

THE NEW TIMES

Registered at the G.P.O., Melbourne, for transmission by Post as a Newspaper.

VOLUME 16, No. 29.

MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, JULY 21, 1950.

SIXPENCE WEEKLY.

KOREA

No intelligent and realistic comment on the Korean incident is possible without some reference to the policies, which made the incident possible. Like the Berlin and other post-war incidents, the Korean incident was only made possible because of the treacherous pro-Communist policies pursued by the Roosevelt regime in all its dealings with Stalin and his associates. Surrounded by Communists' agents like Alger Hiss, Roosevelt at Yalta and elsewhere gave Stalin the all-clear signal to bring Eastern Europe under his domination, and to push East into Asia.

As far back as early in 1949, we published a review of William C. Bullitt's book *How We Won The War and Lost The Peace*. In this revealing book a former American Ambassador provides first-hand evidence of how the policies of Roosevelt's "advisers" paved the way for Communist victories in China, and, of course, the present incident in Korea. It is necessary at present to republish the material we made available from Bullitt's book:

Yalta, February 4, 1945, Roosevelt, sick and moribund, but still determined upon cajoling Stalin. Cordell Hull on October 30, 1943, reported Stalin's affirmation "unequivocally that once Germany is defeated Russia would join with them in defeating Japan, commenting, 'Stalin was sincere and wanted nothing in return.'" Roosevelt, Churchill and Chiang Kai-shek declared publicly at Cairo, November, 1943, that "... all territories stolen from China by Japan, such as Manchuria, Formosa ... will be returned to the Chinese Republic." Yet at Yalta, February 11, 1945, Roosevelt and Churchill signed a secret agreement sacrificing Manchuria to Russian imperialism, granting Russia special privileges over Dairen and Port Arthur with assurance of absolute control of the Chinese Manchuria railway. As a special Stalin bonus the Communist State of Outer Mongolia was detached from China, while South Sakhaline and the Kurile Isles, cutting the air route from Alaska to Japan, were handed over to Russia. And all for assistance already promised unconditionally to Cordell Hull! Roosevelt pleaded that the military experts had overestimated Japanese resistance and that Stalin's former offer of aid was not specific enough. Autumn, 1945. General Hurley, U.S. Ambassador to China, declared publicly on resigning his post that Communists in the State and Foreign Affairs Departments had sabotaged his work. To smother up the scandal Truman sent out Marshall as special envoy. Marshall, who knew as little about China as Truman, sought the advice of State Department officials who still believed that Russia was a democracy in love with peace and that Chinese Communists were agrarian reformers with no connec-

tion with Moscow. The General then drafted out his own instructions, which the President signed—to put a stop to the civil war by bringing about a reconciliation of Nationalists and Communists.

Marshall "Aid" to China

Marshall's prestige was so great upon arriving in China that he succeeded in persuading Chiang Kai-shek to sign an armistice, January 10, 1946. The armistice proved a godsend to Soviet policy. At that moment there were no Chinese Communists in Manchuria, which Russia occupied under the Yalta agreement. Russia therefore planned (a) to send as many Chinese Communists as possible from North China to Manchuria to be armed with equipment and munitions taken from the Japanese; (b) to retain its Russian army in Manchuria until it could be replaced by Chinese Communists properly equipped.

On April 14, 1946, Chinese Communists, well armed, broke the armistice and attacked Chang-chun in Manchuria. Marshall, furious, unable to touch the Communists, took it out on the Nationalists—he stopped all military supplies to Chiang's armies. At the beginning of the summer, 1946, endeavouring to force Chiang to admit Communists into his Government, he instructed the State Department to refuse further export licences for munitions to China. From the summer, 1946, to February, 1948, the Chinese Government did not receive a single cartridge for its American arms, during which period the Communists got all they needed from Russia and were able to occupy vast tracts of territory. In September 1946, Marshall deliberately broke the American contract to furnish aircraft, munitions, and supplies for a period of three years, since when neither bomber nor fighter has been delivered against the contract. Chiang, nevertheless, persisted in refusing to admit Communists into his Government.

June 1947. Marshall returned to the U.S.A. to become Secretary of State, embittered equally against Chinese Nationalists and Communists and equally blind to the mortal danger facing China, as also the fact that a Japan alongside a Communist China could only survive by becoming

a Russian satellite. Truman, always under Marshall influence, refuses to see that the independence and integrity of China is the key to U.S. Pacific security.

"We are today exposed to a struggle," concluded Bullitt, "not for our security but for our existence."

How true Bullitt's words are today!

Three Major Points

Following the Communist victory in China, the American State Department, dominated by Communists and pro-Communists, gave a further all-clear sign to Stalin when they reversed the decision of America's military leaders to defend For-

(Continued on page 8)

OUR POLICY

1. The preservation of Australia's sovereignty as a part of the British Empire, and the exposure of all internal and external groups which attack that sovereignty.
2. The preservation and extension of genuine local government.
3. The preservation and strengthening of all Constitutional safeguards for the purpose of protecting fundamental individual rights.
4. The encouragement of all activities designed to bring Governments under more effective control by the electors.
5. The preservation and extension of genuine free, competitive enterprise and private ownership, and opposition to all Monopoly, whether it be "private" or State.
6. The support of a financial policy which will (a) permit free enterprise to make available to all individuals an increasing standard of living and greater leisure for cultural pursuits; (b) result in no further increase in the community's indebtedness and the sound business practice of gradually reducing existing debt.
7. Recognising that the basis of any sound economy is agriculture, the encouragement of agricultural policies which will ensure the preservation and building up of soil fertility by organic farming and gardening; and the prevention of soil erosion and the protection of forests and watersheds.

Now, when our land to ruin's brink is verging,
In God's name, let us speak while there is time!
Now, when the padlocks for our lips are forging,
Silence is crime.

WHITTIER.

TO THE POINT

More Socialism

It is not anticipated that the Snowy River will make any contribution to national resources within the next decade. So all the capital is being sunk without any immediate return. That means a heavy drain on the national Budget.

Menzies promised drastic economies in the public service. He said: "We believe that the rapid growth of Socialist ideas and practice in Australia is transferring far too many people from productive to administrative activities and that this represents a great danger to our future."

But on the evidence to date, the Menzies Government has gone in for even more Socialism than the Chifley Government. It has not curtailed Socialistic intervention; it has extended it.

