

THE NEW TIMES

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

"Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free"

Vol. 24, No. 23

5th DECEMBER 1958

EDITORIAL

ELECTION COMMENT

Although Mr. Menzies and some of his supporters have been claiming that the Federal Elections resulted in a strong vote of confidence in the policies of the Menzies-Fadden Government, no objective and non-partisan political observer accepts this claim. Prior to the last week of the elections, every well-tryed method of assessing public opinion, including the Gallup Poll surveys, indicated that there was little enthusiasm for the Government. Many Government Members were openly apprehensive of the election results during the last week.

Why then did the Government poll much better than even its most optimistic supporters thought possible? And the short answer is that the electors chose what they eventually considered to be the lesser of two evils. Perhaps the most heartening feature of the elections was the fact that in spite of tempting increases in social service payments promised by the Labor Party payments, which even the Sydney *Financial Review* pointed out were practical — sufficient electors rejected these because they felt that they were jeopardising their futures by supporting Dr. Evatt. It is now certain that, short of a major economic disaster, Dr. Evatt can never lead the Labor Party to electoral victory. The electorate distrusts him, and rightly so, because of his weak attitude towards Communism both at home and abroad. But this does not mean positive support for the Liberals, a fact which the Government will learn if it interprets its victory as a mandate to impose the severe restrictive financial policies it has applied in the past.

While the votes cast for the Democratic Labor Party and the Queensland Labor Party undoubtedly did help the Government in some electorates, perhaps the major contribution of these parties towards a Government victory was their sustained campaign, which kept the pro-Communist policies of the A.L.P. vividly before the electors. Their campaign was assisted just prior to the elections by the judgment in the Hursey case in Hobart and the glaring example of the Unity Ticket in the Victorian Tramways Union elections, which resulted in the Communist O'Shea being swept back to office as secretary for another term.

One of the most deplorable features of the elections was the manner in which the Church of Rome was involved. Subsequent developments have unfortunately played in to the hands

of those who foster and exploit sectarianism while at the same time obscuring the true role of the Christian Church concerning politics. These developments have also brought into the open what well-informed observers have known for a long time: that there is a wide cleavage of viewpoint between the Bishops of the Church of Rome on how best to deal with Communism.

As we have often stressed, the true role of the Christian Church concerning politics is to exercise Authority from the moral viewpoint in order that Power may be restrained and subjected to the Moral Law. The demand that the Church should "confine itself to spiritual matters" and ignore politics is a demand that politics be subjected to no moral restraints whatever. Not only must the Christian Church condemn Communism; it must condemn every policy, irrespective of which party proposing it, which restricts the rights and liberties of the individuals. It is clear that the Bishops of the Church of Rome are confused on this question, a fact which must give the Communists considerable pleasure. While it was proper for Archbishop Mannix to reply to the outrageous A.L.P. advertisement which asked Roman Catholics to "examine their consciences," we must point out that His Grace and his advisers have themselves made a number of bad mistakes which helped lead to the spectacle of prominent D.L.P. spokesmen criticising the Roman Hierarchy in Sydney for the poor electoral support for the D.L.P. in N.S.W. While it may be argued that Archbishop Mannix has every right as a citizen to indicate openly his support for one particular political party, the D.L.P., a most dangerous situation arises when the Church is aligned in any way with a political party. And that fact is that the sectarian-mongers have been quick to point out that there

(Continued on page 4)

NEWS SECTION

Senate Reform: The Federal Election has resulted in a number of press comments on the purpose and function of the Senate. Mr. Menzies claims to be a strong supporter of British constitutionalism, but like all politicians his tendency is to seek power. Mr. Menzies is pleased that his Government now has a majority in the Senate, thus ensuring that there is no check on his powers. If the Senate is to be merely the rubber stamp for the House of Representatives, then why retain the Senate?

The original idea of the Senate was that it should be a States' House of Review. But regimented party politicians have undermined this idea. And if the recommendations of the Constitutional Review Committee are adopted, the value of the Senate will be completely destroyed. If there is to be a genuine House of Review, helping to restrict the powers of the House of Representatives and to represent the States as sovereign entities in a genuine Federal system, the election of the Senate must be different from that of the House of Representatives.

