

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. 26, No. 2

MELBOURNE, FRIDAY

29th January, 1960

EDITORIAL

BEHIND THE "ANTI-SEMITIC" SMOKESCREEN

The world-wide propaganda concerning an alleged outbreak of "anti-semitism" sponsored by Nazis and their associates, is clearly a major part of a pattern of developments which indicate that 1960 could in fact be "the year of destiny" predicted by so many.

As we have observed on numerous occasions, the term "anti-semitic" is a political swear-word used to create an emotional attitude amongst both Jews and Gentiles. In reading through the current realms of comment on the subject of "anti-Semitism", we noted that one of those superior intellectuals, writing in a Sydney journal which caters for those who like to consider themselves so very, very sophisticated, even listed an Arab organisation as one of the producers of "anti-semitic" literature. The most charitable view is that this writer's knowledge is so limited that he does not know that the Arabs are more entitled to call themselves a Semitic people than the majority of those who call themselves Jews. But as even some Jews, particularly anti-Zionist Jews, have also been classed as "anti-semites", it is not surprising that there should be so much woolly thinking and comment concerning what is admittedly a very emotional and vital question and one which is directly related to the developing crisis in Western Civilisation.

This journal supports policies rooted in the Christian philosophy, and rejects all suggestions of hatred and physical violence irrespective of who they may be directed against. We are well aware, of course, that many New Australians have an intense personal dislike of Jews which can only be understood, even if deplored, by an understanding of European history.

Although we have no direct supporting evidence, we would not be surprised if a few of the "political primitives" (a term we borrow from a New Australian supporter) amongst the New Australians are responsible for some anti-Jewish acts. It would be foolish to deny that some New Australians detest Jews. But all the available evidence leaves no doubt that the Communists were associated with the initiation of the "anti-semitic" campaign and are now vigorously exploiting it in as many ways as possible." One of the major targets of the campaign is to influence the coming Summit Conference at which the German question will be one of the most vital discussed. Revival of fear

concerning Germany directs attention away from the fear of Communism and fits in with the current Communist strategy of "peaceful co-existence"

Already the exaggerated propaganda concerning "anti-semitism" has resulted in a wave of anti-German feeling, particularly in Great Britain, where sections of the daily newspapers are aiding Communist tactics by suggesting that there are signs of a Nazi revival. All this suits Khrushchev, who has already commented upon the "anti-semitic" campaign as part of his endeavours to discredit the West German Government. In a desperate attempt to clear itself of charges of being too lenient with pro-Nazi groups and "anti-semites", the West German Government is indicating that it is prepared to yield to some of the most extreme demands of Jewish spokesmen. Here in Australia there are also demands for restrictive legislation designed to curb all comment, no matter how objective and moderate it may be, on Jewish policies. In fact a Sydney meeting at which a spokesman for the Communist-front organisation, the Jewish Council Against Fascism and Anti-Semitism, appeared with other well-known pro-Communists, demanded that the Federal Government bring down restrictive legislation in anticipation of "anti-semitic" activities. There have been demands that "anti-semitism" must be weeded out "root and branch", and that any refugees from Iron Curtain countries who make any critical comments concerning Jews should be immediately sent back under Communist domination, even though this meant immediate death. This policy is supported by an American intellectual well-known for his opposition to the death sentence, which provides striking evidence of special claims made for Jews as compared with all other peoples. We are not very impressed with the policy of painting slogans and signs of any kind on walls, but if "thrashings" are to be dealt out on the spot to those painting swastikas, even though they may be silly juvenile delinquents influenced by newspaper publicity, then we presume that, for example, any Liberal catching a Communist painting, "Out Bolte",

would also be entitled to engage in physical violence. There is far more organised hate created by the Communists than there may exist amongst those sections of the community, such as some business men, who do not like Jews. But all talk of violence is a danger to the maintenance of traditional British law and order, and we urge supporters to take this question up with political representatives, stressing the importance of refusing to tolerate the creation of a crisis in order to prevent legitimate comment by responsible, law-abiding citizens.

