

# 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"*

Volume 28, No. 10

Box 1226L, G.P.O. Melbourne. Phone 63-9749

June 1, 1962

## EDITORIAL

### THE DRIVE TOWARDS MONOPOLY

As we have explained on a number of occasions, the pressure to force Britain to join the European Common Market is an essential part of the drive towards creating a worldwide monopoly of all power. The most dangerous aspect of the European Common Market campaign is the persistent suggestion that Britain must join because it is "economically inevitable". It is the acceptance of economic determinism, even amongst people who call themselves Christians, which provides the anti-Christ with the most formidable weapon in the struggle for the world. The acceptance of economic determinism is a manifestation of the materialist disease rotting the foundations of the Civilization.

In one of his wartime works, *Programme for The Third World War*, C. H. Douglas made the penetrating observation that, once the individual has surrendered to materialism, politics are dominated by economics. If the individual can be persuaded that the progressive centralisation of economic power is inevitable, then the ground has been cleared for the centralisation of political power, which means in practice the destruction of responsible, limited Parliamentary Government, and its replacement by bureaucracy. As Douglas put it, "if you can control economics, you can keep the business of getting a living the dominant factor of life, and so your control of politics..." Although the facts concerning the modern productive system should convince all but the most completely brain-washed that the business of getting a living could be progressively reduced to a comparatively minor aspect of life, the widespread acceptance of the Communist dogma that "labour produces all wealth" results in the most violent opposition to any suggestion of any extension of the dividend system to supplement the wage system. Dr. Coffey, the well-known Jesuit Professor who accepted the truth of Social Credit, once pointed out that the centralised control of financial credit provided the perfect instrument for the transformation of the free enterprise economic system into a Communist system. Events are confirming the truth of what Dr. Coffey said.

The drive towards economic monopoly in every industrialised nation, the elimination of genuine competitive enterprise and private ownership, and the attempt to make the internal economy work by bigger export drives, all stem basically from a materialist conception of the purpose of the economic and financial system in relationship to the individual. The true purpose of the economic system should be to provide the individual with the goods and services he genuinely requires in the shortest possible time. The claim that the individual should receive no financial income outside the wage system makes it imperative that every improvement in the industrial arts, making it physically possible to free the individual from the domination of economics, should be used to expand the policy of what has been aptly described as economic sabotage. All forms of

unnecessary and wasteful economic activities, cleverly supported with modern high-pressure advertising, are justified on the basis that they distribute financial incomes.

The economics of "full employment", supported by the centralised control of the creation and withdrawal of financial credit, not only leads inevitably towards economic—and political—monopoly in the industrialised nations; they bring these nations into increasing conflict with one another in the struggle for export markets. This conflict is then used as the excuse for an extension of monopoly, by organising nations into highly centralised regional blocs. This is what the European Common Market proposes. But even should it prove practical to extend the policy of monopoly in this way, this would not be the end of the development. This regional bloc, totalitarian in structure, would also have to strive for export markets, thus bringing it into conflict with other regional blocs. This conflict would lead to the logical conclusion that these regional blocs should then be integrated into one bloc. All this, of course, under the guise of making the non-Communist world "strong" against Communism. With the world organised into two regional blocs, it would be relatively easy to move into the World Police State, with the Communists doing the actual policing.

Just as the most deadly threat to economic monopoly in any country is widespread ownership of property and small-scale successful competitive enterprise, so does the British Commonwealth of Nations present a barrier to the drive for World Monopoly. The prime movers for World Monopoly will be found amongst the international financial groups, and these power-lusters have not forgotten that during the Great Depression, which was but a necessary prelude to the second world war and the diabolical policies which that war made possible, it was amongst the British peoples everywhere that there rapidly grew a movement which not only challenged the financial policies which produced the Great Depression, but which showed that modifications of financial and economic policies could be made while at the same time preserving and strengthening the foundations of Civilization. A genuine conservative, the genius Douglas demon-

Continued on page 2

## NEWS COMMENTARY

**Roman Catholics and Communism:** In a recent letter published in the Melbourne Roman Catholic journal, *The Advocate*, a correspondent, obviously a migrant, draws attention to the fact that a section of Roman Catholics in both Czechoslovakia and Cuba helped Communism come to power. At a time when a powerful campaign has been launched in the U.S.A. to convince Roman Catholics that the internal menace of Communism has been exaggerated, and that the "right-wing extremists" are a menace to freedom, it is instructive to recall that that section of the American Roman Catholic press which supported Castro, even some writers suggesting that he was supporting the Church's social teachings, has been responsible for spreading the story that the John Birch Society and other groups have been condemned by the American Hierarchy. This story has been repeated in Australia.

We are in the position to say that it is false that the American Bishops have issued any statement condemning the John Birch Society. Private representations have been made to an Australian Roman Catholic journal which claims to be one of the spearheads in the fight against Communism in Australia, pointing out that it has repeated the false story concerning the alleged condemnation of the John Birch Society by the American Hierarchy, and suggesting that it be corrected. But the Editor replied saying that he could not accept the "interpretation", given of the situation. It is not a question of "interpretation", but one of fact and truth. The sad truth is that the Communists have successfully exploited numerous Christians irrespective of which Church they support.