Once the underlying principles of British constitutionalism are understood and accepted, it is relatively easy to make proposals to make these principles effective. Social Credit is concerned with constitutionalism because it is concerned with the subject of power. Next year could provide Australian Social Crediters with an opportunity to make a big contribution to an understanding of this matter when the Constitutional Review Committee's recommendations are discussed. If, as appears possible, the political leaders of all Federal political parties attempt to have these recommendations supported at a Referendum, Social Crediters will provide the spearhead of the opposition to any further centralisation of power. They can not only win the battle against the power-lusters; they can at the same time advance an understanding of the principles of true Christian constitutionalism, the basis of which is that power must be divided and each individual personally responsible for the power he exercises.

Communist Policy Advocated By D.L.P.: One of the most frightening aspects of the Communist question is the manner in which a large number of sincere anti-Communists in all political parties advocate Communist economic policies. We have in the past drawn attention to the pro-Communist economic policies of the Democratic Labor Party, a Party that claims that it is fighting Communism tooth and nail.

For those who may think that we are too harsh in our criticism, we draw attention to the

editorial in *News-Weekly*, Melbourne, of November 26. *News-Weekly* appears to be the unofficial journal of the D.L.P. The editorial draws attention to a recent press article by Sir Douglas Copland in which this economic "expert" complains that no Western democracy will "voluntarily" save 30 percent of the national income and invest it in "essential services."

News-Weekly comments: "The post-war record of the Australian democracy provides incontestable proof for Sir Douglas Copland's case. Governments have not been willing to adopt the legislative and fiscal measures necessary to establish proper basic priorities and to ensure that savings would be used to finance a sufficiency of fundamental investment." Along with Sir Douglas Copland and other totalitarians, the writer of the *News-Weekly* editorial supports the Communist policy of the Government determining how productive capacity shall be used instead of individual consumers. He complains that people are buying hire-purchase goods in preference to the "proper basic priorities" which he with his superior knowledge feels the people should be supporting.

All capital expansion, both private and public, lowers both the immediate and potential standard of living. There is at present adequate capital equipment in Australia to provide every individual with a sufficiency of food, clothing, shelter and other requirements for civilised living. The suggestion that the production of television sets, irrespective of what one thinks of television, prevents people from being housed, is contrary to economic fact.

In a genuine economic democracy the rate of investment in capital expansion would be directly controlled by the individual through control of his own financial credit. Both Sir Douglas Copland and *News-Weekly* are opposed to this genuine democracy. If the individual cannot control how his real credit — productive capacity — is going to be used, he is moving towards complete serfdom.

More American Support For Indonesia: While the Western world is being fooled by the continued references to America as the greatest barrier to the expansion of Communism, the policy makers in the U.S.A., who are using the American people as pawns to further their objectives, continue to give material aid and support to pro-Communist Governments. American policy makers were primarily responsible for the defeat of the Dutch in Indonesia, which paved the way for a Government, which has come increasingly under Communist influence.

The Communists are strongly backing Dr. Sukarno's claim to Dutch New Guinea. The refusal of the Dutch to submit to the Indonesian Government resulted in the widespread attack upon Dutch commercial organisations remaining in Indonesia. And now comes the news that, following a pattern familiar to students of international affairs, the policy-makers in the U.S.A. are offering Indonesia an expansion of military and economic aid. A Washington report states: "The decision to increase aid is seen in diplomatic circles in Washington as evidence of improved Indonesian-United States relations and of Washington's growing confidence in the restoration of Indonesian stability and order."

This is another way of saying that now that the Dutch influence in Indonesia has been practically broken, the way is clear for the further expansion of the Dollar Empire. An early announcement of an export-import bank loan is expected. The promoters of the Dollar Empire again make it clear that they have no hesitation in supporting Lenin's famous tactic concerning the necessity of obtaining "independence" for the colonies of the Western Powers as a necessary preliminary to furthering Communism.

Inflation To Increase During 1959: In our editorial in our issue of July 18, we stated, "All available evidence indicates that 1959 will be a year in which the rate of price rises will increase." We gave our reasons for this view. It is now confirmed by American financial writers, who stress that while increased credit expansion, mainly for increased Government activities, is ending unemployment and recession conditions, it is also paving the way for increased inflation next year. Even during the worst of the last recession the price level in America continued to increase. These increases must become greater as the rate of credit expansion increases.

