

THE NEW TIMES

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

VOL. 17, No. 3.

MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, JANUARY 19, 1951.

SIXPENCE WEEKLY

The U.S. Blunders That Led to the Crisis in Asia

This article from the December issue of the *Reader's Digest* is by the U.S. representative from Minnesota, Walter Henry Judd, who according to *Time* newsmagazine, "Of all Americans occupying elective office, . . . knows most about the Far East." He was for ten years a medical missionary in China and has been a constant critic of American policy towards Nationalist China. As far back as 1938 he was warning Americans of the growing military menace of Japan. One address was republished in the *Reader's Digest* in 1940 under the title "Let's Stop Rearming Japan." Five years ago in an article entitled "Our Ally, China," Judd wrote: "I am increasingly convinced that the Chinese Communists are Communists first and Chinese second." So the leading American expert on the Far East did not swallow the "line" about so-called Agrarian Reformers! He consistently fought to increase aid to Chiang Kai-Shek—but to little avail. According to *Current Biography*, 1949, "he also put himself on record as against appropriations for Korea, which he contended would not be effective if China fell."

The important question arising from this is why were Mr. Judd's views on the Far East so completely ignored by the American State Department? Readers of this journal have had the answer—Zionist-Communist teaching in high places.

I should like to approach the problems we face in Asia today much as a doctor approaches a body at the autopsy table: to make an honest examination of our mistakes. In the present crisis we need to discover how we made the miscalculations that have brought us for the second time in one decade to the brink of a world war. Both times it began with the very same error: failure to realize how important it is to our own security that the opposite shores of the Pacific as well as of the Atlantic be in the hands of friends instead of enemies; failure to understand that it is imperative to U.S. security that the nations of Asia be independent and friendly to ourselves and the other democratic free nations of the world instead of organized and controlled either by Japan's totalitarian militarism or by the Soviet Union's imperialism.

For almost 100 years our forefathers did not make the mistake we have made. They supported whatever Government was in China, whether good, bad or indifferent, rather than let China's potential might come under any outside power that might be hostile to ourselves.

That was our basic policy and it was sound. We got into trouble in Asia only when we abandoned it in 1931, after Japan invaded Manchuria. To the credit of President Hoover and Secretary of State Stimson, they saw the danger and recommended that the League of Nations take a strong stand, pledging our support. But the free

world refused to take strong action against that aggression.

By 1940 and 1941 President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull reawakened to the fact that it was essential to our security to keep Japan from getting control of the manpower, territory and resources of China and then of the rest of Asia. So they took a belated stand against Japan's further expansion, which, after we had systematically built her up to the point where she was strong enough to attack us, led of course to Pearl Harbour.

But our Government's return to the principle of maintaining the independence of China was short-lived. As we approached the end of the war in 1945, the desire to get the Soviet Union to join us against Japan and to co-operate in forming the United Nations led our leaders to sell out the principles they themselves had declared in the Atlantic Charter. They invited the Soviet Union into Manchuria and gave her control of its major ports and railroads, although at Cairo they had promised unequivocally that Manchuria would be returned to China. Thus was set up the situation, which has led us in five years to the brink of another world war.

So the first finding in the autopsy is that twice in little more than a decade we made the same mistake of imagining that what was happening in Europe was more likely to get us into war than what was happening in Asia.

The second finding is that in both wars

we ourselves helped bring on the trouble by putting expediency ahead of principle. In the '30's we helped the aggressor, Japan, instead of the victim, China.

In the '40's we bribed Russia by giving her China's territory and then appeased Communism in China while denouncing those who were resisting it.

In Europe we insisted that in order to get our help the governments must keep the Communists out, but in China we insisted that in order to get our help the government must take the Communists in.

We had better begin to recognize the

(Continued on page 5)

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.

Barriers

When Dr. H. V. Evatt was Australian Attorney-General, we drew attention to the fact that this internationalist has bluntly declared that international agreements can be used to by-pass the barrier of the Federal written Constitution. Written constitutions are detested by the planners everywhere. The following item from "The London Newsletter" reveals how Dr. Evatt's friends are assaulting the American Constitution:

A succession of staunch libertainers leaps on parade as we flick through the leaves of our Journal, and not all of them are Britons. There is Mr. Merwin K. Hart, now in London, who edits the newsletter of the National Economic Council of New York. He comes into the picture this week on the Constitutional question. Unlike our country, the United States has a written Constitution, which the authors wisely determined should be one of the most difficult things in the world to change.

It is not an entirely inflexible instrument, for, under Article V, two methods of amending the Constitution were provided. One method, Mr. Hart points out, has never been successfully carried out. Under it, upon application by the legislatures of two-thirds of the States of the Union, Congress must call a convention for proposing amendments. Those amendments then have to be ratified by three-fourths of the States.

The other method is for each of the two Houses of Congress to adopt an amendment by a two-thirds vote in each House. It must then be ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States, or by conventions in three-fourths of the States, according to whichever course Congress shall decide. And this method has only been successful 21 times. Either procedure ensures that any change in the American Constitution is thoroughly examined beforehand by both Congress and the people.

But Mr. Merwin Hart finds that the internationalists have a much simpler way of getting around the Constitution. Section 2, of Article VI, provides that: "This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land." Obviously this was too good a point for the internationalists to miss. What they could not hope to achieve through the proper course in Congress, they could achieve by embodying their proposals in Treaties. Very, very neat and as wicked a misinterpretation of the spirit of the Constitution as we could hope to meet.

