

THE NEW TIMES

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

Vol. 26, No. 14

MELBOURNE, FRIDAY

1st July 1960

EDITORIAL

TO WORLD TYRANNY VIA THE UNITED NATIONS

The rate of the world revolution continues to increase almost daily, and the pattern of development towards world tyranny is now clear for all to see. Events are demonstrating the truth of the wanting by the famous Spanish Liberal, Professor S. De Madariaga, that "The United Nations Charter is in the main a translation of the Russian system into an international idiom and its adaptation to an international community . . . LINO bore upon its brow from the very beginning the mark of Moscow." Alger Hiss, top Communist agent in the American Administration, and protected by some of the most powerful and influential men in America, played a major role in bringing UNO into existence and was the first Secretary-General.

The Communists are well aware that current world developments are rapidly preparing the way for the time when UNO must become a direct instrument of Communist policy, and if the non-Communist nations are going to accept the idea of their policies, both external and internal, being decided by a majority vote at UNO, they are surrendering themselves to world tyranny. Time is now running short, and Australians should be jolted into an understanding of the threat to their own sovereignty by the recent address of a Mr. Arthur Stein, American Fulbright scholar in International Relations, who told Melbourne University students that "The White Australia policy would probably be challenged in the United Nations within the next few years," and that "it would be better for Australia to modify her migration policy—and win acceptance for it—before this happened."

Mr. Stein then observed, "There seemed to be little realisation in Australia that the Afro-Asian bloc of the U.N. would shortly hold 45 out of 100 votes. This bloc was likely to hold together on colonial and similar issues." Present members of the Afro-Asian bloc in the United Nations have already supported the Communists on vital issues, and all those concerned about the seating of Communist China in UNO should be considering the fact that every new member of the Afro-Asian bloc in UNO is one more vote which will be cast in favour of Communist China.

LENIN'S TEACHING

Lenin's famous teaching that the European powers could be destroyed by attacking them through their colonies, is now very nearly a reality—although in a manner which even Lenin could hardly have envisaged. The European Powers are not only retreating prematurely from colonial possessions and making chaos a certainty; they are accepting representatives of the chaos into UNO and suggesting that these representatives be given an equal voice in deciding the destiny of a Civilization they neither understand nor really accept. The situation is both fantastic and a grim challenge to every person who still retains some conception of reality.

Quite apart from all arguments concerning the traditional Australian migration policy, surely this is an issue to be decided freely by Australians, not by other people. But in this time of worldwide brain-washing, and the use of double-speak, it is claimed in one breath that all the primitive peoples of the world should be granted "independence" as quickly as possible, even if this means that they revert to their ancient customs of murdering one another—this is their internal business and no one must interfere—while in the next breath it is said that Australians and other people have no right to determine who they are going to allow into their countries and what internal policies they are going to pursue. When Jomo Kenyatta and his Mau Mau followers obtain control in Kenya, which they almost certainly will when "independence" comes, they will have their representative at UNO and, if Australians accept the advice of Mr. Arthur Stein, they should attempt to make certain that they will not incur Kenyatta's wrath by starting to modify their racial policies immediately. It will be noted that the use of UNO to attack the policies of member nations is always confined to the non-Communists. The Communists don't bother taking the slightest notice of any criticisms of their own policies in the UNO debates. They regard UNO as an instrument for assisting them to conquer the world, and they will continue to use this instrument just so long as the present attitude towards UNO is maintained in the non-Communist countries.

THE ROLE OF THE UNIVERSITIES

It is of significance that Mr. Arthur Stein chose to outline his subversive ideas to a University audience. Another piece of famous advice given by Lenin was that every effort should be made to capture the student mind everywhere. If Lenin were alive today, he would surely be delighted with the major role the Universities everywhere are playing in the world revolution. For example, the recent rioting in Japan, which resulted in a major Communist victory in the East, was primarily the work,

(Continued on page 8)

NEWS SECTION

Pressure To Recognise Red China: There is growing pressure throughout Australia for the recognition of Red China. Although the visit of Viscount Montgomery to China has helped stimulate this pressure, most of it stems from economic considerations. An increasing number of Australian primary producers, particularly woolgrowers, have been impressed with the argument that there is a large market for their wool in Red China. As we have observed before, exports to Red China, or to any other country, are a genuine economic loss unless they are used to pay for required imports. No one has yet advanced a convincing argument that Australia requires anything from Red China.