—J. T. Lang's *Century*, July 7.

* * * *

Socialism and Centralised Electric Power

In his speech on the Communist Party Dissolution Bill on June 8, Senator Morrow, an ardent Communist fellow traveller, placed great stress upon the fact that Socialism and electric power are closely connected. Lenin stressed the importance of furthering centralised economic control by centralising control of electric power. All anti-Socialist please take note and then ask Liberal-Socialist Casey and his planning associates a few pertinent questions.

* * * *

All Tarred with the One Brush

In a recent statement explaining why he left the British Liberal Party to join the Conservative Party, Lord Cozens-Hardy said:

"I am convinced that the only practical way in which Liberals can achieve their aims, including effective resistance to State Socialism, is by transferring their support to the Conservative Party. It is unfortunately true that there is no hope in the foreseeable future of forming a Liberal Government and, if Liberal aims are to be achieved, it can only be through the combined efforts of Liberals and Conservatives.

"The Conservative Party has in recent years moved toward views which, not so long ago, would have been regarded as akin to those of advanced Liberals; and the presence of ex-Liberals in the Conservative Party must tend to continue the movement in the same direction. For those born and bred in the traditions of Liberalism severance from the Liberal Party may seem hard, but the achievement of aims is more important than adherence to a label."

The Liberal Party in Great Britain paved the way for the progressive centralisation of power and the ultimate victory of the Socialists. It is obvious from the above statement that the British "Conservatives" have also been well indoctrinated by the Statist virus.

* * * *

The Same Principle

It was natural enough in the last century, when Governments were everywhere so much in retreat, so that so great a surrender of sovereignty as observance of an international gold standard was completely accepted as a matter of course by Govern-

ment after Government. Then the principle of State control could be re-discovered as a brilliant novelty, particularly in countries like Germany and France, where the old tradition of busy and officious government was still very much alive. The whole idea of political action, which dominated the life work of the Webbs, wore a quite different look in days when there was very little of it than it wears today. For this century has seen a number of extreme and exaggerated forms of politics as a panacea, and has not liked the spectacle. Communism, Nazism, Fascism all have the same guiding principle, that they create a bureaucracy which makes up its own laws and rules and proceeds to direct and plan society according to the ideas of the small caucus, perhaps of a single man, who controls the great machine.

The Western world, taking its stand against these tyrannical "isms," was first invited to fight them by adopting a variant of their own guiding principle, for the Socialism of Democratic Socialism enshrines exactly the same principle of the politician as master, and it is against that experience that the common sense of the Western world has turned. This is the deeper meaning of the collapse of the *mystique* of the resistance movements in Europe, that a great effort was made to use the strong feeling generated in the business of liberation to carry forward a Socialist transformation of the liberated countries, and the movement has spent its momentum, because what it proposed to do had only too much resemblance to what these peoples had experienced, perhaps from their own Government, perhaps from the Germans, in the years before 1945. They did not want to exchange masters, but to come out into a world in which politicians counted for less altogether.

—*The Tablet* (England), May 6, 1950.

* * * *

Clear Enough

An extract from the Joint Policy of the Federal Liberal and Country Parties, as announced by Mr. Menzies prior to the last Federal Elections:

"Perhaps our greatest charge against the financial and economic policy of the present Socialist Government is that while it has paid a good deal of attention to increasing the volume and circulation of money, it has largely neglected the problem of what and how much that money will buy.

"Every housewife knows how grievous this problem is.

"The statistician will conservatively allow that the pound of 1939 is now only worth 12/2 in purchasing power. But on the true cost of household requirements it would be nearer the mark to say that it is worth only 10/-. The greatest task, therefore, is to get value back into the pound, that is, to get prices down."

* * * *

The Roots of Revolution

An address to the National Geographic Society by William Elery Curtis on the 14th December, 1906, the subject being the Revolution in Russia, was reported in the *National Geographic Magazine*, Vol. XXXIII, No. 5, of May, 1907, on page 313 as follows:

"THE VENGEANCE OF THE JEWS"

". . . Perhaps these reforms are the cause of the present tranquility, because the revo-

lutionary leaders nearly All belong to the Jewish Race, and the most effective revolutionary agency is the Jewish Bund, which has its headquarters at Bialystock, where the massacre occurred last June. The Government (Russian) has suffered more from that Race than from all its other subjects combined. Where a desperate deed is committed it is always done by a Jew, and there is scarcely one loyal member of that Race in the entire Empire."

"Krustaliff, President of the Workingmen Council, a Jew, he managed the General Strike throughout Russia."

"Maxin, who organised the Revolution in Baltic, is a Jew."

"Gernchunin, Leader of the Terrorists, is a Jew."

"... I might enumerate a hundred other Revolutionary leaders and every one of them would be a Jew."

Quoted in *Free Britain*, June 4, 1950.

For the Record

The following letter, posted on June 30, 1950, and issued by Mr. Judah L. Waten, Secretary of the Jewish Council To Combat Fascism and Anti-Semitism, is interesting because it reveals that the Rev. B. Burgoyne Chapman, M.A., has been an agent of a pro-Communist organisation:

JEWISH COUNCIL TO COMBAT
FASCISM AND ANTI-SEMITISM

325 Collins Street,
Melbourne,

Dear Sir,

My Council is arranging a new series of talks to be given to various organisations on a number of subjects of topical interest to the public. The talks will be on such subjects as:—

(a) The Danger of Migration to Australia of Nazi-minded persons,

(b) Anti-Semitism and its Link with Fascism.

The Jewish Council would appreciate the opportunity of sending speakers, well informed on the above subjects, to address your organisation. Recently, *Rev. B. Burgoyne Chapman, M.A.*, addressed many organisations on our behalf, and we have had a great number of letters of appreciation of his addresses. We feel sure our speakers will create a similarly good impression.

We should like to hear from you at your earliest, so as to be able to make proper arrangements as regards dates. Kindly contact our office either per 'phone (MB 2447), or by letter.

Yours sincerely,

J. L. WATEN, Secretary,

Note: Mr. Waten was listed by Mr. Justice Lowe's Report on Communism as being either a Communist or an ex-Communist.

The Mysterious Protocols. 2/8

Full text of "The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion."

Order now from New
Times Ltd., Box 1226L, G.P.O.

