

"All that is necessary
for the triumph of
evil is that good
men do nothing . . ."
— EDMUND BURKE



THE NEW TIMES SURVEY

THE AUSTRALIAN

LEAGUE OF RIGHTS

Vol. 16. No. 12

Registered Australia post — Publication PP343214 / 00016

December 2015

And did those feet in ancient time,
Walk upon England's mountains green:
And was the holy Lamb of God,
On England's pleasant pastures seen!

And did the Countenance Divine,
Shine forth upon our clouded hills?
And was Jerusalem builded here,
Among these dark Satanic Mills?

Bring me my Bow of burning gold;
Bring me my Arrows of desire:
Bring me my Spear: O clouds unfold:
Bring me my Chariot of fire!

I will not cease from Mental Fight,
Nor Shall my sword sleep in my hand:
Till we have built Jerusalem,
In England's green & pleasant Land.

A Blessed and Holy Christ Mass/New Year Season To Our Readers

- "And did those feet in ancient time" is a short poem by William Blake from the preface to his epic Milton a Poem, one of a collection of writings known as the Prophetic Books. The date of 1804 on the title page is probably when the plates were begun, but the poem was printed c. 1808. Today it is best known as the anthem "Jerusalem", with music written by Sir Hubert Parry in 1916. It is not to be confused with another poem, much longer and larger in scope, but also by Blake, called Jerusalem The Emanation of the Giant Albion.

WHAT IS SOCIAL CREDIT? by Betty Luks

“Social Credit assumes that society is primarily metaphysical, and must have regard to the organic relationships of its prototype”, so wrote C.H. Douglas.

As I conceive it, Social Credit covers and comprehends a great deal more than the money problem. Important as that is, primarily important because it is a question of priority, Social Credit fundamentally involves a conception, I feel a true conception – but you must enlarge upon that for yourselves – of the relationships between individuals and their association in countries and nations, between individuals and their association in groups.

– C. H. Douglas The Approach to Reality

I am never satisfied with a vague definition of words not used in everyday English – at least not by me – therefore I try to grasp the original meanings, etc. This is also necessary because words have changed their meaning in the nearly hundred years since Douglas wrote his earlier works.

Wikipedia has been of help in this search for original meanings

Metaphysical – Etymology: The prefix comes from the Greek preposition and prefix "meta-" (μετά-), from μετά, which meant "after", "beside", "with", "among" (with respect to the preposition, some of these meanings were distinguished by case marking). Other meanings include "beyond", "adjacent" and "self", and it is also commonly used in the form μετα- as a prefix in Greek, with variants μετ- before vowels and μεθ- "meth-" before aspirated vowels.

The earliest attested form of the word "meta" is the Mycenaean Greek "me-ta", written in Linear B syllabic script. The Greek preposition is cognate with the Old English preposition mid "with", still found as a prefix in midwife. Its use in English is the result of back-formation from the word "metaphysics". In origin Metaphysics was just the title of one of the principal works of Aristotle; it was so named (by Andronicus of Rhodes) *(continued on next page)*

(continued from previous page)

simply because in the customary ordering of the works of Aristotle it was the book following Physics; it thus meant nothing more than "[the book that comes] after [the book entitled] Physics". However, even Latin writers misinterpreted this as entailing that metaphysics constituted "the science of what is beyond the physical". Nonetheless, Aristotle's *Metaphysics* enunciates considerations of natures above physical realities, which can be examined through this particular part of philosophy, e.g., the existence of God. The use of the prefix was later extended to other contexts based on the understanding of metaphysics to mean "the science of what is beyond the physical".

Now I suppose gentle reader you are going to tell me you knew all of that. Well I didn't. Be that as it may, it has helped me to look beyond the physical (temporal) for the spirit or intent of what Douglas intended by his proposals, such as the National Dividend.

And I pray that you will do the same. ***

THE CONTINUOUS STREAM OF SPIRIT-GROWTH

Rudolf Steiner in "The Redemption of Thinking" 1920 writes: "The modern attitude to the problem of knowledge is exactly as though a man, who wished to study the true nature of the principle of growth in wheat or some other crop on his land, was to proceed to study the food-value of the wheat.