It is significant that, although there have been numerous incidents of an anti-Jewish nature in Germany since the end of the war, including the painting of a few swastikas on walls, there have been no world-wide campaigns similar to the one launched by the actions of two individuals in Cologne on last Christmas Eve. The West German Government claims that one of the individuals responsible was an East German Communist, while it is reported that British Intelligence agrees that the rash of "anti-semitic" activities which immediately followed in Great Britain and other countries was the work of Communists. We also draw attention to the fact that swastikas appeared in Italy, where the Fascists never at any time used this symbol. Why should any neo-Fascist group use it now? The first painted slogan against Jews in Melbourne also included Premier Bolte, providing further evidence of Communist activity.

While it is undoubtedly true, as suggested by psychologists, that many of the anti-Jewish slogans are the work of people who join in any similar form of activity once it has been sufficiently publicised, the important fact is that although there is no evidence to suggest that anti-Jewish feeling in Germany or any other country is greater than it has been for years, the world's press suddenly decided that a few anti-Jewish slogans should receive tremendous publicity. An examination of the Jewish press reveals that even those Jews who dissociate themselves from the pro-Communist activities of the Jewish Council Against Fascism and Anti-Semitism, are helping to create the impression that Jews may be threatened by a new upsurge of Nazism and a campaign of physical violence against Jews. The demand by all sections of the Jews, Zionists, non-Zionists, pro-Communists and anti-Communists, that "group libel" should be introduced, and that Jewish policies should be virtually immune from criticism or comment, is not an intolerable and arrogant demand in a community priding itself on its British constitutional principles, principles designed to protect all *individuals* against physical violence or libel; it is the type of demand which helps fan resentment against those making it.

The Melbourne Roman Catholic weekly, *The Tribune*, makes a sane and refreshing comment on the question in its issue of January 21. After observing that the rights of minorities must be protected, a principle which is seldom applied today in the mass-society, *The Tribune* states:

We should like to add, also, that neither Jews, nor "colored people", nor any human group, ought to be immune from criticism of a civilised kind.

There appear to be some people who hold that, because Jews have been abominably treated in Europe or elsewhere, it should be regarded as "offensive" to discuss objectively the economic causes of anti-Semitic friction in certain countries, as well as the injury done to the Arab world by the establishment of the Israel plantation in its midst since World War I.

To describe the raising of such questions as in itself a sign of "anti-Semitism" is not only wrong in principle, but it is also unwise from the point of the real interests of the Jewish people in the world of today.

The above moderate comment will not, of course, protect the writer from the "anti-semitic" smear. And this brings us to the great difficulty of getting the "Jewish Problem" discussed in a rational and unemotional manner. The moulders of Jewish opinion persist in creating what can only be described as a state of hysteria amongst Jews, of the maintenance of

(Continued on page 3.)

MAKE A NOTE OF BARBACUE DATE

Melbourne and near-Melbourne *New Times* supporters are requested to note the date of the first social event for 1960, a barbecue at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Norman White, "Allwoodley", Garden Road, Donvale, on Saturday, 13th February. Garden Road is off Springvale Road and there will be a sign at the corner. There will be a small charge only for entrance and those attending may arrive from 6 p.m. onwards.

This social event, to be held in such pleasant surroundings, will enable all supporters and their friends to come together and enjoy themselves while at the same time discussing projected activities for 1960. All financial profits from the barbecue will be used to finance *New Times* activities.

a persecution complex, which makes it difficult to convince many Jews that their best interests are not being served by refusing to discuss objectively why there is a "Jewish Problem". To say that there is no problem except in the minds of "hate-mongers" and "paranoics" is to dispute two thousand years of history, the views of Church leaders and scholars down the ages, and the views of a number of courageous Jews who have claimed the right, even though smeared for exercising that right, to oppose Jewish policies.

We note with interest that a spokesman for the Victorian Jewish Board of Deputies, Mr. I. Leibler, is reported in *The Jewish News* of last week as having said at a Jewish meeting:

"The source from which we are in greatest danger is the League of Rights headed by Eric Butler. In his hate system, he has played on political innovations by attempting to link the Jews and Communism, and then separately Zionism and Communism. He is dangerous not only because of what he says and writes, but because of the influence which he carries in some high quarters."

