

THE NEW TIMES

Vol. 22, No. 5

MELBOURNE, FRIDAY, MARCH 9

ONE SHILLING & NINEPENCE FORTNIGHTLY

NEW LIBERAL M.H.R. EXPOSES "PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE"

Mr. D. J. Killen's Inspiring Maiden Speech

We consider the maiden address given in the Federal Parliament on February 28 by the new Queensland Liberal Member, Mr. D. J. Killen, to be one of the most realistic yet heard at Canberra. We predict now that Mr. Killen, one of the youngest Members in the House will, within the next few years, be recognised as one of the most outstanding Members in the Federal Parliament. He goes to the root of policies, the philosophies from which they stem.

It is not without significance that Mr. Killen's maiden address was given the silent treatment by the Australian press. A study of the address itself reveals just why the address was not mentioned.

Mr. Killen said:

I come to this Parliament at a time when the question of peace and war is in close approach to the minds of most of the peoples of the world, and it is to this matter that I address myself, not that the House may have the doubtful value of my political sagacity on the subject, but rather that the House may consider the views of a young man with a vested interest in peace and in liberty. As all honorable gentlemen are aware, despite the distinction in policy between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the free countries of the world, there is a notion that, in essence, no basic conflict exists. In the language of our day, the proposition is co-existence.

I am not unmindful of the fact that an unyielding insistence on a point of view in international dealings may well be the sire of disaster, but I confess without hesitancy that to me the concept of co-existence is not only repugnant but completely unacceptable. I sense that that view jars upon some honorable gentlemen, particularly those on the Opposition benches, so I hasten to establish some understanding in the matter. When I say I reject the concept of co-existence, it does not imply that I am resigned to the inevitability of armed warfare. The question of peace and war with the Soviet Union is a false dichotomy. We have no choice in the matter, not because of any unwillingness on our part to maintain peace, but because of their unwillingness.

About a century ago those forces which prepared to assert tyranny on the Russian people declared war on the rest of the world. Those forces which established that

tyranny, and those forces that now preside over it, have never been persuaded to any abandonment of ambition. True, it has not always been a war in which armies coeval with the day have been used and true, also, that the Soviet Union has been an ally with us against other manifestations of tyranny, but the simple and incontrovertible truth is that that alliance, that partnership, has been only transient. What honorable gentleman in this House would attempt to deny that the Soviet Union used that partnership to gain immense strategical advantages?

I turn to an examination of three specific grounds upon which I reject the concept of co-existence. The first is one, which, I suppose, on casual scrutiny would appear to be lacking in substance, and yet the substance of it can be disturbed neither by theory nor test. That ground is morality. Not even a cursory examination of the philosophy which underlies the policies of the Soviet Union can let go unnoticed the fact that that policy is one of sheer materialism. It is one in which none of the great virtues of mankind — tolerance, love, a recognition for the individualism of man and the spirit and dignity of man — can find any place. It is a philosophy, which is measurably promoted by force. Should there be some doubt in the House as to the exactitude of my assertion that the philosophy which underlies the policy of the Soviet Union is one of sheer materialism, I ask the House and the country to examine just part of the holocaust. Several years ago in the town of Czerverne in Lithuania inenarrable horror struck. Re-

sistance to Soviet forms of control was crushed by the merciless slaughter of hundreds of men, women and children. That butchery in Czerverne is typical. In the adjoining and once-free country of Latvia, planned starvation and mass deportation was the Soviet answer to those who challenged its authority.

No matter what country one looks at that has been bent to the will of the Soviet Union, one finds evidence of unparalleled barbarism. I recall, and honorable members will, too, such incidents as the Soviet obduracy at Berlin, when the very exist-

(Continued on page 2.)

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 to the community's indebtedness and the sound business practice of gradually reducing existing debt. 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.

NEW LIBERAL M.H.R. EXPOSURE

(Continued from page 1)

ence of millions of human beings was thrown into jeopardy because of Russia's insistence on a point of view. I recall the spiritual assassination of Jan Masaryk, who chose to die by his own hand rather than suffer the shame of seeing his people in subjection. I recall the cold-blooded murder of Nikola Petkov, who went to the gallows because he believed in liberty. The House will recall the persecution of Cardinal Mindszenty, and as one who has a filial reverence for a communion other than that of the cardinal's, I recognize in his great stand the portrayal of so many thousands of Christian ministers who have stood by their faith. It is a little difficult to disturb and dismiss all that as merely the play of political forces. Peculation and plunder, predation and murder, and bashings and oppression and slave camps are the bloody and inhuman means of the ministers of darkness, who outrage every precept of civilized behaviour and every canon of moral law. What honorable gentleman is there in this place who can think of the horrors that go on daily at Lubianka gaol without some misgivings? This is no metaphysical consideration, or a problem to be decided and despatched by the application of precise political formulae. This is a challenge to our whole sense of fitness and to every sentiment of honour and decency. I would, I suppose, be the last person in this House to presume to advise honorable gentlemen in the exercise of their conscience, but I do inquire of them who, accepting the supremacy of spiritual values, can in equity accept co-existence with evil.

The second ground upon which I reject the concept of co-existence is that of politics — not politics in some narrow, confined or partisan sense, but in a broad sense and, most decidedly, in a non-partisan sense. One of the facts that cannot escape us is that the basic policy, which has been fastened upon the Soviet Union itself, admits of no co-existence. Certainly, it may pretend to countenance co-existence, but every pretence is but a stratagem. The rulers of the Soviet Union know perfectly well that from a doctrinal point of view they are at perfect liberty to enter into any sort of an arrangement, however unsteady, however changing, however vacillating or wavering, as long as in the ultimate their cause is pressed forward a little farther. Only recently we had the assurance of one of the gentlemen of the Kremlin — and I use the term "gentlemen" in a most disrespectful sense — assured the people of the world that the Soviet policy of smiles was not to be taken as being any departure from the strategy of his political ancestors. That, of course, is perfectly true. That gentleman knew perfectly well, and knows perfectly well, that the strategy that he and the Soviet Union

promote cannot be concluded until the whole of Western civilization is smashed. That, to me, seems to be the core of the problem. If we elect to ignore it I believe we are guilty of a wretched error of judgment. Perhaps some honorable gentlemen in this House can balance themselves between these two extremes, but I confess that I know of no means whereby we may secure equipoise of liberty with the elements of tyranny.

I ask the House now to consider what co-existence has meant in terms of strategical advantages to the Soviet Union. Since 1939 the Soviet Union, or its forces, has snuffed out liberty in the following countries: — Petsamo, Karelia, Esthonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Konigsberg, East Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania — if honorable members will permit a minor defect in exactitude, Yugoslavia — the Kurile Islands, Southern Sakhalin, North Korea, China, Mongolia, Tibet and half of Indo-China. What army that ever took the field fitted with the accoutrements of war gained more conquests than those achieved by Soviet domination in the name of peace? The truth is that not only has the extension of Soviet influence meant an appalling sum in human misery, but it has also meant that the free countries of the world have been seriously disadvantaged from a physical point of view, from a material point of view, and from a strategical point of view. We may command no knowledge of the science of war but I trust that we still command our senses. It is perfectly clear the Western world has been seriously disadvantaged from a strategical point of view. To accept the doctrine of co-existence appears to me to mean that we are resigned to the continuation of circumstances that are inimical to our interests. Therein lies my third reason for rejecting the concept of co-existence. Having stated to the House the three principles upon which I reject co-existence, I make it plain that I am not compliant to a conflict of arms, the use of which may well obliterate all life. Peace is a noble eminence, and we can attain it, but never, I trust, by resigning ourselves to slavery.

A basic fact that I believe we should keep in our minds is that the forces which form the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, plan world domination, want our liberties, and they are prepared to wrench them from us by force, or chivvy them from us by chicane, and I believe that if we recognize that fact we shall be measurably on the way to erecting a barricade against those forces.