As Mr. Hart bluntly states: "Down to the beginning of the present Socialist era, the word 'treaty' was generally considered to mean an international agreement relating to commerce, the settlement of some dispute between nations or the termination of a war. The word's meaning was not intended to include an agreement to delegate the power to make laws or to surrender any portion of sovereignty. Unless there was no other way to deal with a particular subject, it could not be dealt with by treaty . . ."

" . . . To ratify a treaty it is necessary to secure the vote of 'two-thirds of the

Senators present' at the session at which the treaty is voted on. A quorum of the United States Senate is 49. Two-thirds of that number would be 34 — just two more than a third of the entire Senate membership!

"Thus, in place of the long but extremely useful process set forth in Article V of the Constitution, under which process the people are thoroughly educated as to the significance of the proposed amendment, we have a situation where 34 Senators can ratify a treaty, and thus amend the Constitution of the United States."

By JAMES GUTHRIE, in *The Australian Social Creditor*, December 2, 1950.

Whether you consider the British Empire, as a world force, essential to the preservation of a Christian civilisation, depends largely on your own picture of the modern world, and whether or not you consider you have a reasonable choice of alternatives.

If, in your interpretation of history, you attach any significance to the spirit of people who will enter into a fight against tyranny with little chance of success, and will carry on that fight after other nations have collapsed into a disorganised rabble, then you must consider the British people a very significant breed of men and women.

If you consider the Industrial Revolution a turning point in the story of Man on this Planet, then the British people, as chief contributors to that revolution, must be very important people.

A race of people who policed the seven seas, and enabled, under the protection of its flag, hundreds of millions of diverse peoples to grow up in freedom and security, and with a minimum of corruption, such a race must surely have some claims to fame.

The socialist rulers of Russia, before they could impose their will on their helpless victims, killed 30 million Russians. Great Britain, with all her faults, (full details from any United Nations Organisation), never came within reach of such cold-blooded ferocity.

If a kindly and tolerant race, like the British, which has given asylum to so many rebels and revolutionaries, should be held up as a subject of scorn and ridicule by alleged revolutionaries, then surely we are entitled to examine the motives of those people who work so assiduously to destroy the prestige of the very people who have protected them and given them asylum.

It is interesting to speculate how long Bernard Shaw would have lived in Soviet Russia, if he had criticised the rulers there as he criticised the British hierarchy. I wonder how much publicity he would have got in U.S.A. if he had criticised the American way of life as he did the British. Criticism is important and necessary,

"Go Without" Policy Attacked

It is astonishing that the only solution proposed for Melbourne's water shortage is that householders with beautiful gardens should let their plants die in hot weather.

Many of us have spent many pounds on our gardens, and hours of hard work when we might have gone to the football, the races, or the hotel.

Apparently we are to be allowed to water gardens only when they don't need it. Spare the water in a heat wave of three or four days and there will be nothing left to water.

We pay water rates in the belief that the real return for our rates will come in the summer.

Government and semi-government bodies in this country seem to imagine that they have performed acts of statesmanship and settled all difficulties when they have kindly arranged for the public to go without.

—"HOME GARDENER," Essendon.

—*The Herald*, Melbourne, December 1950.

but there are limits set by considerations of ordinary decency, if not by anything else, and the British people have taken adverse criticism a little too complacently.

After all, the consensus of world opinion, if there is such a thing, was against the Kaiser in 1914, at least America and Russia thought so, and the British Empire was in the fight long before America came in and stayed in it even when Russia pulled out at the critical moment. Again in 1939, when the world was howling with rage at Nazi Germany, the British people entered the fight at the beginning, stayed in after France, Belgium and Holland were crushed, and stayed in while America and Russia were still making up their minds which side to fight on.

What these two wars cost the British people we will never know: what the world owed to the British Empire during these critical times when it fought practically alone, can never be assessed. I am not going to say that the terrible price paid, the gallantry of this superhuman effort, should silence all criticism, but I am saying, most emphatically from a practical point of view, it is quite dishonest to criticise the British people and their institutions and their way of life unless some reasonable alternatives have been tried and are within reach.

It seems rather despicable to throw aside, in these troublesome times, an old and trusted campaigner for foreigners who have been tried and found wanting, and who are not even sympathetic towards us. After all, the British Empire was the only organisation, which stood the test of the last two wars. That doesn't seem to be a reasonable excuse for its voluntary liquidation.

If we look round the world today at the other nations of the world, we find, something very disturbing: France, is so disrupted by alien elements that, from a political and military point of view, can be considered nothing but a liability. Germany has been so paralysed by Roosevelt's policy of extinction bombing, and so humiliated

(Continued on page 8)

Bernard Shaw's Evil Influence

So Shaw has passed on, and the most popular dramatist of the first half of the twentieth century will write no more. Most of his best plays were written in the last century, but his reputation for good or ill belongs to this. And, besides, the plum of the nineteenth century must be awarded to Ibsen, who, in addition to his dramatic genius, in its own way as brilliant as Shaw's, had a far deeper mind, and was altogether without Shaw's senseless revolutionary kink. For, beyond all his dramatic genius, and the brilliance of his prose style — perhaps the most admirable example of honest, straight-forward English prose the modern world has to show — beyond his undoubted charm and humanity, it has to be recorded that Shaw was a dissatisfied mischief-maker, as are all revolutionaries. No one can deny his importance and the influence he exerted in what must surely rank one of the most crucial periods in the history of this country and of the world. But his influence was an upsetting one in the common and accepted sense of that word; and how much finer, and more difficult a thing it is to be a setter-up than an upsetter. And, like all mischief-makers, he has created a great deal of wholly unnecessary trouble by helping to confuse the real issues of his period, and impeding the emergence of correct solutions.