It is of course useful to be an expert in food-values, but the understanding of the process of growth in the wheat, from the ear right back to the root - and further still - will never be known through the chemistry of food-values. That only investigates something which is an accompaniment of the actual, continuous stream of growth which is present in the wheat-plant".

"In the same way there exists in us a stream of spirit-growth which is present in us as a force and is related to our being, just like the stream of growth in the plant, from the root, through the stem and the leaf, to the flower and the fruit, and then back again to the seed and the root.

And just as the fact that we eat it can never afford a true explanation of the actual nature of the principle of growth in the plant, so the question of the practical knowledge-value of that which lives in us as an evolutionary impulse must not be made the basis of a philosophy of knowledge".

"Rather it must become clear to us that what is called knowledge in ordinary life is only a secondary effect of the working of thought on man's being. Thus we arrive at the reality that is inherent in thinking. It is an activity that is at work within us".

THE DAY PARLIAMENT BURNED DOWN

On Wednesday 16 October, 2015, Dr Caroline Shenton, currently Accommodation Study Director at the Parliament Archives, delivered the first Open Lecture of the 2013/14 series, discussing the great fire of 1834 which destroyed much of the old Houses of Parliament in a now largely-forgotten disaster. Below is an edited version of that address.



The 16th October 1834 was for contemporaries one of the greatest events of their lives. It was for them like the assassination of JFK or the death of Princess Diana. It was something that they remembered through the rest of their lives and its repercussions carried on into the early 20th Century.

But today this is a largely forgotten event. I think that's because the new Palace of Westminster, the new Houses of Parliament built in its place by Barry and Pugin from the 1840s through to the 1860s onwards, has become so famous as an icon of London - of Britain, indeed - the world over, that really it has obliterated from our memories what was there before.

But the building that was there before, the old Houses of Parliament, is a building worth remembering because this is the structure in which some of the great set-pieces of English History took place.

This is where Thomas More, William Wallace and Charles I were tried; this is where the great debates were staged on the Civil War, over Slavery and the rise of Empire; this is the place where the only assassination of a Prime Minister took place.

So this is the place where these great set-pieces of English history took place - including the assassination of Spencer Percival, the Prime Minister, in 1812. And that's why it's worth remembering... In 1834 the Palace of Westminster was not simply the main residence for the Monarch from the Middle Ages onwards - it was also both the seat of Government and of the Law.

(continued on next page)

(continued from previous page)

And the Law Courts had met inside Westminster Hall from the Middle Ages onwards.

Then in the 1820s John Soane built a new block onto the side of Westminster Hall to provide much better accommodation for the Law Courts. And one of the interesting things here is just how very close it is to the east end of Westminster Abbey. As you exit Portcullis House and go round to Westminster Tube when you leave you'll be able to see the Henry VII Chapel of Westminster Abbey. But in 1834 the Palace was much, much closer to the east end of the Abbey than it is today and that's an important part of the story.

Also important to the story are the buildings of the Exchequer - that's the medieval and early modern Department of Finance. We still have the Chancellor of the Exchequer today, who would be called in other countries: 'Minister of Finance'.

So if we take a cross-section across the House of Commons you can see what a higgledy-piggledy mass of floors and corridors and staircases it's become by 1834. Constant additions over the centuries have turned this into a complete rabbit-warren and also an accident waiting to happen.

There was once a chapel of the medieval palace, known as St Stephen's. What happened at the end of the 17th Century was that Christopher Wren, then Master of the King's Works, put in a ceiling and a floor here to turn a wonderful gothic chapel - one of the most important buildings in later medieval Europe - into a much smaller space, so that the Commons could meet there more comfortably.

The Commons had met inside St Stephen's Chapel since 1548 when Edward VI handed this part of the building over to the Commons for its use.