Senator Rankin Speaks Out

Speaking on the Communist Party Dissolution Bill on June 1, Senator George Rankin (Country Party, Victoria) said:

Many people in this country have been through Laski's London School of Economics. They went to London and swallowed the Fabian socialistic theory expounded by Mrs. Sidney Webb, the Cassels, and Lord Rothschild, who is the leader of the Labour party in the House of Lords.

Senator *Hendrickson*. — That is news to me.

Senator *George Rankin*. —The honourable senator should read about his own people and ascertain the facts. They are the people who assisted Mrs. Sidney Webb to finance the London School of Economics," of which Professor Laski was in charge. They made no bones about it. Bernard Shaw said that the Fabian socialists travelled the same road as the Russian Bolsheviks and that eventually they would achieve the same objectives. He said that socialism comes first and communism afterwards. We know what communism has meant to Russia. Not very long ago, Sir Stafford Cripps, a nephew of Mrs. Sidney Webb, and an important Fabian, wrote a book called *Can Socialism Come by Constitutional Means?* In it he said—

The Government's first step will be to call Parliament together and place before it an Emergency Powers Bill, to be passed through all its stages on the first day. This bill will be wide enough in its terms to allow all that will be immediately necessary to be done by ministerial orders.

The Fabian technique of perverting the parliamentary system to destroy responsible government was dealt with in some detail by a former Lord Chief Justice of England, Lord Hewart, in his great classic, *The New Despotism*. He wrote—

A mass of evidence establishes the fact that there is in existence a persistent and well-contrived system, intending to produce, and in practice producing, a despotic power which at one and the same time places government departments beyond the sovereignty of Parliament and beyond the jurisdiction of the courts.

Senator *Hendrickson*. —Will the honourable senator declare, the Fabian Society under this bill?

Senator *George Rankin*. —I say that the Fabian socialists are as rotten as Stalin and his gang. They have the same objectives. I admit that some of them are well-meaning fools who have been misled; but their objective is the same as the Russian objective.

Senator *Ward*. —Christianity.

Senator *George Rankin*. —Apparently the kind of Christianity of which Senator Ward is in favour is to take away from people everything that they have, pay them no compensation, and, if they dare to protest, murder them. Douglas Reed, the famous English publicist, wrote—

I found it (the London School of Economics) to be well-known to Communists in Berlin, Vienna and Prague before the second war, and some of those young men did not disguise from me their belief that it could be used by Communists who wished to pursue their political activities in England under the respectable mantle of "economics" and studentship.

Senator *Ashley*. —How many chapters are there in the book from which the honourable senator is reading?

Senator *George Rankin*. —I have listened to the Leader of the Opposition (Senator Ashley) reading from a brief on many occasions, but I have not been rude enough to refer to the fact that apparently he could not prepare his own speeches.

The *President*. —Order! The honourable senator must deal with the bill.

Senator *George Rankin*. —In 1936, the right honourable member for Barton (Dr. Evatt) wrote a book entitled *The King and his Dominion Governors*. In the preface to the book, he said—

I am also under obligation to Professor Laski, of the London School of Economics . . . for much encouragement and advice.

Laski's philosophy has been summed up in the following extract from *Faith, Reason and Civilization*: —

Christianity has failed, and the Russian ideal is taking its place as the inspiration of mankind, and as the standard of public morality.

Senator *Grant*. —What is the honourable senator's point?

Senator *George Rankin*. — My point is that I distrust the Labour party because it has played with the Communists, these traitors to Australia. It has accepted their support in the past, and I do not think that it is trustworthy today. It had the "Red Dean" out here.

Senator *Grant*. —We did not.

Senator *George Rankin*. —He has visited this country. When the "Red Dean" held a meeting in Melbourne, members of the Labour party and a Labour member of this chamber were on the platform with him. He also gave a special address in that city under the auspices of the Jewish Council Against Fascism and Anti-Semitism. The following is an extract from the Melbourne *Age* of the 19th April: —

"Australia would be the second major target in a new world war—and you will see how those 200,000,000 Russian people can fight!"

The Dean of Canterbury (Dr. Hewlett Johnson) said this last night, addressing a meeting arranged by the Jewish Council to Combat Fascism and Anti-Semitism.

"Australia would be very vulnerable," he declared, "and do not forget the 450,000,000 population of China, which is now rapidly being economically organized."

"Russia has made great strides since the end of the war," he added. "She has been able to build a sound economy while developing a great army. It could come to war," he said. "But, please God, it need not. Every Russian wants peace. What then is hindering peace talks, such as recently proposed by Mr. Churchill?"

Dr. Johnson suggested that peace moves were being blocked deliberately.

Senator *Grant*. —There is a photograph in today's Sydney *Daily Mirror* of Dr. Johnson with Princess Margaret.

Senator *George Rankin*. —That does not matter. What does matter is whether we are to retain our liberty and whether the British Commonwealth of Nations is to maintain its strength. I believe that in order to protect ourselves we must pass this bill in its present form. There is no doubt that some officials of great trade unions are being paid by a foreign power

ERIC BUTLER'S BOOKS

The Enemy Within the Empire, 10d
Over 30,000 copies of this book have been sold in all parts of the English-speaking world. Carefully documented, it is essential for those who desire to understand the background of the present world situation. The policy of the International Financiers in using the Bank of "England" to cripple the British Empire while helping Hitler is dealt with in detail. The origin of what is now known as the "Financier-Socialist" plot is revealed. This book is generally regarded as one of the author's finest works. *The Money Power Versus*

Democracy..... 10d.

Well worth having if only for the comprehensive selection of statements by various authorities concerning the "Money Power." The main thesis of this book is to show how the "Money Power" has prevented the introduction of genuine political and economic democracy. The author shows how the electors must unite to bring their political institutions under control for the purpose of obtaining the results they desire.

The Truth About Social Credit, 1/1

An excellent introduction to the subject of Social Credit for the beginner. It shows how Social Credit is far more than a "funny money" scheme. The author makes it clear that bank nationalisation and "State control of the issue of credit" has got nothing to do with Social Credit. Social Credit financial proposals are outlined clearly and simply. The 1945 Banking Legislation is revealed as a major part of the policy of totalitarianism being imposed upon Australians. This valuable book must be in the armoury of every Social Credit warrior.

Democracy Flouted..... 7d.