Now that he is gone, the world of literature will be acclaiming him a great artist, and quite rightly, from its point of view. But for readers of this journal it is in his much more questionable capacity of social reformer that the departed phenomenon known as George Bernard Shaw requires some assessment. How did that acute mind, as it approached what he knew was his impending removal from this earthly scene, view his own part in it? Or was he, perhaps, unaware that he had lent his brilliant literary gifts to the satisfaction of his own quite ordinary human disgruntlement, in place of trying to penetrate to the root of things?

Nevertheless, and in spite of all his apparent success, Shaw must have died a mentally baffled and mystified man. In terms of executive achievement, life on this plane inevitably spells comparative frustration. But those individuals go contentedly and peacefully who have found and acknowledged the true cause of this frustration; as it were, gratefully conscious at least of the positive harm they have been saved from doing. Within the last six months, to the positive knowledge of the present writer, Shaw spontaneously sent a cheque to a very needy friend, whose patrimony of rubber shares had evaporated, indirectly, if not directly, because of events precipitated by the politico-economic activities of himself and his fellows. In the accompanying letter he lamented its comparative smallness, as seriously as it is in him to be serious, blaming the unmerciful incidence of super-tax. Since taxation is at the very root of the Shavian philosophy of Social Justice, it is possible to gauge the distressing depth of his final mental bewilderment.

Through the accident of his particular temperament, which was both impatient and puckish, allied to exceptional intellectual gifts of extreme activity, Shaw has undoubtedly been a very potent factor

in the development of the social reactions produced by the Industrial Revolution in this country. To appreciate the forces of which he was an outstanding agent, and the "events" in which he figured so prominently, it is necessary to keep in mind this historic background. Though the point is frequently made that Great Britain is, or was, an island fortress, it is questionable if the vital importance in history of that fact is properly understood. What it actually did was to enable the English genius to develop almost uninterruptedly for at least fifteen hundred years; uninfluenced, that is, by any external or alien pressure. It was an advantage that no other medieval people enjoyed, developing, as they did, out of the semi-pagan inheritance of the Holy Roman Empire. This Constitutional freedom was seriously threatened in the thirteenth century when Edward I took drastic action to break the growing governmental dependence on Jewish finance, which was rapidly degrading the whole Feudal System and the country with it. Whig historians, naturally, make little of the incident, but the autumn of 1290, when the complete banishment of all Jews from Great Britain took effect, was undoubtedly one of the great events in our not altogether uneventful history.

By that act, England's course was set for the next four centuries which led up to and produced all the Elizabethan glories, along with Shakespeare, whom Shaw affected to despise, Francis Bacon, and a host of lesser lights. After the Cromwellian rebellion, to a considerable extent by means of Jewish finance from Holland, the official re-admittance of the Jews was only a question of time, and the subsequent marriage of the heir to the English Throne to Dutch William, confirmed their position in the city. The process of infiltration, and the subservience and degradation of the peerage and the government, which Edward had so summarily stopped, re-commenced almost where it had left off, pre-eminently among the newly created Whig aristocracy, and city-biased government gathered about the equally newly created Bank of England. From then on, England's hitherto comparatively single and united national policy, as it were, split in two, the one half — to continue our somewhat precarious analogy — curving up, the other down, till the phenomenon, actually perceived and harried in its incipient stages by Edward in his day, which Disraeli describes as Two Nations in *Sybil*, became an established fact, Edward's apprehensions of a British government entirely under alien financial influence, were realised, and Whiggery, whatever the name of the political party in office, became the effective political power.

This brings us to the Industrial Revolution, and to what the Germans call Manchesterism; with Karl Marx like a busy wood-worm poring over his books in the British Museum, while Engels supplied the funds from his activities in the Lancashire cotton trade. And we see in the process of being established as an art, the wolfish habit of biting the hand that feeds, so ably followed in the same context by such families as the Laskis. Shaw had been born in the later eighteen fifties, into the comparative Christian freedoms of a nineteenth century

upper-middle-class family, and his early life contained all the variety, opportunity and stimulating uncertainty which it was his destiny — or was it only his whim? — to do so much to destroy.

There have been great and world-shaking events since the time of Cromwell; the French Revolution, American Independence, the Napoleonic Wars, the rise of British Imperialism, the Russian Revolution, not to mention two shattering World Wars — all of which need to be appraised. But, for all the immensity of these historic happenings, it is quite possible that, as a factor in deciding the fate of the British Commonwealth of Nations in this century, and especially the last five years, no one of them ranks in importance with the founding of the Fabian Society, primarily by Shaw and the Webbs in the eighties of last century. Step by step, the path of Wiggism can be traced leading up to that unheralded and fortuitous seeming gathering of a handful of intellectuals in the heart of resplendent Victorian London.

Shaw was an ardent disciple of the poet, William Morris, who had attended the inaugural meeting of the International Association in 1864, when Karl Marx was present, and who told an audience of Oxford undergraduates he was addressing, "It is my business here tonight, and everywhere, to foster your discontent," going on to advise them to marry beneath them, so as to break down social barriers. Such things pass without comment today, but we know something of their effect on society. Morris's views were becoming greatly toned down by Shaw's time, under a somewhat severe knocking; besides, he was nearing his death. But his former beliefs and the writings of Marx had taken firm root in Shaw's brilliant Machiavellian mind, and the founding of the Fabian Society followed inevitably. Out of it, we all know, grew the Parliamentary Labour Party, which ultimately captured the Trades Union Movement; and later the founding of the London School of Economics, endowed by that fine flower of Whig internationalism, Sir Ernest Cassell, as — in his own words — "a training ground for the bureaucracy of the Socialist State."