If you were a woman in 1834 you couldn't view debates actually in the chamber, in the public gallery here - you had to go up into the attic and look at the MPs' feet below you by peering through this little ventilation shaft in the ceiling. That was the only way that women could view debates.

If you were an MP in 1834 you would come into the building really through the back door. There was no ceremonial entrance. You would come the back door, then you'd go up the steps, up another staircase then down and down then up, up and up. How unplanned the whole thing had become by the late Georgian period.

Then finally you'd make it into the Commons Chamber itself which was a very tight, wooden box. No trace at all of that Gothic Chapel underneath; it was all covered over by wood panelling put in by Wren.

And really from the 1790s onwards MPs had been complaining bitterly about this accommodation: it was stuffy, it was cramped; it was smelly when they were all in there. It wasn't big enough to house all of them - there were 648 of them. Condensation ran down the walls when they were all in there. It just became intolerable, particularly around the debates concerning the Great Reform Bill in 1831 and 1832 - the pitch of complaints really rose and rose. Behind them was an MP called Joseph Hume who arranged for two debates, in 1831 and 1833, proposing that the Commons should find alternative accommodation.

One possibility was that they could break through the eastern wall and out on to the shore line of the Thames beyond. Another proposal was that they should move out of Westminster altogether - go somewhere completely different - like St James' in the West End which had started to become very fashionable or even Regents Park, where the Zoo had set up about 5 years previously. Some might feel that that's an appropriate place for the House of Commons to go to! But both these debates got nowhere: Joseph Hume's motion fell on both these occasions.

But on the 16th October 1834 a wag in the crowd was heard to say: "Mr Hume's motion for a new House is carried without division!"

So what caused the fire? What's a tally stick?

Well, the primary cause of the fire was tally-sticks, although there were wider causes as well. A tally stick was a form of medieval receipt.

If you were a Sheriff in the Middle Ages you were told by the King to go off and collect taxes in your county you'd come to the Exchequer twice a year - once at Michaelmas and once at Easter - to hand over the tax that you've collected. And the tally-cutter in the Exchequer offices cut you a tally.

It was a stick about six inches long and was shaped on four sides. It had the name of the Sheriff on the side, the sum of money that he had paid in and the ends are notched with tiny little slices that indicate the sum of money paid in. So there was a little hole if it's a ha'penny, a slice if there's a penny, a bigger slice if it's a shilling, an even bigger slice if it's a pound, then ten pounds, a hundred pounds, a thousand pounds and so on.

The tally-cutter then took the stick and with a chisel and a mallet sliced it in two vertically, giving one half to the Sheriff to take away and keep the other half for the Exchequer. The idea being that the Sheriff cannot come back in six months' time and say: "I paid in five pounds more than you said I did last time."

(continued on next page)

(continued from previous page)

Because all the tally-cutter would have to do would be to take his half of the tally stick, match it up, or 'tally it up' - which is where you get the phrase from - tally it up with the Sheriff's half and show that the two halves of the tally stick match each other exactly and therefore the Sheriff is not telling the truth. So it was a way of creating an un-forgable receipt for government income....

So, incredibly, this seemingly medieval - very efficient but nonetheless very medieval - system, carried on into the 19th Century.

The result was that there are a couple of rooms, large rooms, inside the Exchequer buildings filled with tally sticks in 1834. They really represented the last few decades of that whole tally-cutting process. They'd never been got rid of. Over the centuries in various phases tally sticks had been destroyed - given away to Palace servants or Exchequer servants for firewood. But the last couple of decades' worth, before the final tally stick was cut in 1826, remained in these buildings.

So, on the 14th October 1834 the Clerk of Works at Westminster, Mr Richard Weobley, received an instruction from the Treasury to clear out these rooms in the Exchequer and make way for a new court. There wasn't room for this new court - the Court of Bankruptcy - in the law courts building so they were going to re-use some space in the Exchequer. The tally sticks had to be cleared and Weobley was put in charge of working out what to do about them.

Instead of giving them away to Palace servants he decided, first of all, to put them in a big bonfire behind the buildings between the river and the Exchequer. That was his first thought.