The full text of a radio script prepared by the author while a member of the Armed Forces. Although the A.B.C. considered the script one of the finest submitted by a member of the Army, a Communist in a key position in Army Education had the talk banned after all arrangements had been made for its broadcast.

A Defence of Free Enterprise and The Profit Motive.... 7d.

A brilliant exposition of the control of the production system by the money "vote."

Constitutional Barriers To Serfdom 7d.

All prices listed above include the cost of postage. Order from *New Times Ltd.*, Box 1226L., G.P.O., Melbourne.

THE NEW TIMES

Established 1935.

Published every Friday by New Times Limited, McEwan House,
343 Little Collins Street, Melbourne, C.I. Postal
Address: Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne. Telephone: MU2834.

Subscription Rates: 25/- Yearly; 13/- Half -Yearly; 7/- Quarter.

VOL. 16,

FRIDAY, JULY 21, 1950.

No. 29.

FREE TRADE AND SOVEREIGNTY

A recent suggestion that Australia should encourage a flood of imports in order to defeat the growing menace of inflation has been vigorously attacked by representatives of secondary industries on the grounds that these imports would destroy large numbers of Australian industries and thus create unemployment. We believe that with the world as it is today, there is a very sound argument in favour of a policy of protection, which will enable a country like Australia to develop to the maximum all the industrial arts. Unfortunately, however, this argument is obscured by the old cry that cheap imports will result in unemployment. Under present financial rules they do. Even in the U.S.A., which has developed the industrial arts further than any other country in the world and which economically is nearly self-sufficient, tariffs are regarded primarily as a means of preventing other countries from "exporting their unemployment" to America. We have no sympathy whatever with this approach to the question of Free Trade versus Protection.

Free Trade between nations is only possible when the internal financial policies of nations are such that all exports are a genuine surplus necessary to obtain desired imports. In attempting to follow the Free Trade ideal under orthodox financial rules, Great Britain sabotaged her natural resources and so ruined her agriculture that in two world wars she was most vulnerable concerning food supplies. This vulnerability was shrewdly exploited after the last war for the purpose of imposing from the U.S.A. economic and financial policies, which have aimed at destroying the economic sovereignty of the British people.

Even if at present certain Australian secondary industries cannot produce quite as efficiently as can old-established industries in other countries, they must be encouraged to develop and improve in order that we can be as economically independent as possible. In the event of war, for example, we do not want to be in the position where we have to depend upon vital supplies from thousands of miles away—supplies, which may easily be cut off. Economic self-sufficiency—as far as it is practically possible—is the basis of genuine sovereignty.

Needless to say, protection policies should be such that they do not permit monopolistic policies by local groups.

Contempt

As a passing instance of the contemptuous insolence with which it is now the done thing to treat the British and the British Empire, we may note the speech of Pandit Nehru when speaking as a guest of the British Government of Singapore.

Of course, said Mr. Nehru, the British will have to get out of Malaya, as they have had to get out of India and Burma. But if they were to get out now, that would leave an inconvenient problem to be solved. So they must remain until the present

fighting, and the threatened difficulties which Indonesia might have to face, had been liquidated at British expense.

And, then, having lost some thousands of British lives and suffered tens of thousands of casualties, imported and developed the rubber, tea, and coffee plantations, the tin and the gold, built the towns, harbours and railways, we are to retire gracefully, not merely without compensation, but owing Malaya large sterling balances, just like India and Burma. Waal, waal, waal.

—*The Social Creditor*, July 1.

"Near to Breaking Point"

From the outset of his book Mr. Jenks emphasizes the primacy of husbandry in any sound economy, and makes clear the inescapable rules that nature imposes upon the husbandman, not only if he is to continue and increase the primary products that the land provides, but if the secondary or manipulative production of industry is not to fail. It is through violating these rules in the supposed immediate interest of industry and finance (the former a type of production dependent upon agriculture and the latter utterly unproductive) that our modern economy is racing to destruction. So long as the depleted soil of the world could provide enough food and raw materials to satisfy the populations of the great trading Powers, little thought was given to the shrinkage of the sources of wealth. So long as scientific ingenuity was able to deceive men's palates with nutrition-less food and captivate their taste with second-rate materials and shoddy makeshifts, finance-industrialism was secure. But such losing of capital and such deterioration in the quality of food and other essentials could not go on indefinitely. We are coming near to breaking point, and the peril in which we stand is already being felt, though its causes are rarely understood.

—Review of Jorian Jenks's book, "From The Ground Up," in *The Tablet*, May 6, 1950.

Conspiracy

Speaking in the Federal Parliament on June 8, Mr. Chifley made the interesting admission that his Government had not accepted the claim "that Dr. Sockarno had collaborated with the Japanese" because Lord Mountbatten had said, "that the real force behind the Indonesian revolution against the Dutch was nationalism."

The above information provides further evidence confirming our opinion that Lord Mountbatten, husband of Sir Ernest Casel's favourite niece, has been a useful tool of the Dark Forces at present desperately attempting to complete their campaign against Western Civilization.

Keep This Date Free

New Times country readers in particular will be pleased to know that this year's *New Times* Dinner will be held during Show Week. The date is Friday, September 29. We feel confident that having the Annual Dinner during Show Week will result in a very large attendance. Plans are in hand to make this, year's Dinner an outstanding success in every way. No *New Times* supporter should miss it. Details will be announced later. At this stage we merely draw our supporters' attention to the date and ask them to reserve it.

British Sovereignty

We are very pleased to report that there is at least one British Conservative Member of the House of Commons who has had the courage to speak out against the "Schuman" Plan and other schemes for a European Federation. In the following speech on June 26, 1950, Major Legge-Bourke, clearly showed how all international organisations must result in the destruction of the unity and sovereignty of the British Empire, and made a powerful appeal for Empire solidarity:

But, because I have opposed the State taking over British industries, even more I deplore the very idea of establishing, or trying to establish, some new form of international control which could bind Governments and which would work only if all men were perfect—in which case it would be utterly unnecessary. The Motion before us has safeguards. If the Plan is not practicable, we shall reserve freedom of action. But I submit that no plan which aims at the establishment of a high authority that can bind Governments can, in my view, ever be practical with men as imperfect as they are, save in the cause of setting up an international tyranny and totalitarianism.