The suggestion that it is necessary for the West to invite Red China into the United Nations, in order that the Chinese Communists may be better "understood", masks the truth that the real source of the drive for recognition comes not only from the Communists and their numerous unconscious dupes, but from powerful financial and commercial interests in the West who continue to promote dangerous propaganda concerning export markets. It becomes increasingly obvious that the Achilles heel of the Western nations in the struggle against Communism is the failure to solve internal economic problems without being tempted by the bait of export markets in Communist countries.

Viscount Montgomery's Misunderstanding Of Communism: Upon his return to England from his visit to China, Field Marshall Viscount Montgomery said that there could be no world peace until China and the U.S.A. agreed. He said, "I know very well that the Chinese are Communist and I also know that Communism cannot tolerate any other allegiance except to the State. But I cannot see that this is any reason why we cannot talk to these people. Their religion is their business. It only becomes our business when they try to push their philosophy down our throats."

There is no reason at all why anyone should not talk with the Communists. But he should first make certain that he knows what he is talking about. Clearly Viscount Montgomery doesn't know much about Communism, or he wouldn't express the view that it is possible to have any genuine agreement with a dedicated Communist, who must subscribe to the fundamental Communist doctrine that the victory of Communism is "inevitable" and that all steps towards furthering this victory are justified. Even telling fairy tales to a politically naive British military figure.

Communist Leaders To Visit Cuba: Cuba is now openly emerging as the Communists' major base in the Americas. The Communists made a powerful economic thrust with their agreement concerning the purchase of Cuba's sugar. Now it is revealed that the way has been paved for the visit this year of both the Chinese Communist leader, Chou En-Lai, and the Russian Premier, Mr. Khrushchev.

Not Reported In The Daily Papers: When Ghana became an "independent" State, a number of educated natives left South Africa and went to Ghana, not as political agitators, but to make a living in their various professions. Some, for example, were teachers. Most of these natives lost no time in returning from Dr. Nkrumah's "freedom" to the "brutal police State" of South Africa. The experiences of these natives who went to Ghana have been published and should be made compulsory reading for all those so ready to create the impression that the world will be a better place for all coloured peoples when enough Dr. Nkrumahs have been given despotic power.

Answering The Communist Economic Offensive: In a brilliant article in the April issue of *The Canadian Intelligence Service*, Desmond O'Connor, a man who has held top economic advisory posts in Canada, states:

"The extent to which Khrushchev succeeded is a matter of record. And it was of a significance, which should not be overlooked that he displayed complete confidence on the outcome in revealing Soviet strategy. "Having got themselves into a position of overwhelming military strength, the Soviet Union is confident that the West dare not embark on war. For their part, they do not want a war of devastating proportions, the outcome of which is problematical. They know with certainty that the economies of the West are vulnerable. They know that it is only the huge expenditures on defence, and the enormous volume of exports, which are bolstering the economies of the United States and Great Britain—their Number One targets.

"Their obvious strategy, then, is to force upon the West large-scale disarmament, over a short period, at the same time forcing their way into those foreign markets on which the United States, Britain and others rely for their exports. And, of course, the Soviet Union can sell in those markets at any price they want under Communism.

"This strategy is not only aimed at the economic disruption of the democracies as a prelude to Communist revolution; but it also ensures that as the West gets weaker, the U.S.S.R. will strengthen its economy and, therefore, in any programme of disarmament retain military superiority in relation to the democracies—for it is not merely a country's armed forces, but the strength of the economy backing them which, counts.

"It is all too evident that the political and business leaders of the Western democracies are blind to the peril they face. Otherwise, surely they would be losing no time in rectifying the serious fault in their economies, which is the focus of the Communist attack. It is unthinkable that the men in whose hands are the lives and destinies of millions of men, women and children,

(Continued on page 8)

SOCIAL CREDIT TRAINING COURSE - LECTURE 4

In this Lecture we are going to study the question of how much power Governments should have and how that power can be restricted. The famous statement by Lord Acton, that all power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely, is one of the most profound observations ever made. No individual or group of individuals can be trusted with too much power. The obtaining of power results in the striving for still more power. Power is particularly dangerous when those wielding the power cannot be made directly responsible for their actions.