This statement, coming from a Jewish spokesman who claims to be anti-Communist, is most revealing. We are not told just what is the nature of the "danger" threatened by Mr. Eric Butler. As a practising Christian Mr. Butler has no time for hate, he is not seeking power for himself or for any movement, he and the League of Rights advocate individual freedom, limited Constitutional Government, and the decentralisation of all power, political, economic and financial. Mr. Butler strongly opposes all policies of centralised power, irrespective of whether these policies are termed Communism or National Socialism, a fact which Mr. Leibler knows. If Mr. Leibler does in fact regard Mr. Butler as his greatest danger, and is not merely making this assertion to create fear amongst his listeners, then Mr. Butler's exposure of policies of centralisation, aggression and subversion must in fact mean that Mr. Leibler supports at least some of these policies. The significant thing is that both the Communist press and the Zionist press charge Mr. Butler with being a "danger". Both class him as a "notorious anti-semite" and attempt to obscure the fact that Mr. Butler and others who think like he does are primarily concerned with the emergence of philosophies in the form of policies. Clearly the philosophies underlying both Zionism and Communism are anti-Christian, and therefore there can be nothing but conflict between the policies rooted in such diametrically opposed philosophies.

The fundamental question is not whether individual Jews are more cultured or better parents than Gentiles, whether Jews should be excluded

from businessmen's clubs, but whether, like the Germans under Hitler, the Jews are dominated by group activity controlled by Jewish policy makers who use and exploit this group activity to further their own policies. For example, there is no argument whatever, as an Anglican Bishop put it, the British were forced out of Palestine by one of the most "lying" and "murderous" campaigns in history. Zionist leaders used Jewish group activity to drive the Arabs from their homes and to create one of the biggest refugee problems in the world. Has the time arrived when it is felt that critics of Zionist aggression, and its contribution to the expansion of Communism in the Middle East, one of the most vital parts of the world, can have their "illegal" activities stopped because it is regarded as an affront to those Jews who have allowed themselves to be used in various ways by the Zionist leaders? Is it no longer to be permissible in a British country for a commentator on international affairs to suggest that it is a thought-provoking fact that Jews are the only group of people being permitted to leave Communist-dominated countries, and that it is reported that many of these are not going to move to Israel, but are going to Australia and other countries?

It is our conviction that the future of the world depends upon these and similar questions being honestly faced by both Jews and Gentiles.

The current "anti-semitic" campaign has been created to ensure, if possible, that such questions are not only discussed, but that they are "solved" by the creation of the World Slave State. Yes, 1960 could be a year of destiny, a year in which the dying embers of Western Christendom were completely blanketed out or one in which a dedicated few rekindled the embers into a flame lighting the way forward to a new and more Christian Civilization. Clearly we are on the verge of tremendous developments.

CREATING A CRISIS ATMOSPHERE

Further to our editorial comment concerning the current hysteria about Nazism and "anti-semitism" which some Jewish spokesmen are helping to create, we note with interest the comment by Pamela Ruskin, a columnist for the Melbourne *Jewish News* who in last week's issue of this paper criticises the Victorian Jewish Board of Activities because of "their blanket of censorship with which they have smothered what actually has occurred and the moves made to deal with the occurrences.

"If this were a drastic emergency *or even a time of real danger*, there may be some justification for all this drama." (Our emphasis.)

DOES BRITAIN NEED THE ATOM BOMB?

Since it was first published in "The Sunday Times" (England) of July 5, an article by Mr. L. W. Martin, a British student of strategy and Assistant Professor of Political Science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, has resulted in considerable discussion on the issues raised. We believe this article to be one of the greatest importance to all British nations and for this reason are republishing it for the benefit of our readers.

The concept of a British deterrent naturally comes in for heavy criticism, as it has in the current wrangle in the Labour movement, at a time when the whole idea of nuclear deterrence is undergoing a sceptical reappraisal. At the moment the United States relies upon its capacity to deliver a crushing blow on the Soviet Union to deter a Russian nuclear attack or assault by superior conventional forces; and we in turn, rely on the United States. Russia's own growing nuclear strength increasingly threatens to convert one-sided reprisal into mutual annihilation.