There was a civilization, which long ago disappeared, which had a dictum, "If you want peace, prepare for war." When I say that we should prepare for war I hasten to add that our first preparation in the matter should be spiritual, or, if you like, ideological. I realise that that may be a quaint, and possibly a naive, point of

WITNESS

By Whittaker Chambers

Price 27/6, post-free.

It was the evidence of ex-Communist secret agent, Whittaker Chambers, before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, which caused top Communist espionage agent in the U.S.A., Alger Hiss, to be indicted and convicted on a charge of perjury. Not only the American people but many people in other countries were startled by the disclosure that the official who advised President Roosevelt, helped draft the disastrous Yalta Agreement in 1945, and who was the first Secretary-General of the United Nations Organisation, was a Communist agent.

Before being finally convicted, Alger Hiss, aided by some of the most influential people in America, fought back against Chambers, who was subjected to a whispering campaign described by one prominent American writer as "one of the most repellent in modern history". Chambers replies to this campaign in one of the most important autobiographies of our times. Not only does this book deal exhaustively with the Hiss-Chambers battle before the Committee on Un-American Activities and the Courts; it is a moving human document which explains how Chambers first became a Communist, his work in the secret Communist apparatus, how he met Alger Hiss and worked with him, and how eventually he came to repudiate Communism.

Near the conclusion of his book, Chambers makes one of the most important observations yet made on the Hiss-Chambers case: "No feature of the Hiss case is more obvious, or more troubling as history, than the jagged fissure, which it did not so much open as reveal, between the plain men and women of the nation, and those who affected to act, think and speak for them. It was, not invariably, but in general, the 'best people' who were for Alger Hiss and who were prepared to go to almost any length to protect and defend him. It was the enlightened and the powerful, the clamorous proponents of the open-mind and the common man, who kept their minds shut in a pro-Hiss psychosis, of a kind which, in an individual patient, means the simple failure of the ability to distinguish between reality and unreality, and, in a nation, is a warning of the end."

"Witness" must be read and studied by those who want to know the truth about Alger Hiss and his part in the Communist conspiracy in the U.S.A. Every student of Communism and international affairs must have this work on his shelves. No one with an unbiassed mind can read it without realising that Hiss was undoubtedly guilty of the charges made against him.

£1000 NOW CONTRIBUTED TO SPECIAL FINANCIAL APPEAL

Just as we were going to press with this issue a most generous donation of £10 from Rev. Fr. T. Lynam, of Maitland, N.S.W. (Fr. Lynam is a comparatively new supporter), carried our special financial campaign to the total of £1,004. Our total objective is £2,000, and it is surely unthinkable that the great majority who has not yet contributed will fail the few who have donated half the sum we require.

The £1,004 has been contributed by approximately 100 individuals only. This means an average donation of £10 per individual, one of the most inspiring financial efforts ever made by supporters in the history of "The New Times". We believe it indicates the growing spirit of Christian militancy in our ranks as we carry forward our campaign for the creation of genuine Christian society.

It was our hope that this special financial appeal would be concluded by the end of this month. This can be achieved if all those who have not yet joined in this campaign send their donations immediately. We believe that the facts of the present situation are a challenge which none of us can ignore.

Since our last issue we have received two further £50 donations, one from a supporter who prefers that his name should not be published, and the other from Mr. J. J. Cronin of South Australia. Seven individuals have now made individual donations of £50 or more. We are certain that there are others who could easily give £50 or more.

A READER'S CHALLENGE

During this campaign we have been moved on numerous occasions by the genuine sacrifice of some supporters, but we think that our old supporter, Mr. G. Forrest, of Brisbane, makes a challenge which is the most moving we have yet received. We quote from the following letter by Mr. Forrest on February 20:

"Reading of what some have done has forced me to a decision, that is to cut out smoking and to donate 10/- per week to the fund while I can. My wife and I are both on the pension but I am at present on a job, which gives us a bit extra but as I have been over-doing the work the last three years I am beginning to feel the strain and may be forced to give up. But while I am getting the extra I will post £1 every pension day to help in the good work."

We are certain that Mr. Forest's challenge will stimulate us all to do our very best.

The following contributions have been received since our last issue, in which we acknowledged receipt of £817: Miss B. Suter, Vic., 5/-; Mr. E. St. Clair, Lancefield, Vic., £2/10/-; "Gus," N.S.W., £5; E. Welsch, Nhill, Vic., £5; B. Alford, Croydon, Vic., £3; F. Garner, Vic., £1; R. Wintle, Qld., £6; J. Peterson, £3; G. Forrest, Brisbane, £1; Vic. Douglas, Credit Women's Group, £10 (our special thanks to this group for their support); W. Kuhne, Hershams, Vic., £2; H. Kurtz, W.A., £2; A. Plum, £3; E. R. Belling, N.S.W., £5; Elizabeth A'Beckett, Vic., £5/5/-; G. Cole, N.S.W., £2; M. Condon, Vic., £1/10; "Anonymous," Vic., £50; J. J. Cronin, S.A., £50; J. G. Belling, N.S.W., £3; Ron Harris, Narrabri, N.S.W., £1; L. Brown, Vic., £10; R. Wright, Melbourne, £5; "Anonymous," Elsternwick, Vic., £5; Miss Ramke, £1/10/-; Ron Hancock, Vic., £3; Rev. Fr. T. Lynam, Maitland, N.S.W., £10. Total, £1,004.

REGULAR CONTRIBUTIONS APPRECIATED

Some supporters who cannot afford to make a substantial donation are making regular weekly or monthly contributions. These contributions are just as helpful as immediate donations. They help us to plan ahead with our work.

CLARIFICATIONS

*There is no local
freedom without local
control of local purchasing
power.*

* **

*The present production
system produces prices
FASTER than it distributes
the power to buy.*

* **

*There can be no
successful decentralisation
without a sane and scientific
issue of purchasing power
based upon REALITY.*

The Iron Curtain Over America

By Colonel John Beaty.

This book is a "must" for every student of international affairs. It is one of the most important books published since World War II, but, like similar books which have been appearing in America over the past few years, it has received no mention whatever in Australia by leftist book reviewers for the "Capitalist" press.

The author of "The Iron Curtain Over America" is not only an outstanding American scholar; his work with the American Military Intelligence Service during the last war enabled him to learn at first hand of the manner in which the Zionist-Communist conspiracy was being furthered under cover of war.

Colonel Beaty deals objectively with the history of the Jews, with particular reference to the fact that the ancestors of most Jews of today were Khazars, originally a people from Central Asia, and had never seen the Holy Land. He writes most penetratingly on the Jewish invasion of the U.S.A. and the subsequent Jewish impact on America's foreign and internal policies.

After outlining the treacherous, pro-Communist activities of Jews in the U.S.A. Colonel Beaty asks — and answers — the question: "Does the high ratio of appointed persons of Eastern European or contacts in United States strategic positions reflect the will of the U.S. people? If not, what controlling will does it reflect?"

"The Iron Curtain Over America" proven conclusively that not only was the second world war organised, but that it was deliberately prolonged, and only included when the controllers of the Zionist-Communist conspiracy had achieved their major objectives. Detailed evidence is provided of the manner in which the truth about this conspiracy has been kept from the American people.

Colonel Beaty's conclusion is that America, and other Western nations, can only survive by first defeating "the enemy within." He points out that this first step is essential before a more realistic foreign policy can be implemented, one which would obtain the friendship of all anti-Communist nations and which would seek to widen the gulf which already exists between the Moscow gangsters and their unhappy victims.

It is not surprising that Zionist organisations in the U.S.A. have been campaigning vigorously against Colonel Beaty's exposure and that pressure has been applied to the press to prevent any reference to the book. Even Church "leaders" have been used to smear Beaty. But his book continues to contribute to the general awakening in the U.S.A., an awakening that Australians unfortunately know little about.

Price 31/3 post free

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

"New Times," March 9, 1956. —Page 3

The New Times

Established 1935.

Published every alternate 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; 40/- Yearly; 20/- Half Yearly; 10/- Quarterly.

Vol. 22.

