

# THE NEW TIMES

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

Vol. 26, No. 5

MELBOURNE, FRIDAY

11th March 1960

## EDITORIAL

### MONARCHY OR MARX?

Although much has been said and written concerning the birth of another Royal Prince, some of the comment unconsciously reflecting a deep-seated yearning for the preservation of an institution which is both stable and permanent in a world of great change and revolution, it is clear that the British peoples generally have little real conception today of the true purpose of the Monarchy. The roots of their history have been cut. This appears to us to be a most opportune time to refer to this subject, and to draw attention to the little recognised fact, even by many students of Communism, that the Marxians draw their greatest strength from the very historical character of social thinking which is also the true basis of the institution of Monarchy.

No matter how false their theories may be, we ignore at our peril the truth that the most powerful appeal of the Communists is their doctrine of "historical inevitability." This appeal is increased by the dominant teaching in the West that the past doesn't matter, that tradition is "out of date" and "unscientific", and that the future, which alone is all-important, can be determined exclusively by the comparatively modern doctrine, "that the will of the people must be supreme." The Communists are, of course, correct when they stress the fact that man is a social being, that all human life forms part of a single historical process and that no people can truthfully claim to be independent of that process. Because the Communist thinks of himself as an active, intelligent part of a universal process, an active co-worker with the purposes of human life, he thereby increases his power and is ever ready to make great personal sacrifices in order to further purposes about which he has no doubts whatever. He sees himself as an integral part of the flow of history. False as the Communist conception of history is, large numbers of intelligent men and women have accepted it as the only alternative to the mechanistic view that the life of man can be regarded in complete abstraction from the flow of history.

In one of the most important books published in the post-war years, *Freedom Wears a Crown*, Mr. John Farthing, brilliantly argues that:

" . . . the British tradition (the free and living order whose strength and symbol is the Crown-in-Parliament) is that it is the only one whose underlying or implicit interpretation of history is capable of dealing adequately with the Marxian who now have a jump on the rest of

the world precisely because they have a clear conception of history and realize to the full its importance."

We observed on the occasion of the Coronation of Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth the Second, that while there were many references to a "Constitutional Monarchy," the great majority of those using this term would very quickly criticise the Queen, and her representatives, if they started to play an active role in government. Any suggestion that the Monarchy should, for example, exercise the power of veto in the same way that the American President does, would bring the immediate cry that this was most "undemocratic". Those reacting like this generally defines democracy as "the absolute will of the people", inferring that this expression of will should be independent of time and reason. But even in America, often claimed as the "greatest democracy on earth", the absolute will of the people does not prevail except within a constitutional framework designed to provide a framework in which is enshrined and protected an ideal of life to which people will always be subject. This ideal of life was the result of history, a history rooted in the Christian tradition.

The American Constitution is, in fact, an institution similar in intention to Monarchy. It is most important to note that the American citizen does not swear loyalty to the land that gave him birth. The oath of loyalty makes no reference whatever to the soil or to the map of U.S.A. The American citizen swears to defend a Constitution *embodying a national ideal*. But in British countries the Monarchy has been steadily reduced to a passive role in constitutional government. We are not denying for one moment the present great beneficial effects of the Monarchy. But we are asserting that so far has the undermining of our sense of history gone in British countries, that only a few, even amongst so-called educated men, could give a reasoned argument in favour of the traditional conception of Monarchy as part of a Trinitarian constitution and the living embodiment of national ideals and traditions.

John Farthing, in the book we have mentioned, summarises the fundamental clash between the Monarchist and the Communist conceptions of society:

(Continued on page 4)

## TWO PRESS LETTERS ON INFLATION

The following two letters, the first by James Guthrie in *The Mercury*, Hobart, of February 26, and the second by H. Gerrand in *The Age*, Melbourne, of March 2, contain more realistic comment on the inflation question than all the wordy press editorials put together:

The mad chase of prices and wages, each trying in vain to keep up with the other, is getting beyond a joke, and I think it is time a little logic was brought to bear on the matter.

Apart from everything else, the increased prices are becoming a first-class tragedy for pensioners and others living on a currency, which is disappearing in value each year.

*The Mercury* has stated what some people have been thinking for a long time: "The people may have wondered what standards and factors were used by the arbitration system in assessing wages."

I would say that the increase in the standard of living, that is, what wages should buy, should be automatic, and should be indicated by a gradual reduction in prices. In this way the entire population would receive a dividend dependent on progress and efficiency. That many of the prices today are ridiculous is not a matter for discussion. One of the chief culprits in the maintenance of high prices is the Federal Government; it has a very heavy vested interest in high prices and high wages, as its taxation returns clearly show.

It has been stated that the proposed rise in wages would circulate another £150 million a year. Most of this would go into prices. But the new credits issued by the banks to inflate prices could be diverted into another channel to reduce prices by reducing sales tax. This is not a theory: this is something that has been tried under the most rigorous conditions.