The central theme of the history of the British people in particular, has been the constant endeavour to prevent power from being centralised, to keep all power decentralised by limiting the powers of Governments in various ways. There is no more vital issue confronting us than the urgent necessity to attack the totalitarian idea of more powers for Governments—particularly centralised Governments. As we saw in our last lecture, **Governments are merely instruments through which the individual should lay down the general rules under which the game of life is to be played.** We hear much about what wonderful things Governments have done, or are going to do, for the individual members of Society, but the facts of history prove that most reforms have been initiated by individual members of the community and forced upon reluctant Governments. Writing of this matter in 1867, the English historian, Thomas Henry Buckle, said: —

"That the civilization of Europe is chiefly owing to the ability which has been displayed by two different governments, and to the sagacity with which the evils of society have been palliated by legislative remedies is a notion which must appear so extravagant as to make it difficult to refer to it with becoming gravity . . .

"No great political improvements, no great reform, either legislative or executive, has even been originated in any country by its rulers. The first suggestions of such steps have always been by bold and able thinkers, who discern the abuse, denounce it, and point out how it can be remedied . . . At length, if circumstances are favourable, the pressure from without becomes so strong, that the government is obliged to give way; and, the reform being accomplished, the people are expected to admire the wisdom of their rulers, by whom all this has been done . . .

"It is only with the greatest difficulty that parliament is induced to grant what the people are determined to have, and the necessity of which has been proved by the ablest men. Posterity ought to know that great measures are extorted from the legislative by pressure from without; that they are conceded not cheerfully but with fear; and carried out by statesmen who have spent their lives in opposing what they now suddenly advocate . . .

" . . . Since the most valuable improvements in legislation are those, which subvert preceding legislation, it is clear that the balance of good cannot be on their side.

It is clear that the progress of civilization cannot be due to those who, on the most important subjects, have done so much harm that their successors are considered benefactors simply because they reverse their policy, and thus restore affairs to the state in which they would have remained if politicians had allowed them to run on in the course which the wants of society required . . . The effects produced in European civilization by political legislation compose an aggregate so formidable that we may well wonder how, in the face of them, civilization has been able to advance. That under such circumstances it has advanced is a decisive proof of the extraordinary energy of man . . .

"The world has been made familiar with the great truth, that one main condition of the prosperity of the people is that its rulers shall have very little power, that they shall by no means presume to raise themselves into supreme judges of the National interests, or deem themselves authorised to defeat the wishes of those for whose betterment alone they occupy the posts entrusted to them."

It is obvious that we no longer have the political wisdom of our forefathers. In his essay, "The Situation and the Outlook," C. H. Douglas says that " . . . Government is inherently and inevitably restrictive and therefore . . . the amount of Government which a community can stand without collapsing is definitely limited, and if Governments are competitive, the most governed community will collapse first. And, therefore, the first policy to be applied to over-Government, i.e. Socialism, is and must be, a negative policy—a retreat from Government; less Government."

Let us now consider the main ideas developed by our forefathers in an attempt to limit the power of Governments and thus prevent the growth of that corruption Lord Acton warned about and which we have appalling evidence of on all sides today. The idea of limiting the powers of Governments which we understand best, is the decentralisation of political power by decentralised Government—small political units in which the representatives of the people are more easily amenable to electoral control than is the case in big political units. Decentralised Government is local Government. Local Government is Government on the spot by those who understand the conditions of their own locality. In Government close to the people, there is less chance of delegated authority to an irresponsible bureaucracy—a feature of all centralised Governments. Centralised Governments, striving as they do for more and more power, try to legislate on so many matters which should either be the province of local Governments or right outside the control of all Governments, that the excuse is that there is too much legislation and that some responsibility must therefore be delegated to a bureaucracy. All Governments have argued in modern times that modern conditions have so complicated Government that some powers must be delegated to a bureaucracy. The complications mentioned

can be traced to the policies of Governments interfering with matters over which they should have no control.