The increase in the American Federal debt has now reached the stage where the interest charge of 7.7 billion dollars estimated for 1959 is approximately the same as the whole Budget of Government before the war. Inflation is inevitable while credit expansion merely results in further costs, which must be charged into total prices and paid by the consumer in one way or another. Inflation is a reflection of economic exploitation and is one of the greatest secret weapons being used by the Communists in every Western country to further class warfare.

D. J. KILLEN RE-ELECTED

The re-election of the young Liberal Member for Moreton, Queensland, Mr. D. J. Killen, at the Federal Elections must be regarded as a personal victory. Mr. Killen won his seat with a very small majority at the previous elections. Since then approximately 6,000 new electors have moved into the electorate. Many of these are in housing commission areas. The Labor Party was naturally confident that they could win the seat. The Communists also had very good reason to desire Mr. Killen's defeat and they stood the Jewish solicitor M. Julius, who polled over 1000 votes.

Mr. Killen not only won the contest comfortably; a preliminary investigation of the voting indicates that he obtained a strong personal vote. The vote for Government Senate team in Moreton was substantially less than the vote obtained by Mr. Killen. We confidently expect that Mr. Killen's standing and influence will be substantially greater in the new Parliament.

MAJORITY RULE

Now that the Federal Elections are over, it is appropriate to recall the following comment on majority rule, made by C. H. Douglas in September 1951:

"One of the most vicious fallacies of the period is that numerical majorities have rights, simply because they are majorities. It originally had validity in the pragmatic fact that a sufficiently large majority could militarily overwhelm a minority.

"The opinions of the majority were never more unreliable and unrelated to reality than they are at present when they are misled by the Press and the 'B.' B. C. and have no appreciable military power.

"Only...*individuals* have rights, and these are being systematically infringed by the manipulation of majorities, real and bogus."

PRE-CHRISTMAS HOUSE PARTY TOMORROW NIGHT

Melbourne and near-Melbourne supporters are reminded that they and any friends they like to bring will be welcome at the pre-Christmas House Party tomorrow night, Saturday, December 6. This is the last social event of the year and will be held at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Eric Butler, Alma Road, Panton Hill.

ELECTION COMMENT

(Continued from page 1)

has been a degree of alignment between the Church of Rome in Victoria and the D.L.P. For example, *News-Weekly*, which openly supports the D.L.P., has been sold at churches, while *The Catholic Worker*, which opposes the D.L.P., has been virtually banned. As we are critical of many of the policies of both journals, our comment is entirely objective and designed to demonstrate our view that the Church must remain aloof from party politics if it is to be effective in influencing how power is used.

Archbishop Mannix, like Mr. Santamaria, has said some very fine things on many issues. But both have made some bad political blunders. During the 1944 Powers Referendum, pioneered by Dr. Evatt and enthusiastically supported by the Communists, Archbishop Mannix openly supported Dr. Evatt. Needless to say this did not make His Grace a Communist. But he was certainly supporting a Communist policy, just as many Roman Catholic members of the A.L.P. are supporting Communist policies. *News-Weekly* today is very critical of the socialisation objective of the A.L.P. But it is only a few years ago that the same journal was arguing that there was nothing wrong with the socialisation objective of the A.L.P. Some of the D.L.P. candidates criticising the A.L.P. socialisation objective are the same men who when candidates for the A.L.P., signed the famous pledge concerning the very same socialisation objective.

In the very nature of things, party politics are concerned with the obtaining of power. And irrespective of the party, the effort to obtain power inevitably produces a tendency to compromise with the truth and with principles. The Church must keep strictly clear of all party political activities and pronounce clearly on specific policies. Its true role is to restrain power, and if the controversy created by the elections results in a start being made towards the Church adopting its true role, then Mr. Menzies will find it much more difficult to attempt to do as he likes because he likes to believe he has received a mandate from the electors. But there is obviously much to be done before the Christian Church takes correct action.

There is one final point we would make: With an ineffective opposition in the next Parliament, we must look to certain of the Government back benchers to provide some check upon the will-to-power of the Executive. Ways and means should be devised of establishing a closer liaison with those Members who, given evidence of support,

may be prepared to resist on certain issues. We ask all readers to give this matter their earnest thought. Further comment on this will be made early next year. Politics is the art of the possible. Our task and the task of our supporters are to persistently endeavour, by experiment, to discover just what is possible within the present political framework. We are confident that much more is possible than is generally realised.