It becomes more and more certain that the United States would have to bring destruction on itself in order to defend many quite substantial objectives which Russia could seize without posing an immediate and fatal threat to American survival. American military leaders are wondering, indeed, how long the deterrent can remain effective against conventional attacks. Soviet nuclear capacity is thus progressively narrowing the range of contingencies with which the American deterrent can deal.

This poses important questions for nations like Britain whose survival may become one of the issues for which the United States is unwilling to commit its nuclear striking force. Can we rely on the American deterrent or can we conceive of circumstances in which our most vital interests could be lost without steeling the United States to use—or more important, to threaten convincingly to use—its strategic nuclear weapons?

It seems that such circumstances will become increasingly likely as Russian power grows and as submarine and space-satellite bases for missiles and radar make European sites less important for American defences. Even while the United States maintains ground forces in Europe there can be no certainty that an attack involving them would provoke American leaders to the ultimate retaliation. It might be more rational for the United States to fight a withdrawal or even to sacrifice the troops while taking limited material and moral compensation in other areas.

* * *

Enough responsible American officials have already asserted that Europe is expendable under certain conditions to cast the kind of doubt on American intentions which is fatal to a reliable deterrent. One of the most remarkably frank statements was provided last year by George W. Rathjens, a member of the Weapons Evaluation Group in the Office of the Secretary of Defence and of the Institute for Defence Analysis in the Pentagon. He declared that for a European to have

nuclear weapons . . . on his soil which are controlled by the United States offers him the worst of all possible choices. He will be severely damaged in a nuclear exchange, yet he may have no say in whether such weapons

will be used in his defence in a limited war. Neither he nor the U.S.S.R. (nor for that matter the U.S.) can be sure that we would use such a capability at the risk of starting a general war or even a large-scale limited war just to repel a localised Soviet threat.

The writer adds, engagingly, that the only nations likely to accept nuclear weapons under American control will be those "with poorly informed publics, those that are so poor that they can be bought and particularly those whose Governments are not responsive to public opinion."

* * *

These observations are not, of course, an official pronouncement but they plainly convey an attitude taken seriously in the Pentagon. If the American deterrent cannot be relied upon to serve British interests in all circumstances, then we must either do without a deterrent in some cases, or provide our own, or find a way to make the American umbrella more reliable.

It may be argued that no conventional attack or defeat could be worse than the suffering Britain would undergo in a nuclear war and that therefore we want no part in any deterrent. Logically, this argument calls for severance of all connection with American nuclear efforts as well as abandonment of our own. Surrender of our capacity to defend ourselves is, of course, always a possible solution to the dilemma. So long as we retain hopes of making a stand in the world, however, the nuclear deterrent will retain its role as a guarantee against nuclear attack or rocket-rattling blackmail of the type used by Mr. Khrushchev in the Suez crisis.

Can British nuclear weapons remedy the situation? Even at great cost the British nuclear force must be small by super-power standards. But a force capable of delivering quite a limited number of hydrogen bombs can still be effective in more ways than is at first apparent.

To begin with, a British nuclear attack could confront the Soviet Union with an amount of destruction to its cities, industry and nuclear striking-power which though not complete, would be a heavy price to pay for any benefits which might flow from our defeat.

There are, moreover, good grounds for believing that a well-deployed British force can exercise a deterrent effect out of all proportion to its intrinsic power. This effect flows from Russia's need to reckon with the possibility that, should Britain be provoked into using its nuclear weapons, a chain-reaction would lead to a total exchange with the United States even when American leaders intended to remain aloof.

There are two ways in which this might occur. First, Russia might be unable to distinguish a British from an American attack and therefore be forced immediately to

launch its own assault on the United States. Secondly, even if Russia correctly identified a British attack, could she afford to accept heavy damage, especially to her nuclear capacity, while leaving the United States with its power unscathed?

The British nuclear forces could fill a role which Admiral Tirpitz once assigned to the German navy in relation to Britain: that of presenting the enemy with an unacceptable risk of finding himself crippled in the face of a third party. To prevent this the Soviet Union might feel compelled to retaliate upon America as well as Britain. Given this possibility, the United States in turn would have to consider the advisability of acting in concert with Britain, and this again would be apparent to Russia. Thus the British deterrent might be able to bring about that situation of dire peril to the United States which would make sure the American deterrent would be used.