It is not suggested that the above is the only aspect of the last four centuries of English history. What is suggested, though, is that, for all its unobtrusiveness, this stealthy penetration of British policy by International Finance, and the nation's public life by alien personalities; this subtle and deliberate deflecting of Great Britain's native constitution, is, historically speaking, by far the most important. To follow its underground course, one has to shield one's eyes temporarily to the blinding spectacle of wars and revolutions, to see how the island fortress of British freedom has been captured, her left-wing ideologists and intellectuals materially assisting in the final assault which may be taken as the post-war election of 1945. There can be no question that Shaw's creation, the Fabian Society, and its direct offshoot, the London School of Economics, played the predominant and decisive part in this.

What the fastidious and genuine appre-

(Continued on page 4)

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. 17.

FRIDAY, JANUARY 19, 1951.

No. 3

The Surrender to Communism

Mr. Menzies twice in two days has warned of the danger of the present world situation, and at the same time has complained of the difficulties that leaders are experiencing in getting the people to appreciate the danger. We understand very well how he feels; for we, with a number of small and independent journals, have devoted our efforts for several years to warnings of what was to come, when the dangers were, seemingly, not at all apparent to Mr. Menzies and his kind.

But there is, even yet, no evident realisation by the "leaders" of the real nature of the world situation; they talk of nothing but aggressive war, when they face in reality revolution—the overthrow of the existing order. This revolution, based on a philosophical belief, has the driving power of a religion, while it is diametrically opposed to anything we should call religion. Aggression is anything but a religion; and to call a revolutionary movement, which claims faithful adherents in every country, and which has the most powerful emotional appeal literally to millions, a mere war of aggression is to concede a solid advantage to our adversaries, by reducing the situation to the very material level which they aim to establish.

In their hearts, indeed, the politicians do concede the main claims of Communism, just as Mr. Menzies and Mr. Casey concede the main claims of Socialism. Their actions are based on the supremacy of the purely material view of life: seek ye first Power (for the politicians), and "Security" (for the proles), and all these things shall be added unto you. They preach democracy while they practice centralisation, less ruthlessly, but more fraudulently, than the Russian Communist hierarchy.

And their view of the world is merely their national ambitions writ large. They want One World, nicely planned and organised, with the politicians in control; they want just what Communism aims to achieve, but with themselves as the ruling Party. They do not want to set men free from the power of other men; they want themselves to wield that power, to organise for Mankind the "Good Life" of the most strictly materialistic kind.

—*The Australian Social Crediter.*

BERNARD SHAW'S EVIL INFLUENCE

(Continued from page 3)

ciator of the arts of the music and painting and literature of a pre-Marxian Christian culture, thought of these later phases, one can only guess. Unlike the grumbling and bumble-headed J. B. Priestley, Shaw was too proud — or was it vanity, perhaps, that closed his lips? — to express what must have been his deep disgust at the antics of the Socialist Government in power, and the ugly mess he himself had done so much to promote; and the alarming and depressing drabness his impious and ignorant creed of equality was producing. But, if it is a fact that there is no fool like an old fool, it is equally true that there is no more subversive social factor than the revolutionary intellectual. Inevitably, he is a Rationalist, as it is called, for no better reason presumably than that rationalism is based on the wholly unreasonable belief that what the human intellect cannot directly apprehend and embody as a formula, doesn't exist. This is an altogether irrational conclusion, refuted by all existing evidence, and leading directly to the creed of materialism; that it is only what can be seen and measured that has, or is reality. Only grant the premises, which is all a dialectician asks, whether they are false or true is immaterial, and there is literally nothing to hold back your Intellectual, no restraint in the religious sense, which is derived from the Latin *religori*, to bind back, from drawing the wildest logical conclusions. This is the cult of dialectical materialism, the creed of the Jew, Marx, of which both the Russian Politburo and Shaw's Fabian Society are exponents.

—N. F. WEBB, in *The Social Crediter.*

BOOKLETS BY

ROBERT K. WILLIAMS

(Published in U.S.A.)

FEPIC AND THE MINORITY MACHINE

—The Conquest of American Cities

2/- (postage 2d.)

THE ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE and Its Use in the World Communist Offensive

2/6 (postage 2d.)

THE UNTOLD STORY OF STATE MEDICINE

2/- (postage 2d.)

Now available from

NEW TIMES LTD., Box 1226L, G.P.O.,
MELBOURNE.

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 U.S. Blunders that Led to the Crisis in Asia

(Continued from page 1)

potentialities in Asia. It has great-undeveloped natural resources and human resources. More than half the people of the world live in Asia. Which way they go is likely to be the decisive question of this century.

At the end of the last war the Soviets had about 200,000,000 people under their control. Now, with their satellites in Europe and what they have seized in Asia, they have almost 800,000,000. We of the free Western world are almost 800,000,000 people. The two roughly balance. Who determines which way the balance is to tip? The remaining 700,000,000, of course, and where do they live? On the periphery of China—in Korea, Japan, Formosa, the Philippines, Indonesia, Indo-China, Siam, Malaya, Burma, India, Pakistan. These 700,000,000 people, who can tip the balance of power between the Soviet world and the free world, are still on the fence. Which way are they to go—with us or with the Soviets? All the other problems on the international front depend on that.