FRIDAY, MARCH 9, 1956

No. 5

Mr. McEwan and the Export Madness

The directors of the Communist conspiracy must be watching with eager anticipation the frenzied activities of the Western nations as they strive to make their internal economic systems work by progressively increasing their exports. Mr. J. McEwan, Minister for Trade, no doubt believes what he said in his much-publicised address in the Federal Parliament on Tuesday, February 28. But we predict now that, providing there is no major military conflict or a drastic modification of financial and economic policies in countries to which it is hoped to send increased exports, Mr. McEwan's trade policy is doomed to failure before it even starts.

Every major industrial nation in the world is at present striving to increase its exports while at the same time limiting imports. Unless the Federal Government is going to submit to Communist tactics and send vast volumes of exports to Communist countries, including Communist China, where are these export markets which Mr. McEwan's export promotion plan is going to win for Australian production? Even if the plan were successful, it would only mean that other exporting nations would sell less. And here we have the seeds of an unnecessary trade war, which Stalin predicted just prior to his death would lead to growing friction between the non-Communist countries.

It is futile for Mr. McEwan to talk about demanding "the right of entry into overseas markets on fair terms" when under present financial and economic rules the Governments of other countries must use tariffs and other measures to protect their own local industries against excessive imports. When Mr. McEwan's own Government imposed import restrictions, it did the very thing, which Mr. McEwan criticises, other Governments for doing. We would agree that the British Government should be doing all that is physically possible to free necessary trade between Empire countries, but this Government is dominated by the same fantastic economic and financial ideas which are forcing Mr. McEwan and his colleagues to impose a further dose of Socialist medicine as prescribed by Dr. Coombs.

How are the British to buy more Australian production when their purchasing power is being reduced and, like Australians, they are told that they must import less and export more? Mr. McEwan may say that the British should not be buying wheat and meat from the Argentine. But the Argentine also claims that unless it can export more and more primary production, its internal economy must collapse.

Genuine international trade should be an exchange between countries of genuine surpluses after the local markets had been fully supplied. But the growing trade war is basically caused by the internal financial and economic policies of all countries. Every country cannot export more than it imports and it is pathetic after all the years of bitter experience before the war that the present Federal Government has learnt nothing whatever on this subject.

Permanent Assistant Urgently Required at "New Times" Office

As our present assistant at the office, Mrs. Phillips, finds that she can no longer continue to serve in a full-time capacity, it is urgently necessary that we find another assistant immediately. It is impossible for us to continue efficiently without permanent help in the office.

A small salary is available for anyone who can assist us. Hours are from 10 a.m. until 4 p.m. We sincerely hope that one of our retired supporters can come forward.

Social Credit Barbecue an Outstanding Success

The Social Credit barbecue, held at the home of Mr. and Mrs. W. J. Carruthers of Ringwood on Saturday, February 25, was not only a success financially (it benefited "New Times" funds by £83); but it brought many new people in contact with Social Crediters in an ideal environment. As a social occasion it was most enjoyable in every possible way and we are greatly indebted to Mr. and Mrs. Carruthers for their generous hospitality. We would also like to thank all those Social Crediters who co-operated in various ways to make the event so successful.

Apart from the £83 profit made from the barbecue a number of pieces of literature were sold.

This is the second successful barbecue Mr. and Mrs. Carruthers have conducted. We suggest that there may be other supporters prepared to arrange some suitable social event which would help raise funds for our work while at the same time providing an opportunity for bringing non-Social Crediters in contact with our ideas.

OBSERVATION

"When the press is unready to tell the truth, it is sometimes instructive to observe which falsifications it will select for its readers."

VERSAILLES AND WAR TWO

Some Americans remember that Admiral Beatty, speaking to young Americans in Europe in 1919, said: "Yes, the war is over and you are going home. The politicians are going to Versailles to prepare the next one."

THE INFLATION BOGEY

Would you call it inflation to print tickets for every seat in a theatre, regardless of the fact that the house had hitherto been always two-thirds empty simply because no tickets had been printed for the greater number of seats? —A. R. Orage.

Magazine Section

WHAT DID JESUS BELIEVE ABOUT WEALTH?

The founder of the Social Credit Movement, C. H. Douglas, stated that "Socialism, Communism and Atheism are all of a piece, as are Christianity, private, decentralised property, and respect for family tradition as part of respect for the individual. There is no compromise possible—either there is no Christ, or, Socialism and Communism are of the Devil. The essence of them, without exception, is that group giveth, and the group taketh away; blessed be the name of the group. Anyone with experience of life knows that the group giveth; yes, in exchange for the soul."

While we would not agree with every point made in the following article by the Rev. Irving E. Howard in "Christian Economics," U.S.A., it does contain much in common with Social Credit thought:

Someone has observed that no generation of Americans has thought more about freedom than ours, and none has shown a greater readiness to abandon it. This is especially true in the realm of economics. The crux of the problem of economic freedom is the nature of wealth and man's right to it.

In view of this, it is important to consider what Jesus thought about wealth. Since He was concerned with life and since economics is involved in the whole of life, we should expect to find economic implications in the teachings of Jesus. This expectation is not disappointed.

Consider Jesus' parable of the labourers in the vineyard (Matthew 20: 1-6). Here is the story of an employer who hired a series of labourers at different hours of the day and at the end of the day paid them all alike. When those who had worked the longest complained because they had not been paid more than those who worked for an hour, the employer answered: "Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with my own?"

Whatever theological meaning this parable may have, it clearly assumes that a man has a right to his property. This is not a surprising assumption for Jesus to have made, for it was a central idea in the Ten Commandments and was a part of the Judaism of Jesus' time. Much so-called social legislation is in conflict with the teachings of Jesus on the question of property, for this kind of legislation is usually founded upon the assumption that a man's property or wealth belongs to the community, and that the community has a right to determine how it should be used. Jesus had a different idea; namely, that ultimately, all property belongs to God. More about that later.

Jesus also had a more constructive thought about the nature of wealth than "share the wealth". "Tax the Rich" legislation assumes that there is a fixed amount of wealth, which must be more evenly distributed throughout the economy if we are to have a "just" social order. Our Marxian graduated income tax operates upon that principle.

Jesus' theory of the nature of wealth corresponds to that of the classical economists. Both were expounding something that is written into the nature of things and is therefore unchangeable.

The classical economists taught that there are four ways to get property or wealth. It may be created by the sweat of one's brow or the use of one's talents. It may be traded for, received as a gift or taken by force. In simpler days, when people were so naive as to believe the Ten Commandments, taking property by force was called "stealing". In more recent times, however, we have been led to think that what may be wrong for the individual is right for government. According to this philosophy, if by majority rule, the government takes property by force, the fact that the majority voted for it makes it not an act of theft, but an expression of "social consciousness".

No one who is serious about the teachings of Jesus can ever be happy with this socialistic teaching. Not only did Jesus not believe in stealing, he did not believe that wealth was static. Study the parable of the ten pounds. Here Jesus told the story of a nobleman who gave his ten servants one pound each before he left for the far country. Upon his return, he called them to account. All but one had invested and increased his pound. This servant had hoarded his in fear that he might lose even that one-pound. His lack of enterprise was condemned (Luke 19: 11-27).

Thus, from Jesus' point of view, if one man has less wealth than another, he may get more, not by robbing the man who has more, but by creating some for himself. The only limitation upon the amount of wealth in existence is in man's ingenuity for creation. In this parable, the more the servants made on their investments, the more they were applauded and there is no suggestion that there was anything immoral in their creation of wealth. Only sloth, fear and hoarding were condemned.

In "The Religious Foundations of Economic Progress", published in the "Harvard Business Review" of May, 1952,

(Continued on page 8)

CONTEMPORARY MENTALITY

The Labor Party would not fail "to exploit any and every difficulty" confronting the Federal Government, the deputy leader of the Opposition, Mr. Calwell, said yesterday. —Melbourne "Age", February 20th, 1956.

This poisoned state of mind, which is certainly not in the tradition of Roman Law-and-Order, is far more prevalent in left wing than in conservative circles. How many socialists, even those who are men of goodwill, can say truthfully that they would not, if the opportunity arose, cause a severe breakdown in the present "system", for the sake of achieving a socialist goal?