It is not necessary to be certain that either side will act in these ways. A real possibility that the British force might act as a trigger to detonate the larger forces would compel the Soviet Union to approach any provocation of Britain to nuclear retaliation almost as cautiously as provocation of the United States. Those who propose to join a non-nuclear "club" must consider how we would fare without that capacity.

* * *

This is not a cheerful line of thought, but it is one that military planning cannot ignore. One conclusion which it reinforces is the desirability of maintaining adequate conventional forces to narrow the range of contingencies in which we must rely on the nuclear arm. Such a policy being also clearly in American interests, we might consider whether we could not save the resources of the West by offering increased conventional efforts in return for greatly increased help in developing a nuclear force under our own control. A bargain of this sort is the more attainable the less we waver in determination to have an independent nuclear striking-power, one way or another.

Development of conventional forces may seem increasingly attractive if the Soviet sprint in nuclear weapons creates a situation in which the deeper technology of the West can best be exploited in the complicated structure of ordinary weapons and formations. A N.A.T.O. force which could handle a wide range of situations without using even tactical nuclear weapons—a dubious tool which cuts both ways—would enable us to restore a clear-cut distinction between nuclear and conventional weapons and to set our deterrent the well-defined task of holding that line.

EXPERT ON BRAINWASHING SURVEYS CURRENT COMMUNIST STRATEGY

(Continued from page 1 article section)

Either way, the United States cannot make a silken purse out of a sow's ear. A highly-glamorized show put on by the White House or the Kremlin, even with all of Madison Ave. and Pavlov's tricks, could not overnight remove

the effects of years of make-believe that the Reds aren't Reds, but really are just like your neighbor at the cigar counter at the corner, if you only get to know him, and be friendly, with maybe a little togetherness thrown in.

If we make believe that the Communists react the way we do, we will continue to play into their hands, and do exactly what a Communist agent would want us to do, no matter how anti-Communist we think we are. This time the price we could pay would be our survival as a free people or even as a Country that can be lived in.

What could save us has to be the possession of the intelligence facilities and the military hardware—and character behind them—to detect and block any Pearl Harbor ideas Khrushchev and the Kremlin have. If we haven't these yet, we still have the opportunity to make hard, calculating use of what time we have left for stalling until we develop them.

Communism, demonstrably hated by its peoples, is off-balance in the really weak position. Khrushchev and Mao's co-ordinated antics are just for this purpose to stall until they regain their equilibrium, and accomplish the real subjugation of their people, transferring their hatred of Communism to the friends they believe let them down. This means us!

The Free World and particularly the United States can win out by understanding "coexistence" as the Communists define the word, in their own dialectical materialism, and acting accordingly. This could turn the tables. In such a contest, a strong character is the first essential.

THE COMMUNIST CONCEPTION OF WARFARE

(Continued from page 2 article section)

Because of these revolutions, by the time the Second World War broke out, there were small Communist and Fascist revolutionary factions (inner fronts) in all the victor countries, and extensive anti-Nazi and anti-Marxist factions (inner fronts) in Germany and the Soviet Union. This was the fundamental difference between World War II and World War I. Nobody, except Stalin, realised this. Hitler failed to create a counter-revolution within the Russian empire, and Churchill and Roosevelt failed to do so within Germany. Worse still, by giving all possible support to Stalin, they enabled him to win the war. Once won, he immediately set about to attack all non-Communist countries on their inner fronts. This is what is now called "cold war"; yet the Western Powers fail to realise that it is the *real* war in a revolutionary age, and that the nuclear war they fear and are preparing for is nothing other than the old-fashioned outer front type of war raised to the nth degree. Once again they are preparing to fight the last war over again, while the Kremlin is fighting the real war and winning hands down.

6. Which policy would you suggest the West should adopt as regards Russia and the subjugated peoples?

Answer:

Any policy but lip service—and preferably the one outlined in Answer 4.