**The Danger of Monetary Reform:** We have noted with interest that *The Social Crediter*, the official journal of the Social Credit Secretariat, has recently re-printed an earlier comment concerning the danger of a concentration on monetary reform *at the present time*. In its issue of May 12, *The Social Crediter* publishes the substance of a letter by an Australian Social Crediter to an overseas correspondent. The following Comment is, we feel, important, "As for an appeal to the electorate on monetary reform this has been discussed and tested over a long period. The immediate reaction and the very definite results of a strong monetary reform movement would be centralisation of banking. We are very nearly there now, but not quite."

There can be little doubt today that the strong monetary reform activities of the pre-war years helped bring the Labor-Socialists to power that then proceeded to centralise the control of credit even more than it had been previously. Any tinkering with the monetary mechanism without a clear-cut philosophical base upon which to work can lead to nothing but further disasters. If the battle to survive can be won, it may then be possible to erect more realistic economic and financial policies after a suitable philosophical groundwork has been laid. But to attempt to erect such policies without this groundwork is like attempting to build a house with no solid foundations.

We firmly believe in the importance of keeping clearly in our minds the picture of the type of house we hope and believe can be built in the future. But to concentrate on discussions as to how the house is to be built while ignoring the fact that we have few foundations upon which to build, and that these could be swept away at any moment, is a policy of suicide.

**Communism And The Common Market:** The advocates of Britain joining the European Common Market never tire of singing their theme song: "Britain must join to help make Europe stronger to defeat the Communists." But if Britain unites with the present Common Market countries she will be joining with France, on the verge of revolution with the powerful Communist Party awaiting its time, with Italy, which has an increasing Communist minority now putting pressure on the Italian Government, with Belgium, whose Communists were strong enough to cause the abdication of their own King, even though he had the support of a big majority of his people, and with Germany, where there is still plenty of support for the philosophy which produced National Socialism.

Britain has fewer Communists than any other European nation, with the possible exception of Spain. In spite of the Common Market, the press reports reveal growing problems and frictions in all Common Market countries. Britain cannot possibly make any contribution towards a solution of the problems of the French, German and other people by joining the Common Market. It was Britain's very independence of action, which enabled her to save herself in 1940. The peoples of the British world can best make their contribution towards defeating the Communist challenge by today retaining their freedom of action instead of being sucked into the conflicts in Europe.

## THE DRIVE TOWARDS MONOPOLY

Continued from page 1

stated that the policy of Social Credit was the answer to policies driving the whole world towards collectivism. The war averted the Social Credit challenge, but the probability of a further challenge remains a certainty just so long as the British world retains sufficient independence of action. Social Credit strategy at this present critical time must therefore be concentrated upon maintaining the present independence of the British Commonwealth. This strategy requires that all suggestions about the "inevitable" need for Britain to be economically integrated with other European nations be attacked and exposed as a manifestation of materialism and contrary to truth. There is heartening evidence that responsible British people in all British countries are becoming aware of the time situation. But the time left for effective action is perilously short. The Common Market issue could be "the last throw" for the British world. A great-united effort is needed.

# COMMON MARKET THREATENS BRITISH CROWN AND BRITISH COMMONWEALTH

If Australians were served by a responsible daily press, devoted to a defence of the British world and its institutions, they would have read in full the text of the address by Mr. D. J. Killen, Queensland Liberal M.P., at Canberra on May 8. But comparatively little reference was made by the press to one of the most important addresses ever made in the Commonwealth Parliament. Mr. Killen said:

I have been opposed to the proposal that the United Kingdom should enter the European Economic Community. My views, I imagine, have been made quite clear. This is another opportunity to expand on those views, and I welcome it.

I confess I still feel stunned with disbelief that a British Prime Minister and Government would seek to commit the United Kingdom to an arrangement whereby the ancient and proud sovereignty of the British people would be destroyed.

I say with both feeling and force that I regard this exercise in politics as the most calamitous for the British people since that which was influenced by the wretched and supine authority of George III.

Whatever may be one's feelings regarding the fate of the United Kingdom in this solemn matter, there are other considerations of tremendous importance.

I regret I do not share the optimism of those who believe that the Commonwealth of Nations will be strengthened if the United Kingdom should enter the Common Market. On the contrary, I am convinced that far from the Commonwealth being strengthened, the Commonwealth will be ripped to bits.

My friend and colleague, the Minister for Trade, has presented with vigour and candour the probable economic effects on this country and on the Commonwealth if the United Kingdom should join the Six. With great respect, I regard his analysis as accurate, and his argument unassailable.

My objections to the United Kingdom entering the Common Market are on economic grounds strong enough, but they are secondary to my objections on institutional and political grounds.

## POLITICAL INTEGRATION MAIN OBJECTIVE

The main aim of the Community is political integration. That is made plain by the Treaty itself, and unless we are no longer disposed to give language its plain and ordinary meaning, the political ends of the Community will not be doubted.