And in determining which way they are to go, China has always been and still is the crucial area. The Communists have always realized this fact. Back in 1927 U.S. Communist chief Earl Browder was in China with other leaders of the Communist hierarchy to help the Reds seize complete control of China as the Bolsheviks had done in Russia ten years before. Chiang Kai-shek was scheduled to be in China what Kerensky had been in Russia — an interim leader to be overthrown by the Reds as soon as he had defeated the warlords in southern and central China. But Chiang was strong enough to block the 1927 Red rebellion in China. If the Communists had succeeded in their plans, it would have advanced their programme of world conquest by at least a decade. Naturally they have hated Chiang, seeking always to weaken and discredit him and the Chinese Government until they could take over China.

It will be incomprehensible to historians why some in the U.S. State Department should also have made it a major project for the last seven years to discredit and destroy the one man who more than all others bought us years of time in this fight to the death with an enemy which he knew and has warned all along was our enemy much as China's.

The success of the Communists in beguiling us into stopping effective assistance to China led of course not to peace but to war — first in China and then in Korea. So the third finding in the autopsy is that the Kremlin has been vastly smarter than our Government in understanding where the real keys to world power are.

However, some people besides the Communists have long understood this. In 1947 General MacArthur said to me:

"Our failure to help the government of China effectively at the end of the war, with its otherwise insuperable problems, particularly the Communist rebellion, will turn out, I fear to be the greatest single blunder in the history of the United States. For the first time in our relations with Asia, we confused the paramount strategic interests of the United States in that area with an internal purification problem in China."

Let me pursue further the question of

why the loss of China to Communist control is the key to present events in the Far East. It is due in large part to China's central geographical position in Asia. State Department spokesmen for years have talked almost casually of writing off China and then building up the countries around her. But if you let the hub of a wheel be chopped out, how can you hold together or make anything useful out of the individual spokes? Korea is just one of the spokes. Among the mistakes that led to the present crisis in Asia, the first was at Yalta, where we granted to Russia rights in Manchuria, which did not belong to us and did so without even the knowledge of the Chinese to whom they did belong and to whom we had solemnly promised at Cairo that they would be returned.

There is no way we can build a world order that will be just and peaceful without international morality, and we cannot get international morality by breaking commitments. It was wrong when Hitler did it; it was wrong when Japan did it; it was wrong when the Kremlin did it; it was wrong when we did it. Most of our troubles flow right from the expediencies of Yalta.

A second mistake was the decision by military men in Washington to divide Korea along the 38th parallel and assign the Russians to accept the Japanese surrender north of that parallel while we were moving our troops in to accept surrender south of it. The line chosen was just about the worst possible one that could have been picked. Division along the 38th parallel made it impossible for either side to survive without a lot of assistance from the outside. The best agriculture is south of the line; most of the good coal, waterpower and industries are north of it. And there is no evidence that any division at all was necessary.

A third mistake was that for the first three years after V-J Day we refused to train armed forces to defend South Korea, although we knew the Russians were feverishly developing large forces in North Korea and had large and experienced units made up of Koreans in both Siberia and Manchuria.

One hears people ask, how did the North Korean armies become such fanatical fighters, such skilful warriors? First, because those who were actually North Koreans had been in training for as much as five years. Second, no one yet knows how many of them were not North Koreans but Siberian Koreans trained by the Russians. On top of that, there were somewhere between 50,000 and 100,000 Manchurian Koreans who had been trained and fought with the Chinese Communists in Manchuria. They too had battle experience and long indoctrination.

A fourth mistake was the withdrawal of our own troops in June of last year. On November 20, 1948, the Korean National Assembly passed a resolution urging that United States troops remain in Korea until the security forces of the republic became capable of maintaining national security. Instead, our Army decided that Korea was not of great strategic advantage to us—and it was not. So it pulled out before the South Koreans had had a chance to build the strength necessary to hold their own.

That brings us to the biggest error of

all — the announcement by the President on last January 5 that we were not going to provide any military aid or advice to Chinese forces on Formosa, those Chinese who have been fighting Communism for 23 years — most of the time alone — and who still have the courage to fight it. The Secretary of State enlarged upon the President's statement in a press conference:

"We are not going to get involved militarily in any way on the island of Formosa."

Those statements gave public notice to the Kremlin that the door to Formosa was open as far as we were concerned, and they could walk right in.

Then on January 12, 1950, the Secretary of State was reported as saying that our security line runs from the Aleutians through Japan and Okinawa to the Philippines. The occupants of the Kremlin looked at the map and found that Korea, like Formosa, was beyond our line and therefore would not be defended by us. So they moved in. Why should anyone be surprised?

In view of all this, why did the President reverse the previous policy and send troops back into Korea? It was not because Korea had strategic value to us, or because of any possible material gain to ourselves.

We had to do it, when it came to a showdown, because of the moral factors involved and the political objectives at stake. If we had failed to take a stand against this further and particularly bold and unprovoked Communist aggression, then not only Korea but also the United Nations would have gone down just as the League of Nations did when it failed to act against aggression. Who in Asia — or Europe, for that matter — could again put any confidence in us or in the United Nations? Formosa would go. The Philippines would go. Indo-China and the rest of Southeast Asia would go. Then Europe would go, because it cannot become self-supporting without Asia.

We had either to resist this aggression in Korea or withdraw to the North American continent. Those were the only choices we had.

