THE NEW TIMES

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

VOLUME 16, No. 45.

MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 10,1950.

SIXPENCE WEEKLY

The Menace of the "United" Nations

A Challenge to British Patriots

By ERIC D. BUTLER.

In an obscure report in its issue of October 30, the Melbourne "Sun" was the only Melbourne daily to reveal that the celebration of United Nations week in the U.S.A. resulted in nation-wide protests against the flying of the U.N. flag.

At one meeting of educationalists a majority condemned the proposal to fly the U.N. flag as "part of an international plot to produce World Government and to subvert American traditions."

The Melbourne Sun report also said, "A representative of the American Defence Society said that he was opposed to the United Nations flag because Secretary-General Trygve Lie was a Socialist and many member nations were dictatorships.

"In Los Angeles a group of elderly demonstrators stormed a U.N. flag-raising ceremony and chanted 'U.N. is un-American.' One Illinois city banned the flag from public buildings because the Russians remained in the United Nations. Objections were raised in scattered towns all over the country."

The Purpose of "Korea"

The above brief report is an indication of what this journal has been pointing out to the Australian public for some time: that there has been a growing criticism in the U.S.A. of the disastrous policies of American Secretary for State, Dean Acheson, and other prominent officials who have followed the Zionist-Communist "line" of furthering World Government. Many conservative commentators in the U.S.A. and elsewhere have drawn attention to the significant "fact that the Korean incident occurred at a time when the campaign for internationalism was lagging badly. Dean Acheson and his sponsors had received a heavy setback concerning their Schuman Plan for centralising control of Europe's steel industries, while Senator McCarthy and other courageous Americans were exposing Communist influence in Acheson's State Department. The Korean incident enabled the internationalists to conduct a worldwide campaign in favour of a strong "United" Nations "to prevent aggression." It also created the right atmosphere in which power could be centralised under the control of "strong National Governments." These National Governments can then hand the centralised power over to the International Government, which can then dominate the entire world.

Under "the threat of war," Governments everywhere are demanding more and more power over the individual, who is told that the first step to defeating Communism abroad is to accept Communist policies at home.

The U.N.O. Conspiracy

Anyone who doubts the "United" Nations organisation, dominated by Washington and Moscow, is being used for evil purposes by evil groups, should ponder over the following facts:

It wasn't the "United" Nations, which declared war in Korea, but President Truman on the advice of Dean Acheson and his associates. It is reported that American military leaders were opposed to intervention in Korea. The Commander-in-Chief of the so-called United Nations' forces in Korea is General MacArthur, but he is not responsible to U.N.O., but to President Truman. President Truman recently travelled thousands of miles to General MacArthur personally for only a few hours, presumably to inform him that it was proposed not to defend Formosa, and that Communist China would soon be admitted to U.N.O. Apparently the Chinese Communists are not Aggressors and must be encouraged. Their attack on Tibet has not resulted in any "United" Nations opposition.

Exploiting Aggression

In Malaya the British and Australians have been fighting Communist aggression, now becoming stronger, for years without any worldwide publicity or support from the "United" Nations. The "United" Nations condoned Zionist aggression against the Arabs and has raised no voice of protest against the attack upon the Ambonese by the controllers of the "United States of Indonesia," a U.N.O. creation.

The controllers of U.N.O. are obviously not genuinely concerned about defeating aggression, unless in the process the policy of centralising power can be extended. The Korean incident, which has been a Godsend to power-lusters everywhere, obscures the fact that not only has U.N.O. condoned Communist aggression in all those countries behind the Iron Curtain — these countries are "represented" at U.N.O-but that its controllers propose that the peoples of all non-Communist countries should have their internal policies decided by Communists and their agents. Australians must face the realities of this threat to their sovereignty. Does any genuine patriot consciously support, for example, the policy of placing the armed forces of this country under the control of an international organisation, leading members of which are Communists?

Australia's Sovereignty Threatened

Well, apparently Mr. Menzies, previously a critic of U.N.O. and an advocate of British Empire sovereignty, has, since his visit to the U.S.A., been influenced by Mr. Dean Acheson, personal friend of Communist traitor, Hiss, and other pro-Communists in the U.S.A. and been converted to this idea Upon his return from the U.S.A., Mr. Menzies immediately altered the terms of en-

(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.
- 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,

are forging,
Silence is crime. WHITT1ER.

TO THE POINT

Coal Monopoly

The idea of a Joint Coal Board representing the Commonwealth and the State of New South Wales, was initiated by the Menzies Government early in the war, and then developed by the Labor Governments. The creation of this Coal Board was a major step towards the Monopoly State; it centralised control of a basic raw material. It appears that this policy of economic centralism is to be extended to Queensland. It has been announced in the Federal Parliament that an agreement has been reached between the Commonwealth and Queensland Governments for the creation of a "Joint Committee" to sponsor the Callide coal project.

At this stage, of course, this agreement may appear harmless enough, but bitter experience suggests that the Commonwealth never makes any agreements with the States unless they provide the basis for the expansion of Commonwealth influence and control at a later date. If the State of Queensland were genuinely sovereign, the State Government would have no difficulty in ensuring that Callide coal was made available to consumers without seeking financial assistance from the Commonwealth.

It is interesting to note that Liberal-Socialist R. G. Casey has played a prominent role in furthering the "Joint Committee" idea for the Callide coal project. This fact alone is sufficient to make it suspect.

Economic Madness

"No great forward move had ever been made without inflation, Sir Douglas Copland, Vice-Chancellor of the Australian National University, said at the opening lecture of a series arranged by the Australasian Institute of Cost Accountants. He deplored the current campaign against high prices and claimed that such increases were a natural outcome of national development. Greater productivity was the key to the success of our future."