I am on record in this House and in my constituency during the Election as having said that the United Nations organisation ought to be wound up. I say it again today. I say it because not one single member of the United Nations has been elected by the nations of the world. Even if they had been, I should still not approve of it. Hon. Members may laugh, but I wish to point out the way in which the world is going at the moment. My reasons are that statesmen are elected by their own countries to suit those countries and not to suit the countries whose future they will be deciding at U.N.O. Another objection is that a system in which men are elected by one nation to deliberate on the affairs of another is in itself totalitarian, if it works, and chaotic when it does not work; and as it is not working at the moment we have chaos.

The United Nations organisation, as was the League before it, was set up to restrict the operation of national sovereignty. That in itself may or may not have been desirable at the time it was done. But what has happened? As did Germany in the League, so Russia in U.N.O. has used an organisation set up to limit all national sovereignties in order to increase her own. Let no one imagine that Russia would remain a member for one moment longer than it served her purpose to do so. Let no one fail to see that the purpose of Russia since the Revolution has been to increase her national sovereignty until she becomes the ruler of the world. It is that organisation which the French desire to see sending an accredited representative to the high authority, the supra-national authority.

What, then, must other members of the United Nations do? They have but one safe course, and that is to increase their own national sovereignty as rapidly as possible. I do not believe that Great Britain can ever fully restore hers 100 per cent. What she can and ought to do is to base herself upon the sovereignty of the British Commonwealth and Empire, and restore that to the maximum she can achieve. The role of the Conservative Party, I think, is quite clear. Surely it is to make absolutely plain that it will not countenance, still less discuss, any steps which from the outset will restrict the right of Britain to make whatever arrangements she cares to make with other members of the Commonwealth.

From the very outset, from the French note of 9th May, this idea of the pooling of steel and coal production is inevitably an interference with that right. Therefore, the role of the Conservative Party is to declare here and now that it will play no part in the construction of a body, which must be as unconstitutional as it is undemocratic and which must, if it is to achieve the aim visualised, automatically interfere with the British Commonwealth.

Let no one imagine that if, as I hope, we refuse to take any part in these negotiations, we can stand idly by. We should, without delay, negotiate with our Dominions with a view to their taking all the steel and coal we can let them have; but that will not meet their full needs—it will fall short by about 3 million tons. It is for that reason that Britain must keep on close relations with the United States and never forget that she is a European Power as well as an Imperial Power. That is why the document of the Labour Party on European unity is so wrong. The Socialist Party ostrich is to bury its head in the British Socialist sandpit, until it emerges as completely bereft of industrial plumage as the head of the author of that document is devoid of hair.

We must play a part in Europe; indeed we must play the lead. Hon. Members may laugh, but I believe that one is sent to this House to say what one thinks, and that is what I am attempting to do. If Britain is to lead Europe she must be as mighty in her own political strength as possible. She will not lead Europe, or anyone else, by hurrying off to a concert, for which she is already late, there to play a flat second fiddle under the baton of a third-rate Svengali in an overture that ought never to have been written.

I cannot support the Motion of my Right Hon. Friend and I hope that I have made my reasons clear. Let him not think that I am any less fervent in my belief that the hope of Britain is the return of Conservative Government. But let him know this, too; it must be a Government that is Conservative abroad as well as at home. It must be a Government that will take no chances about the future of the British Commonwealth. It must be a Government that holds certain things sacrosanct. I hope it will be a Government that will not sap the energies of our own people by attempting the impossible task of bringing about a state of affairs in Europe contrary to all the traditional influences of the nations that form that continent. As was said in this House a long time ago:

"The world is governed by conciliation, compromise, influence, varied interests, the recognition of the rights of others, coupled with the assertion of our own."

Upon the assertion of the rights of Great Britain, with all her great ability in conciliation and compromise, and with all her varied interests, hangs the peace of the world. Let the Conservative Party speak first, not for a Western Union that few understand and which can never materialise

on a basis of federation; let it speak for all those many millions of our people who though they wish the whole world well, are first proud to call themselves subjects of His Majesty.

There is not the faintest sign of even a glimmer of understanding of these matters "at Cabinet level," whether Liberals or Labour are in office. There are signs of some uneasiness among backbenchers, and no doubt there will be more when the efflux of time reduces Parliamentary salaries by a third. But that is hardly enough. The steady dissipation of purchasing power is one arm of a strategy of which Communism is the other; and unless the former is attended to, we shall end up as slaves of a World State, Communists or no Communists. —*The Social Creditor*, July 8.

Action

The following excellent letters appeared in *The Courier*, Ashley Park, S.A.

This is the type of activity, which we feel more readers of this journal should participate in.

Sir, —If there should be a Federal double dissolution, then a party vote will in one case openly support socialism, which is communism by stealth; in the other case, Menzies and Co. will be confirmed in their stealthy socialistic courses under international domination.

If electors have any sense of self-preservation, they will ignore the party sham fight and make a real election issue centred in the slogan: "Put the shillings back into the pound." Now is the time to be alert and active with educational measures.

At election time, enough pressure must be put upon candidates to force them to promise to give first preference in Parliament to the issue selected for them by the electors themselves.

Conventional financial policies are stupid and anti-social. They must be drastically altered in order to "put the shillings back into the pound," and when satisfactory, financial policies are in operation the present industrial unrest, which fosters communism, will recede.

C. H. ALLEN.

Sir, —In one of the earlier books of C. H. Douglas, the idea that consumers as such should combine in political action is enlarged upon.

In view of the alarming rise in the prices of goods and services, the time seems ripe to exploit this idea.

Ways and means of forcing this issue, and so keeping Menzies and Co. up to their promise to "put the shillings back into the £," can easily be devised. What is lacking is the covenanting zeal to bind us together, as it did our Scottish brethren in the seventeenth century.

If we all take a determined stand, we can regain the whip hand over our Governments. If we instruct our representatives and they refuse to act on our behalf, then we can suspend our tax payments, for no taxation should be imposed upon people who have no proper representation.

While the iniquitous payroll taxation deductions continue, employers and employees would need to co-operate. Why should we not have a "strike" staged in such a way as to benefit all of us as consumers?