COMMUNISM AND DESEGREGATION

Washingtonians journeying to the South in recent weeks note the increasing tendency there to identify three issues of pressing importance to Dixie - - communism, desegregation and the Supreme Court. These issues, most Southerners feel, are basically one, and they trace the sudden inflammation of race antagonisms in recent years to the efforts of Reds to divide the United States internally at a time of international peril.

This sentiment is not confined to the South. Many responsible Northern commentators are moving to the same conclusion, particularly in view of the fact - - pointed out by Dr. J. B. Matthews in testimony before a Florida legislative committee that "Communist leaders have asserted that 'Negro liberation' is their Number One issue on the domestic front." Matthews, one of the country's top experts on Red subversion, declared, "the Communists are at work, with their customary fanatical dedication, in stirring up trouble in the field of public school integration in the South."

As further background on Red agitation and racial strife, Matthews gave a list of the number of Communist-front affiliations for all officials of the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People who had 15 or more such associations. The grand total, for 46 officers: 1789 affiliations. Democratic Congressman, E. C. Gathings of Arkansas inserted similar information in the *Congressional Record* for February 23, 1956. His listings for NAACP leaders, culled from the files of the House Un-American Activities Committee, stretched from page 2805 to page 2846 - - 41 pages in all. (See *Human Events* for September 28, 1957.)

—*Human Events*, Sept. 29, 1958.

[Those requiring more information should obtain the booklet, *Communism And The Race Question*.]

Election comment in this issue is authorised by Eric D. Butler, Alma Road, Panton Hill.

THE NEW TIMES

ARTICLE SECTION.

CHRISTIANITY AND WORLD GOVERNMENT

The notes of an address given this year to an English District Clergy and Ministers' Association by the Reverend H. S. Swabey.

Before the coming of Jesus Christ, the world had seen a number of great powers that claimed absolute control over their subjects — we read of a string of them in the Old Testament and of the Syrian regime in the book of Maccabees.

It is true that in Greece and Rome modifications had been attempted. The philosophers Plato and Aristotle opposed tyranny and tried to modify it through a kind of constitutional theory or mixed government. Athens had her divisions of power, but was always relapsing into a tyranny, and was surrounded by tyrants. Both writers saw clearly enough that power was dangerous and degrading — and Plato pictures the tattered souls of rulers as they entered the next world. But Plato had little effect on Demetrius of Syracuse, and Aristotle did not for long guide Alexander.

In Rome, the Republic persisted for centuries, with its consuls, senate and assembly and tribunes, but this empire too fell under despotism and declined into an overtaxed bureaucracy. When Cicero protested, there was no place to which he could escape, for all was Rome. He had written of duty and even of the bond of charity, he had helped to save the Republic from the murderous Cataline, but in the end he was caught in his litter and coolly offered his throat to the knife.

But Our Lord gave us a principle, a canon of right conduct among many, when he was challenged - "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, unto God the things that are God's." He refused power, from the times of temptation in the wilderness, to the day when He pointed out that if He had been a temporal ruler, His servants would fight. He told them to put up the sword. Yet He claimed the authority of the truth: He spoke as one having authority. And from that day to this, Christian countries have known the distinction between temporal power and spiritual authority. This distinction was embodied roughly in the two spheres of Emperor and Pope, never quite satisfactory and often overlapping. But Church and state have persisted, the power and the guide, the truth and the sanction, each respecting the other. "Fear God, honour the King", is another expression of the right order.

Hence Christian countries have respected liberty, recognising that man has a soul and

conscience which cannot lawfully be violated, and that mere power is apt to corrupt and to monopolise and to trespass into the spiritual sphere. For ultimately we are responsible to God, our Judge, and society exists for man, not man for society. The truth shall make us free, and we shall enjoy life more abundant.

This respect for ordered liberty has been made concrete in at least two directions. First, as St. Thomas Aquinas pointed out to Frederick II of Sicily, Christianity favours constitutional government with the separation of powers. Kings, Lords, commons; president, senate and House of Representatives; independent legislature, executive and judiciary. Secondly, the Common Law of England arose in the light of Christianity, and fostered by Christian men. The author of *Glanvil* was Bishop of Winchester, and Braeton was Archdeacon of Barnstaple. Coke was a practising Christian, as earlier was Sir Thomas More. Magna Carta was signed by numerous Churchmen, with its strict condemnation of monopolies. This charter was called the charter of liberties - concrete rights that could not be violated. "The common law hath admeasured the prerogative. Monopoly infringes the liberties of the subject," said Coke. Blackstone described the ideal balance between King, Lords and Commons.