—Melbourne Herald, October 28, According to Professor Copland, "progress" and inflation are synonymous terms. As has been explained in this journal time and time again, present financial rules are inherently inflationary. While these rules are persisted with, capital expansion is essential to a continuation of the present economic system. But this expansion is, as Professor Copland admits, inflationary. Surely it is stark madness to say that the capital expansion of the past, which has increased the capacity of the individual to produce more in less time, must, instead of reducing prices, increase them?

"Tolerance"

In last week's notes reference was made to the fact that some rank and file Liberals were concerned about the appointment of Mr. H. W. Arndt, Socialist lecturer on economics, to the staff of the Canberra University College. But in answer to a question on this matter by Liberal Member Bates, Mr. Menzies deplored "any suggestion that University appointments in Canberra should depend on the candidate's political opinions." "I am a great believer

in academic freedom," Mr. Menzies said. "I have no interest in whether the university man is a Liberal, Labor or Country Party supporter." (Vide Melbourne *Sun*, October 27.)

This kind of reply reveals just why the Socialist and Communist conspirators have been so successful. It may also explain why the Menzies Government has retained as one of its principal economic "advisers," Socialist Professor Coombs. If, as Mr. Menzies said last year before the Federal Elections, Socialism is a menace to the individual, obviously every person holding this viewpoint must be concerned when he sees known Socialists obtaining positions in the community, where, under the guise of "academic freedom," they can wield enormous influence.

The undermining of the British peoples can be traced to the exploitation of their tolerance by aliens. Under the guise of tolerance, Mr. Menzies is apparently prepared to allow loyal taxpayers' money to be used to pay advocates of totalitarianism to poison still further all those who come under their influence.

Recognition of Tito

Whatever may be the truth about Tito's disagreement with the Soviet, the American State Department's policy of accepting Yugoslavia as a potential ally of the West against the Kremlin conspirators, is a direct repudiation of the claim by the "democracies" that they are opposed to aggression and tyranny everywhere. Acceptance of Tito means condonement of this Communist's butcheries and anti-Christian policies. Tito has attempted to impose upon the Yugoslavian peoples the very system Stalin has imposed upon the Russians. If the Christian West is to remain true to its heritage and traditions, under no circumstances can it permit Tito to be whitewashed.

Socialist Aggression

Speaking at Wesley Church, Melbourne, on Sunday, October 29, Rev. H. Palmer Phillips, President of the Australasian Association for the United Nations, claimed that in five years, action by U.N.O. had "Limited conflict in Palestine and brought about establishment of Israel"; "Brought into being the United States of Indonesia"; "Enabled settlement of the Pakistan and Kashmir conflict."

Like most Socialists, the Rev. Phillips apparently condones aggression so long as it is conducted by those who further Socialist ideas. This Christian gentleman makes no references to the brutal expulsion of at least 700,000 Arabs from their own country, and the terrible conditions under which they have since existed. Neither does he make any mention of the aggressive tactics of the gangsters now controlling the "United States of Indonesia." Why doesn't the "United" Nations stop these gangsters waging war against the Ambonese, who don't want to become part of the United States of Indonesia?

The "settlement" of the Pakistan and Kashmir conflict amounts to condoning the aggression of Socialist Nehru. The Rev.

Phillips says, "The attack launched by the North Koreans was halted, not because they happened to be Communists, but because they were aggressors. The aim was to maintain the right of people to live without aggression from their neighbours." This nauseating hypocrisy reveals the evil purposes for which the "United" Nations is being used today. British Empire countries should withdraw from this Socialist organisation immediately.

True

"A society of sheep must, in time, beget a Government of wolves."—Bertrand de Jouvenal, famous French philosopher.

Intruders and Disturbers

"Marcus Eli Ravage scarcely exaggerated when he boasted,

"You have not begun to appreciate the real depth of our guilt. We are intruders. We are disturbers. We are subverters. We have taken your natural world, your ideals, your destiny, and played havoc with them. We have been at the bottom not merely of the latest Great War but of nearly all your wars, not only of the Russian (Communist) but also of every other major revolution in history. We have brought discord and confusion" and frustration into your personal and public life. We are still doing it. No one can tell how long we shall go on doing it."—Century Magazine, January 1928.

The Mass Electorate

"There never was a time when so few people anywhere could say with any confidence under what institutions, regimes or ethos they would be living in ten or twenty years' time. England has not escaped the growing worldwide instability, which is the natural result of elevating the passions of mass electorates to be the dominating influence in the ordering of society."—The Tablet, October 7.

We are pleased that a situation, which has steadily been getting worse for two hundred years, is receiving attention, if not intervention.

—The Social Crediter, Oct. 21.

SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

(Lectures and Studies Section)
ASSOCIATE EXAMINATION

The next examination for the Diploma of Associate will be held in March 1951. Entries for this will close January 31st, 1951.

The books set for special study this year is:—

- (a) Realistic Constitutionalism.
- (b) The Realistic Position of the Church of England.
- (c) States, Real, Actual and Potential.

Students wishing to take the examination can obtain fuller particulars from: —

Miss G. MARSDEN (Representative in Australia), 6 Harden Road, Artarmon, N.S.W.

Will There be War?

In view of the prevailing international situation, we feel that the following message from Major C. H. Douglas first published in 1938 is highly appropriate. The figures on the stage have altered, but the same answer to the question given in 1938 still stands.

I have been asked to express my views on the hope which is in all of us that not-withstanding the gigantic armament programmes, the world may be spared Armageddon.