* * *

The Federal Government is strengthening its economic brains trust . . . The expert committee is likely to become the most important group close to Cabinet since the war. Four of the six were members of the Post-War Reconstruction Department under Labor's Post-War Reconstruction Minister, Mr. John Dedman. —Melbourne "Sun", February 21st, 1956.

An Australian who voted for the Menzies-Fadden conservatives during the last election might now ask, "What's the use? Why vote at all?" Governments come and go but the "economic experts", the men whose job it is to see that the present monetary fallacy continues, go on forever, it seems. The present "democratic" system apparently is powerless to check this government-by-"expert".

* * *

But on 17 million acres farmers started growing feed grains . . . thus encouraged farmers to raise cattle faster than the demand called for. To add to the trouble, pig production, which normally does not move up with cattle production, also increased. —"Time" magazine, February 27th, 1956.

Whence comes this poison, which causes men to use the word "trouble" when referring to the glorious abundance of nature? It probably goes back beyond recorded history, but was certainly known in Classical times as fertility versus sterility, or Demeter versus Attis.

"New Times," March 9, 1956. —Page 5.

CLASSICIST, ROYALIST and ANGLO-CATHOLIC

T. S. ELIOT, in His poetry, reaches that intensity of meaning, which is great literature, but in his prose often tends to disguise his more important formulations that they hurt not the tender modern ear unused to hard fact.

This disguising is what Eliot himself calls "my Times - Literary - Supplement - leading-article manner."

However, imbedded in dull patter, he has left dozens of solid statements. Once, writing of "free verse" he said, brilliantly, "no verse is free for the man who wants to do a good job." And in his preface to Dr. Johnson's "London", says more in one sentence than any dozen volumes by university critics: "To be original with MINIMUM of alteration, is sometimes more distinguished than to be original with the MAXIMUM of alteration."

He has made statements of a similar tough nature, on culture and society. Unfortunately people whose profession it is to put men like Eliot on pedestals (in order to get rid of them) consistently ignore these important statements or throw them out of focus. The following quotations are taken from Eliot's long essay "The Idea of a Christian Society" published by Faber & Faber in 1939—more than ten years after Eliot had stated his position as "classicist in literature, royalist in politics, and Anglo-catholic in religion."

"My primary interest is a change in our social attitude, such a change only as could bring about anything worthy to be called a Christian Society. That such a change could compel changes in our organisation of industry and commerce and financial credit, that it would facilitate, where it now impedes, the life of devotion for those who are capable of it, I feel certain."

"The future of art and thought in a democratic society does not appear any brighter than any other, unless democracy is to mean something very different from anything actual . . . What is more insidious than any censorship, is the steady influence which operates silently in any mass society organised for profit, for the depression of standards of art and culture. The increasing organisation of advertisement and propaganda—or the influencing of masses of men by any means except through their intelligence—is all against them. The economic system is against them; the chaos of ideals and confusion of thought in our large scale mass education is against them; and against them also is the disappearance of any class of people who recognise public and private responsibility of patronage of the best that is made or written. At a period in which each nation has less and less 'culture' for its own consumption, all are making furious efforts to export their culture, to impress upon each other their achievements in arts which they are ceasing to cultivate or understand. And just as those who should be the intellectuals regard theology as a special study, like numismatics or heraldry, with which they need not concern themselves

and theologians observe the same indifference to literature and art, as special studies which do not concern THEM, so our political classes regard both fields as territories of which they have no reason to be ashamed of remaining in complete ignorance. Accordingly the more serious authors have a limited, and even provincial audience, and the more popular write for an illiterate and uncritical mob."

In the closing paragraphs of "The Idea of a Christian Society", Eliot writes of 1938 and the doubts, which formed the starting point for his essay:

"Was our society, which had always been so assured of its superiority and rectitude, so confident of its unexamined premises, assembled round anything more permanent than a congeries of banks, insurance companies and industries, and had it any beliefs more essential than a belief in compound interest and the maintenance of dividends?"

The Church and Politics

"For the most part," he says, "theologians and Christian people generally in modern times, if they have bothered about their beliefs and doctrines at all, have gone on writing and writing and talking and talking about them; but nine times out of ten have never even started to try to apply the Christian creed to real life and problems."

"With some exceptions, there has been little attempt to use Christian doctrines — as they were always intended to be used — as tools to cultivate and develop, not only the lives and characters of individual men, but the shape and texture of society itself."

"Who is it now that obeys our Lord's stern command to us, 'Let the dead bury their dead; but go thou and preach the Kingdom of God'?"

"The good Communist in his own way follows the precept, suitably adapted. How many Christians do?"

"This is where we Christians have failed disastrously, and have been ourselves to quite a large extent a cause of the rise of Communism."

"'Oh! as Christians,' we have said, 'we mustn't say anything about that, or it might be construed as interfering in politics — we must leave that to the politicians to deal with.'"

"Or: 'Oh! dear, no! —this is for the sociologists to deal with.'"

"Or: 'Certainly not! Such things are for scientists and psychologists to handle.'"

"What on earth then, ought these poor miserable Christians to be concerned about? 'Oh! yes, of course, naturally, Christians must be concerned only with spiritual problems!'"

"But every problem that ever confronts you and the world is at one and the same

time a political, social, economic, scientific and spiritual problem — according to the aspect from which you are regarding it. For Christians to pretend to deal with only spiritual problems — which can never exist on their own while we live in material bodies — means that they have, in fact never linked up their faith with real life at all.

"No wonder that men and women have come to think of our Christian creed as a museum piece, of no value and use in a man's life."

"But it is not our creed that is wrong. It is the most glorious creed in the world. It is we who are wrong for not bringing it out into the world for use."

—Rev. R. S. Brown, Vicar of Berkhamstead, England, in "Communism—A New Faith".

Has the Standard of Living Increased?

Yet if we subtract from our present power-mechanical civilisation its mass amusements and its gadgets, how much higher is the standard of living than it was in civilised communities in pre-mechanical times? Is the life of the contemporary wage-slave, with his repetitive part in a mass-production process which he does not comprehend in its entirety, with his beers, his gambling (this, surely, in the hope of escaping his lot in life?); with his fear that the fecundity of his wife will outstrip his economic resources; with his only idea of Heaven derived from the synthetic standards of the movies—is his life in any sense superior to the life of a native in living communion with an undespoiled Nature, living in symbiosis with his environment, and participating in the mystic rites of his tribe? Again: one can only ask how much worse is his life than that of a craftsman of the Middle Ages? And where now are our Socrates, our Chaucers, our Shakespeares, our Beethovens, our Rembrandts? Are there now as many craftsmen in the world as there were three hundred and more years ago? Technicians, yes. But a craftsman is concerned with the whole of a thing; a technician with a process only. The life of a craftsman is creative, that of a technician repetitive.

The apparatus of modern civilisation is highly impressive. Yet—how much of it is to enable us "to have life more abundantly," and how much to enable us to do more business? Full Employment in fact? How many women overload the transport system going to work to help pay for the labour-saving devices to enable them to go to work, and thereby create employment for thousands in enlarging the transport facilities? And what employment do they give in the chemical industry, by their demand for contraceptives so that their unwelcome fecundity shall not inhibit this "expanding economy"? "Work", as described, is Moloch.

—Bryan Monahan in "The Social Crediter", March 3.

LITERARY DIGEST

WHY IS EZRA POUND IMPRISONED?

Ezra Pound is now seventy years of age, yet, despite his obvious sanity, is still imprisoned in a criminal asylum in Washington, D.C. One can't help wondering how many UNKNOWN Americans have been put in asylums, and driven mad, because nobody knew they were there, and because their cases have had no publicity.

On February 11th, in the Melbourne "Age", Mr. Ian Mair entered the Pound case without knowing a thing about it. He commented on the inclusion of Pound's Canto 90 in the Australian literary magazine "Meanjin":

"I run it down . . . for carrying . . . four pages of polyglot nonsense by a poet whom the gods destroyed before they made him mad, Ezra Pound."