Then he slept on the idea and on the 15th October he came up with an even better wheeze. The whole bonfire idea was going to attract people pilfering them and would cause annoyance to the neighbours, so he came up with an alternative which in the end caused even more annoyance to the neighbours: that was to burn them in the under-floor heating furnaces of the House of Lords.

And I think, speaking as a professional archivist, I would have to say that this is possibly the worst records management disposal decision in the history of the world.

So the labourers began work around dawn, starting to load the coal furnaces on the ground floor of the House of Lords with these sticks. The actual chamber of the House of Lords was on the first floor so they were underneath it, and the furnaces had flues that ran up the walls, along the floor above, up through the walls of this chamber and then out through the roof through chimneys and this was designed to be an under-floor heating system.

It was clear from early on in the day that all was not well: there was a very strong smell of burning and there was a little bit of smoke noticed in the chamber. Nobody did anything about it, but things really started to 'hot up' as it were by about 4 o'clock in the afternoon when the housekeeper of the House of Lords was showing two gentleman tourists around the building. Because then, as now, Westminster was a tourist attraction: you'd come to the Abbey in the morning and you'd come in to Parliament in the afternoon.

The tourists had come to see, particularly, the Armada Tapestries, which were on the walls. They're very, very famous works of art and they portray the victory over the Armada and they'd hung in the Lords' chamber since the early 17th Century. At the public inquiry, which followed the fire, the tourists say they're very disappointed because there is so much smoke in the chamber that they can't see the tapestries.

What's going on?

There's an enormous amount of smoke and nobody's doing anything about it! The housekeeper, who's with them, tries to distract them from their disappointment and she takes them over to the area which is called Black Rod's box.... They can't get any further forward because it's so hot that their feet are burning through their boots. So they back away and the housekeeper shuffles them off to another part of the palace behind the curtain at the throne end.

Well, what's happened under their feet is that the intense heat from the very careless burning of these sticks - despite what the labourers said at the public inquiry afterwards, that they'd been very careful. Clearly they were very negligent and were just piling the sticks on as fast as it would go, and it took about 8 hours anyway at that rate - it was a huge job. They piled the wood into the furnaces, the intense heat has melted the copper lining of the brick flues and started to cause a chimney fire and that's why there's the smoke and that's why there's the heat coming up through the floor. ***

"NewTimes Survey" is printed and published by The Australian League of Rights,
Level 9, Suite 8, 118-120 Queens Street, Melbourne, 3000

Postal Address: GPO Box 1052, Melbourne, 3001. Telephone: (03) 9600 0677
Subscription \$30.00 p.a.

TIME INDEED TO STAND UP FOR FREE SPEECH

By Ian Wilson LL.B.

There have been a number of good articles in *The Australian* about the further threat to freedom of speech posed by the same-sex marriage debate. The Tasmanian Anti-Discrimination Commission has held the Catholic Church has a case to answer for publishing a booklet defending the traditional view of marriage and criticising same-sex marriage. Similar to Section 18C of the Federal Racial Discrimination Act, the contents of the booklet would seem to violate Tasmanian law that it is unlawful to offend, humiliate, intimidate, insult or ridicule a person on the basis of, among other things, sexual orientation, marital status and relationship status.

That, in my opinion, is what the law says, and under the present regime it is indeed unlawful to publicly put the case against same-sex marriage. It is likely that the same situation will arise with the Aboriginal constitutional referendum. It will be difficult to publicly debate these referendums, but if enough people work at the grassroots level it will be impossible for the System to silence them all. This is yet another example of how the law is being used as a political weapon to silence, or try to silence, public debate. I will vote “No” for no other reason than that it is occurring. ***

PLANETARY HEROES MEET IN PARIS TO SAVE EARTH FROM BAD WEATHER Andrew Bolt's Blog:

“Never before has there been so many ego’s in the one room: It was the largest single-day gathering of heads of state or government in history, the UN said. “Never have the stakes of an international meeting been so high because it concerns the future of the planet, the future of life,” French President Francois Hollande said in an opening speech.