I think we should distinguish more clearly than perhaps we do, between the CAUSES of war and the means and oppor-

tunities for war.

As to the CAUSES of war, I have already said in the Broadcast on this subject, and elsewhere, that in my opinion they lie almost wholly in the psychology, which arises and is inseparable from the present financial system. Not only is it obvious that Socialism, so-called, is no remedy for war, but on the contrary, the rise of a Marxian Socialist Power (Russia), a National Socialist Power (Germany), and a hybrid Guild Socialist Power (Italy), together with the almost unanimous clamour for war of the English Socialist Parties and their attacks on Mr. Chamberlain for a certainty of war, demonstrate to anyone not blinded by prejudice, that Socialism increases the danger of war.

The characteristic of these States is the primary characteristic of English Socialist policies, such as nationalisation, of this, that or the other. IT IS CONCENTRATION OF POWER. Large numbers of people in the world are bemused by the rapturous glamour of abstract words, and are passive instruments in a worldwide policy designed to separate power from

responsibility.

There is no such thing as collective security—there is only individual security. What possible meaning can be attached to a statement that Herr Hitler, or Signor Mussolini, or Captain Anthony Eden, or Mr. Churchill, would be responsible if Germany, or Italy, or England, declared war? Would Herr Hitler, Signor Mussolini, Captain Eden or Mr. Churchill each of them die a million deaths or suffer ten million wounds? For over a thousand years the people in the world have striven towards REPRESEN-TATIVE government, and what they have got is DELEGATE government. That they have NOT delegated responsibility should be obvious to anyone who realises that the next war will not be fought by delegated fighters, even though delegated governors declare it.

As Mr. Chamberlain (for whom I have only a strictly limited admiration) said, in effect, in a speech so sound that the Germans refused to listen to it and it received little applause, omnipotent governments are merely handy instruments for ambitious men.

The answer, then, to "WILL THERE BE WAR?" is "YES. There will be war after war until civilisation is destroyed — UNLESS POWER AND RESPONSIBILITY ARE ONCE AGAIN REUNITED IN THE INDIVIDUAL."

If this idea be accepted, and I find it difficult to see how anyone who will understand it can fail to accept it, it is clear that, so far from an extension of the powers of any one Government until they

become worldwide (which is the aim, conscious or unconscious, of the Internationalists, active in such institutions as the League of Nations Union and the Royal Institution for International Affairs), the first effective step to be taken is to bring the foci of governments closer to the individual, so that he becomes effective in them.

In the British Commonwealth it is clear that a desperate attempt is to be made to abrogate the privileges of State Parliaments in Australia and Canada, and to concentrate them in Federal Parliaments. Not only do I think that this should be resisted by every possible means, but that, at the same time, steps should be taken to bring State Parliaments themselves under more localised and individual control. Whether this can be done in the time that remains to us I do not know, but as to its necessity I have no doubt.

I might add that perhaps the first step to Armageddon was taken when mankind accepted an amorphous abstraction called "money" as a REASON for his services. The present heavily increasing taxation is a specific method of transferring the individual's power of individual action from himself to a central source of power, masquerading under the abstract name of "the

State.'

Just as it is necessary to decentralise power over the sanctions of the State, so it is necessary to decentralise power over money, and the first step to this end is to oppose centralisation. There is no justification in any policy anywhere for an increase in taxation at the present time, and no hysterical call to sacrifice should be permitted to obscure the meaning of such an increase.

Aneurin Bevan

In the Melbourne *Herald* of Oct. 9, a photograph depicting the brutal features of Aneurin Bevan appeared as part of Trevor Smith's London Round-Up. To us the face has all the marks of hatred and envy essential to the future dictator of once Great Britain. Smith, in the course of his comments on Bevan's Left Wing group's victory in the recent election of the National Executive of the Labor Party, has this to say:

They (the Bevanites) will demand a capital levy, severe increases in income tax, which already is the world's steepest; more nationalization and virtual extermination of

private enterprise . . .

... They proclaim attachment to free elections and the existing parliamentary system. But, given their way, they will cast these islands very near to the Russian mould.

Their goal is the all-powerful State. Nothing less than a nation of commissars and a "privilegentsia" will satisfy Bevan's ambitions.

He should know — he reckons capitalism has "had it," and does not seem dismayed by his £5000-a-year salary and its accompanying privileges.

"Conservative" Party Policy

Housewives Today publishes the following from the President of the Scottish Housewives' Association to the Rt. Hon. Malcolm McCorquordale, M.P.: — "Dear Sir,

"I have just read your article in The Bond [the official organ of the Conservative Party in the Constituency of Epsom], and I must say I am at a complete loss to understand Conservative policy of today.

"It is a recognised fact that your Party regained lost ground in the last election through 'no more nationalisation.' You cannot 'eat your cake and have it.' In other words, how can you possibly defeat National Nationalisation and uphold International nationalisation?

"Our Association has taken the keenest interest in this supposed 'Schuman' plan because what has been press news to the British public during the past two months has been 'official' news to us since the E.C.A. administrators, Messrs. Finletter, Harriman and Hoffman, gave their testimonies to Congress and the American Foreign Committees in February, 1949, and I have no hesitation in saying that it was largely due to our subsequent enquiries that Mr. Finletter's 'resignation' followed.

"I cannot agree that the 'plan' was Schuman's. In 1941, part of the 'Plan' was as follows: —'The simplest general pattern would be for each producer of key commodities to belong to a national association of producers of that commodity, which would in turn belong to an international control of that commodity. This in turn would be affiliated to an International Raw Materials Union for all commodities. To conclude no Trade Treaty with a non-member State and to give such State less favored status in economic matters . . . etc.'—[From P.E.P. Broadsheet.]