1. Mr. Mair knows nothing about Pound's long poem, *The Cantos*. I rang him on February 11th and found him quite unable to answer questions about even the general "drift" of the *Cantos*. And Canto 90 is only part of an unfinished epic poem, which already runs to 670 pages. We should remember that Keats was criticised for obscurity in his own day.

2. Mr. Mair has no real knowledge about Pound's mental state. In answer to questions he could only say: "Of course, he's mad." Even "Life" magazine, in an editorial on February 6th, was content to describe Pound as "mentally unfit". "Life" said:

"Tokyo Rose got out of jail the other day. This American citizen . . . has now finished her sentence as a war criminal. The Nazi storm trooper responsible for the Malmedy massacre of 1944, General Dietrich, is also out of jail . . ."

"If their crimes can be atoned or forgotten in 10 years, attention is surely due the case of Ezra Pound, who has been incarcerated for the same length of time."

NO mention of the poet's ceaseless defence of the U.S. Constitution or of his preaching, before the war, during the war, and since the war, of John Adams, second President and Father of the American Nation. No mention either of other interesting facts in the case—such as the one mentioned by Gunter Blocker ("Deutsche Kommentare", Nov. 12, 1955, "Der Tagesspiegel", Berlin)—"In 1941, as America enters the war, he tries to repatriate, but Washington refuses to furnish him with the necessary papers."*

However, "Life" eases its conscience by telling us that "he is one of the best translators of poetry who ever lived" and "he has done more to serve the art of English poetry, to keep its practice alive, and its standards high, than any living man".

But the most important part of the "Life" editorial is the admission, after all this time, that "our government has in its power to quash his indictment".

It is interesting to note that "Life" recognised Pound's existence after Yale Broadcasting Company, on December 5th, 1955, broadcast a tribute to Pound by a number of professors and important writers; one of them, Ernest Hemingway, growled an appeal for his former teacher's release. Archibald McLeish, professor of poetry at Harvard, and sufficiently involved in politics to be labelled pro-Roosevelt, spoke thus of Pound's translation of the Chinese "ODES", done in the asylum: "Wonderful work, beautiful work. My colleague, Achilles Fang, who is multilingual to the point of being able to walk in and out of all the tongues, tells me that it's close to a miracle in terms of translation—that is, not really the translating of the poem, but the creation of the equivalent in the other language . . ."

Ten years ago T. S. Eliot said of the *Cantos*—"There is nobody living who can write like this."

So much then, for Mr. Ian Mair. I am reminded of Pope's letter to Swift in 1725: "My spleen is at the little rogues of it; it would vex one more to be knocked on the head with a piss-pot than by a thunderbolt . . ."

—NOEL STOCK

Winter Time Is Reading Time

Most people read much more during the long winter evenings than they do during the rest of the year. Wintertime enables people to catch up on their reading, particularly serious reading. We suggest that all "New s" readers take the opportunity winter time presents, to widen knowledge and understanding of vast field which "The New Times" covers. A wide selection of books on politics, economics, international affairs, organic farming, gardening and associated subjects, is available.

We ask "New Times" readers to remember that they can also obtain all general books, including works of fiction and text books, through the "New Times" Book Service. Every book order placed helps "The New Times" financially. Please let us have your reading list for the winter TODAY.

New Times Book Service,
Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne.

FORGOTTEN DOCUMENTS

GEORGE BERKELEY, BISHOP OF
CLOYNE

Whether money is to be considered as having an intrinsic value, or as being a commodity, a standard, a measure, or a pledge, as is variously suggested by writers?

Whether the true idea of money, as such, be not altogether that of a ticket or counter?

Whether a nation might not have, within itself, real wealth sufficient to give its inhabitants power and distinction without the help of gold or silver?

Whether money circulating be not the life of trade, and whether the want thereof doth not render a State gouty and inactive?

Whether it be not evident that not gold, but industry, causeth a country to flourish?

Whether, without proper means of circulation, it be not vain, to hope for thriving manufactures and a busy people?

— The Querist, 1750.

* * *

ST. THOMAS AQUINAS

Wealth is of two kinds, natural and artificial. Natural wealth, such as food drink, clothing and shelter, supplies natural needs. Artificial wealth, such as money does not directly serve nature, but is invented by art to facilitate the exchange of goods . . .

Perfect enjoyment demands intelligence...

What is contrary to the natural order is viscous. Nature provides pleasure in vitally necessary activities, and the natural order requires that a man should ENJOY what is required for the well being of the individual and the race . . .

Whether the possession of external things is natural to man? . . . In its nature as subject to the will of God . . . a thing does not fall under human power. But for its utilization, man has natural ownership over external things . . .

Private ownership is not contrary to natural law, but is an addition to it devised by human reason.

—Summa Theologica, c. 1270.

WHAT DID JESUS BELIEVE ABOUT WEALTH

(Continued from page 5)

Kenneth Boulding, economist, commented upon the gospel of self-help, which has been largely lost from modern Protestantism. "Part of the cause," he wrote, "lies in sheer misunderstanding, stemming from failure to appreciate the ethical significance of economic progress, and a resultant economic ethic based on static assumptions, in which undue stress is laid on distributing a fixed sum of wealth fairly rather than on increasing the total to be distributed." We might add: "distributed by the method of the free market."

To be sure, Jesus' concept of wealth was in the framework of the Old Testament doctrine of the sovereignty of God: "The earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof." Thus, man is a steward over his wealth and is obligated to use it to the glory of God. Man has an account to render.

However, he renders his account to God. If man is responsible to society, as suggested by the World Council of Churches, the door is opened to totalitarianism. Society can become demonic! Our Founding Fathers were aware of the danger of despotism of the majority growing up among us, and therefore tried to construct a government of checks and balances which would restrain majorities by a concept of justice. They saw something beyond society as the source of man's freedom, dignity and responsibility!

In addition to His idea of stewardship, Jesus' attitude toward wealth was conditioned by an otherworldliness. He was not primarily interested in this present world, but in a world to come.

Therefore, when a man came to Jesus saying: "Master, speak to my brother, that he divide the inheritance with me," Jesus rebuked the man and refused to be an equalizer of wealth. He continued by warning the man against covetousness.

Jesus had not heard about the Social Gospel, so his response to this challenge did not reveal an "enlightened social consciousness." It is odd that the covetousness Jesus warned against so frequently has been turned into a virtue by the Social Gospel and Social Action movements in the modern church.

Jesus followed his warning against covetousness with the parable of the rich fool who built ever-larger barns only to die suddenly unprepared for eternity (Luke 12: 13-21). To Jesus, wealth was a threat to the soul of the possessor, not a problem to be solved by social engineering. His focal point was always upon the individual rather than the group. While what he said to the individual had wide social consequences, he always started with the individual. So how to use wealth was a problem for the individual to solve with a sense of stewardship to God.

Consider the Rich Young Ruler who asked Jesus what he should do to inherit eternal life. Jesus recited the Ten Commandments

to which the Rich Young Ruler replied: "I have kept these from my youth up." To prove that he had not understood the full implication of them, particularly of the first, Jesus replies: "If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, give to the poor . . . and follow me." Note that the point of emphasis in this incident was not upon the welfare of the poor, but upon the welfare of the Rich Young Ruler's soul. He had made a god of wealth (Matthew 19: 16-26).

Jesus was for neither the poor nor the rich. He was for all men as individuals. Most of all, he was for their spiritual development and commanded charity as a means to that development.

In Jesus' hands, the Old Testament doctrine of the sovereignty of God became a warm, personal faith in the providence of God. While expounding upon God's willingness to care for those who trust Him, Jesus enunciated one of the greatest truths of the New Testament: "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness and all these things shall be added unto you." (Matthew 6: 33.)

