

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. 27, No. 9

May 5, 1961

EDITORIAL

DIRECTION OF LABOUR BY CREDIT POWER

When Mr. Harold Holt, Federal Treasurer, and public relations officer for Dr. Coombs and other permanent officials, claims that the decline in employment in certain industries proves that the Government's financial policy is "succeeding," he is saying that the Government's planners are using the financial system to force people from some industries into other industries. In attempting to defend the Government's policies at Canberra last week, the Minister for Labour, Mr. McMahon, put the position clearly when he said, "The effect of the Government's economic measures has been to transfer employees to industries which were essential to Australia's progress." The direction of labour is now as real in Australia as it is in Soviet Russia. In Russia police power is used to direct labour to the "essential" industries, but in Australia credit power is sufficient.

Further striking evidence of this country's march towards totalitarianism has been provided by Mr. Holt in his attempted reply to the spokesmen for Australian manufacturing industries. These spokesmen, both in statements and in advertisements, have dared to point out to the Government that the Government's financial policy has had a most depressing effect upon industry, and that many industries have had to reduce the number of employees in order to stay solvent. They have also gone so far as to talk about the necessity of increased credit expansion in order to prevent a depression from developing. Mr. Holt bristled with indignation and said that he was not going to be "intimidated." He made it clear that he thought he and his advisers were more competent to advance sound financial and economic policies than were the spokesmen for "sectional interests." What he did not point out was that the Canberra planners have proved by their results over many years that they are either incompetent, or they are deliberately working to produce crises which they can then exploit to further centralised Government control.

We warmly welcome the action initiated by the manufacturers, which is providing the present Government with a new experience: a strong public attack upon their financial policy by the manufacturers. An increasing number of business men have started to grasp the fact that there is no need to depress the internal economy because of the country's lack of overseas earnings. They can also see that centralised control of the whole economy is effected through centralised control of credit creation. The trading banks are today merely instruments for the implementation of the type of credit policy decided upon by Dr. Coombs. However, while the strong opposition to the Government's financial policy is to be welcomed, we urge readers to support this opposition with appropriate personal letters to their Federal Members — an increase in credit expansion of itself will not solve the basic problem, which is how to place the individual in the position where he can freely decide in order of priority what results he wants from an economic system which can easily provide him with an abundance of the goods and services required. Genuine economic democracy

requires that the present *methods* of expanding financial credit be altered.

WHAT IS PROGRESS?

In his claim that the Government's policies had been responsible for transferring employees to industries which "were essential to Australia's progress," Mr. McMahon did not mention the thousands who have since last November left private employment to swell the growing ranks of the Government's army of officials. Is the increase of officialdom essential for Australia's progress? The answer is yes only if progress means increasing government control of the economy. Centralised credit policy is being used to create the centralised economy. Big business becomes bigger while smaller and medium businesses are either absorbed into bigger units or close down. And the bigger business units become progressively more dependent upon Government orders in order to function. A so-called Free Enterprise Government is creating the totalitarian State. It is implementing every totalitarian policy, including the direction of labour, which it once charged the Labor Party was attempting to implement.

There is no doubt that many Members of the Government Parties are concerned about the direction in which Mr. Holt and his "advisers" are taking them. But no modification is possible unless there is some hard and original thinking concerning the use of credit policy to enable the individual to obtain some real benefits from an economic system which has increased enormously both in size and in efficiency even in the past five years. Easier financial credit for home building would not only overcome some of the biggest social problems in this country, but would immediately stimulate demand for consumer goods. Credit could also be made available for other social objectives which come within the scope of Local Government. But, apart from these obvious objectives, all of which are essential for a really strong and united nation in these perilous times, the basic problem concerning credit policy is how to expand credit without at the same time expanding the rate of increase in the price level.

(Continued on page 4)

AUSTRALIAN PRESS IGNORES LIBERAL MEMBER'S APPEAL FOR A CROWN COMMONWEALTH

Although the address by the Liberal Member for Moreton, Mr. D. J. Killen, during the recent debate on international affairs, was easily the most logical and constructive of the contributions from both sides of the House it was completely ignored by the Australian press. As far as can be ascertained, every other speaker rated at least a mention. The reason for the suppression of Mr. Killen's address, delivered on April 13, can readily be ascertained by an examination of what the Liberal Member said. He mentioned facts which the supporters of revolution find unpalatable, while his suggestion that the British peoples should now re-group themselves into a Crown Commonwealth in order to make a traditional British contribution towards the solving of the world's problems was no doubt regarded as a dangerous challenge to the policy of complete destruction of what remains of the British world.