"All over the country, I hear complaints about the Left Wing tendency of the Conservative Party, and, while attending a meeting in London some days ago, one speaker remarked, 'how unfortunate it is that the Conservative Party have such a Left Wing Group and is so taken up with planning.' There seems little doubt that Planning has permeated the Conservative Party, just as the Fabians permeated the Liberals.

"It is to be regretted that Major Legge-Bourke's admirable contributions to one of the most historic debates of recent years received practically no National Press report.

"We cannot afford to be isolationists, neither can we afford to cut ourselves adrift from our Empire.

"Yours truly,
"ELIZABETH PATTULLO,
"President."

A Great Idea

A thought on professors: If Uncle Joe wants to steal professors from Britain, why doesn't he take a few of the economists?

—The Bulletin, Sydney, Nov. 1.

"New Times," November 10, 1950 — Page 3

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: MU 2834. Subscription Rates: 25/- Yearly; 13/- Half Yearly; 7/- Quarter.

VOL. 16 FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 10, 1950. No. 45.

Honouring Those Promises

When confronted with the fact that the Menzies-Fadden Government had not honoured its pre-election promise to reduce the Federal bureaucracy, Mr. Holt brazenly said that this was true and that the Government was "the victim of its own political propaganda." Now Mr. Fadden, Federal Treasurer, tries to bluster that the joint policy speech of the Liberal and Country Parties contained no specific promise to put value back into the pound. This type of political dishonesty will certainly destroy the present Government if continued much longer.

Speaking in the Senate on November 1, the leader of the Senate Opposition, Mr. McKenna, convincingly answered Mr. Fadden by not only quoting from the joint policy speech of the Liberal and Country Parties, but by also quoting from numerous Liberal Party advertisements, in which Mr. Menzies specifically stated, particularly in women's journals, that he would reduce the cost of living. When these promises were made, Mr. Menzies and his associates obviously felt that they could carry out their promises and had concrete proposals for this purpose. If this is correct, who has since prevented the implementation of the most important of pre-election promises? This vital question demands an immediate answer.

Mr. Menzies does not increase his prestige by seeking to blame the obstructionist tactics of the Senate for all our growing problems. The Senate has not obstructed any proposal to reduce the cost of living, for the simple reason that no such proposals have been placed before them.

If Mr. Menzies is really determined to tackle the inflation menace, he can do so immediately without concerning himself about the Senate, He can, for example, start to reduce the burden of Government, one of his pre-election promises, instead of continuing to increase the burden. He could also re-introduce and extend price-subsidies on a large number of consumer goods.

The fact is that the Menzies Government made no move whatever to tackle inflation until public agitation compelled it to put forward proposals, which, upon examination, however, prove to be an extension of further centralised control of the individual.

Reports that the States are pressing the Commonwealth to extend price-subsidies, indicate that the States realise they cannot prevent further price rises by mere price-fixing. All electors should support the States in bringing pressure to bear on this fundamental question of compelling the Federal Government to free the individual from the inflation robbery, which is fast destroying the entire social and economic structure of this country.

"Taxpayer Not Welcome at Canberra"

"Canberra is given over to the politicians and their families. Their idea seems to be to let Australia sink while Canberra floats," the secretary of the Taxpayers' Association (Mr. M. J. Pettigrove) said last night.

"My chief impression after a few days in Canberra is that the taxpayer is not welcome there.

"Increasing taxation is just the refuge of politicians when they are in trouble. Strict economies in Government services and a reduction in taxation generally would do more to meet present-day problems than additional taxes."

He said he was amazed at the way public money was being spent at Canberra.

"Palatial places are being built at enormous cost," he said.

—The Sun, Melbourne, October 10.

Another Jew Traitor?

Press reports state that Professor Bruno Pontecorvo, missing atomic scientist, was a close personal friend of traitors Nunn-May and Fuchs, and is a cousin of a member of the Italian Communist Party Execu-

The Sunday Sun and Guardian of October 22 states: "Born at Pisa, he left Italy during Mussolini's campaign against the

Jews in 1930."

All this only proves that we must bring more "refugees" to this country and get them naturalised as quickly as possible. It is claimed that this policy is designed to strengthen our defences. And large numbers of apparently sane Australians believe this dangerous nonsense.

Charity Begins at Home

After many promises to reduce excessive expenditure, the new Federal Government has decided (without consulting the electors) that Australia will be a partner in the British Commonwealth Plan for Economic Aid to South-East Asia. A preliminary estimate fixes the sum at £175,000,000. The extent of this country's contribution has not yet been announced, but the countries to be "assisted" are Indonesia, Borneo, Malaya, Burma, Thailand, and French Indo-China. It is now a well-known fact that huge contributions previously made to U.N.R.R.A. to help the starving Asiatics turned out to be a gift to the Communist forces. Mr. Spender and his colleagues have no mandate to squander the already overburdened taxpayers' money outside Australia. Obviously, even Mr. Spender will have no say in how this money is to be spent. There is no assurance that these funds will not be used to build up the Communist forces in those countries, so that they can more readily attack us. Surely it is time the electors themselves decided where and how their own money should be spent.

Printed by W. and J. Barr, 105-7 Brunswick Street, Fitzroy, N.6, for New Times, Ltd., McEwan House, Melbourne, on whose authority these articles appear.

The Mount of Olives Versus **Mount Sinai**

Address by Mr. L S. Bull at the N.S.W. Henry George League's Annual Dinner on September 27.