C. H. ALLEN.



Relation of Soil to Health

By Dr. W. G. MACDONALD

(Address given at the Open Day held at Chertsey Grange, England on April 28, 1949, by kind invitation of Mr. J. L. H. Chase)

Reprinted from *Mother Earth* (England)

At a previous meeting of the Soil Association at the Grange, Mr. Easterbrook warned us that we must not expect diseases of plants to disappear because compost is used. This admonition requires amplification if we would avoid the danger of generalization, and it will be my endeavour to fill in some detail.

We must clearly distinguish in our minds the state of health, which connotes a general state of well-being with a high level of efficiency and resistance to disease; and disease, which in the plant, the animal or the human being is characterized by vital inefficiency and is usually due to a specific type of infection or to deficiency.

Disease germs and viruses are part of nature's ecology and always have been, always are, with us. That in itself would lead us to doubt the banishing of disease by compost. While we recognize that the final cause of disease is infection by a specific "bug," we must take into account a large number of contributory causes that make infection possible. Those we can lump under the general term of *adverse conditions*. They lower vital capacity. Then there are the particular factors of dosage and virulence of the infective agent, which, if overwhelming, must inevitably cause disease in the healthiest.

We fully realize that the adequate use of properly made compost provides, on the one hand, the best possible conditions for healthy plant growth; but, on the other hand, we cannot control all adverse conditions, climatic, the hunger of a desperate wire-worm, and so on. To expect disease to vanish would indeed be wishful or fragmentary thinking. What then can we expect?

In my garden in Boxmoor, Hertfordshire, strawberries (and also roses and apple trees) were for many years ravaged with Black Spot. Expert advice was sought and obtained in plenty. Chemical attack was tried with no beneficial result, the only response being weakened plants. New stock was introduced from different sources and all developed Black Spot.

Another crop that never could be grown successfully was onions. White Rot caused by the fungus *Sclerotium cepivorum* invariably destroyed the majority of the bulbs.

But, when soil fertility was assured by an adequate use of compost, an astonishing transformation was seen. Both diseases, the

Black Spot and the White Rot slunk back into insignificance.

Composting a Health Service

The subsequent observations are of informative interest. In the first year of composting the diseases were negligible. By the second they had apparently disappeared. Last year, 1948, which, as you well remember, consisted of a procession of adverse climatic conditions, mild recurrence of both diseases was observed.

It is clear that, by composting, a plant health service had been inaugurated. Immunity was raised to a new level and the plants' resistance to disease was greatly increased. That this was and is a raised resistance is shown by the fact that with the bad climatic conditions of 1948 (early heat and drought, late frosts, cold, wet periods). Black Spot recurred to some extent, to vanish again when weather conditions became favourable.

In the onion bed under adverse weather conditions an odd bulb weaker than the rest developed *sclerotium* disease, although the general crop was free from disease and of excellent quality. I may mention that the onions were Ailsa Craigs, which are particularly susceptible to White Rot, and in passing let me stress the fallacy of the popular belief that large onions do not keep well. The keeping qualities of large onions depend on *how* they are grown. If starved on poor soil or forced and bloated by artificials they rot quickly. Composted they keep well.

We see then from these instances that as a result of composting plant resistance to disease is raised. This is further evidenced by the remarkable resistance of the compost-grown plants to parasitic attack. We have long known that it is the weakling and the diseased that attract parasites. In the hospital ward, for example, it is the desperately ill patient round whom the flies gather. So in field or garden it is the ill plant that is assailed by parasites and the "illness" may be due to adverse climatic conditions, poor soil or nutritive imbalance due to artificials.

What is the nature of the health factor and increased resistance to disease in the compost-grown plant? There can be no shadow of doubt that this protection is given by a substance derived from the living soil, a substance that we have every right to regard as a hormone.

Transfer of Resistance

Since all flesh is grass, the question logically arises; can this resistance derived

from fertile soil be transferred by the healthy plant (a) to the animal, (b) to the human being?

It is obvious to anyone who has given thought to the problem of health that salvation lies only in raising immunity and increasing resistance to disease.

An attempt to destroy or control all germs and viruses by antiseptics would result in the weakening or extermination of the organism we sought to protect, be it plant, animal or man. In recent years we have become aware that in fertile soil, that is to say, in earth enriched by the residues of plants and animals digested by moulds and bacteria, in short, enriched by compost, there are substances that destroy our natural enemies—penicillin is one of them. This purifying action of fertile soil is indubitably one of the greatest health factors on our planet.

Here, however, we are, at the moment, concerned with the constructive health hormone rather than with the germ destroying, or, as they are called, the antibiotic soil substances.

Are we justified in believing that the compost grown plant bequeaths the health factor to the animal that feeds upon it? There is abundant proof that it does, and that the animal, in its turn, derives a state of good health with markedly raised resistance to disease, and, mark you, not to one specific disease, but to all.

The rat experiments of McCarrison, Rowlands and Wilkinson, and others, have proved it in the laboratory; Sir Albert Howard, Mr. Friend Sykes and many others amply confirmed it on the agricultural scale; at the human level it has been demonstrated beyond doubt.

Our aim, therefore, is crystal clear. It is to insist on the *quality* of foods. Quantity without quality is, in very truth, a *crime against humanity* to be resisted by every possible means on every possible occasion. By our individual compost production, by helping our neighbours to knowledge of the virtue of compost grown food, by the education of the politician (Strachey still bleats in terms of calories) we shall make progress.

Eventually we shall obtain maximum Soil Fertility and maximum Quality of Food. A real Health Service in contradistinction to Bevan's blunder of "free" pills (not forgetting pheno barbitone!), wigs, spectacles and teeth! We shall then have all organic wastes converted into good, clean compost, by individuals, on a municipal, and on a national scale for our own uses and for export to our, and to the world's vast benefit.

A False View of Science

Unfortunately, the human being is obsessed with the fallacy that test tubes and glittering apparatus possess some mystical virtue, which is dubbed "science", and under the cloak of science almost divinely infallible attributes

(Continued on page 7)

RELATION of SOIL to HEALTH

(Continued from page 6)

are assumed. I repeat *assumed*.

The trend today is to process everything; Nature is lip-sticked and outraged by human "cleverness." Food is robbed of its removable essentials which, rendered stable (and often ineffective) by chemical means, are made into pills for sale at much profit. The buyers appear to be indifferent to the fact that they were defrauded of those essentials in the first place and, in the second, have paid an exorbitant price for an inferior article. Think for a moment of our daily bread—and cake. The bulk of the grain at our disposal has first been impoverished by artificials. The milling processes remove the mineral salts, the bran with its vitamin wealth, and the germ with its high food and health values, the semolina, which all go to the chemists and processed food manufacturers.