Another very good reason why local, decentralised Government is necessary, is because the smaller the political unit, the less chance there is of majorities being used to destroy the rights of minorities. There has been no more dangerous definition of democracy than that which says that it is majority rule. In *Sham Democracy* James Guthrie writes: —

"Those in control of the modern State can, and do, penalise minorities, because they claim that they represent a majority—the fact being overlooked that we are all, at one time or another, a member of a minority. Parents are in a minority, farmers are in a minority; the country dwellers are in a minority: skilled men are in a minority; the politically wise are very much in a minority. But so-called democratic governments demand the right—and they continually exercise this right—to over-rule every minority, which together make the majority. In other words, in practice we are witnessing governments using the technique of the manipulated mass-vote to disfranchise successive minorities, and transfer their rights to the manipulators."

The success of the political vote depends upon whether the individual can preserve and extend his sovereignty by the use of it. We can best study the menace of the majority vote by considering the creation of one world political unit. Under such conditions, nine million Australians would, in the world central Government, obviously be hopelessly outvoted by the representative of, say, China. Now surely no one in his right senses would suggest that Australian affairs should be controlled by a majority on a world scale.

Another aspect of the political vote which has been given considerable attention in recent Social Credit literature, is the use of the secret vote, which permits not only majorities to be used to disfranchise minorities, but also permits this to be completely irresponsible.

In his address, *Realistic Constitutionalism*, Douglas said: ". . . the individual votes must be made individually responsible, not collectively taxable, for his vote. The merry game of voting yourself benefits at the expense of your neighbour must stop . . . There is a clear method by which to approach this end—the substitution of the open ballot for the secret franchise . . ."

The following extracts from an article by Hewlett Edwards, first published in the *Social Crediter*, will provide the student with the basic arguments concerning the secret vote: —

"Decisive exercise of judgment is that policy *formation* which is the function proper to an individual, as an elector. This is the basic factor in any system, which approaches the reality of democracy; and it can only be operative in the choice between practical, well-defined alternatives. This is the antithesis of what exists, for the keynote of elections is confusion, not clarity; they are contests between catchwords, slogans, vast generalisations and diffuse abstractions . . . a technique of perversion . . .

has reduced the political system to effective bar between the ordinary man and his common sense. The common sense, which is at once his compass and his arm. So bereft he is unable to take part in the formation of directive policy, and must submit to the imposition of other policies, alien to his own . . .

"Probably the most debilitating factor of current political action is the irresponsibility of those concerned. Freedom—the ability to choose or to refuse—is primary; but it is commonsense that a man should be simply and directly answerable for his actions, it is that which binds him back to facts. This is dependent on action being open and avowed; it is the free expression of opinion, which is a part of the English tradition, not the secret ballot that dates from 1872. At the present juncture it is not easy to find many who will admit to having put the present government into power, the elector hides behind the secret ballot when it suits him: Party members are screened by 'Party decisions', and those who enact so many regulations . . . are shrouded in an anonymous service. Such devices are so many channels for the exercise of power without responsibility . . . Measures which diminish the integrity of the economic vote have been accomplished by an increasing advertisement and use of the political vote; to the effect, e.g. that the only recourse left to a man who wants to buy a banana is political . . .

"It is often said, without realisation of what lies beneath the surface, that 'the world is going mad'; and there is something in it. Only the ordinary man by use of his compass and his arm—his common sense—can reverse the process. But he cannot vote with common sense unless the issues presented for decisions (at elections) are reduced to such as common sense can deal with. This manner of summing up a proposition—its consequences and its cost; whether this is what you want, and whether this is what you want to pay for—forms a medium in which the ordinary man is still capable of the decisive act: and wherein he is accustomed to take direct responsibility, profiting if he 'buys well' and losing if he does not."

Douglas suggests that the secret vote be abolished and replaced by an open, recorded and published vote, and that those who vote for the Government to pay all increases in taxation, etc., which the Government may levy.