The following is the "Hansard" report of Mr. Killen's address (cross-headings supplied):—

The speech that has just fallen from the lips of the honorable member for Hindmarsh (Mr. Clyde Cameron) will surprise nobody. It was, of course, a leftist speech. That is to be expected, because the honorable member's intellect and sympathy are both directed perceptibly and willingly towards the left. He finished his speech by referring fleetingly to the problems of South Africa, having devoted most of his time to what he is pleased to call an analysis of South-East Asia. Having considered what the honorable member has said about South-East Asia, I suggest that one could say quite accurately and quite simply that he has vamped the theme of colonialism. According to him, all the countries of the world that have ever had any interest in South-East Asia have been rotten and corrupt. It is strange to hear this suggestion, which is not, of course, in accord with the facts. If there is one thing that has appalled me during the course of this debate, it is the way in which the facts, the record and the history of events have been trampled upon, disposed of and dismissed and not even acknowledged.

What are the facts about colonialism? Let me give them to the honorable gentleman. Between 1945 and 1960 the Western Powers brought 38 nations to full independence. In the years between 1920 and 1958 the Soviet Union extended its complete control over seventeen countries and in eight regions. This is the colonial record that should be examined.

"POLITICAL CANNIBALISM"

"The amendment that has been proposed by Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Calwell) is as ruthless an expression of political cannibalism as I can imagine. The honorable gentleman set out to belittle the record of the Prime Minister. Let me say this to honorable members opposite: When their leader moved this miserable, contemptible little amendment, it was their unworthiest hour. Their battle cry in this debate, as it seems to be in any debate, is, "Anything for a vote". That is the battle cry of the Labor Party. Few in this century have worked with such a sense of devotion and a sense of understanding, in the interests of the Commonwealth, as has the present Prime Minister (Mr. Menzies). I do not believe in indulging unnecessarily in flattery. I believe in supporting the sturdy qualities of candour. However, that is my belief, and even though some may think I am in error, when the eye and the mind of the historian look back on the record,

I believe he will come to the conclusion that I have already arrived at. But a fundamental truth, of course is that great ideas are never understood by those who have little minds.

The Labour Party has said in this debate that the South African policy of apartheid is a non-domestic matter. Very well, concede that argument for the time being. What is the formula by the use of which you can say that one policy is domestic and another policy is not? Am I to understand that the policies pursued by Archbishop Makarios in Cyprus -- the leader, sponsor and inspirer of the wretched Eoka movement that killed men, women and children — are a domestic issue? Am I to understand that the policies of the Prime Minister-apparent of an emerging, independent Kenya -- Jomo Kenyatta — are domestic? Is there any person in this House or in the fourth estate who can go to his womenfolk and without batting an eyelid recite the oath of the Mau Mau? Am I to understand that the wretched form of blasphemy of Dr. Nkrumah in Ghana, who during the course of the last election styled himself greater than Jesus Christ is non-domestic? It offends me.

MR. NEHRU'S SOMERSAULT

What of some, of the policies of Ceylon and of India? The fact of the matter — and I would hope that the House and the country clearly understand this by now—is that there is no formula devisable to determine what is domestic and what is non-domestic. But in the case of the Commonwealth it has been the settled convention that no discussion upon domestic issues would take place. I am going to summon this evening in support of my contention that the policies of South Africa were domestic, the most violent and consistent opponent of apartheid in the world. I summon, not a person in this Parliament, but Mr. Nehru, whose whole life, history and being have been involved in the detestation of apartheid. This is what Mr. Nehru had to say speaking in the Indian Constituent Assembly on 16th May, 1949—

"I am often asked how we can join a Commonwealth in which there is racial discrimination, in which there are other things happening to which we object. That, I think, is a fair question, and it is a matter which must necessarily give us some trouble in our thinking. Nevertheless it is a question which does not really arise....

(Continued on Page 4)

"This House knows that in the last few years one of the major questions before the United Nations, at the instance of India, has been the position of Indians in South Africa. One of the pillars of our foreign policy, repeatedly stated, is to fight against racial discrimination, to fight for the freedom of suppressed nationalities. Are you compromising on that issue by remaining in the Commonwealth? We have been fighting on the South African-Indian issue and on other issues, even though we have thus far been a Dominion of the Commonwealth."