The Kremlin embarked long ago on a vast programme of world conquest. Never in history has such a military expansion stopped until it was checked. Our only choice has been whether we could check it early when we are still strong and have allies and most of the world is with us, or wait until we stand alone.

You ask, May this action lead to all-out war? Of course it may lead to war; but not to take it certainly would have led to war, and very possibly to our destruction. Great as are the risks of the decision that has been made, the risks of further indecision would be greater.

As a matter of fact, there are some grounds for encouragement. Our mistakes and miscalculations are being recognized and acknowledged. That is the first step toward their correction.

Moreover, we are arriving at last at a clear diagnosis: Communists in Asia are not likely to be accepted much longer as simple agrarian reformers. Communist movements are seen to be not spontaneous peasant uprisings but organized aggression, completely subservient to and directed from the Kremlin.

(Continued on page 8)



The Menace of Superphosphate

By J. I. RODALE

One of the most common of commercial fertilisers is superphosphate. It is an incalculably harmful fertiliser. Why? Because the plant will take up the phosphate but leave large amounts of sulphur, which is a dangerous element if in excess in the soil. It has a harmful effect on the biologic life of the soil—the bacteria, fungi, etc. Let us see how superphosphate is made. The base product is raw phosphate rock, of which there are large deposits in Florida, Tennessee, and some of the Western States. Since the phosphate in this rock is raw or inert and supposed to be unavailable, or insoluble or slow acting, a method was devised to make it, or a great part of it, immediately available to the plant.

This is done by mixing large quantities of sulphuric acid with the rock, in a process that turns out a fine powder, loaded down with sulphur, and phosphate which don't do the earthworms in the soil any good. It kills many of them. The fertiliser companies like such a product because they can get a much higher price for it. They don't care too much to ship the raw rock because the freight on heavy tonnage is too much of a factor. A serious disadvantage of the superphosphate is that it inactivates many of the trace elements, which are contained in the raw phosphate rock, such as boron, zinc, nickel, iodine, etc.

Something has happened in the last decade or two which has transformed the whole picture. It has crept up quietly so that even today the average farmer and agricultural college staff are not aware of this sensational development. In the old days the machinery for grinding the raw phosphate rock into a powder was quite crude, so that the ground-up particles were coarse and did not break down too easily in the soil. But today there is such elaborate machinery available that the rock can be ground finer than talcum powder. Thus a sufficient part of it is immediately available to the plant, because the particles are so tiny that the bacteria and carbon dioxide of the soil can break them down quickly.

I was amazed a few years ago, in the November 30, 1946, issue of the Science News Letter to be exact, to read of an experiment conducted by Dr. Neil W. Stuart, U.S. Government plant physiologist at Beltsville, Md., in which the results were summarized as follow: "Another money-saving discovery is the use of ground-up crude phosphate rock . . . The plants get as much phosphorus as they need, without the necessity of adding costly phosphates to the nutrient solution."

This looked extremely interesting. For

years we had been hammering away against superphosphate, and now a Government investigator had shown that the raw crude phosphate rock was not to be waved away with the ivory baton of the agricultural scientists. In some of the Western States the farmers have been wise to the substantial savings affected by using the raw rock. Here are the figures for 1947 for the State of Illinois, showing the entire amount of commercial fertilisers used:

	Tons
Superphosphate.....	48,396
Rock phosphate.....	707,868
Mixed commercial fertilisers with numbered analysis	289,747
Other commercial fertilisers .	26,083

Those farmers who used the 48,396 tons of superphosphate shown above are just throwing away money, at the same time reducing their yields, as will be shown below, and harming their soil, three strong counts against superphosphate. In spite of these figures, in other parts of the country practically no rock phosphate as such is used. Farmers, wake up! Save money, and at the same time build up the biological life and fertility of your soils.

Recently a farmer from Nebraska visited me, and said he was thinking of changing over to the organic method. In discussing his present practice I found that he used large amounts of animal manure, raw phosphate rock, and only small amounts of potash. He wasn't far from an organic basis. In many parts of the West, the use of raw phosphate rock is quite common.

In the December 1948, issue of the *Southern Farmer*, published in Montgomery, Alabama, with a circulation of one million readers, a battle cry is sounded against superphosphate. Let me quote parts of their editorial:

"You can save from five to ten dollars a ton on phosphate by purchasing phosphate which has not been 'burned' by sulphuric acid.

"Natural phosphate will not leach from the soil. Rains will not wash it out. It remains in the soil until your plants use it. It is not water soluble,

"You can apply natural phosphate at any time, and benefit from it. . . . You cannot apply it too heavily, and 'burn' your crops. You can either broadcast or drill it in the row.

"Modern technology has discovered the way to grind it finer than flour, or talcum powder. You can now buy it ground that 85 percent, of it will pass through a screen so fine that it has 90,000 openings to the square inch.

When phosphate is so fine, more surface area is exposed to the acid exchange process by which phosphoric acid is absorbed

by plant feeder rootlets. This absorption is by osmosis, not by the phosphorus running up the plant in a stream of sap.

"Soil and chemical experts now agree that mixing sulphuric acid with phosphate rock is only a process of breaking down the phosphate rock. Why pay for expensive sulphuric acid when you can get the same results from machinery?

"*Southern Farmer* is prepared to show where untreated phosphate under legumes deposited more nitrate in the soil than superphosphate, and even high-priced commercial mixed fertiliser. (University of Illinois' famous Mumford-7 plots.)"