The order of this verse is exceedingly important. Seeking the fulfillment of one's economic needs is not evil, but it must be secondary. When God is kept first, Jesus promises that man's economic needs will be met. Many historians have observed that at the root of the amazing economic development of western civilization have been deep-seated religious convictions about God, man and the universe, especially the conviction that man is a morally responsible individual accountable to God and who therefore should be free to make choices and suffer the consequences. Thus, the futility of trying to transplant western know-how to lands which have not accepted the western know-why. When such countries master western know-how without the religious worldview, which inspired it, those countries have invariably become a Frankenstein of political despotism. All forms of coercive socialism, which put materialistic, economic considerations first and spiritual considerations last, invite disaster.

Man's accountability to God in the use of his wealth obligates him to practise charity, which was the point of the story of Dives and Lazarus. The rich man in this story was punished, not because he was wealthy, but because he did not have compassion upon the beggar at his gate. Nevertheless, there is no suggestion in this story that Lazarus had any claim upon the rich man's wealth (Luke 16: 19-31).

Emil Brunner has stated it well in "Justice and the Social Order": "(Man) is obliged, not by justice, but by compassion to give to those who are in need out of what is entirely his property, but those in need have no right to it . . ."

The best-known example of Jesus' insistence upon charity is the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10: 25-37). A close examination of this story reveals that while it was given in answer to the lawyer's question—"Who is my neighbour?" it

answered an unasked question—"Who is it that acts neighbourly?" In "The Peril of Modernizing Jesus", Dr. Henry Joel Cadbury made the point that Jesus shifted the emphasis from the recipient to the doer of the deed, but Jesus actually went beyond that. Jesus emphasized the motivation of the doer of the deed. The spirit of compassion was more important to Jesus than the act of getting a wounded man taken care of on the Jericho road.

These distinctions are vital. Too frequently we have made the mistake of thinking that Christian ethics is concerned only with the objective deed, the consequences, rather than with the subjective motivation.

It used to be the fashion to complain that the church had ignored the social implications of the teachings of Jesus. The complainers then proceeded to demonstrate that Jesus' teachings implied socialism. Now that many people are taking a second look at those teachings, they are finding that they do imply a social message, but that message is one of individual responsibility, freedom and the right to private property.

With a cry of alarm, ecclesiastical experts now warn that we must never seek to identify the ethic of Jesus with any civilization. Indeed! Is it permissible to discover that Christianity produced the healthy and admirable values in our society?

If teachings of Jesus are not relevant to the problems of life in any age, then Christianity is indeed bankrupt. But Christianity is not bankrupt! It is socialism that is bankrupt for new ideas. The teachings of Jesus are still relevant and contain the truth that makes men free. Man is a spiritual being, not a materialistic mechanism. Man is responsible to God beyond all other authorities. As such, man has inalienable rights to life, liberty and property, which rights no government can give and no government take away. This is the true Social Gospel.

CANDOUR

The British-Views Letter

This hard-hitting, patriotic journal, edited by Mr. A. K. Chesterton, M.C., should be of interest to all genuine patriots desirous of defending their British heritage against evil international groups which are attacking the British nations both from within and from without.

Every issue contains brilliant commentaries and information concerning international politics, particularly as they affect the interests of the British nations.

Subscription rate (Australian), 30/-a year, post free, from New Times Ltd., Box 1266 L, G.P.O., Melbourne. Copies are also available at the New Times office for those who can call personally. Price, 9d. per issue.

Automation and Christian Objectives

From "Vers Demain," French-
Canada, November 15, 1955

"Automation is more and more talked of . . . Industrialists study its advantages. Sociologists are anxious about its effects on the only present source of income of the majority of wage earners.

"Automation is the introduction of automatic techniques into productive procedure. Not only the introduction of machines to work in the place of men but the introduction of automatic controls to guide the functioning of the machines without the aid of operators . . . The whole mechanical process is assured automatically with a precision, which surpasses anything one can expect from the most competent workmen.

"What kind of reception should be given to this second industrial revolution?

"If products are what are required from industry, automation will supply them, as well as or better than mechanical production which still calls for the co-operation of manpower. But if what is required is work, employment, clearly automation will not favour this, since by its mere definition it tends to eliminate the need for workers.

"Would it not be possible to gain from this elimination a liberation, an enrichment of the life of men, of all men?"

The writer then quotes in full the text of a letter written in answer to an editorial which appeared in "L'Action Catholique", as follows: —

" . . . Automation . . . is the result of the constant effort of man to perfect his means of production while freeing himself as much as possible from drudgery. This effort is praiseworthy, since it has as its end the greater well being of man, in which human beings, freeing themselves gradually from servitude, find their true direction towards full development. For this reason I am very much surprised to learn that certain men are anxious about automation. Ought one to fear what is a benefit to humanity? . . . In point of fact, they say, will not automation bring about large-scale unemployment? How is full-employment to be maintained? Employment is not an end but a means. If man has enough genius to discover methods, which free him from painful and often sub-human tasks, why refuse or fear this means?

"Daniel-Rops writes in one of his works (Tar dela notre nuit,' pages 62 and 63): 'The machine is in itself a liberating factor, since by its very existence it tends to lighten the yoke of "Thou shalt earn thy bread by the sweat of thy brow!" and later he says: 'By lifting from the living being the load of exhausting tasks, it opens up new space for the disinterested activity of the mind.' In other words, man, freed from drudgery by the advent of the machine, has the benefit of wider leisure, thanks to which he can more truly become

a man in the intellectual and moral sense. To my mind, therefore, to wish to maintain full-employment in spite of liberating machinery, is a crime.

"The problem to be solved is not then how to maintain full employment, but rather how to maintain the right to life" ('le droit a la vie'; 'la vie' incorporates life, a living, a livelihood), —"the right to a full life, even without 'employment', even for those workers who have become unemployed through technical progress." The letter-writer quoted by "Vers Demain" then refers to a previous article in "L'Action Catholique" in which the same writer had said that so long as the right to life (la vie) had not been dissociated from the right to work, the advent of more and more perfect industrial techniques would be translated into poverty and humiliation for the mass of workers who were displaced and replaced. "The right to life ought to be recognised in itself; it ought to be disconnected from the obligation of taking part in production." (Ultimately, work which is chosen under no economic necessity is that which is of true value; although saintly and heroic qualities may be developed in any circumstances, it is for us to point out that all which can free man to make his own choice — and especially that great choice which decides his whole way of life — is to be sought, if we have the courage to seek it, and not to be feared lest it should be misused.)

The letter continues: —"Daniel-Rops demands the institution of a minimum sum for living guaranteed to each individual. Social Crediters demand the institution of a regular dividend attached to the person and not to the job, which would allow primary needs to be satisfied. The two ideas are based on the same principle and have the same end in view . . . unemployment benefit smacks of 'charity' and makes a degraded being of the unemployed man . . .

"If it is admitted that it is in his leisure that man can best find himself, and best work towards his full development, and that it is in leisure that he becomes a truly free man, a person in the full sense of the word — then to be determined to see that the workman is a fully-employed person, in spite of the advent of liberating machinery, is to refuse him the opportunity of becoming in the highest sense, a man."

**Douglas Social Credit
Movement of Victoria
ROOM 8, THE BLOCK,
Elizabeth Street, Melbourne.**

**Books, Pamphlets, Periodicals on
Social Credit Available. Send for
List. Enquiries Invited.**

NEW LIBERAL M.H.R. EXPOSURE

(Continued from page 2)

view, but I propound it. So much of our struggle is a struggle for the minds of men. It is a battle of ideas, and the only possible armour against that is a superior idea, a superior way of life, and a superior mode of thinking.

Nor should the matter rest there. We must show those who want our liberties that we are not prepared to jeopardize the future by any reluctance to defend it. That requires of us that we strengthen ourselves, materially, militarily and economically.