I have stated these principles as a background that guarantees to the individual his integrity, his place and his dignity — unless violated. I fear they have been violated. Is World Government going to set things straight? We approach the problem as Christians. We have seen H. H. Lippincott's contribution to *Christianity Today* (February, 1958), and I will recall his chief points.

As he says, people are frightened. We recall P.E.P. saying, that only in war or under threat of war would the British accept large-scale planning. Democracies crumble within, and dictatorships have taken over — "sick democracies troop to strange doctors" - - "the dangerous man is always waiting to exploit tensions." So democracy must not soften up and lose its "wondrous strength," for power over other people is "loaded dynamite."

He notes that spiritual ambassadors dream of a paradise organised on military lines and notes also how impossible a world mob would be to

handle. He refers to Burkhardt. I have just read his "Force and Freedom," and his reiteration that power is of its nature evil. But Commander Lippincott refers to the "rule of the masses." A super-government is not the answer, he says; power is not the way to the Kingdom. He recalls the saying of Periles, "In crisis hours peace must be sacrificed for freedom *but never freedom for peace*!" and calls for responsibility to keep freedom, not abdication. Yet he sees clergy crusading for "top-boss rule," for "a monolithic state," and warns of a Hegelian theology of the superstate, a world Napoleon. "Power turns those endowed with it into tyrants."

The Commander concludes with the solemn warning, "Think or Perish!" Christianity would be swamped under a World Government, which would represent two billion non-Christians. The persecutions under Roman times might indeed appear mild, or at least Christianity would sink into insignificance. He lists 800,000,000 communists, 700,000,000 Moslems and almost a billion Indians and Chinese and other kindred Asiatics. He calls World Government a bid to make communists and their allies the governors of the world. Every civilised value would be obliterated.

There would indeed be an end of any government representing us and a complete enthronement of the servile state. Gone would be the whole apparatus of the check and balance of power, of constitutional government, of the separation of powers, of the law, let alone the moral law, of trial by jury, family life and any sort of freedom that remains to us now. We should have abdicated our Christian and civilised responsibilities.

Commander Lippincott's words receive support from J. Howard Pew, a member of the Presbyterian Church in U.S.A. *The Intelligence Survey* of February 1958, under the title, "We must not appeal from God to Caesar," introduces extracts from an outstanding address by Mr. Pew by saying "Many well-meaning Christians are today unconsciously helping the growth of Socialism by seeking to reform society by the power of the State instead of having faith in the fundamental message of Christ." Mr. Pew points out that the Founding Fathers of America were students of history and knew that every government throughout recorded history had eventually fallen into the absolute control of unprincipled men, who enslaved the people, confiscated their property, and threw the objectors into gaol. They knew, too, that many of the great minds throughout the world had for thousands of years been pointing out that Divine Law, Moral Law, commonly called Natural Law *must*

be basic to all man-made laws, if dictators were to be prevented from destroying the freedom of people, for man is endowed by God with certain inalienable rights.

He says that the need of all Christians today is that of speaking out against Marxian socialism with one great voice.

He tells of a man and his wife who fell into a quarrel and afterwards went out and sat silently on the porch. When a magnificent team of horses pulling a wagon loaded down with stone came slowly up the hill and passed in front of the porch, the wife turned and said, "Wouldn't it be wonderful if we could pull together like that?" Her husband reflected, "Well, we could—if *we had only one tongue between us.*"

"One tongue against evil and the loss of our Constitutional liberties under God in this Republic of magnificent heritages, is what we Christians now need . . . The issue is freedom, just as it was 180 years ago . . . William Penn truly said: 'Man will either be governed by God or ruled by tyrants'."

Mr. Pew went on to say that the wearers of the cloth had long realised that religious freedom is of paramount importance if their country is to remain great, but "*far too few realise that religious freedom cannot exist in a collectivist state*, because freedom is indivisible. Thus, if we should lose our industrial freedom, then religious freedom, political freedom, and all other freedoms will certainly fall." Referring to the phenomenal material progress of his country during the last hundred years, Mr. Pew said this was accomplished by freedom of initiative. He reminded his hearers that the danger of people losing their interest in freedom is not a new one

- Lincoln was deeply concerned over it. In 1864 he said, "The world has never had a good definition of the word liberty . . . With some the word liberty may mean for each man to do as he pleases with himself, and the product of his labour; while with others the word may mean *for some men to do as they please with other men*, and the product of other men's labour."