The price structure is top-heavy and the majority of the population does not possess the purchasing power to pay present-day prices, as the hire-purchase system clearly demonstrates. The large sums of money going into the building of capital goods this year will appear in prices and taxation next year, and this process is becoming so top-heavy that neither individuals nor their governments can balance their budgets.

What urgently requires explanation is why

the use of electric power, every new invention, and every improvement in management, should increase prices. Surely this indicates that our accounts are false from the point of view of overhead charges.

Fern Tree.

JAS. GUTHRIE.

Sir. —For many years now all salary and wage earners have been expending much effort and money on chasing higher wages.

Experience, if nothing else, should have taught us that higher wages mean steeper prices and heavier taxation and the poor worker finds himself even worse off, so surely it is time we tried something else.

When wage rises are granted, industry has to meet the increased wages bill by obtaining an advance of new credit from the banks.

The recent basic wage and margins rise increased the total Australian wage bill by £120 million.

Why not pay, say, half of this amount to the wage earner in the form of a production bonus, thereby increasing his purchasing power without increasing prices?

The other half could be used to finance a scheme of price subsidies applied at the retail counter.

This overall scheme would benefit all and harm no one.

The only people likely to oppose the proposal would be the international financiers, whose only concern is power, and the Communists, who capitalise on industrial discontent and inflation.

Box Hill.

H. GERRAND.

### FLUORIDATION REJECTED IN QUEENSLAND TOWN

The recent referendum on fluoridation in the small Queensland town of Chinchilla provided the first clear expression of Australian public opinion on this issue. The fluoridationists boldly claimed that Chinchilla would be a test case. They were defeated overwhelmingly. If they had won, the news would have been featured in the press and over the radio right throughout Australia. But, as far as we can ascertain, the press outside Queensland completely ignored the rejection of mass medication by the people of Chinchilla. This is typical of the methods of all totalitarians.

THE NEW TIMES

## DEBT AND TAXATION IN ALBERTA

In spite of the criticisms of the Manning Government in Alberta by the late C. H. Douglas, and the obvious fact that this Government has progressively become Social Credit in name only, some monetary reformers have still continued to make extravagant claims for Alberta. When the Manning Government introduced the idea of a dividend financed out of oil royalties, we pointed out that, while the dividend was not a true Social Credit dividend, it was based upon a Social Credit conception. The hope was expressed that the oil dividend was a re-start towards introducing Social Credit financial and economic principles. But even this limited dividend was short-lived.

Much has been made of the reduction of the Albertan Provincial debt by those who have failed to appreciate the significance of the fact that this reduction was not achieved by the introduction of any Social Credit financial principles, but as a result of the tremendous increase in revenue of the Provincial Government, much of it from oil royalties. Mr. L. D. Byrne, former Social Credit technical adviser to the Albertan Government, has observed that the start of the perversion of Social Credit by the Government coincided with the terms agreed upon to repay the Provincial Debt.

A member of the Alberta Government, Mr. Jorgenson, visited Australia for the last Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference, and was invited to address Social Crediters in Adelaide and Sydney. Upon our attention being directed to one lengthy press report of Mr. Jorgenson's extensive claims concerning the reduction of debt in Alberta, we wrote to Canada and obtained the following revealing information as taken from the latest (1959) *Canadian Year Book*.

At the end of 1958 the total Provincial and Municipal debt of Alberta was 389,892,000 dollars, the highest of any of the Western Provinces. It is true that the Provincial Debt of Alberta, 72,636,000 dollars at the end of 1958, is the lowest of the Western Provinces, but its Municipal Debt of 317,256,000 dollars was the highest. The most realistic measurement of the debt position in Alberta is the per capita debt, which is 347 dollars. This is the second highest per capita debt of the four Western Provinces, Saskatchewan being the highest with 375 dollars.

Turning to Municipal Taxation, we find that Alberta's rate of taxation is only exceeded by Saskatchewan. Provincial taxes are much the same in all the Western Provinces and there is little variation in the price of goods.

THE NEW TIMES

We are not concerned here with the question of whether the Albertan Government is a "good government" or not, but with pointing out that many of the claims made on behalf of the Government are not true and that little or no attempt is being made to advance Social Credit.

### Interstate Lecturing Tour by A. K. Chesterton and Eric D. Butler

*New Times* readers will be interested in an interstate lecturing tour by visiting English writer, A. K. Chesterton, and Eric D. Butler. Already several successful Victorian meetings have been held.

#### HOBART

Mr. James Guthrie, of Fern Tree, Hobart, has arranged a small meeting for next Monday, March 14, and those desirous of attending should contact Mr. Guthrie for details.

#### ADELAIDE

A public meeting will be held at Laubman and Panks, Gawler Place, Adelaide, on Wednesday, March 16.

#### SYDNEY

Readers desirous of obtaining an invitation to attend a private house meeting on Sunday afternoon, March 20, should contact Miss Kath Marlow at The Electoral Campaign, 296 Pitt Street, Sydney.

