic Forum, World Health Organisation etc. Leader of the pack is Klaus Schwab and the WEF - this body openly meets in Davos Switzerland telling the world, that we for instance, will have to reduce cattle numbers, reduce farm fertilisers, deal with carbon emissions etc etc. Unfortunately our new King Charles III is also supporting these actions.

In depth research shows how finance is being used to push us in this wrong direction. Again, finance is operated on a global (centralized) basis. If the interest rate rises in the US, it will follow in Finland, New Zealand, India, Australia etc - national currencies are no longer controlled by their host country. All nations are operating on debt finance. They are heavily in debt. Have you ever wondered to whom we are in debt? Could we be in debt to Canada for instance? Hardly, since Canada is in debt!

Money is a wonderful system for facilitating exchange of goods and services. It could not be better! However it is the control of money where the problem exists. With manufacturing and virtually every business operating on borrowed money, the lender has the 'whip hand' and dictates the terms. The borrowed money is debt created by the banking system. Is there any alternative? What about accessing some funds from the credit side of the ledger? Taking the situation of former Argentina and even the US and Australia now, we have vast resources of minerals, good soils and the climate generally provides us with plenty. We also have modern technology, infrastructure and ample workers. All of these attributes stand to our credit and could be considered collateral for a basis for a supply of credit rather than debt.

The finance matter deserves attention because it is the primary cause of our problems. Unless we have a change from the current debt system we are guaranteed of the problems continuing. More information is available for those interested. ***

TRAINING

To become an effective Actionist, training is essential. Eric constantly reinforced this point. Utilize the online **'Actionist Corner'** with many links to *pro forma* letter templates, pamphlets and other important training and unique research resources.

Our ongoing training initiatives now include —

'Science of the Social Credit Measured in Terms of Human Satisfaction' — in three work-packs, steadily developing the individual actionist in their area of particular interest to release freedom of choice.

'Introducing Social Credit by Betty Luks' is built around five modules, as well as Video and Podcast lessons, other reading material and on completion, examination to achieve a basic **Science of the Social Credit** understanding.

'Intermediate Social Credit by ED Butler' includes eight written assignments, Video and Podcast lessons and other important developmental reading material.

'Advanced Social Credit' is conducted with the assistance of experts in this science, included is the historical *'Elements of Social Credit by Tudor Jones',* (originally published by The Social Credit Secretariat), two courses including texts, Video and Podcast lessons and other reading material and on examination to ensure an advanced ability of effective action in the Science of Social Credit measured in terms of human satisfaction. **Start your Training Today.**

**NewTimes Survey is printed and authorised by A. J. Luks
13 Carsten Court, Happy Valley, SA.
Telephone: 08 8322 8923 eMail: heritagebooks@alor.org**