"Real liberty," said Mr. Pew, "is the freedom of the individual to exercise his talents, his initiative, his ingenuity and his resourcefulness—it is freedom to be an individual. Bogus liberty is to have the security of a government bird cage."

He continued, "In 1790, John Philpot Curran, the great Irish patriot, in a speech to his constituency said: "The condition upon which God hath given liberty to man is eternal vigilance; which condition if he break, servitude is at once the consequence of his crime and the punishment of his guilt.' . . . It was Christ, who taught us,

saying: 'If ye continue in my word, . . . ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.'

"Your failure to fight for the preservation of liberty is a crime, and the punishment for the crime is servitude," Mr. Pew concludes.

At this point we should examine something of what World Government advocates have to say, and where better than in the House of Lords, where a debate on World Government took place on May 14, from 2.47-6.43 p.m.

Lord Beveridge asked the Government just what they meant by "world government" or a "World Authority" and invited them to descend from hot air to brass tacks. He said that many things—in his view most things—should be left to separate national Governments. All peoples desired both peace and their own way of life. How could they make certain of peace? He disagreed with the Prime Minister when he said (and this was also implicit in the Report on Defence) that our armed power was a contribution to peace because it maintained the balance of power—he found this open to serious question. He appealed to the Government to set down in black and white a design for a world authority strong enough to stop war with certainty while leaving freedom to every nation to live in its own way. Saying that the book *World Peace Through World Law* startled by recalling the statement made by Eisenhower in 1956, "There can be no peace without law," he said; that *law involves a judge to declare justice when people or nations disagree and police to enforce the decision of the judge.* (Our emphasis—Ed.)

The Marquess of Salisbury thought that agreement would be easier to get from a few large blocs—yet felt that a clear statement of policy was necessary from the United States if the Western bloc was to win the cold war, about which he was deeply apprehensive.

Lord Boyd-Orr stated, "There is need for a central World Authority to get nations to cooperate in adjusting human society to the great changes which modern science has brought about." (Is this a police job?) "The great advance in technology . . . has enabled us to produce real wealth in such over-abundance that the economic system tends to break down because it cannot get that wealth dispersed." It may be noted that he was here equating the "economic system" with "distribution." The purpose of production is surely consumption? Yet Lord Boyd-Orr mentioned the "Peace Scare" announced in an American financial journal at the time when it appeared that the Korean war was to end and peace was to be made—"not hope, but scare—because that meant . . . unemployment would result." Among the conditions which he

considered need to be adjusted he included, "We must increase world markets to carry the new wealth which is being created and prevent unemployment." The struggle for world markets is surely accepted as being one of the causes of war, and other methods of distribution are possible than continuous "employment." Surely the purpose of man is not employment, but something higher. A national dividend, to be distributed in accordance only with the availability of real wealth, would be a step to freeing man to rise from material preoccupations to a higher level.

Lord Brand in a shorter speech noted that Lord Beveridge had said that the World Government would have to be strong enough to abolish war the implications of these words should be understood. "The World Government would have to tax all the individuals in the world to get the necessary revenues to create large military forces, in order to be able to coerce any recalcitrant members out of the one hundred or so nations." "Perhaps it is worth asking whether such a Government would be a democratic or an autocratic Government. Would it be a democratic Government? And can we imagine, with ease, a world general election taking place at the same time in every country on certain world issues?" . . . "At the present moment the only possibility of a World Government would be a Government created by force . . . to create a World Government would be more difficult and perhaps even more dangerous than to pursue, by all means, all possible disarmament and better political and social relations between the great nations." . . . "I am all in favour of every means of reconciling social, political and religious opinions in the world, but I believe that at the moment it is a mirage to suppose that this can be done through a World Government."

Lord Russell regarded World Government as "the only way of survival for our species" . . . to get it fully established would be by no means a short or easy task, for he admitted "it means placing a monopoly of all the serious weapons of war in the hands of that World Government."