The most dangerous conception of responsible Government is that which insists that once a Government has been elected to office, it should have all power to do as it likes. A little thought will indicate the menace of this conception. Writing in his book, *The King and His Dominion Governors*, Dr. H. V. Evatt points out how a Government is only the Government for the time being and should not be unlimited in its powers. He instanced how the Government of Newfoundland abolished itself without consulting the people of Newfoundland. Our British forefathers learned through hard experience that definite checks were required on elected Governments. This brings us to a study of Upper Houses, the Crown,

and other checks on Governments. In his address, "Realistic Constitutionalism", to the British Constitutional Research Association, Douglas said: —

"In some form or other sovereignty in the British Isles for the last two thousand years has been Trinitarian. Whether we look on this Trinitarianism under the names of Kings, Lords and Commons or as Policy, Sanctions and Administration, the Trinity-in-Unity has existed, and our national success has been greatest when the balance (never perfect) has been approached.

" . . . By the strengthening and elevation of Common Law, and its repository in the care of an effective Second, non-elective, Chamber, or by some other method, clearly defined limits must be placed on the power of a House of Commons elected on a majority principle . . . Common Law is something which, if it changes at all, ought to change very slowly indeed, and the greatest difficulty should be placed in the path of an attack upon it, both by insisting on its supremacy over House of Commons enactments, and by making it subject only to something at least as arduous as an Amendment to the United States Constitution . . ."

English Common Law can be traced right back to Magna Carta. It was built up to protect the rights of the individual. When the Common Law was more widely understood, before the growth of what the former Chief Justice of England, Lord Hewart, termed "bureaucratic lawlessness", the individual's rights were firmly protected. The Courts existed to ensure that his rights were upheld, even against the Crown itself. Today the Courts don't uphold the Common Law: they are used by the "new despotism" for its own ends.

Sir Henry Slessor has said: "The future of the Common Law is plainly more than a matter for lawyers. The Law of England is a unique contribution to Christian civilization; its decay may prove to be one of the greatest tragedies of our age."

In Australia, as in America, we do not have a non-elective Upper House such as the House of Lords in Great Britain. The Upper House in the Federal sphere, the Senate, was the result of the Federal Constitution, and was intended to be a protection for the local State Governments. The Party system has destroyed the value of the Senate, and it is indeed fortunate that the Australian people have been protected to some extent from the predatory designs of the Federal Government, by the written Federal Constitution. One of the most important tasks confronting Australian Social Crediters is to make a positive defence of the Federal Constitution, the great bulwark against a complete centralised despotism from Canberra.

Those who have never studied the history of Government complain that the Upper Houses are anti-democratic and oppose the will of the people. It is amazing how many people accept this nonsense. The basic idea of the Upper House, brought to this country from Great Britain and based upon sound tradition, was to preserve the Trinitarian balance in Government. The Upper House,

restricted to those with specific qualifications, was intended to be elected by a more responsible vote. Its function is not, as some ignorant people contend, to block all legislation, but to ensure that legislation is not rushed through Parliament, legislation which could destroy the rights of the electors before they knew what was happening.

Those people, who complain that Upper Houses insist on opposing legislation affecting property rights, completely ignore that fact that the ownership of property of some description provides the individual with some degree of liberty and security. The most serious charge that can be levelled against Upper Houses is that they have failed to protect the basic rights of the people.

Probably the most classic example in recent times of the great benefit of a responsible Upper House is the manner in which the Tasmanian Upper House refused in 1944 to permit the Tasmanian Parliament to transfer enormous powers to the Federal Government, thus destroying the Federal Constitution. All the totalitarians were loud in their cries protesting how an "anti-democratic" Upper House was preventing a "democratic" Lower House from doing as it desired. Now, the Tasmanian Upper House accepted its responsibilities and insisted that no powers should be transferred to Canberra without the people's direct consent at a Referendum. The responsible action of the Tasmanian Upper House resulted in the 1944 Referendum, at which the Tasmanian electors voted overwhelmingly against surrendering to Canberra the powers willing to be granted by the Tasmanian Lower House. In other words, if it had not been for the Tasmanian Upper House, the Tasmanian people would have had their rights destroyed without redress.