"Of course, in some Southern States, the Extension Service and/or the regular fertiliser trade, strenuously oppose raw phosphate. One company has informed *Southern Farmer* that it cannot even ship its phosphate into Virginia. Farmers there have taken the matter up with one of their Congressmen, who promised during his campaign a full investigation of the reasons why this natural phosphate is prohibited in Virginia.

"In Alabama, many farmers have had to ignore the Alabama Extension Service, as usual. The Alabama Extension Service and Experiment Stations have even gone to the point of conducting a full-dress exposition of why colloidal (natural) phosphate, for example, is far inferior to other phosphates, despite the proof to the contrary offered by the leading experiment stations of the Mid-west.

"More and more results of experiments are coming to the attention of *Southern Farmer*. Besides those mentioned in our last several articles, we note that the University of Oklahoma has allowed publication of the following figures:

CRIMSON CLOVER	
200 lbs. phosphate rock with 400 lbs. lime,	
4175 lbs. hay;	200 lb. superphosphate with
600 lbs. lime, 3620 lbs. hay;	200 lbs. phosphate rock, 3920 lbs. hay;
200 lbs. superphosphate,	3170 lbs. hay.

The Missouri Agricultural Experiment Station shows:

	bu.	bu.	bu.	lbs.	lbs.
					tim-
	corn	oats	wheat	clover	othy

Manure, Rock					
Phosphate	41.0	38.0	27.5	4138	5425
Manure, Super-					
phosphate.	38.4	32.4	28.3	3584	5066

"As will be noted here, untreated natural phosphate showed up better in every instance (but one) than superphosphate. These results are in addition to previous proof we have submitted on this highly controversial question."

This editorial speaks for itself. In fact, it shouts, so I do not have to dwell further upon it. But there is one more development, a sensational one, which I am sure that *Organic Gardening* readers will be inter-

(Continued on page 7)

"There's No Shortage of Minerals"

(Condensed from "This Should Be Explained", by E. H. Faulkner, author of "Plowman's Folly", in "Organic Gardening", June, 1946.)

In a radio interview some time ago, a representative of an important agency of the United States Department of Agriculture said that farmers are removing plant food minerals from the soil sixty times as fast as they are replacing them. So far as I know, the statement is true.

The implication of such a summary of our plant mineral balance sheet is that farmers must begin to use far more fertilisers than they have ever used before; sixty times as much, in fact, if they are to maintain at its present level their land's ability to produce crops.

It is not conceivable, however, that present works could produce and deliver sixty times as much fertiliser each year as is now annually used; neither is it possible for present known reserves of phosphate and potash to last indefinitely if mined at any such rate; nor could the farmers pay for any such tonnage of fertilisers if they were produced, even though our known mineral reserves should prove adequate and enough additional works were constructed to do the job of manufacturing.

Even during the lean years, many farmers have been using enough commercial fertilisers to cancel a handsome profit. Does anyone believe ordinary farmers can multiply their usual fertiliser outlay by five or six, to say nothing of sixty — and still successfully fend off the sheriff?

When somebody says farmers must replace in the soil every bit of mineral their crops and animals take out of their soil, the statement has the proper ring, certainly. The trouble is, though, that such a viewpoint isn't correct, and never was.

The fact that we in this country (the U.S.) inherited originally the last-known big expanse of untouched soil, and have since "worn it out," does not really constitute an argument; for most farm lands can with relative speed be restored by natural processes to that same original condition of high productive ability.

Consider how the earth was originally brought under control by the plant kingdom. The only "soil" available to the very first plants was just like what you can see in the bottom of a well-worn erosion gully on almost anybody's farm. That original "soil" was pure crystalline minerals, worn to some degree of fineness by millions of years of exposure to heat and cold, the scraping action of glaciers, the pounding of waterfalls, the milling around of swirling stream-water, etc. And, until the first plants developed, this mechanical milling of rock is all that had happened, except that the big pond we call the sea had begun to become "salt" because the restless water had started the process of continuously dissolving out of the stone everything it could release to water solution. That process, of course, continues today, and provides in seawater the minerals necessary to sustain every living thing in the vast ocean.

Scientists think life first developed in the ocean, this nutrient solution that separates our continents. And, once life had begun in the sea — only elementary "curiosity," or whatever in primordial life corresponds to that human trait, was necessary to stimulate the first effort to establish a

"beach-head" on shore. However, we may choose to explain it, that first beach-head was established; and we must not forget that there was neither organic material nor commercial fertiliser available to assist in raising the green flag of vegetation over each conquered square foot of shore. From the fact that plant life originally developed without the helpful offices of organic decay, we know that the "soil solution" in which the first roots fed did supply enough minerals to do the job. There were then enough minerals; there are today enough minerals; there will always be enough minerals. The rock-mass that forms the base upon which every vestige of life and civilisation rests consists of nothing but minerals — a fair proportion of which are necessary for living creatures, plant or animal.

Never again will it be as difficult for plant life to take over land that has no organic matter in it. Now that plants have covered practically the entire earth's surface, there is no lack of the vital acids necessary to procure minerals from the rock itself, provided sufficient organic matter is supplied within easy root reach of the plants to be grown. And, even on land which is temporarily "out" of organic matter, the supply can be renewed, fortunately, in many soils, by the simple procedure of growing a winter crop that will be well supplied with ground water during the cool season; then making proper use of that organic matter to provide the necessary organic acids for growing crops for food or market.