There is the question of Soviet agents in this country. It would seem to me to be a tragedy of tolerance if we fail to expose them. These people have a malignant zeal for treason. They have but one purpose—to work from within this country, to weaken it and to assist in its destruction. That fact must be realized. The attainment of peace is a great enterprise. The easy and yet disastrous way for us to attain it would be for us to despise our responsibilities. The difficult and yet fruitful way for us to attain it would be to accept our responsibilities with a will and with high purpose, and, I trust, with a decent pride. What is our course to be? Is humanity to be blotted out because of an eclipse of faith on our part? Do we now reject the entire ethos of Christianity, abnegate its instructions and eschew its philosophy? Is the moral law to be cast aside as being too synthetic for our time and our problem? Is this century, with all its great victories, yet to be remembered as the one in which the whole conscience of mankind withered beyond response? Do we commit ourselves to the surrender of our ancient rights and liberties? To answer those questions affirmatively may well be the course of a people determined to repudiate their heritage. But is that our anxiety? Somehow or other, in the midst of this man-made maelstrom of human forces, I sense the past in communion with the future, challenging us, that no matter what our hopes and fears may be, our clear course and our plain duty is to reaffirm the faith of our fathers, to vindicate their trust, to uphold their honour and to maintain our own.

Earthworms

"Darwin on Humus and
the Earthworm"..... 17/7

A description of the original
investigation of the habits of
earthworms and the role they
play in soil building.

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.

"New Times," March 9, 1956. —Page 9.



DO CHEMICAL FERTILISERS INCREASE PRODUCTION?

By J. Rodale in "Organic Gardening and Farming"

It is hard to believe that chemical fertilizers do not give greater yields of crops. The idea is considered so basic, that it has become the equivalent of an axiom, as in mathematics, but actually it is as wrong as wrong can be.

Here is a typical bit of evidence. Dr. Wm. A. Albrecht who is chairman of the Department of Soils of the University of Missouri testified before the Delaney Congressional Committee investigating the subject of chemicals in foods, and the use of chemical fertilizers. It was on November 15, 1950. He said, "You will be interested in the fact that just last Friday the corn yield report of Kansas came out and the headline of the 'Capitol' paper of Topeka said that the acre yield of 1950 is the first to match what it was in 1889."

In a letter to me dated September 2, 1955. Dr. Albrecht said, "I remember distinctly that I was struck with the fact that we were bragging about our tremendous corn yields as the result of the introduction of the hybrids and that for the State of Kansas, with all its vagaries, the crop of 1950 had finally gotten an acre yield of the State up to what it had been in 1889 . . . It is a part of my thinking when we emphasise bushels and bulk and forget quality." What Dr. Albrecht means is that hybrid corn developed to produce bulk. It does not contain the vitamins and minerals of the old-fashioned natural, unhybridised corn varieties, and definitely contains less protein. And yet it took more than 60 years for it to begin to approach the production figures of the older more natural types of corn. I wonder, with the weakening effects of chemical fertilisers, what the corn yields would be today if we still grew the old-fashioned varieties. It no doubt would be the old story of the effect of chemicals on the "running out" of the variety. What will happen when the hybrids of today begin to run out?

In his letter to me Dr. Albrecht said, "We are finding some other interesting things about our trying to manage the biology of agriculture, which is still a perplexing matter when we have emphasised the technology and economics so thoroughly but have lost sight of what nature is doing in spite of us rather than because of us."

The agronomists are at their wits ends in an effort to maintain farm production and are constantly on the lookout for methods of producing more bulk, without any regard to the undermining of the nutritional quality of the food they are raising to maintain the health of the public whose stewards they are. And when a headline appears, like the one in the 'Topeka Daily Capitol', it is lost in the shuffle of things. The farmers are confused by it, the agronomists do not permit it to register with them.

Here is another item that is overlooked, but it is the truth just the same. In 1947 the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station at New Haven began a series of tests in the growing of tobacco to compare the use of the powder of natural granite rock as a fertiliser with the artificial muriate or sulphate of potash. The use of this granite rock powder is one aspect of the organic method. Our opponents claim that the potash in the straight rock form is so slow acting that it is not available to the current crop. We maintain otherwise. Therefore, it is extremely significant that the Connecticut tests in the growing of tobacco showed up favourable for our claims. The experiment was written up by the Connecticut Agricultural Station in a booklet entitled "Granite Stone Meal as a Source of Potash for Tobacco," Bulletin 536, April 1950. The work was done by T. R. Swanback. I am quoting herewith the summary in this booklet of the results of this experimental work:

"Granite stone meal used in the experiment carried a total potash content of at least eight percent. In addition, the material contained small amounts of trace elements.

"An application of two tons of stone meal per acre, combined with the usual amount of nitrogen and phosphoric acid, produced fully as good a yield and quality as a standard 6-3-6 formula.

"Better burn and lighter colour of ash were obtained with stone meal, yet somewhat lower potash was deposited in the leaf tissue.

(Continued on page 11.)

ORGANIC FARMING AND GARDENING BOOKS

Watch this list for the latest books.

"Ley Farming"..... 26/-

By Sir George Stapleton and William Davies. Describes the ley as a means of restoring humus and fertility to the soil, and the best and most economic way of producing grass.

"The English Complaint" . 12/6

by Franklin Bicknell, D.M., M.R.C.P. A well-known English authority on nutrition examines the causes of the decline of the British peoples. He points out how the goodness of food is destroyed by refining and the addition of chemicals.

"Compost for Garden Plot and 1,000-Acre Farm" 8/10

"Is Digging Necessary?" 1/5

By F. C. King. Describes how vegetables can be grown without digging, also describes method of compost making.

"The Compost Heap".. 1/8

By The Victorian Compost Society. A complete description of the making of compost, with illustrations.

"Simple Pruning" 13/7

By N. Catchpole. A very practical book which covers a wide range of plants.

Order now from
NEW TIMES LIMITED,

DO CHEMICAL FERTILISERS INCREASE PRODUCTION?

(Continued from page 10.)

"With stone meal as one of the sources of potash in a tobacco fertiliser, the crop value was increased nearly 5 percent. Burn was fully as good with stone meal as with standard sources of potash; and lighter coloured ash was produced, accompanied by fragrant odour of the smoke."

When it is considered that the potash rock is much cheaper than the chemical forms of potash and that it contains trace mineral elements, it will be seen what an advantage it will be to use the ground up rock rather than the chemical fertiliser form. One of the dangers of sulphate of potash which is a chemical fertiliser form, is the sulphur, which cannot be used to too great extent by the tobacco plant, and keeps on piling up in the soil from year to year.

The main point is that in using only a part of the organic method, the yield was maintained. But if the other two chemicals had not been used and if instead, compost plus phosphate rock powder would have been applied to the soil, the results would have been much better for our side. But at any rate the idea that a chemical fertiliser superior as far as yield is considered gets a good kick in the shins in this piece of Connecticut research.

May I quote the testimony of Mr. Leonard Wickenden, an industrial chemist, and a prolific writer on the organic method, which he gave before the "Delaney Congressional Committee to Investigate the Use of Chemicals in Food Products," on January 10, 1952. He said:

"A statement that has been made repeatedly to your Committee is that chemical fertilisers give increased yields. For instance, Dr. Bear has told you that 'by their use acre yields can often be doubled and trebled,' Dr. Bradfield has reported to you that 'it has been conservatively estimated that our supply of food and fibre during the war period was increased between 20 and 25% by the use of chemical fertilisers.' Every year, the U.S. Department of Agriculture publishes a volume of Agricultural Statistics. There is, therefore, no need for estimates, conservative or otherwise. The figures are there for everyone to see. One can study them in vain to find a basis, either for Dr. Bear's tripling of yields or for Dr. Bradfield's 'conservative' estimate of 20 to 25% increase in production, by the use of chemical fertilisers.

"I propose to examine some of these figures, but before doing so I would like to discuss some of the many factors which determine the size of a crop and the yields per acre. First of all, there is the weather. Of all factors, weather is the most influential. A farmer can have seed of highest quality, fertile soil, years of experience, skilled help and up-to-date equipment, but, if the weather is against him, he is beaten.

"In the 1930's, we had a succession of bad seasons with floods, droughts, late wet springs, early fall frosts—every kind of bad farming weather. It was probably the worst succession of growing seasons in the history of American agriculture. Production slumped, yields dropped. In the 1940's, the pendulum swung the other way and year after year we had good growing weather. 'Farm Journal,' in its June 1950, issue, referred to this period as 'the string of good-weather years that extended straight through the war and four years more.' To compare production in the 1940's with that in the 1930's, leaving weather out of the picture, would plainly be meaningless and misleading. To learn what effect the great increase in the use of chemical fertilisers has had, we must find a period of similar weather conditions when fertilisers were used in relatively small quantities.