Those who oppose Upper Houses also rail against Constitutional limitations to Governments. How often do we hear it said that it is ridiculous that the Federal Government, elected by a majority of the people, should be restricted by the Federal Constitution? We also hear the High Court attacked. Like most written Constitutions, our Federal Constitution embodies the political traditions of our race. Tradition may be termed the accumulated experience of the past; it is what has been found to work. The idea of tradition is essentially sound and even the most primitive people develop it in order to ensure the survival of the tribe. Over a long period of time our forefathers learned that Governments must have their powers limited, otherwise "snap" legislation could destroy what took hundreds of years to build up. All British constitutional safeguards can be directly traced to our Christian background. In an article, "Under What King?" Douglas wrote in 1945: —

"The Church (during the Mediaeval period) claimed to be, and was to quite a considerable extent, a living body of Superior Law, not different in intention but far higher in conception, to the Constitution of the United States."

Compared with the Australian Constitution, the American Constitution has the advantage of being much more

difficult to amend. We can best understand the conception of a tradition, whether it is embodied in a Common Law interpreted by a non-corruptible judiciary, a House of Lords such as in Great Britain, or in a written Constitution, by referring to that most English of games, cricket. Although there are specific rules under which the game is played, the actions of the players are also modified by a code of sportsmanship. How often do we hear, "That is not done" or "It isn't cricket"? This code is not continued by a "voting" process: it is a living, permanent tradition. We now come to a brief examination of the function of the Crown. It is often contended that the major principle of the British Constitution is the omnipotence of Parliament. So far from this being the case, the great Bill of Rights specifically lays it down that the individual may petition the King.

The essential idea behind the Bill of Rights was . . . that the British people had certain rights and liberties, established by custom and not subject either to the whim of Parliaments or the conspiracies of politicians, and the King was the supreme Defender of these Personal Rights. In his *Realistic Constitutionalism* Douglas writes: —

"The essential soul of a nation is in its character, its culture and tradition. The King is the natural embodiment of Honours and Sanctions—of Culture and Tradition and, as such, is naturally the Supreme Commander of the Armed Forces."

Because of his embodiment of the nation's culture and tradition, the King, or his various representatives in all parts of the British Empire, represents all the people and has the power to veto all legislation. If used, the veto could compel legislators either to place legislation directly before the people, or if they felt that the people would not sanction it, not pursue it any further. It is interesting to note that even in a Republic such as America, the Trinitarian idea of Government has been maintained, with the President having the power of veto of any legislation.

So far from legislation being easy to pass, it should be made a process, which permits the greatest possible consideration to be given to it. If Upper Houses and the Crown were functioning as they were conceived by our forefathers, they would be ensuring that legislation be reduced to a minimum and carefully examined.

QUESTIONS ON LECTURE 4

1. Why have Governments generally opposed genuine progress?
2. Suggest policies to further Douglas's suggestion that these should be "a retreat from Government".
3. Under what circumstances do you think that majority rule may be acceptable?
4. Briefly outline why you oppose World Government.
5. What is the purpose of a Constitution? Do you think the Churches should concern themselves with constitutionalism? If so, why?

NEW SERIES OF MELBOURNE HOUSE MEETINGS

A new series of Melbourne house meetings will start on Saturday, July 16. Melbourne supporters are requested to make use of these meetings to bring along new people. A number of current issues will be dealt with by competent speakers at the meetings, which will enable adequate time for questions and discussion. Supper will be provided.

The following is the series:

Mr. J. Lennie, 47 Spruzen Avenue, East Kew.
Saturday, July 16.

Mr. K. Hanger, 29 Spencer Road, Camberwell.
Tuesday, July 26.

Mr. F. O. Tamas, 206 Auburn Road, Hawthorn,
Tuesday, August 2.

Mr. L. Wilson, 12 Bolden Street, Heidelberg,
Tuesday, August 9.

Mr. Ron Dyason, 17 Sylvester Crescent, East Malvern. Tuesday, August 23.

Mrs. Fell, 418 High Road, Mt. Waverley.
Tuesday, September 6.

A SOCIAL CREDIT SOCIAL EVENING

A Social Evening will be held at St. Mark's Hall, George Street, Fitzroy, on Friday, July 22. This will be a most enjoyable evening, which everyone will enjoy. Make a note of the date now.