“The hope of all of humanity rests on all of your shoulders.” -- Paris Climate Change Talks begin, *The Australian*, Graham Lloyd. Glory be. Pray to our Elected Fathers (and Mothers) who have come to save us from our sins. The Chosen Ones shall rescue us with full gloss PR. For it is only in the world of Mass Marketing that we can call China a climate saviour:

[Obama] then met Chinese President Xi Jinping before the summit started, with his focus turned to deepening co-operation between the world’s two biggest emitters of the greenhouse gases that cause global warming. “As the two largest carbon emitters, we have both determined that it is our responsibility to take action,” Mr Obama said as he sat alongside Mr Xi.

And so it comes to pass that the largest producer of carbon dioxide “pollution”, the land with the dirtiest factories can be lauded.

THE INCOHERENCE OF LEYONHJELM

by Mrs Vera West

Crossbench senator, libertarian David Leyonhjelm supported the government’s “no jab no pay” legislation, saying, and this needs to be preserved for the record: “Parents do not have a right to welfare payments. It’s bad enough that people continue to bring wave upon wave [of] these little blighters into the world. The least they can do is minimise their bundles of dribble and sputum, so they don’t make the rest of us sick.”

Leyonhjelm is a libertarian, a philosophy which is essentially liberalism on steroids, which supports many things which we also support (with clearly defined meanings...ed): liberty, self-reliance, small [or no] government, free enterprise and the sovereignty of the individual.

Clearly, if Leyonhjelm is serious in his critique of babies – future individuals – “bundles of dribble and sputum” – this sentiment is contrary to the libertarian idea of the sovereignty of the individual.

It reduces individuals to pure bodily secretions.

(And the journalists will largely fall for this fanciful narrative.)

For each product they make, Chinese factories on average, will make four times as much CO2 as cleaner Western factories. Who seriously believes that the nation that is the largest consumer of coal is suddenly “determined to be responsible” even though all its promises amount to nothing more than token schemes and business as usual.

Based on past numbers, in the next 12 months, China will increase its emissions by an amount that is more than Australia’s total annual emissions. As is already widely known, it’s likely Chinese population growth will peak in 2030, as will their emissions.

The Chinese are flatly smiling, watching Western competitors cripple their own industries, while they reap income from selling solar panels, and then take money for carbon credits from cleaning up a few of the worst factories. What’s not to like?

If Australia somehow “succeeds” in cutting our emissions by a whopping, preposterous 25%, at the moment China will replace that in 45 days. (Coal Fired plants, World Resources Institute, China) ***

A FUTURE WITHOUT WORK? THAT'S NOT SUCH A BAD THING!

Jessica Barrett - Edmonton Journal, Canada.

Not all jobs are safe: Making a living these days is a confusing business. Jobs are created and become obsolete within years. For those starting out, the future looks daunting. For those well into a career, they wonder how long they'll last. Jessica Barrett, the 2013-14 Michelle Lang Fellowship recipient, examines the current state of uncertainty and attempts to make sense of one of the most important aspects of our lives.

Tinkerine Studios' loft-like space in central Vancouver seems innocent enough. Part hip startup, part modern hobby shop, its minimal work stations and fresh white walls contrast with the candy-coloured plastic trinkets lining the shelves, each one produced by Tinkerine's marquee product: a line of 3-D printers.

For those who haven't seen the process in action, 3-D printing can be a hard concept to grasp. Taking a virtual design and making it physical at the touch of a button still seems like something out of science fiction. Up close and personal, however, it's much less mysterious. In fact, it's kind of cute. Each sleek little machine hums a wheezy little tune as it sucks bright plastic filament off a spool, heats it up and pumps it through a nozzle - sort of like a hot-glue gun—adding layer upon layer until—voilà—you have a thing! An iPhone case, a vase, a scale model of the Eiffel Tower: these are just some of the items they can produce.