#### NEWCASTLE

A Dinner is being arranged for this centre, and those desirous of attending can contact the Rev. Fr. T. P. Lynam, Catholic Presbytery, Cessnock, N.S.W.

### HOUSE MEETINGS IN FULL SWING

The 1960 programme of house meetings is now in full swing. Results are most encouraging. Following a most successful meeting addressed by Mr. Eric Butler at the home of Mr. J. Lennie last year, a further meeting has been arranged for Saturday evening, March 12, when Mr. Butler will proceed further with an examination of the realities of national and international politics. Mr. Lennie's address is 47 Spruzen Avenue, North Kew. Readers living in the area are invited to bring along any responsible people they feel would be interested.

Details of further house meetings will be published shortly.

## MONARCHY OR MARX?

(Continued from page 1)

" . . . the monarchial ideal of society is that of a free and essentially historical order of life. And because it is an historical order it does not suppose that a perfect fabric of political-social-economic life has already been achieved. Like the Marxian, it is fully aware of the important role that historical change must play in the life of a people, and it is unwilling to suppose that all such change is part of a meaningless procedure. Marx seeks to explain all historical change by fitting it into a predetermined framework of dialectic necessity; the monarchal idea of a personal order carries with it the further idea of an essentially free development of life . . . . Whereas the Marxian views the historical process as a space-time system based on necessity, the monarchist sees the historical drama as rooted throughout in freedom and in the sense of responsibility that freedom always involves.

"Where the Marxian affirms the impossibility of advancing to a new and better order of life than that prescribed by the laws of nature, save by appeal to hatred and conflict, revolution, destruction and dictatorship, the British ideal is that of an essentially evolutionary advance, appealing throughout to a spirit of unity centring in the throne and in the creative freedom enshrined in British traditions. The one aims to destroy, the other to fulfill, the law."

We are firmly convinced after many years of experience, that there is little hope of meeting the Communist challenge with success while the Communist is permitted a monopoly of an appeal to history; while the prevailing political philosophy of the West is that the "majority will" can do no wrong, that this will does not require to be informed, enlightened or inspired by an appeal to anything *beyond itself*.

In upholding the traditional British role of Monarchy in constitutional government, we are not concerned so much about preserving the past, as of directing attention to the vast and almost untouched resources of truth and power in the essentially Christian ideal of a kingly order of life, in order that by appreciating the great heritage with which we have been blessed, we may as a people point the way to a future which our history proves could be ours. By such an appeal to history as we suggest, we believe that British Monarchy could prove one of the greatest barriers in the world to the Communist advance. A study of Communist literature and policies leaves no doubt about their attitude towards Monarchy. The tragedy is that great numbers of non-Communists accept basically the same view. Loyalists everywhere could fittingly express their thanks for another Royal birth by coming to grips with this question.

**The Coming African Revolution:** While the world's press and the Socialists everywhere have been applauding Prime Minister MacMillan's famous "winds of freedom" speech to the South African Parliament, there has been no mention of the growing number of warnings coming from authorities that understand the realities of the African situation. These authorities warn that the British Prime Minister's address could be a major factor in hastening a revolution in Africa, leading first to chaos and then to Communist exploitation of the chaos.

The black African Nationalist leaders, most of them demagogues of the worst possible type, are already reacting by boldly stating that not even a multi-racial society will be acceptable to them: the European minorities, who alone have brought a degree of law and order out of barbarism, must now become completely subservient to all-native governments "elected" by peoples who are still primitive in their outlook.

The much-publicised Prime Minister of Ghana, Dr. Nkrumah, has indicated his conception of democracy by throwing his political opponents into prison and forcing others to flee the country. Even in the Belgian Congo, once regarded as the most stable colonial area in Africa, the rot has set in and it is now claimed that the Macmillan address has hastened its spread as the Belgians prepare to abdicate both power and responsibility. There is open talk now of Jomo Kenyatta, one of the inspirators of the frightful Mau Mau terror being freed to participate in the feverish developments.

European non-Nationalist supporters in South Africa have become increasingly shocked as they fully realised the full implications of the Macmillan policy, a policy that goes far beyond anything they have ever suggested as an alternative to the "Apartheid" policy of the Nationalist Government. It is clear that the Nationalist Party will now gain increased support from sections of the non-Nationalist groups as it is realised that the coming revolution in Africa could eventually force the Europeans to evacuate every part of the continent.

Another aspect of African developments which has been completely overlooked except by a few penetrating observers, is the fact that every new State created in Africa means an increased number of delegates in the United Nations who consistently vote for pro-Communist policies. Already the majority preventing Red China from being seated in the United Nations has been dangerously reduced. How many Australian Members of Parliament have looked ahead and considered the possibility of a majority in the United Nations demanding that Dutch New Guinea be handed to the Indonesians?

If the real history of the present period is ever written, Macmillan's "winds of freedom" address will be recalled as being even more disastrous than his famous mission to Moscow to prepare the way for the march to "the Summit."