The Rev. Norman Hill will, with the aid of his excellent films, give a travel talk, "To England and Back." The social evening will be held in a warm, comfortable room, and supper will be provided. Ladies are invited to participate in a sponge cake competition. And one supporter has donated a lady's gold wristlet watch for raffling.

CODNER BROS.

Builders and Joinery
Manufacturers Homes and
Home Sites Available
WHEATSHEAF ROAD, GLENROY

PROSTITUTION OF HUMAN NATURE

The following article by G. K. Tavender originally appeared in "Social Credit Digest."

"... A centralised system of totalitarianism requires, even if it could be made to work, a completely selfless integrity which is not only unknown, but for Christian—"thy neighbour as thyself" presumably means what it says. So far as I understand Christianity, it is the easy (not necessarily the immediately easy) way to do things. "My yoke is easy, My burden light." Christianity is not a pathetic and everlasting effort to do the undoable. The Satanic ideology of work, employment, austerity, sacrifice, is not an ideology of achievement. Surely anyone can see that. It is an ideology of sabotage, destruction, corruption, and decay."—C. H. Douglas in *The Big Idea*.

The author of the above is listed in "Who's Who?" for his achievements as a railroad construction engineer. He was noted also as a yacht builder, mathematician, accountant, and philosopher. A journalist named him "the Einstein of economics." People familiar with his literary work saw the "smeared" death notice from the press agency as a tribute to his greatness. Neither eulogy nor condemnation prove anything; so let us examine the facts.

Opposed to Douglas' conception of Christian living are the pessimists who say, "You can't get more out of life than you put into it." On the other hand are eminent preachers who proclaim: "The best things in life are free." They mean friendship, the faculty of reason, appreciation of beauty, and so on. A material basis for their slogan is apt to be overlooked. From the Christian standpoint, the right amount of rain at the right time is regarded as a gift from nature. Tide, wind, solar energy (as oil and coal) provide billions of man power, from which we draw vast multiples of our own expenditure of energy. Nature contributes infinitely more than man to the production of food, clothing, housing, transport, etc.

A few hours of pleasurable study can yield knowledge, which required of our forbears centuries of trial and error in compilation. Experience is our best teacher, but we "save time" by drawing it from our heritage.

Much more evidence is available, but surely the foregoing proves that man gets "more out of life than he puts in."

HONEST WORK?

Another shibboleth widely used in resistance to truth, and needing rebuttal, is: "There's no substitute for honest (or hard) work."

WORK is the overcoming of resistance to motion.

POWER denotes the rate at which work is done.

ENERGY is the ability of an agent to do work.

No work is done unless something is moved. Work may be done for a dishonest purpose—e.g., unnecessary taxation, sabotage, theft, etc.; but there is no such thing as "honest" work. Work is merely work, as defined above, whether the objective be good or evil.

It should be clear also that hardness is not a quality of work. The term "hard work" expresses the excess of pain over satisfaction experienced by a human attempting something at the limit of, or beyond, his capacity. Any work can be done if sufficient energy is available.

Men like Edison, Ford, and C. H. Douglas accomplished much more than average not by "hard work," but through good sense and good fortune in choosing work that was easy for them because it suited their talents, and provided absorbing interest and pleasure. They had the mental attitude of free men, like today's John Gunther, who says: "I have not time or freedom or energy enough to do all the things I would like to do."

In the language of physics there is no substitute for work. But the pessimists mean there is no substitute for human work, and, of course, they are utterly wrong.

Although nature has done most of the work in providing metals, timber, food, solar energy, and so on, man must do some work in turning these gifts to advantage. His gift for positive thinking urges him to increase the advantage by extracting from nature's bounty increasing utility (profit) in less time.

His method is to discover natural laws (God's laws) concerning principles of mechanics, mechanics of fluids, properties of materials, etc., then to arrange various combinations of machine elements and solar energy to do most of the work he had formerly done himself. In other words, motors and machines, products of positive thinking, are a very effective substitute for human toil. With later discoveries it is now possible to arrange other elements to do the least interesting thinking for mankind.