The starch and gluten that is left is now "improved" by bleaching with Agene, an improvement that causes dogs and ferrets fed upon it to develop fits. Can you imagine a more inexcusable exploitation?

Once imbued with the mystical, so-called scientific, idea it is difficult to return to sanity. Wholeness gives place to specialism, the concept narrows and the prejudiced doctrinaire is created, who brushes aside all evidence that threatens his tenuous concept. When his doctrine is also heavily backed by financial interest, his blindness to reason and to human needs is absolute.

That is what we are up against when we try to show the exponents of artificial manures the error of their ways. Our words seem wasted. Still, let us not be discouraged. Repetition has its propaganda value; and truth will out.

What Is Natural Is Scientific

When it all is said and done, is not what is natural the most truly scientific? The laws of Nature in actual fact are the laws of the electron and the atom with which the scientist deals fractionally and often destructively. Has any scientist ever succeeded in creating one blade of grass in his laboratory? Indeed, scientific attempts to emulate Nature's effortless productions are ridiculously crude. It is true that science has given us many marvellous advantages mechanically—rapid transport, communications, radio (that insects have used for centuries), nylon stockings and atom bombs. Mechanically we have been well served. But our basic needs remain. We must have food. To live well and to be healthy we must have good food and this we cannot get from the laboratory. The bread evolved by science becomes more and more like a stone. It keeps, yet does not nourish.

Many of you here have adopted composting to solve your own problems and to satisfy your own needs by ensuring a supply of good quality food in an age of less than mediocrity; to achieve a degree of health in a world of increasing ill health. By logical analysis you have arrived at the conclusion that *Nature* with an experience of plant production of over 300 million years and *the weight of evidence* provided by competent and financially disinterested observers shall be your guides rather than the specious advertising puffs of National Growmore or other artificial stimulants. You have learned that raw animal and plant waste,

manure, is a plant poison until it has been trans-formed into compost by the action of moulds and bacteria. You have become steadfast composters and your industry in composting will carry more conviction than any words. Words can be denied; preaching can be wearisome: practice convinces.

No one can look upon a well-composted field or garden without danger of breaking the tenth Commandment, and none can eat of its produce, fresh and well prepared, without enthusiastic appreciation of its quality, and without being the better and the healthier for it.

(In thanking Dr. MacDonald for his address, Mr. Chase mentioned that he himself used for his vegetables, flowers and fruit over 4,000 tons of compost a year and was satisfied that it paid him well, both directly in cash returns and indirectly in building up the fertility of his land.)

Agricultural Costs

"... While it is always possible, by isolating a particular operation, to show that a particular technique reduces costs, agriculture's mounting bill for machinery, fuel, fertilisers and technical aids generally has not enabled it to reduce production costs to anything like the extent expected, but rather the reverse.

"In a paper read to the Agricultural Society last January, based on costings for 160 farms kept at Cambridge University, Mr. F. G. Sturrock showed that in East Anglia—where mechanisation is well advanced—expenditure on the upkeep of implements and machinery increased from £137 per farm in 1938 to £707 in 1948, or from 9.4 to 21 percent of total costs, while *over the same period* the wage bill per farm increased from £401 to £1,268, or from 27.4 to 31 percent of total costs. 'Work units' per man per year (i.e., crops and stock tended) were actually fewer in the period 1946-48 than before the war, a finding confirmed by other agricultural economists for the country as a whole. Though suggesting some reasons for this unexpected phenomenon, Mr. Sturrock could not avoid the conclusion that "in spite of a very considerable increase in expenditure on machinery, productivity per man is not increasing.

"Such calculations, moreover, leave out of account the second (and more highly paid) labour force now indirectly employed by agriculture through the engineering and chemical industries. If this were included, the trend of 'productivity per man' might be even more disquieting.

"Superficially, this development is good for industry in that it enlarges the market for factory products and so helps to maintain 'full employment.' But if thereby it adds progressively to the cost of food production, the long-term effect must be to place industry as well as agriculture under a serious handicap. We cannot live merely by making work for one another."

—Jorian Jenks in *Rural Economy* (England) May, 1950.

"SOCIAL CREDIT AND CATHOLICISM"

By George-Henri Levesque, O.P., Professor of Economics, Laval and Montreal Universities, Dominican House of Studies, Ottawa.

Introduction by Eric D. Butler.

Price 1/1 (Post free). Order now

SALE

Stocktaking Sale Books at Bargain Prices

Some of these books are slightly shop-soiled.

- 2 only *Orientalisms*, Storrs, 13/3. Now 10/-.
- 2 only *Man Born to be King*, Dorothy Sayers, 15/3. Now 12/6.
- 1 only *Bradman*, Moyes, 11/6. Now 7/6.
- 5 only *Property and Poverty*, A. M. Crofts, 8/6. Now 6/-.
- 1 only *Unfinished Business*, Stephen Bonsai, 21/9. Now 8/6.
- 1 only *An Arab Tells His Story*, Edward Atiyah, 15/3. Now 10/6.
- 1 only *This Man Truman*, McNaughton and Henmeyer, 12/6. Now 6/-.
- 3 only *McKenzie King*, Ludwig, 7/3. Now 3/-.
- 1 only *The Discipline of Peace*, K. E. Barlow, 12/6. Now 5/-.
- 2 only *The Two Nations*, Hollis, 19/6. Now 10/-.
- 1 only *Ouma Smuts*, McDonald, 15/3. Now 5/-.
- 1 only *Gentlemen Talk of Peace*, W.B. Ziff, 19/6. Now 10/6.
- 3 only *The Age of Plenty*, C. M. Hattersley, 12/6. Now 6/-.
- 4 only *Bureaucracy*, Von Mises, 7/6. Now 5/-.
- 1 only *War Speeches of Winston Churchill*, 7/6. Now 5/-.
- 3 only *Downfall*, Douglas Reed, 8/3. Now 4/-.
- 3 only *The Problem of Security*, Lt. Gen. Martell, 12/6. Now 7/6.
- 1 set *War Memoirs of Lloyd George* (4 vols.), £5. Now 20/-.
- 2 only *Report on the Russians*, W. L. White, 16/9. Now 11/6.
- 1 only *Russia's Neighbour — The New Poland*, Bernard Newman, 15/3. Now 10/6.
- 1 only *The Goebbels Diaries*, 25/-.
- 2 only *Communism and The Conscience of the West*, Fulton Sheen, 25/-.
- Now 17/6.
- 1 only *The Framework of the Future*, L. S. Amery.
- 1 only *World War, Its Cause and Cure*, Lionel Curtis, 10/-.
- Now 7/6.
- 2 only *Speaking Generally*, Lord Wavell, 10/-.
- Now 7/6.
- 1 only *Out of the People*, J. B. Priestly, 5/-.
- Now 3/-.