Let's forget most of our current theories about plant minerals, and view realistically for once the procedure necessary to ensure health and happiness of the people, who must live from the products of our fading soils. Purchased minerals aren't the answer. The development everywhere of soils that can be considered complete in every sense is the answer. —*Mother Earth.*

THE MENACE OF SUPERPHOSPHATE

(Continued from page 6)

ested in. When we attacked the use of superphosphate, the experts, including those in the U.S. Department, said we were culturists, and intimated, therefore, that we did not know what we were talking about. We said we did not like the sulphur residue left in superphosphate. Now, look what's happened. At the Tennessee Valley Authority, T.V.A., they have perfected a process of producing a phosphate fertiliser without the use of sulphuric acid. It is done by melting the raw phosphate rock in a shaft furnace at a temperature of 1300 deg. centigrade. It is called defluorinated phosphate rock. If you want information about it, write to T.V.A., Wilson Dam, Alabama.

Now, we don't want to take any credit for this, because T.V.A. by 1942 had already developed the process, but we do want to show that our "rantings and ravings" against superphosphate have a scientific basis. It also begins to look as if the gap between the organic and the "commercial" method is narrowing. And to the agricultural colleges we say it is about time that the left hand finds out what the right hand is doing, and that they begin to

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. 19/6

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 REDWOODS"

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 society.

"PLOUGHING IN PREJUDICES"

By Edward Faulkner. 10/-

Another book from the author of "Plowman'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.

experiment to see if they can take the sting out of the other commercial fertilisers.

We do not suggest a rush for this new defluorinated phosphate. While it is better than superphosphate, it still costs more money than the plain, untreated, raw phosphate rock.

The most important aspect of the victory is the taking of the sulphur out of the superphosphate. W. C. Greene, in his book, *The Cancer Problem*, has shown that sulphur in coal smoke is one of the causes of cancer. His book was published in 1914 in Scotland, and it is amazing that as early as that he attacked the use of sulphur in fertilisers as a cause of human cancer.

—*Organic Gardening* (U.S.A.).

"New Times," January 19, 1951 — Page 7

U.S. Blunders that led to the Crisis in Asia

(Continued from page 5)

And we have quit running backward. At last we are beginning to grapple with the problem instead of deluding ourselves that it does not exist, or at least is not serious.

For the first time, the doctrine of containing Communism until it breaks from its inner weaknesses and cruelties has a chance to succeed, because for the first time we are to try it. Another favorable factor is that it is better to have the showdown over a case of naked, premeditated aggression against the United Nations-sponsored Republic of Korea, with a government chosen in a supervised election in which 92 percent of the people voted, than to have the issue drawn over Hong Kong or Indo-China, for example. Our moral case is stronger because the issues in Korea are clear and uncompromised.

There are only two things to be afraid of in this whole world situation. One is that we might fail to understand the nature or underestimate the strength, the determination, the wide infiltration, and the cruel ruthlessness of the forces of the Kremlin. The other is that we might fail to understand the nature or underestimate the size, the strength, the wide distribution, even behind the Iron Curtain, of the forces of freedom that are for us. That would be just as deadly a mistake.

A lot of time has been lost; it is late, but I believe not yet too late. If we will mobilize fully and organize effectively the moral, the material and the military resources of ourselves and of all free peoples under imaginative, courageous and inspiring leadership, then the tide of tyranny that threatens everything we count precious can be turned back.

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.

Anti-British Conspiracy

(Continued from page 2)

and irritated by America's post-war policy that it is very doubtful if she will feel inclined to act as a bulwark of American civilisation; at any rate, she is not likely to become an integrated cultural unit in the near future.

China, after years of civil war, has been left with a vast task to feed, clothe and rehabilitate its starving millions.

The "Great Powers" which remain as active and visible political forces are the British Empire, the U.S.A., and Russia; with the field so narrowed, it becomes important to consider the position of the British Empire vis-à-vis U.S.A. and Russia.

No one, who has followed recent history, can doubt that Great Britain's loss of prestige, most of her financial difficulties, and her removal as a world force, are almost entirely due to the people who constitute the "Power behind the Throne" in America.

One of the most amazing facts in modern history is that the people of Great Britain do not know, and are not permitted to know, that the official policy of U.S.A. is, and has been for many years, to produce through every medium of "education" and publicity, a climate of opinion which could lead only to contempt, if not to mistrust, of the British people.

It was reported that, during the last war, Roosevelt told Churchill that "The British Empire was only a figment of the imagination," which is as good a sample as any of the usual wishful thinking indulged in by America's ruling clique.

When the American soldiers, billeted in England during the last general election, said to their English friends, "Why don't you vote for a d'markracy like we have in Amurrica?" they were merely talking, with suitable prompting, from their school textbooks.

Needless to say, the American people have had little say in the policy of their own country, and practically no control over the men who govern it. Whatever may be their objectives in entering the last two wars, the advent of America as a world power has been disastrous to the British people, not to mention many others; and the destruction of the German Army and the German cities was not the only, or the main objective of world wars I and II.

When we know that the ruling clique in America financed the Russian Revolution and the industrialisation of the Soviet, the American policy of crippling the only two military powers, which could contain Russia, takes on a sinister aspect.

The position of the British people in the world today is more important and more unique than perhaps at any other time in their history; in other words, the cultural unity and prestige of the British people will probably be, in the near future, the element which will decide whether or not the world is to be turned into a slave camp on the Russian model; and, as a corollary, those people who are working for an international slave State, or a world State as they prefer to call it, can be identified as the persons, or their agents, who are working with every means at their disposal to destroy the power and prestige of the British people.

(To be continued)

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

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 7/10, post-free. Order from New Times Ltd., Box 1226L, G.P.O. Melbourne.