ARTICLE SECTION

EXPERT ON BRAINWASHING SURVEYS CURRENT COMMUNIST STRATEGY

The following are extracts from an analysis of Communist strategy in relationship to Khrushchev's visit to the U.S.A., by Edward Hunter, the American expert on brainwashing:

Success in convincing Premier Khrushchev that the United States is stronger, more prosperous and more united than he believed, would have the effect opposite to what Americans expect. Communist ideology produces different reactions than Western culture, a point we seem unable to grasp.

Under Communist ideology, there can be no substitute for conquest of the world by Communism; it is merely a matter of strategy—a comparatively few years one way or the other. Evidence that a non-Communist country is in a firmer position than had been thought brings about only a reappraisal of tactics, never an abandonment of the objective.

This goal remains intact through all the varying Red tactics, which have such names as "peace drive," "co-existence," "liberation war" and "liberation." There is no room in dialectical materialism, the Red bible, for anything less than total, in this case, total victory.

Realization by Khrushchev that America is not as vulnerable as he believed would bring about such a reappraisal of strategy, directed toward the overthrow of the American system in spite of its stronger power. Everything that has happened under Communism since Marx and Engels came out with their Manifesto confirms this approach.

Both sides of the Moscow-Peking axis have reached their present peak by a technique of discussing such problems cold-bloodedly, within the atheistic framework that gives no thought to elements of good or bad as we know them. Once they reach a decision on this basis, they act on it without regard to cost in lives and property of their own people...

As long as the United States is able to provide its people with prosperity and happiness within a system of private enterprise and dignity for the individual, it remains an incitation to revolt inside the Communist world. If permitted to exist indefinitely, it would ultimately bring down the Red monolith like a house of cards.

Dialectical materialism teaches that failure to eliminate such a peril is the greatest crime that can be committed against the "people"—this word in Communist language meaning those who are already Communist or fellow-travellers with no thought of opposition. Hesitancy about this is called "bourgeois sentimentalism" and lack of "socialist realism," which are persecuted as criminal offences.

This is the same problem that confronted Mao Tse-tung when his "hundred flowers" campaign backfired. That drive was an invitation to the "people" to express themselves frankly, meaning within the framework of Communist policy. Instead, all sectors of the public, especially the

students and intellectuals, blasted Communism as hateful. Mao quickly put the lid back on. The nation's brainwashing had not accomplished what he expected . . .

Mao took the hatred for granted. It existed, which is what "coexistence" means in Communist language. A dog "coexists" with a bone. After the dog has devoured the bone, coexistence takes a different form. The word isn't at all what we mean. Mao's only thought was how to bottle up the existing hate and use it. The solution he came up with was the establishment of the communes, that put the Chinese masses under more intensified control. He then gave them the United States as a target against which, in their hopelessness, they could focus their hatred. This is a trick any psychiatrist understands; it is called transfer.

It is part of the Pavlovian basis to brainwashing. The idea is to make a brain—whether that of a dog or a human being is irrelevant—react the way master, or Big Brother, wants. This is the basis of Khrushchev's approach to any conclusion he reaches in his trip through the United States.

If he finds we are in a more invulnerable position, he will accept this as a new problem. He will still think in terms of our liquidation. If the capitalist world does not "dig its own grave," as Communist theoreticians including Mao literally predict, then they will have "to bury" us, as Khrushchev says.

The idea that there can be anything basically unworkable in Communism, that should require its fundamental change or abandonment, can never enter their heads . . .

Obviously, if what he finds here convinces him that the United States cannot be overturned by a fair, frontal attack, through above-board means, then "socialist realism" requires he plan an unfair, infiltrated or flank attack, that must be made through clandestine channels.

In war, this means a Pearl Harbor attack. A sneak attack this time would have to be on American continental soil, a Pearl Harbor Sputnik. This would be the only alternative left under dialectical materialism.

If we fail in our good willed effort, and Khrushchev leaves feeling that he wasn't wrong and that we are soft, confused and as vulnerable as his "coexistence" tactics assume, then he will feel perfectly satisfied with himself, and go ahead with his present, confidence-man pose of high friendliness.