"At the end of the day, we're really here to make a product or tool that allows anybody to do anything they want with it," says Eugene Suyu, Tinkerine's 25-year-old founder. "The sky's really the limit for the end user." Right now, that's mostly design geeks and small businesses looking for a means to produce cheap and easy prototypes, but Suyu has his sights set on a much larger market.

"These units will eventually trickle into homes," he says.

He's probably right. Like the Internet in its early days, 3-D printing seems niche and esoteric now, but the technology seems destined for ubiquity just as soon as the kinks get worked out and we all learn how to use it. When that happens, a lot of people are going to be out of a job.

But imagine the implications of a world where anybody can make anything they want without leaving home.

THE DEATH OF THE HUNTER VALLEY

Not With A Bang but a Whimper: We realise the importance of coal for Australia's energy needs and are not 'anti-coal', but there is all the difference in the world between coal mines on unproductive land and coal mines smack bang in the middle of our most fertile food-producing lands.

Dr. David Pascoe asks Australians to "Look what

If the only thing standing between me and a new iPhone case— or a car part, or a pair of earrings, or even most of the parts necessary to build my own 3-D printer—is a spool of plastic and a pattern I can purchase conveniently online, there goes the entire supply chain.

I no longer need anyone to sell, store, market, manufacture, transport or, if my skills are sharp enough, design stuff... This wave may or may not end up the same. Some experts argue that we've reached a tipping point with mechanization where productivity and capital can increase without a greater need for labour. Other sectors may spring up to fill the void, but for now it seems as if we're headed for a future where there may not be enough work to go around. It could be the best thing that ever happened to us.

"Too much of our lives are subordinated to work," argues Kathi Weeks, professor of women's studies at Duke University and author of the book "The Problem with Work". While the inexorable march of the machines makes many of us anxious, Weeks says we should get comfortable with the idea of a future where work isn't the defining characteristic of our lives. Whether you're logging 80-hour weeks in your C-suite job or pounding the pavement between multiple minimum-wage gigs, she argues, our system of wage labour is already broken....

We're all used to getting cash at the ATM, using automated checkouts at the grocery store and sending electronic, not snail, mail. But what else could be automated in the coming years?

Oxford University researchers Carl Benedikt Frey and Michael A. Osborne looked at advances in computer science and the historical impact of automation on the labour force to come up with a probability index for jobs at risk for automation. By their calculation, 47 per cent of 702 jobs listed in a U.S. Labour Market Index are at risk of being eliminated by machines. While some vulnerable jobs, such as those in manufacturing, won't be a surprise, others, such as frontline service jobs thought to require a human touch just might be. According to the study, cooks, taxi drivers and receptionists could soon be a thing of the past while jobs that survive will require a high degree of creativity and social skills such as therapists and artists..."

Anyone for a Social Credit National Dividend?

they've done to the legendary Hunter Valley. One of the most beautiful fertile parts of the country... gone... next they want to rape and pillage the Liverpool Plains, The Darling Downs, and The Galilee Basin. These are all our prime Agricultural regions and the coal miners want to do...this? Why aren't you rioting Australia? This is insane!"

Did Whittaker Chambers misunderstand the real nature of the beast? by Nigel Jackson

It was in September 1964 that I met Eric Butler and one of the first books he urged me to read was *Witness* by Whittaker Chambers (Random House, 1952). I don't think I had ever heard of the Hiss-Chambers trials before then. I cannot recall what Eric said to me, but am pretty certain that he told me that Chambers' experience of opposition from many 'Establishment' Americans between 1948 and 1950 was a sign that Communism was only part of a much bigger conspiracy.

Witness begins with a foreword in the form of a letter by Chambers to his children, Ellen and John. Especially compelling is his account of a man who defected, as he had done, from Communism: 'One night – in Moscow – he heard screams.' As Chambers explained, 'a soul in extremity has communicated with that which alone can hear it – another human soul.' The listener had 'brushed the only vision that has force against the vision of Almighty Mind. He stands before the fact of God.' The crisis of the Western world, Chambers added, 'exists to the degree in which it is indifferent to God.' He saw faith in God as the only effective answer to the challenge of Communism.