Does this mean that man's purpose is to put himself out of work? Not exactly. Biologists claim that in the early stages of man's evolution the function of breathing required continuous effort, until, after thousands of years, it became automatic. Even so, singers, sportsmen, and others today enhance satisfactory living by further cultivation of breathing. Similarly, the functional

PROSTITUTION OF HUMAN NATURE

(Continued from Page 7)

activity of acquiring other basic needs tends increasingly to become automatic, and with the wide variation of human tastes, it is quite conceivable that, released from compulsion, some people would elect to improve their skill at some work which others regard as drudgery. Grape picking, sheaf tossing, and wood chopping competitions readily come to mind. Although man's ultimate purpose is unknown, the immediate one is "freedom to choose."

Recent discoveries, wrongly used, could "blow up" the earth. The question arises, in searching for the means to freedom, is man becoming too clever for his own good? No. Every step forward in the field of physics should be balanced (but is not) by increasing knowledge of man's proper relationship to the universe. In this field he is not "clever" enough to grasp the significance of Christ's assurance that institutions are for the service of individuals, and not vice versa. He is unsure of his proper relationships to religion, education, finance, economics, legalism, and government. He does not understand the principles of human association. He allows himself to be the plaything of bureaucracy and permits sabotage of his freedom, and perversion of purpose by wars, depressions, social debt, price inflation. He does not know how to sanction the turning of atomic truth to advantage. No, man is not becoming "too clever for his own good."

"I am confident that there is an organised attempt to drive him down the scale of existence, so that he becomes primarily a number on a card index, by taking away, as far as possible, any recognisable initiative, his potentially divine attribute. It is not human nature, which is at fault—that is exactly what it is not. It is the prostitution of human nature to a lower order of evolution—the group soul. Evidently an organisation, which is expressly designed to make use of individuals without allowing them to understand the true object for which they are being used, is inherently evil. It is a matter of no consequence whatever that it may have been founded by an idealist with an eye on the Millennium."—C. H. Douglas in *The Big Idea*.

The philosophy known as Social Credit ("practical Christianity") supplies the answer. Resistance to this branch of truth may prevent its getting through in time to avert disaster. We repeat Edmund Burke's challenge: "All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing."

TO WORLD TYRANNY VIA UNITED NATIONS

(Continued from page 1)

not only of University students, but of University teachers acting under Communist direction.

The promoters of world revolution are, of course, not interested in the slightest in the so-called oppressed peoples, backward peoples, or the underprivileged peoples. The promoters of the revolution are not concerned about the growing bloodshed in Africa, so long as it provides with both votes in UNO and areas in which to expand their influence without opposition. And it is for similar reasons that the Communists persistently campaign for the abolition of Australia's present racial policies. An influx of Asians or Africans into this country would not solve the problems of the people of Asia or Africa, but it would inevitably produce an internal problem, which would be further exploited to destroy Australia's sovereignty. The fact that a large number of idealists are openly leading the attack on Australia's migration provides the perfect front behind, which the Communist plans to obtain their objective.

A number of experts on the Communist conspiracy have warned over the years that UNO was a deadly trap which would ultimately be used to enslave the whole world. Their warnings can no longer be dismissed as ridiculous. The genuine defence of the Western world requires the immediate withdrawal of all Western nations from UNO and its numerous agencies. A genuine alliance of non-Communist nations, sovereign in their own domestic affairs, could replace UNO, thus depriving the revolutionaries of their major instrument of conquest. But the time left for action is desperately short.

Postscript: The former UNO official, Bang-Jensen, was one of those responsible for the report on the Hungarian uprising in 1956 and its brutal suppression. He was removed from his post because he discovered the network of Communist sabotage within UNO. Bang-Jensen later committed "suicide."

NEWS SECTION

(Continued from page 2)

would consciously be the instruments for the collapse of what civilisation remains to us, and the subjugation of their countrymen by the tyranny of Communist rule. Yet, unknowingly, that is just what they are doing.

"It can be demonstrated that by simple corrections within our financial system it would not only be possible to correct its faulty operation, but within a matter of months prices could be reduced substantially, all incomes increased, and everybody assured full social security under a strong and stable economy.

"This is no theory. It is fact. The alternative is disaster on a scale too terrible to contemplate."