"Because of the exceptional conditions in the 1940's, this has not been easy, but after going over the records in the office of the U.S. Weather Bureau at the top of the Whitehall Building in New York City, I found that the six years 1920-25 compared reasonably well with 1940-45, although the later period still had the advantage because the year 1924 was an exceptionally bad one and pulled down the figures for the whole period.

"Taking our largest cereal crop, corn, I found that production in the six years 1920-25 was 16,603,000,000 bushels. In the year 1940 to 1945, production was 17,407,000,000 bushels, an increase of less than 5%. Between these two periods, our population had risen from about 110 million to about 140 million, so our production per head of the population, for the six-year period, had dropped from 150 bushels to 124 bushels.

"Such figures certainly do not bear out the claims for chemical fertilisers quoted above. To be fair, however, we should also consider the yields per acre as well as the total production. When we do so, we make a rather surprising discovery. Although the population between the two periods increased over 25%, the acreage of corn dropped approximately 11%. Based on this figure, the yield of corn per acre rose 17½%. Perhaps it is here that we find the use of chemical fertilisers justified. Let us see. 11,000,000 had gone out of production. It is certain that these abandoned acres were not the most fertile. Because labour was scarce and expensive, it did not pay the farmer to use his submarginal land. This elimination of the acres giving lower yields would, of course, bring about an arithmetical rise in the average yield.

"Also, between 1920 and 1940 much happened in agriculture. The Department of Agriculture and the Soil Conservation Service had worked ceaselessly at improving farm practices by initiating contour plowing, strip cropping, irrigation, better drainage and so forth. But, most important of all, during this period hybrid corn had been developed. Today, over 90% of all corn acreage is planted with hybrids. Richard Crabb, in his book 'The Hybrid Corn Makers,' claims for the new corn an in-

creased yield per acre of 36%; Q. F. Callender of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, puts the figure at 21%; Dr. Wheeler McMillen, editor of 'Farm Journal,' puts it at 30%. Yet with improved farm practices, and the abandonment of submarginal lands to help hybrid corn, the increase in yields reached a figure of only 17½%. In face of such facts as these, how can anyone claim that, over the years and taking the country as a whole, chemical fertilisers have increased yields by as much as a bushel?

"I do not wish to weary your Committee by quoting detailed figures on other crops. Let me merely say that with oats the situation is rather worse than with corn while with wheat it is rather better. But from any one of them or from all of them put together it is impossible to obtain any justification for the high claims made for chemical fertilisers.

"As for truck farming, the situation is dismal indeed. In the growing of vegetables, especially in the Eastern States, chemical fertilisers have been freely used for many years, yet the yields per acre for beans, cantaloupe, cucumber, spinach and tomatoes have, in the last thirty years, dropped by amounts ranging from 15% for tomatoes to 40% for spinach.

(Continued on page 12.)

WHAT IS WRONG WITH AUSTRALIA?

This book by a former Victorian Premier provides a wealth of factual material concerning the Communist conspiracy in Australia. It is also a frightening history of the Communist domination of the Australian Trade Unions and the influence of the Communists in the Australian Labor Party. An excellent reference work for anti-Communist workers.

Available from New Times Ltd., Box 1226L., G.P.O., Melbourne. Price 22/7, post free.

FROM ADMIRAL TO CABIN BOY By Admiral Sir Barry Domville 14/6

This book may be described as a biographical history of international affairs from the end of World War I to 1943. Admiral Domville has an excellent knowledge of the part played in world affairs by the Jews; this knowledge caused him to be imprisoned for three years.

"New Times," March 9, 1956. —Page 11.

DO CHEMICAL FERTILISERS INCREASE PRODUCTION?

(Continued from page 11)

"On experimental plots and for a single year spectacular increases can sometimes be obtained; but on a large scale and over long periods of time the story is very different. The key to high production and high yields still remains what it has been through the centuries—organic matter supplemented with such rock mineral as may be required. That statement is well borne out by experiments made at the University of Illinois and reported by Dr. A. L. Lang in an article published in 'Better Crops with Plant Food' in November 1945. Dr. Lang gave figures showing yields obtained in seven experimental fields, which were fertilised only with manure, limestone and rock phosphate over a 4-year period, 1940-43. The average yield was 104 bushels per acre compared with the average for the whole United States of 32 bushels per acre. The crop was corn.

"My final point I introduce with reluctance. I do so only because I believe it goes to the very heart of the matter your Committee is investigating.

"I have, upon my desk, an advertisement published by the National Fertiliser Association. I think it is fair to call it a typical advertisement. It contains much truth, as all advertisements must if they are to carry conviction. It contains many half-truths and some, which barely reach the halfway mark. From beginning to end it is extremely biased—again, a necessary characteristic of advertising matter. Its by-line reveals that it was written by a distinguished professor on the staff of one of our more important agricultural colleges. On the front page is an excellent portrait of the author with a caption setting forth

some of his achievements and the positions he has held.

"Everybody knows that such things are done and nobody seems to care. But what should we think of a distinguished physician, perhaps the head of one of our famous hospitals, if he wrote an advertisement for a proprietary medicine and not only allowed his name to appear but permitted his portrait to be printed on the front page? How long would he retain his professional standing? How long would he remain a member of the American Medical Association?

"If it is undignified and unethical for a distinguished physician to write advertisements for one commercial product, why is it not equally undignified and unethical for a distinguished agronomist to do the same thing for another commercial product? If some of the professors in our agricultural colleges are employees of the National Fertiliser Association or of any of its members, can we be quite confident that their teaching is entirely unbiased? If some of the members of the staffs of our state experiment stations are receiving compensation in any form from the same source, can we be fully satisfied that all their research work is wholly in the interests of the farmers and to no slightest degree in of manufacturers of fertilisers, poison sprays or other materials or equipment used in agriculture?

"Upon your shoulders, gentlemen, rests a share of the heavy burden of making our country's laws. I respectfully suggest to you that legislation should be introduced making it illegal for any person who receives compensation, in any form, from a source connected with the manufacture or sale of material or equipment used in agriculture, to hold, at the same time, any position on the staff of an agricultural college or of a state experiment station."

Childbirth Without Fear

By Dr. Grantly Dick Read, M.A., M.D. (Cantab.).

This book, by an eminent medical authority, explains the principles and practice of Natural Childbirth.

Every woman who is expecting a baby, and, in fact, all potential mothers, will find this book of the highest importance to them both as a practical manual of preparation and as a source of reassurance and hope.

The author is the best known exponent of the theory of natural childbirth, and his methods have earned the widest and most authoritative support in the medical and nursing profession, as well as the confidence and gratitude of many mothers, since he first began to practise and write on the subject over 20 years ago.

D.S.C.M. WOMEN'S GROUP

(VIC.)

Now Meets on

THE THIRD TUESDAY

of Every Month

All interested are invited.

SPOTLIGHT ON RED SPY RINGS

This is a very excellent booklet on Communist espionage activities in all parts of the world. Ties the recent Petrov disclosures to similar happenings in other parts of the world, including the Canadian Spy Trials, Klaus Fuchs and the Atom spies, the Alger Hiss case and Sorge, the Communist spy who was executed by the

Comprehensive and revealing.

Price 1/3 posted.

SUBSCRIPTION FORM

To THE MANAGER, NEW TIMES LTD., Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne.

Please enrol me as a subscriber to "The New Times" from issue of.

Quarter for Half-Year Year

NAME.....

ADDRESS.....

Cheque

I enclose Money Order to the value of.....

Postal Note

SUBSCRIPTION RATES are: 40/- Yearly; 20/- Half-Yearly; 10/- Quarterly, Post Free.

USE ENWITE speciality

TEXTIT waterproofing compound.

SOLVIT paint remover. No difficult neutralization.

AQUALAC wood putty. For good class cabinet work.

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: JA 5967