I am ashamed to say that I have not yet read the bulk of the book's 800 pages. Nor have I read Allen Weinstein's 674-page book *Perjury – The Hiss-Chambers Case* (Alfred A. Knopf, 1978), though I have had it since 7 September 1983. As with *Witness*, my copy was bought from the League's Heritage Bookshop when this was located at 273 Little Collins Street. Weinstein began his investigations believing that Hiss had been unjustly convicted – only to conclude after five years of intensive research that Hiss, exposed by Chambers as having been a Communist spy in the 1930's and 1940's, had indeed been guilty of perjury in denying that.

However, I *have* just read the whole of Sam Tanenhaus's biography, *Whittaker Chambers* (Random House, 1997) in the Modern Library edition published in 1998. This experience – peculiar in certain ways – has prompted this short essay.

Tanenhaus has published essays in *The New York Times*, *The Wall Street Journal* and *Commentary* – which suggests that he is probably 'an Establishment man' and one sympathetic to Zionism.

His book is superbly written and contains, I believe, great insight into the personality of its subject. I had not realised until I read it what a prodigiously intelligent man Chambers was, although I knew Hiss was such, for why else would he have attained the significant roles he played at Yalta, at Dumbarton Oaks and at the inaugural meeting of the United

Nations Organisation at San Francisco, for which he was Secretary-General? Chambers engaged with enormous persistence and ingenuity in most arduous labours as a Communist spy and then became a top writer and editor with the prestigious magazine *Time*. He spoke several languages and, an autodidact of supreme achievement, had an extraordinarily wide general knowledge. He was also a successful and hardworking farmer.

However, there are, for me, several 'false notes' in Tanenhaus's account. In the last part of the biography he narrates, in effect, how Chambers became in his last ten years a strong opponent of the 'extreme right' and especially Senator Joseph McCarthy, who gets a very bad press in the book indeed. Plainly Tanenhaus approves of Chambers' position and of his friendship with William F. Buckley who founded and edited the allegedly conservative journal *National Review*. My impression is that, despite the intense demolition of McCarthy's reputation that occurred over some decades, his investigations and actions have been shown by recent research to be closer to the truth than was once thought. And I have suspicions that Buckley was in cahoots with 'the Establishment'.

An extraordinary omission in Tanenhaus's book and his discussions of American conservatism is that there is no mention at all of Russell Kirk and Eric Voegelin. The former became very alert in his later years to the dangers of Zionism to the free peoples. As for Voegelin, Kirk quoted him in his book *Enemies of the Permanent Things* (1969) as making a statement entirely consonant with Chambers' views in *Witness*: 'The true dividing line in the contemporary crisis does not run between liberals and totalitarians, but between the religious and philosophical transcendentalists on the one side, and the liberal and totalitarian immanentist sectarians on the other.'

Nor does Tanenhaus discuss fairly and in adequate detail the widespread suspicion of many conservatives in the Western world that Communism has been merely one arm of a 'New World Order' conspiracy of the super-rich aiming at a world government. If he ever touches on such a view, it is only to dismiss it derisively.

All of which makes me wonder whether his book, whether intentionally or not, is a work of disinformation, tending to turn eyes away from a bigger evil than Communism itself. This in turn relates to something in Australia that has been obvious to me for many decades. There is a clear cleavage here between respectable writers 'on the Right' and unrespectable ones (of whom I am one).

(continued on next page)

(continued from previous page) The former do not, in general, engage in activism that might annoy those suspected by us pariahs of being the Hidden Hand behind Communism. It would be good if someone could research this thesis comprehensively in the future. Obstacles to such a project are the obvious fact that those of the Unrespectable Right never get financial grants, rarely get books published and, if they do, are likely to have those books unreviewed in the major public forums. A sad situation indeed, my masters!