The Communist Conception of Warfare

Major-General J. F. C. Fuller, famous British military historian, has made it clear in his writings that he understands fully the true nature of the warfare being waged by the Communists. In its issue of September, 1959, *A.B.N. Correspondence*, journal of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations, publishes an important interview with Major-General Fuller. The following are the questions asked and the answers given:

1. What is your opinion of Russian action as regards Berlin, and do you think that Russia will risk going to war if her ultimatum is rejected?

Answer:

My opinion is that Khrushchev's ultimatum of November last is no more or less than a continuation of Lenin's policy, which, in his own words, was:

"To unite the proletariat of industrial Germany, Austria and Czechoslovakia with the proletariat of Russia, and thereby create a might agrarian and industrial combination from Vladivostok to the Rhine . . . capable of feeding itself and confronting the reactionary capitalism of Britain with a revolutionary giant, which with one hand would disturb the tranquillity of the East and with the other beat back the pirate capitalism of Anglo-Saxon countries. If there was anything that could compel the English whale to dance, it would be the union of revolutionary Russia with a revolutionary Central Europe."

In brief, Lenin's policy was to conquer a "Lebensraum" for the Russian Revolution in Central Europe.

When, in 1939, Hitler set out to do the same in Western Russia for his Third Reich, he brought the whole might of Great Britain and the United States down on him; but so little did Messrs. Churchill and Roosevelt appreciate that Stalin's policy was identical to Lenin's, that at Teheran and Yalta they made him a free gift of Eastern Germany including a large slice of Berlin.

What is Khrushchev's aim? It is to complete Lenin's policy by pushing the Russian "Lebensraum" from the Elbe to the Rhine, and the first step towards achieving it is to gain control of Western Berlin.

Should he fail to do so, will he risk a war? Of course not, because ever since April 14th, 1917, when Lenin proclaimed that "World Imperialism cannot live side by side with a victorious Soviet Revolution," Russia has been at war with the West, and the West has refused to realise it.

Because such exalted personages as a British Prime Minister and a British Field Marshal have rushed to Moscow to discover what the Kremlin wants, Khrushchev knows that the statesmen of the West are as blind today to what Russia's policy is as they were at Teheran and Yalta. All he has got to do is to push them about as he likes, and destroy them by creating such confusion in their ranks that, step by step, they destroy themselves. Hence, Khrushchev's call for another Summit Conference.

2. What is your opinion of the present tactics pursued by the Western Powers as regards Russia?

Answer:

The tactics of the Western Powers are those of blind-man's-bluff upside-down. In the game, as played to rule, one person of a company is blindfolded, and he tries to catch one of the others—who are not—and tell who he is. In the game as played at Geneva, all the Western Powers are blindfolded, and they set out to catch the one man—Mr. Khrushchev or his representative—who is not, and discover what his policy looks like. Their tactics are as blind as those of a bat-headed owl in a jazz palace.

3. How can the Russian advance in the Near East be prevented?

Answer:

This is not an easy question to answer, because, up to date, British policy in the Near East has been a tangled one. First, the Arab world was wooed; next it was antagonised by the creation of Israel; then came the Suez fiasco, which made Nasser the champion of Islam. Culturally, Islam is anti-Communist, therefore it may be accepted that, as Nasser wants to boss the Arab world, he can only do so if Russia is kept out of it. For the Western Powers, which is the more threatening—a Near East under the influence of Nasser or under the influence of Khrushchev? Obviously the latter; therefore my answer is: the Western Powers should put their political money on Nasser. In other words, back anti-Communism wherever it is and whatever may be its colour, shape or form.

4. What importance do you ascribe to the national revolutionary liberation movements of the peoples subjugated by Moscow and Communism in the present international situation?

Answer:

This is a question which can be briefly answered. Wherever there is opposition to Marxist-Tsarism, whether in the U.S.S.R., behind the Iron Curtain, in China and elsewhere, every possible step should be taken by the Western Powers to stimulate and aid the national liberation movements, so that war on Russia's inner frontier vital front—may day in and day out be waged with ever increasing intensity. Whatever is anti-Communist should be supported, and whatever is pro-Communist should be attacked. This war should be absolute.