"To grasp even a limited understanding of modern politics and the world conflict it is essential to understand that every philosophy has inherently its own unique policy." This gets right down to the springs of action between the policies of the left and of the right. It is vitally important and warrants further (though tonight necessarily brief) amplification.

FIRSTLY: Every philosophy or religion has as its base a conception of reality.

SECONDLY: From this conception of reality is derived a doctrine of relationships between our actions and what we conceive

THIRDLY: Out of that doctrine of relationships arise social objectives.

FOURTHLY: Towards those social objectives is designed a "policy" or plan of action.

Hence where there are conflicting philosophies conflicting policies are inevitable and irreconcilable. On the other hand if unanimity on philosophy is fairly general, then differences in policy are usually capable of reconciliation.

Against this background let us now consider conflicting philosophies, which may be said to have originated on the Mount of Olives and on Mount Sinai.

Two Conflicting Philosophies

It is not my purpose to criticize the biblical record of what took place when Moses disappeared in the mist on the top of Mount Sinai some three thousand years ago. My interest in the Moses story is an inference it gives in respect to authority. It depicts a conception of reality, which has had a tremendous effect on history and human thinking. It is this aspect of the story with which my thesis is concerned.

The story presents a picture of Moses engaged in a personal two-way conversation with God. There on Mount Sinai God, in effect, appointed Moses His chief agent on earth. Thereafter it was the role of Moses to rule and the lot of the brethren to obey. The concept of man having within him a spark of the divine from which he could and should draw moral sustenance and direction had not yet dawned in the human mind. Man's lot was to acknowledge his leader as ruler by divine right. He must never question the Ruler's judgment or disobey his edicts.

A thousand years later on the Mount of Olives we have depicted a conception, which is the reverse of that given on Sinai probably because man had by this time reached a sufficient state of development to be capable of receiving the new concept. There was God Himself "made flesh"; not so much laying down the law and demanding obedience to it—but rather teaching men to search their souls—"Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His Righteousness"—"The Kingdom of God is within you." Here is the exquisite difference between the two concepts. In the former God imposed His authority on man externally through an agent who enforced obedience; in the latter, God seeks expression through man's soul, through conscience, and asks man to discipline himself. The one is a philosophy of external authority; the other is a philosophy of internal authority.

Conflicting Doctrines of Relationships

Now these diametrically opposed philosophies have given rise to conflicting doctrines of relationships and consequently irreconcilable social objectives. Under the one the relationship of man to the State is that of serf. The State is supreme and man exists but to serve it. Under the other, man is supreme and the function of the State is to serve man. The leader in one is Master, in the other a servant. "Whosoever will be chief among you let him be your servant.

Social Objectives

These conflicting doctrines of relationships respectively result in social objectives most likely to give expression to and reflect the doctrine. The Master State must not permit anything that could grow into a power capable of challenging the ruling regime. Therefore, independence of any kind cannot be tolerated. Private business particularly is taboo because it involves an independent employer class, which tends to develop the power to maintain its independence. Further, an independent employer class provides a choice of employers, which tends to give workers a measure of independence. The Authoritarian State cannot tolerate any form of individual or group independence. Political opposition of the mildest sort must be ruthlessly exterminated. If any religion is permitted at

all, the State must be the Supreme religious

Conversely, where the philosophy of internal authority prevails independence of individuals is the supreme social objective.

Constitutional Government, as we understand it, means Government by consent of the people. Not only must that consent be sought at regular intervals but in between times it is the duty and function of the governing body to heed and be responsive to "public opinion." It is a Free State; a private enterprise State. It suffers all forms of political opposition just as tolerantly as it should be intolerant of treason and sedition. The main function of the Free State is "keeping the ring," i.e., maintaining conditions under which all manner of men may, in justice and equity, work out their own affairs.

Opposing Policies

Finally, from these differing social objectives come differing and generally violently conflicting policies. It is important to remember that policy has to do with activity. Policy is any action taken or proposed to be taken towards a conscious and recognised objective.

By now you will have perceived that the philosophy of external authority has produced the policies of what is called the left, while the philosophy of internal authority finds expression in policies of the right. It is not clear-cut, of course, There is a tremendous amount of confusion on both

Only last Sunday I read in the "Sunday Sun" that an influential section of the Liberal Party, lead by Mr. Kent Hughes, is bitterly opposed to Mr. Menzies' policy of calling on members of the Regular Army and Militia to volunteer for overseas service rather than be called up. Mr. Kent Hughes and his influential Liberals obviously are in the wrong camp. The compulsory way of life is consistent with Labor's philosophy, not the Liberals'. Then we have Labor politician Monk, who is most gratified that "the Prime Minister had appreciated the difference between Australians volunteering for overseas service or being conscripted." Clearly Mr. Monk is in the wrong camp. He should be among the Liberals.

However, when it comes to unionism, Mr. Monk likes it compulsory, so we'll have to yank him back into the Labor Camp, and as Mr. Kent Hughes would no doubt disapprove compulsory unionism, we'll have to bring him back into the Liberal Fold.

This philosophy of external authority inevitably leads to power politics. It leads to policies the guiding principle of which is "monopoly." Indeed, there is a movement in the world today towards monopoly in every department of life. It is on a national and international scale with world domination as the ultimate goal. It is being directed as a conscious policy by a comparatively small group who do not all live

This policy of monopoly is known by various names at different levels. In ministration it is known as "Centralisation," in business as "Cartelisation." The Liberals call it "Efficiency." The Labor Party calls it "Socialism." The Com-munists call it "The Dictatorship of the Proletariat." All these names amount to the same thing—The power of a decreasing

(Continued on page 8)

AMERICAN

BRING a GIFT and BUY a GIFT

Saturday, 2nd December

Commencing at 2 p.m.