He continued—

"It was a dangerous thing for us to bring that matter within the purview of the Commonwealth because then the very thing to which you and I object might have taken place. That is, the Commonwealth might have been considered as some kind of superior body which sometimes acts as a tribunal, or judges, or in a sense supervises the activities of its principal nations. That certainly would have meant a diminution in our independence and sovereignty if we had once accepted that principle.

"Therefore, we were not prepared and we are not prepared to treat the Commonwealth as such or even to bring disputes between principal nations of the Commonwealth before the Commonwealth body. We may, of course, in a friendly way discuss the matter; that is a different matter."

Now who has turned the somersault? In 1949, when India was admitted to membership of the Commonwealth, Mr. Nehru said that South African policies were not to be taken before the Commonwealth for consideration.

MR. MACMILLAN'S "COMMON IDEALISM"

The British Prime Minister has contended that the concept of the Commonwealth has changed. Let that be conceded. He has gone on to describe the Commonwealth as being an association now. He said—

"This association must therefore depend not upon the cold concept of common allegiance but on the new principle of common idealism."

The words "common idealism" are the important ones. Let us assume that Mr. Macmillan is completely correct. What is the common idealism? I want to put three questions to the House. First, is that common idealism represented by a common support for parliamentary democracy? That answer plainly is "No", because some Commonwealth countries do not vaguely parallel our concept of parliamentary democracy, and this, mark you, in some cases after years of effort. Secondly, is the common idealism a common support for the principles of justice, the maintenance of order, the protection of the weak and the discipline of the unruly? That could hardly be the case because contemporary experience simply does not confirm the existence of these qualities in some Commonwealth countries, nor as yet any affection for them. Thirdly, is the common idealism referred to by Mr. Macmillan as being the core, the heart and soul of the Commonwealth to-day, common support for the onward march of man towards a new dignity, towards fresh and compelling pursuits of human endeavour and

towards a, lasting and genuine peace? The fact of the matter is that some Commonwealth countries are still manacled by the forces of ignorance, superstition and a solemn stolidity.

Having dismissed the idealism in that way, we ask: What is it? I say plainly that the idealism has gone. The common idealism of the Commonwealth was to be found in a brotherhood which was certainly unique and which strove to give meaning to its belief through a steady practice of tolerance of the weaknesses of its members. The brotherhood sought enlightenment not through resolution, but through persuasiveness. Patience and restraint were its virtues and its plea. You will not find the ambitions of the Commonwealth detailed in minutes. It has been content to let its achievements find a firm place in the chronicles of free men. For good reason the Commonwealth did not lay down the rights and responsibilities of its members, realizing that the integrity of man is never won by the flourish of pen on paper, but only when both mind and heart will it.

OLD CONCEPT GONE FOR EVER

Many people have watched the changing structure of the British Empire with anxiety and regret. From Empire we passed to British Commonwealth and then to Commonwealth. Now, in the light of the last Prime Ministers' Conference, what do we pass to? There was a time when, in the words of Pitt, we could say that we were one people, "Be one people," was Pitt's great cry. We no longer have anything approaching a voice in world affairs that has any unity about it at all. One of the supreme follies of this century, apparently not to be conceded by the Labour Party, is that so many people have accepted the view that the instinct for self-government can be claimed in the same way as a chattel under a will. The genius of the British world in history was found in the reluctance of our people to base their policies on mere legalism. Our people established their principles inductively, not deductively. Even so, their behaviour had a strong oneness about it.

From the Balfour Declaration we progressed to the Statute of Westminster and now to the Prime Ministers' Conference of 1961. Sir, I believe that the old concept of the Commonwealth has gone for ever because of the conference. In its present form the Commonwealth is utterly useless. Having passed that judgment on the domestic policies of a member country, the old concept has gone and the significance of it cannot be easily exaggerated. I believe that those who are interested in the heritage of their people must re-think furiously their concept of Commonwealth.