Order now from

New Times Ltd., Box 1226L., G.P.O.,
Melbourne.

"New Times," July 21, 1950 — Page 7

Limiting Governmental Power

The following statement by Mr. Eric D. Butler, Campaign Director of the Victorian League of Rights, was issued to all Melbourne dailies on July 6, but the Melbourne *Herald*—July 8—was the only paper to publish:

"Canberra reports which state that the Federal Government is not only not going to honour the pre-election promise to reduce taxes, but will actually have to increase taxation, provide striking confirmation of the fact that the mere act of voting at elections provides electors with no effective control whatever over modern Governments, all of whom tend to centralise power at the expense of the individual.

"Apart from a Constitutional safeguard preventing Governments from nationalising private enterprise, there should also be a Constitutional safeguard limiting the power of Governments to destroy private enterprise and individual independence by imposing whatever they like. Before elections, Parties should be compelled to outline their proposed programme, what benefits it will yield to the individual, and the maximum amount of money required for the programme. Like a business enterprise, a Party seeking to become a Government should present a properly drawn up prospectus, and, having been elected, should not be permitted constitutionally to increase taxation in excess of the maximum amount mentioned in its 'prospectus.'

"If desirous of increasing taxation, the Government should first have to approach its 'shareholders,' the electors, outlining to

them why more taxation is required. The electors could then decide whether or not they would subscribe the money. This is a sound business practice, which should be extended to all big capital development schemes, which, under present methods of Government finance, can only result in further taxation and a swollen bureaucracy to try and administer the schemes.

"As all capital expansion is an investment requiring an immediate curtailment of the actual and potential standard of living in anticipation of a much higher standard in the future, the ratio of capital production to consumer production should be directly determined by the taxpayers, not by the Government. Governments should be limited to fostering possible developmental schemes, which, instead of being financed by inflationary credit expansion, and compulsory taxation, should be financed by share-capital from investors. All work should be done by private enterprise.

"One of the basic requirements for a reduction in both taxes and prices, is a drastic reduction of Government activities which encroach upon the activities and aspirations of the individual. Socialism cannot be defeated by endorsing one of the basic doctrines of Socialism: The best Government is that which taxes heaviest and spends the most."

KOREA

(Continued from page 1)

mosa, a key strategic position in the Far East. There is probably little doubt that this disastrous decision encouraged the Communist leaders to exploit the position in Korea. Now, there are three major points concerning the Korean conflict to which we believe it is essential to direct attention.

The first is the fact that we are asked to believe that American Intelligence was so poor that it had no knowledge of the size or competency of the North Korean forces and the inability of the South Korean forces to resist aggression. Bearing in mind the policies, which encouraged the Communists to attack in Korea, we feel that the only intelligent explanation of the complete misrepresentation of the position in Korea is more Communist treachery—particularly in the American State Department.

The second major point, and directly related to the first, is the fact that the American military effort so far has been depressingly unsuccessful. Raw and comparatively untrained troops have been used, numbers have been insufficient, and equipment has been inferior. Is it another example of what happened during the last war: "Too late and too little"? We have no doubt that genuine American patriots, who have been pointing out for the past few years how "American" policy in the Far East has contributed to one Communist success after another, will be asking some

very pertinent questions about these matters.

The most significant point of all concerning the Korean incident is the manner in which every effort has been made to use it to further the "United" Nations idea. Press and radio commentators cry out that we and fellow Britishers must help the Southern Koreans because of the "United" Nations, one of whose leading members is Soviet Russia! Amidst the blast of propaganda by the internationalists everywhere, who make it clear that the Korean incident has been a great boon to them, it is generally overlooked that, although the "United" Nations did condemn aggression in Korea, and called upon all Members to resist aggression, President Truman took the first action as President of the U.S.A. He was supported in his action by the British and other Empire countries. The right of a nation to make its own decisions concerning war is one, which basically concerns its sovereignty. That sovereignty must not be surrendered to any international organisation, particularly when that organisation has been the creation and instrument of the Communists and their fellow travellers. To allow the Korean incident and its possible extension to be used to intensify the policy of world centralisation and the further destruction of the British Empire's sovereignties, would be a victory for Communism irrespective of what happens in Korea.

If the international plotters have by their treacherous policies now made another military struggle inevitable, the future of Western Civilization depends upon those resisting the Red hordes and their satellites taking every care to insist that their efforts are not perverted as happened during the last war.

USE ENWITE specialities

TEXTIT waterproofing compound.

SOLVIT paint remover. No difficult neutralization.

AQUALAC wood putty. For good class Cabinetwork.

BRYNAC. The enamel for resisting water, acids and alkalis.

FERROSOL Rust killing paint. In all colours.

RUSTEX. For removing rust from motor bodies and metal work.

THERMEX. Silver paint. Can be made red hot without discolouring or coming off.

Manufactured by:

ENWITE PTY. LTD.

84-86 Cromwell Street,
Collingwood, Vic.

PHONE: JA5967

Senator Rankin

(Continued from page 3)

to cause industrial disturbances in this country. A few days ago Mr. Bird, an official of the Seamen's Union, decided that there should be a strike in the Port of Melbourne and that 26 ships should be held up, even though seamen in other ports would not support that action. The Communists act in that way because they are anti-British and anti-Australian, and mad for power. They believe that eventually they will be in a position to dictate to the people of this country.

Sir Stafford Cripps is another product of Laski's London School of Economics. In my opinion he is one of the rottenest leaders that have ever been foisted on the British public.

**CODNER
BROS.**

**Builders and
Joinery
Manufacturers**

**HOMES AND
HOME SITES
AVAILABLE**

**Wheatsheaf Rd.,
GLENROY**