At the Home of Mrs. G. a'BECKETT, 14 Tintern Avenue, Toorak

Come and buy your Christmas Gifts

Refreshments

Strawberries and Cream

Organised by the D.S.C.M. (Vic.) Women's Group in aid of their Funds

"New Times," November 10, 1950 — Page 5



Improve Soil Fertility with Clover Ley System

One of the greatest contributions to agricultural development in the 20 to 25-inch rainfall belt has been the demonstration of ley farming principles by the Rutherglen (Vic.) research station. Visitors to the field day, conducted last week by the Department of Agriculture, saw ample evidence of its value.

The principles are by no means new, but it is only in recent years that they have been put into practice by farmers. The effect on soil fertility maintenance has been spectacular.

Farmers in an environment similar to Rutherglen now know that there is a marked relationship between crops and pastures, and soil fertility — its maintenance and improvement.

As practised at this centre, clover ley farming is the rotation of cereal cropping with subterranean clover pastures, irrespective of whether the cropped land is fallowed or not. It is applicable in mixed farming districts where conditions favour sub. clover, and particularly where the bulk of the annual rainfall comes in the March-October period.

Permanent rotation trials begun at Rutherglen in 1912 show that cereal yields have declined slowly but steadily when the land is regularly cropped. Fallowing of itself is insufficient to maintain soil fertility.

In contrast to ether farming rotations, particularly various crop rotations excluding pasture, the clover-ley system will quickly build up soil fertility, thus resulting in higher crop yields and a greater stock-carrying capacity.

A comparison between sub. clover ley and volunteer pasture ley, both as a pasture and a means of restoring fertility to land under cultivation for many years, is clearly in favour of the clover ley.

In four years when dry sheep grazed the clover ley an average of 2.2 sheep an acre was carried. The volunteer pasture carried 1.6 sheep.

Dry sheep were then replaced with ewes with 100 percent lambs at foot, and both types were stocked at 2.5 ewes an acre. But the lambs produced on the sub. clover pasture were heavier by an average of 7.8 lb.frozen weight, and were of better quality.

Further evidence of the effect is shown by wheat yields after a period in ley. Wheat on regularly cropped land averaged 24.4 bushels an acre. After volunteer ley the figure was 26.3, and after clover ley, 31.2 bushels an acre — a clear indication and measure of the improvement in soil fertility.

There has been abundance of evidence

Page 6 — "New Times," November 10, 1950

that soil fertility can be built up by spelling a paddock under sub. clover pasture for a few years. The problem then arises as to the best method of cropping this improved clover paddock in order to maintain fertility and yet farm the land economically.

Over a period of years the tests show that cropping continuously for a few years after clover ley is better than incorporating a winter fallow. In addition to greater wheat returns, the grazing afforded by reestablished clover pasture is considerable, and contributes to improvement of fertility.

Poor Strike

In good conditions sub. clover will reestablish itself after the second crop. But if a poor strike occurs, a third or fourth crop can be grown and 2 or 3 lb. of clover seed sown with the last cereal crop.

High yields from the third and fourth successive crops show the accumulation of fertility in a good clover paddock.

Under Rutherglen conditions winter fallowing is not necessary and is uneconomical, unless it is required in the rotation for the control of weeds.

The clover ley farming system, however, does not necessarily exclude fallowing. Where the annual rainfall is considerably less than at Rutherglen, fallowing may be essential to obtain good crops.

Centralised "Education"

"Owing to the policy of closing small village schools and conveying the children out of the village to some larger school, a schism between child, community and Church is being sharply cut . . . Only those familiar with rural life can appreciate how deeply a village school enters into the communal life. Unless the present policy is checked, we shall educate generations of children alienated from the life of a settled community and tend to reproduce in villages the worst features of suburbia, those of dormitory communities. Economic tendencies have already started the process."

—"The Future of Voluntary Schools," by the Rev. Guy Mayfield in the September 1950, issue of *The Nineteenth Century* (England). Further, to practise clover ley farming without fallow on a large scale, greater tractor or horse strength is required to efficiently handle the peak cultivation period in the autumn than when the work is spread by the inclusion of some spring fallow.

—Weekly Times, Nov. 1.

A Selected List Of Books On Organic Farming And Gardening

"THE EARTH OUR MOTHER"

By B. A. Santamaria. 5/-

An important study of rural economics under Australian conditions.

"CHEMICALS, HUMUS AND THE SOIL"

By Donald C. Hopkins.

Those people who are interested in the controversy about chemical manures versus organic manures will find much to interest them in this book, which is written by a chemist, who examines in an analytic fashion the case for and against.

"THE FAMILY FARMER"

By F. D. Smith and Barbara Wilcox.

16/9

A delightful book on the life of an English farmer.

"THE RED WOODS"

By Richard St. Barbe Baker. 19/6

A finely illustrated book on the Californian Redwoods by one of the world's foremost authorities on trees. "THE WAY OF THE LAND"

By Sir George Stapledon. 20/6

An excellent book illustrating the relationship of agriculture to our civilization.

"ALTERNATIVE TO DEATH"

By the Earl of Portsmouth. 12/6
This book, written by a well-known agriculturist, serves as a warning of the dangers of an unbalanced commercialism, and serves as a statement of principles and exposition of reform of vital necessity for the health of our

"PLOUGHING IN PREJUDICES"

By Edward Faulkner.

society.