Lord Milverton, agreeing with Lord Brand, asked, "Supposing that there was a World Government—and the only World Government one can visualise is that one nation should conquer the world—what would that mean? However high might be the principles actuating those who held that authority, it would mean breeding a race of world slaves; it would mean, inevitably, the suppression of liberty." "The aspiring spirit of man always aspires, first of all, to control his fellow men, and I suggest that it is this itch to control one's fellow men which is at the back even of this high-souled Motion that we are discussing today . . . moral and cultural militancy

is at the back of most of these suggestions for world government."

Lord Chorley used the need for conserving the world's natural resources as a plea for World Government. They could be conserved and made use of in the most rational and scientific way "only by first of all planning the whole problem out and then having a supra-national authority to enforce the decisions of the planning authority."

— More work for the police! The emphasis on industrialism, the "creation of markets" and the forcing of exports, certainly drain the resources!

Lord Birdwood, approving the "great work" *World Peace Through World Law* (by the Americans Grenville Clark and Louis Sohn) spoke of an agreement on United Nations reform being a pre-requisite. Prominent among the reforms suggested in this book, he said, was the abolition of the Security Council and its replacement by an Executive Council of seventeen members to be elected by a reformed Assembly. These seventeen "would be responsible for international and total disarmament, to be achieved over twelve years, and . . . in the meantime there would have been set up this International Police Force of some 500,000."

Lord Silkin declared: "What those of us who believe in world government want to do is to put teeth into the United Nations Organisation to make quite sure that a decision given by them will be operative and can be enforced. Before you do that, you must have a code of world law, which has been accepted by the members of U.N.O. So we would endeavour in the first instance to create a world law, a world authority to interpret the law and to make decisions, and a world police force to enforce them."

The Earl of Home, replying for the Government, stated: "There is wide disagreement upon the relationship between the State and the individual, the rights of the individual under the law, the principles of justice, either within a nation or internationally. These . . . are the questions which, in their practical application, constitute the dividing line between tyranny and freedom." World government, as seen through Soviet eyes, is an instrument to assert Communist domination over all. "The most astonishing feature of this debate has been that not one of the noble Lords who have spoken has mentioned the disarmament scheme accepted by fifty-seven of the nations of the world in the United Nations Assembly - - by all, in fact, excepting the Soviet *bloc* . . . It covers balanced disarmament, dealing with both nuclear and conventional weapons . . . the halting and international supervision of new fissile material for weapons, and lays down the most elaborate scheme for inspection

involving inspection from the air, control posts, road stations and factories . . . Only the Russians and the countries of the Soviet *bloc* are preventing it." (Poor Beveridge had never, it seems, heard of this disarmament scheme!). The Earl of Home in concluding, stated, "I would say that the most promising exercise in international co-operation is that within the British Commonwealth of Nations . . . the most convincing example to the world of the possibility of world government in the future is the Commonwealth example."

The British contribution to peace over wide areas through the Commonwealth came from her *distributing* power, not concentrating it. We have no right to merge it again, or to enter a system of lower values. This would suggest the sacrifice of quality to quantity; St. Paul stood out against merging the infant Christian body in Judaism. To remove the economic cause of war would be a vital contribution to peace. It is impossible for us to take the International Police seriously, as against Soviet or indeed United States aggression — unless it is to take over and direct our whole lives. Lord Chorley's suggestions went much further than those of Lord Beveridge!

These threats may possibly be designed to take our eyes off the subversion of our Christian heritage and loss of freedom in accord with Marx's manifesto, and the removal of such constitutional safeguards as those once used by the House of Lords itself and by the Sovereign.

Against all this we must maintain the Christian conception of individual freedom, rights and responsibility. Freedom means the ability to choose or refuse one thing at a time. We are losing it. Choice is disappearing. In the field of education we are confronted by the formidable "multi-lateral" school; in that of medicine, in the National Health Service, the doctor is under the control of a central authority and the individual, whose right to contract-out has not been recognised, has to pay National Health contributions, whether he has decided to remain a private patient or not; our bread is denatured and our water may be adulterated. Monopoly in fact is the order of the day — we see labour directed willy-nilly by unions, while the employers have as little concern for the consumer. I have even read of distinguished Churchmen commending the planners and their centralised power, and one pamphlet enunciated the false doctrine that only a Plan, in the days before the last war, would have averted revolution! Others, of course, care for none of these things and would in fact have the Church abdicate from her position as the vehicle of truth. We may recall the parable of the seven devils that entered into the place that was empty.