Occasionally in our major newspapers the Chambers-Hiss affair has been discussed in recent decades. Jewish intellectual Frank Knopfelmacher touched on it in *Nation Review* (30th January 1976) in 'Alger Hiss and the CIA'. He had no doubt of Hiss's guilt and its dreadful implications. Then there was a kerfuffle in 1992 when a Russian intellectual, Dmitri Volkogonov, initially announced that there was no evidence in Soviet archives that Hiss had been a Communist agent. It soon became clear that he had not really studied all the available data and the balloon burst. Tanenhaus deals with this in an epilogue and points out that in 1993 proof of Hiss's complicity was found by Hungarian historian Maria Schmidt. The Volkogonov episode was well reported in *The Australian* (22nd December 1992) in 'Traitor or victim? The Hiss mystery deepens'.

On 29th-30th May 2004 ('Red agent in denial', *The Australian* published a review of G. Edward White's *Alger Hiss's Looking-Glass Wars: the Covert Life of a Soviet Spy* (Oxford University Press). Reviewer Peter Coleman concluded that White had summed up Hiss as 'a sad, ingratiating and formidable character who achieved psychic integration through spying and lying.'

(While Chambers had died at the age of sixty, Hiss lived into his late eighties and campaigned tirelessly to restore his reputation – a quixotic struggle indeed.)

Then both *The Australian* (9th-10th May 2009) and *The Age* (23rd May 2009) reviewed Susan Jacoby's *Alger Hiss and the Battle for History* (Yale University Press). *The Age* reviewer noted that Jacoby thought Hiss guilty but intended 'to spare American liberalism from the opportunistic conservative and neo-conservative politics' of the time. The reviewer for *The Australian* concluded: 'This excellent exercise in intellectual history explains why the affair never ended.'

Indeed. It was and is part of a titanic struggle in which we in Australia are currently deeply involved as a major assault is operating against both conservatism (the real deal) and Christianity.

When is some person of influence going to break ranks and defend those on the Unrespectable Right worthy of defence? ***

PROSECUTORS BAN SOROS FOUNDATION AS 'THREAT TO RUSSIAN NATIONAL SECURITY'

The Russian Prosecutor General's Office has recognized George Soros's Open Society Institute and another affiliated organization as undesirable groups, banning Russian citizens and organizations from participation in any of their projects.

In a statement released on Monday, prosecutors said the activities of the Open Society Institute and the Open Society Institute Assistance Foundation were a threat to the foundations of Russia's Constitutional order and national security. They added that the Justice Ministry would be duly informed about these conclusions and would add the two groups to Russia's list of undesirable foreign organizations.

Prosecutors launched a probe into the activities of the two organizations - both sponsored by the well-known US financier George Soros - in July this year, after Russian senators approved the so-called "patriotic stop-list" of 12 groups that required immediate attention over their supposed anti-Russian activities. Other groups on the list included the National Endowment for Democracy; the International Republican Institute; the National Democratic Institute; the MacArthur Foundation and Freedom House. <https://www.rt.com/politics/271456-russia-undesirable-groups-gatilov/>

THE LEAGUE'S BOOK SERVICES: —
<http://alor.org/>

When ordering journals, 'On Target' and 'New Times Survey' – Please make Cheques/Money Orders payable to --
'ALOR Journals'

For educational books, videos and DVDs, etc. please make Cheques/Money Orders payable to --
Heritage Bookshop Services'

For donations to the League please make payments to--
'Australian League of Rights' or 'ALOR'

Books are available at meetings, at our Melbourne bookshop or by mail order from the following addresses:

Victoria, Tasmania:
Heritage Bookshop,
Level 9, Suite 8, 118-120 Queen Street,
Melbourne, 3000
(G.P.O. Box 1052, Melbourne, 3001).
Phone: (03) 9600 0677

South Australia
Heritage Book Mailing Service,
P.O. Box 27, Happy Valley, 5159.
Phone: (08) 71237131;

All Other States:
To either Victorian or South Australian addresses.

VERITAS BOOKS ONLINE:
<http://veritasbooks.com.au/>