10/-

Another book from the author of "Ploughman's Folly," in which he answers the questions provoked by the revolutionary ideas contained in that book. It is a consolidation and extension of those ideas in the light of subsequent experience.

Proletariat Unlimited

FOOTLE.

Some people are never satisfied. For as long as I can remember, there has been a campaign in the ranks of Labour' for the downfall of something or other. And now, with a of Lords, the ball is at last at the feet of the rank and file. The trouble is, though, apparently, that the ball has a chain on it.

My newspaper informs me, "London, October 2. —Labour Party members lashed out at the Labour Party's annual conference at Margate today, at Communism, American Capitalism, the British attitude to the Schumann plan and State ownership."

I am not sure whether the reporter desires to convey that members lashed out at the conference itself, but that wouldn't make much difference, anyhow. They appear to have lashed out at all the known and practised forms of organised society. The report continues, "The main argument at today's opening arose over Nationalisation, as rank and file members complained that State ownership of basic industries had failed to bring the improvements they had hoped for."

To know whether their lashing of everything in sight was justified, it would be necessary to know what they had hoped for. This vital information is not reported, and

we are left to our speculations.

From the point of view of ownership, the members of a democracy are surprisingly wealthy. You might never guess it from appearances: you might, in fact, be inclined to bracket in your mental impressions, an aged and decrepit pensioner in our own country with some remembered dusty figure seated with begging dish on the steps of a mosque in some Eastern dictatorship. How wrong you would be! On the one hand, you see a shareholder in the world's greatest empire, complete with navy, transport and other empire mod. cons., and on the other, a shareholder in nothing but the sunrise. Mind you, I don't think even the pensioners themselves ever stop to wonder what it feels like to be poor.

It seems to me that the rank and file of "Labor." probably made a mistake in the first place by not saying what it was they wanted. I mean to say, if you ask for nationalisation and get it, who is to

blame but yourself?

This idea of owning the source of production never has appealed to me. From earliest infancy, if I wanted an apple, I just said so. And, even when I grew up, it would never have occurred to me to buy an interest in a hotel if I fancied a glass of beer. As a matter of fact, from observation of beer lovers who've tried it, this hotel-buying wheeze hasn't worked out so well.

Of course, I quite understand that everything must be owned by someone, but I can't grasp the notion that everyone can own everything. If everyone has an equal right to everything, then no one can own anything, even in a proprietary sense, let alone in an executive sense. The most one could would be expressed by an oppressively vulgar fraction consisting of the figure "one" divided by a number representing the population The official version of this fraction for the benefit of those not good fraction, for the benefit of those not good

'Labour' Prime Minister in Britain and a distinguished and wealthy peer as 'Labour' leader in the House

> at rithmetic, is "Keep out. This means you!"

I find this idea most unsatisfactory. Not only is my person indivisible, but so also are those appurtenances, which administer to my personality. I cannot conceive of the "common ownership" of toothbrushes and toupees. And hats and boots aren't much more adaptable to universal appropriation. There is a German motto, which avers, "Everybody's friend is nobody's friend," and, in like manner, everybody's dog is nobody's dog.

The idea of the "dictatorship of the proletariat" is an extension to the uttermost of the same entertaining theory that the attributes of individuals can be grafted on to multitudes. The right of dictatorship is a property of a most exclusive kind, and, if it can be proved that it is not a property becoming to any individual, it would appear to have been proved that dictatorship is, of itself, not a proper thing. That proof is not, of course, necessary to demonstrate the simple fact that it is just as impossible for everyone to dictate to everyone (we are all proletarians today) as it is for everyone to own everything. The utmost we appear able to do in this direction, is to hire ourselves — per medium of the ballot for the time being — a bully. But it does seem foolish to ignore the obvious fact that a bully likes to be a bully in his own right and that the "hire and fire" principle does not apply to him.

The first thing any dictatorship ever does is to attack someone's property, because property and independence are inseparable, and because to be independent is to be free. Property is a very real attribute of freedom. It's all very well to sing about "open road, open sky," and all the joys of vagabondage and desert islands. I regard these idyllic outpourings as a fairly normal reaction to rates, taxes and the other irks of 'security" as practised by democracy. A vagabond isn't free in any sense that matters. He isn't free to have a family and be responsible for them. He is not even free to entertain his friends. He is only free to tell you how jolly everything is

when it doesn't rain.

Most likely, all these things would have been apparent to the rank and file of the Labour Conference at Margate, if they had given the matter of what they really wanted the amount of thought it deserved, instead if confirming minutes and rising to points of order, which is the traditional way of all democratic undertakings.

I doubt whether the stirrings of the rank and file will open a window on the world, for I note, again according to the report, that, "Cabinet chiefs, from the Prime Minister (Mr. Attlee) downwards, listened in silence as the critics aired their grievances."

I gather that the dogs bark and the caravan moves on.

NEW TIMES BOOK SERVICE

offers a wide range Delightful Children's Books.

No.	Title	
E62 E63 E64 E234 E163 A3 A4	Delightful Ducklings Chippy Chicks Frisky Puppies Picture Book of Trains Jolly Farm Book Popsy and Bunny Twins Popsy and Jimmy at the Zoo. Giant Series Popsy's Picnic. Popsy at the Seaside Rhymeland Duffy Goes Fishing Jolly Zoo Book Mother Goose Tiny Series Playtime Happy Holidays Magic Hat Playful Pets Ghost of North Mede College	1/3 1/3 1/3 2/- 2/- 2/- 2/- 2/- 2/- 2/3 2/- 1/6 2/3 1/6 1/6
	Hoopla Game	3/-

All prices include postage. Order by Number.