NEW CONCEPTION NECESSARY

I suggest that a focal point for a new Commonwealth could be a Crown Commonwealth, consisting of countries that accept the Crown as a living part of their parliamentary system. A Crown Commonwealth with a unity founded upon a common allegiance and taking up again some of the old sense of direction, purpose and vigour, could restore to a world threatened with

calamity a tranquillity that would last. Whatever faults may have possessed the British Empire of old, it did have moral and intellectual qualities not to be denied, and it has profoundly benefited mankind. Everywhere in the world where parliamentary democracy is found, something of those qualities can also be found, and just as it was our forebears who nurtured and cultivated parliamentary democracy, so too did the same breed defend it whenever it was assailed.

It is impossible, to my mind, to examine critically contemporary events without feeling that the world desperately needs a third force that is not only dedicated to the cause of peace and that has a moral resolve but also one that has a vision that has been stimulated and steadied by experience. If this civilization is not to disappear, then some authority must come between the world-wide political design of Moscow and the well-meaning contentiousness of Washington. To look to the United Nations for that authority is to look for fish in the desert sands, for that body now encompasses some nations barely out of the cradle of independence and, unfortunately, some nations utterly incapable of following the natural law.

A Crown Commonwealth could, with high hope for all, undertake the mission I have outlined. Little now separates the world from disaster. The establishment of peace on earth and goodwill towards men is no mean ambition. A Crown Commonwealth would immeasurably enable that end to be gained.

DIRECTION OF LABOUR BY CREDIT POWER

(Continued from page 1)

A DIVIDEND FOR ALL

There is no way of expanding credit without at the same time increasing prices unless portion of the new credits are paid direct to the individual and not used to increase costs in industry. Those who claim that an attack upon internal costs is the basic requirement in Australia, and one which is absolutely essential if the wool and other export industries are to earn necessary overseas credits, are quite correct. The solution is, in general terms, to lower the price level with benefit to all—a form of social dividend—by using new credits for subsidies paid only at the retail counter. This type of solution was partly applied in order to help this and other English-speaking countries to survive during the last war. We are fighting for survival today, and courageous, bold thinking is required in the sphere of finance and economics to prevent recurrent crises which are destroying the nation from within. Can some of our business leaders now go a step further in their campaign for credit expansion, and propose that this expansion be used to lower the price level?

THE EICHMANN "TRIAL"

When Adolf Eichmann was seized by Israeli agents in Argentina and unlawfully taken to Israel, a number of anti-Zionist Jews in the U.S.A. warned that the Zionists were going to attempt to use the "trial" of Eichmann to stage a world-wide propaganda stunt. Events to date have confirmed this warning. We will at a later date make a more detailed survey of this matter. For the present we point out that we have waited in vain to see presented any reliable evidence that six million Jews were gassed or otherwise murdered by Eichmann and his associates. That a large number of Jews were killed during the war years is certain. Large numbers of other people were also killed. But the figure of six millions has been deliberately invented to further the plans of World Jewry. When the prosecutor in the Eichmann case claimed that he was speaking in the name of six million murdered Jews, he was deliberately using the occasion for propaganda purposes.

The Communists are, of course, delighted with the manner in which the Eichmann "trial" is being conducted. Once again the Germans are being condemned as a nation, which fits in with current Communist tactics. And, of course, there is no doubt that the Israelis are confident that the "trial" will ensure that the flow of reparations from Germany continues.

Although any "confessions" made by Eichmann since he has been in the Jews' hands must be discounted, it is significant that the alleged confession by Eichmann that he personally planned for gas chamber exterminations in the Auschwitz camp has only been made available to the Israeli court in the form of a statement which it is claimed was made in two death-cell statements by Eichmann's former associate, Dieter Wislicency. But, as evidenced by his own statement, Wislicency was desperately attempting to save his own life and offered to help track Eichmann down, claiming that he could soon find him. No British Court would regard Wislicency's alleged statement as very reliable evidence.

The Israeli prosecutor has termed Auschwitz the "largest and most terrible of the death camps." But he has not pointed out that most of the information concerning Auschwitz has been supplied by the Communists, who took it over as the Red Army advanced eastwards towards the end of the war.

In his book, *Teufel und Verdammte*, published in Switzerland, Dr. Benedikt, who spent seven years in concentration camps, including three in Auschwitz, writes "I must establish the truth that in no camp at any time did I come across such an installation as a gas chamber." Similar statements have been made by other inmates of German concentration camps.

The truth about the concentration camps is well known in Germany, but no open discussion is possible because legal action can be taken against any person even asking any difficult questions. Such is the power of World Jewry, which now seeks to use the Eichmann case to prevent discussion everywhere of the role of the Jews in world affairs.