5. Do you consider the West's fear of an atomic war justified?

Answer:

Certainly not! In this revolutionary age, and ever since the days of the Paris Commune, more and more have wars been decided by revolutions and not by battles. In the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-1905, Russia was defeated not by the Japanese on her outer front, but by the fear of revolution on her inner front. In 1914-1918, it was actual revolution which finished off Russia and Germany and Italy only just survived the war to experience the Fascist revolution.

(Continued on page 5)

THE AMERICAN REVOLT AGAINST HIGH TAXATION

Even people with little understanding of public finance should be able to grasp the vital fact that high taxation in every country of the world makes only a minor contribution to Governments' total spending, and that it is therefore clearly an instrument of policy being used to make it impossible for many people to make themselves genuinely independent.

High taxation is one of the most insidious evils undermining the non-Communist world from within. This is made very clear in the following instructive report from America, as published in "The Advertiser," Adelaide, of November 17, on the growing restiveness of American taxpayers under the progressive imposition of higher taxes: . . .

The inevitable finally happened the other day. Taxpayers in New York rose up at an election and booted out a proposal solidly backed by the City Hall for a further drain on their pockets.

The Mayor and his colleagues — except for one notable official who lone-handed aroused the public's resentment into revolt—wanted approval for a \$500m. bond issue outside the city's debt limit to finance new school construction.

Its overwhelming rejection is a symptom of something that is sharply apparent across the nation this year, the highest-taxed year in U.S. history.

Burdened with Federal and State taxes, and then more taxes on almost every retail item they buy, angry taxpayers are groaning that incentive is disappearing and that making ends meet is almost impossible.

Legislators and civic officials are facing mounting criticism for over-spending.

Congressmen are finding that protests from constituents are growing louder every time another massive foreign aid vote is taken.

More than 10 years of the working life of the average U.S. taxpayer, says the Commerce Clearing House, is spent just to pay off his various taxes, claiming close to 40 per cent, of his income.

Another estimate says that the average earner here spends 2½ hours of every eight-hour working day to satisfy the tax collector.

Even the wealthy, though more able to pay, are under the same yoke. The highest tax bracket goes up to an incredible 98 per cent., and when you add State tax to that you get to the somewhat absurd position Australian-born businessman Al Daff found himself in.

Formerly head of Universal-International in Hollywood, Daff was told by his accountant that he could not accept another salary boost or he would be paying more than 100 per cent, of his additional income in taxes!

Yet as more and more stirrings of tax revolt appear in various parts of the country, State Governments are in the throes of the biggest revenue search ever undertaken.

If individuals cannot be taxed much further, companies can, and today they are feeling the

heavy hand of the collector. Already 52 cents of every corporate dollar is Government property.

Where will this dog-chasing-its-tail business all end? In Washington, the Eisenhower Administration has taken the unprecedented step of raising the total debt limit twice in the same year to a phenomenal \$288,000m.

This works out per person in the U.S. to more than \$6,250 a year, more than the national average wage of just over \$5000.

Most State Governments are today spending more than they are earning—just to keep pace with established services and projects, let alone trying to match a booming population and urban growth.

Local government is in the same boat. One expert calculates that for every dollar earned, State and local governments are spending today \$1.10

One State, Michigan, is already facing bankruptcy, and others are steadily dropping deeper and deeper into deficit.

At the end of World War II only one of the country's 48 States, Massachusetts, was working outside its income. At the end of last year, 32 were working in the red.

States are even borrowing against future tax collections, and up goes their debt interest payments. This year the States have introduced 116 major new tax laws, including 92 increases and 12 new charges.

There is one important thing for Australians in State and local government to remember whenever they protest about the deal they get from Canberra and want to cite U.S. tax systems.

The U.S. has something like a 165m. population start over Australia, it has a free economy that exploded into prosperity unlike anything ever seen years before income tax was a heavy burden, and it has as a corollary an enormous reservoir of private capital.

It is this capital, accumulated in the almost taxless past that has financed much of America's expansion. Now heavy taxation is damping down productivity, so much, indeed, that the growth in the national product compares unfavourably with that of Russia.