Order now from

NEW TIMES LIMITED,

Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne.

The Big Idea

The comment on the Vesting of the Iron and Steel industry is, from its almost uniform nature, a further instance of the control of Press central political

inspiration.

If there is any genuine historical analysis of the era through which we are passing, the amazing swindle of "acquiring property by paying for it with money robbed either by taxation or inflation (coin clipping) from the owners of the property so acquired, must attract close attention.

Bearing in mind the type of ındıvıdual dominant in effective politics today, it is not remarkable that a trick of this nature should be attempted. It would be more remarkable if it were not.

But what does verge upon the miraculous is that hardly a word is said to emphasis the nature of the fraudulent prospectus, or the absolute certainty of its detonation of British credit.

But perhaps that is the Big Idea. —The Social Crediter, Oct. 21.

"New Times," November 10, 1950 —Page 7

THE MENACE OF THE UNITED **NATIONS**

(Continued from page 1) listment for the Australian Army. Speaking on this matter in the Federal Parliament on September 27, Mr. Menzies said:

"One idea, which is being much canvassed at the moment, is expressed in the statement of Mr. Dean Acheson, that the United Nations must be given some effective force that would be instantly available, and that the nations concerned should nominate units of their own forces that would be available for service. Of course, it is abundantly clear that no such unit can be nominated unless every member of it is capable of being sent wherever the United Nations' decision may require." (My

emphasis.)

Mr. Menzies may not realise the dangerous implications of what he is proposing, but surely it is clear that once any nation surrenders even a portion of its sovereignty over its armed forces, financial, economic or tariff policies, it is paving the way for the destruction of all independence. The Korean incident—no doubt there will be more such incidents if necessary in order to continue "the threat of war"—has been blatantly exploited to further the attack upon the British Empire, to attempt to allay American criticism of Communist influence in the State Department, to impose Socialist controls upon the American people, and to force the peoples of Western Europe into a "United States of Europe.'

Patriots Must Act

This gigantic conspiracy against the remnants of Christian civilization can only be defeated if genuine patriots everywhere rally in defence of their traditions and vigorously oppose all alien policies and propaganda. Christian Nationalists in the U.S.A. are now making themselves heard and feared. Where are our British patriots? They have little time left in which to speak and act.

THE FARM EXCHANGE

(J. E. Harding & A. E. Webb) If you should think of coming to Central Queensland to live, we shall be glad to advise upon, and assist you to find, Farming, Grazing, Business or House Property. We are Farm Specialists, both having had extensive practical farm experience. Write to us about your needs. Social Crediters will be very welcome. Central Queensland has much to commend it.

THE FARM EXCHANGE

Real Estate Agents, Auctioneers. Valuers. DENHAM ST., ROCKHAMPTON.

> C.Q. Phone 3763. After Hours 3199 and 2161.

Page 8 — "New Times," November 10, 1950

The Mount of Olives versus Mount Sinai

(Continued from page 5)

minority to dominate the majority. It means loss of personal power to the individual. Men and women are finding themselves less and less able to act on their own decisions, particularly when those decisions are in conflict with the Executive bodies of Professional or trade Associations or Industrial Unions.

The evidence of a conspiracy towards monopoly is monumental. In the International field we have the numerous International Organisations such as the Food and Agriculture Organisation, The United Nations Educational, Social and Cultural Organisation, The International Monetary Fund, The International Bank, and so on. There are literally dozens of these International Organisations, most of which were adopted by Mr. Chifley and supported by Mr.

Nationally, we have the Commonwealth Government encroaching on the powers of the State. For example, the Uniform Tax Act. Then there is infringement of local governing powers by the Governments of the States. More directly both Employers and Employees find themselves restricted and dominated by their respective professional, trade and industrial organisations.

It is a very disturbing picture. A picture which presents the world of human activity as a vast stormy sea in which many Ships of State have foundered while others were caught in the strong current which flows to the marshlands of "Socialism" or "International Monopoly." Other Ships of State are still bobbing about in the current not knowing whither it flows, and knowing, even less, how to steer clear of it. But on this sea there are several small craft sailing off the current trying to show some of the larger vessels the channels, to safer waters. And there is one very big ship among them, which, while she is taking an awful buffeting, seems to be in the masterful hands of a very able mariner. She is rendering aid right and left, and picking up all survivors calling left, and picking up all survivors calling for her aid. The several small craft are several organisations like the Henry George League. The big ship is the Christian Church throughout the world.

If we avert the disaster towards which we are at present moving, it will be by a miracle, a miracle in which such organisations as yours, Mr. Chairman, will have played a small but vital part.

Waal! Waal! Waal!

"The Government has no desire to control the wool industry. God forbid."

Mr. Menzies' statement at the recent Sydney sheep show.

On Record

"Republican as successor to Mr. Douglas: Mr. W. Gifford to be U.S. London Envoy. "Washington, Wednesday.

". . . Mr. Gifford is a close friend of General Marshall, the new Secretary of Defence, who is said to have inspired the appointment "—The Daily Telegraph, September 26.

USE ENWITE specialities

TEXIT 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

CODNER BROS.

Builders and Joinery Manufacturers

> **HOMES AND HOME SITES AVAILABLE**

Wheatsheaf Rd., **GLENROY**

COMPOST

For Garden Plot Or **Thousand Acre Farm**

By F. H. Billington, N.D.A., N.D.D. Here is the very book for the gardener or farmer who has had no previous introduction to the subject of compost making. It is a most comprehensive survey of the whole subject of organic farming and gardening. Price 5/8, post-free. Order from New Times Ltd., Box 1226L, GP.O., Melbourne.