Speaking in the Commons on the 12th February 1959, the then President of the Board of Trade referred to this aspect. He said: "We can see that in Article 138 of the Treaty, which looks towards a common assembly directly elected. The whole idea of the Six, the Coal and Steel Community and Euratom, is a movement towards political integration. That is a fine inspiration, but we must recognise that for us to sign the Treaty of Rome would be to accept as the ultimate goal political federation in Europe, including ourselves."

A host of matters would be affected by the United Kingdom being included in a form of political integration. I am not impressed by the argument that the United Kingdom entering the Community will mean that the Treaty may undergo violent change. We must heed the discipline that we are to take the Treaty as it now stands. There is so much at stake in this vital issue that we must concern ourselves with the known, not with the unknown and with probabilities.

## WHAT IS THE FUTURE OF THE CROWN?

On the 11th July last year, in a letter to *The Times*, I asked: "What is to become of the monarchical institution within the framework of the European unity? No British Minister has made the slightest attempt to answer this question. How, one may ask, can allegiance be given to a European Parliament and to the Monarchy? What if circumstances promoted a conflict between the allegiances? Which allegiance would have priority?"

I ask those questions again.

The monarchy has in relation to the British Constitution a central place. The Monarchy has more than symbolic authority. It has a juristic significance. Within the framework of a European unity that significance would disappear.

I submit the proposition is readily tested. The Monarch gives assent to the Acts of Parliament. The Prime Minister of the United Kingdom is Her Majesty's Prime Minister. The Leader of the Opposition leads Her Majesty's Opposition. The Courts are the Queen's Courts, and it is the Queen's writ, which issues from them.

The character of the Rome Treaty is such that not only in its ultimate sense, but in transition, would require the surrender of sovereignty which would greatly affect the British Parliament, its powers and the rights and duties of its servants.

It would seem to me to be at least rashness for any person to attempt to simplify the whole chain of profound constitutional changes, which would be inevitable with British entry into the Community.

## A QUEEN WITHOUT A PEOPLE

I invite the House to consider the position of the Monarchy with respect to Article 7 of the Treaty. This Article lays it down that discrimination on the grounds of nationality shall be prohibited. There is to be, in short, a common nationality. At the present time the people of the United Kingdom are Her Majesty's subjects. She is their sovereign. But what is her position to be when the Common nationality comes into force? She would no longer be Queen of the British people, because those people would have surrendered their nationality. They would be members

of a European Community, and having the nationality of that Community, in relation to the rest of the world. A British passport, with all the majesty of protection it once gave, would be replaced by a Community passport. The Queen would be a Queen without a people. She would, in relation to the Commonwealth, be Head of the Commonwealth, to this country Queen of Australia, with we Australians remaining her subjects, but in relation to the land of her birth and to the United Kingdom she would be a Queen without subjects. The Treaty is not silent on the question of nationality. It aims at having one nationality. But what bewilders me indeed disturbs me, is that not one British Minister has sought to explain how British nationality and its relationship with the Monarchy can be preserved within an arrangement that plainly aims at eliminating nationalities.

I turn now to the second institution that would be tremendously affected by the United Kingdom entering the European Community—that of Parliament.

### **PARLIAMENT DESTROYED**

The Treaty calls for, in Article 3, the establishment of a common Customs tariff and a common commercial policy, a common agricultural policy, a common Transport policy, the approximation of Municipal Law; in Article 6 for co-ordination of economic policies, in Article 48 for common employment conditions, in Article 57 for common professional qualifications, in Article 99 for harmonising of taxation, in Article 117 for the equalisation of social conditions. These are but a few of the requirements of membership. The control, in fact, of the whole social and economic life of the people, their fiscal policies, their financial systems, passes from Parliament. British membership would, as the Treaty now stands, involve the abdication of every worthwhile power that the House of Commons has. That is a matter not to be lightly brushed aside. But the system of Government postulated by the Treaty of Rome would, I have thought, make those reared in the traditions of British Parliamentary democracy raise their hands in horror.

Articles 137 to 163 deal with three institutions of the Community—the Assembly, the Council and the Commission. The Assembly, by force of a Convention signed at the same time as the Rome Treaty, is common to the three Communities. But it is not a Parliamentary Assembly, as we know it. It has no legislative authority whatsoever. It has sanctioning power that seems to me to be most restricted.

### **RULE BY BUREAUCRACY**

The legislative authority of the Community rests primarily with a Commission of nine people. They have powers strikingly akin to those held by members of the Soviet Presidium. The Commission in a technical sense is subject to the authority of the Council, but if the Articles of the Treaty are closely examined it will be seen that the Council's control of the Commission is limited by the fact that depending on what issue is involved will depend what sort of

vote is required of the Council.

The Commission is a recommending body, a planning body, but its powers are so laid down that it is in essence a legislative body.

Our people have travelled a long way since the first Moot. We have taken a decent pride in the fact that everywhere in the world where you see Parliamentary democracy you see something of the British genius, that everywhere in the world where free men and women go to a free Parliament and speak in a free way there is something of the British intellect, and everywhere in the world where the ideals of liberty and justice are upheld and the inviolability of the individual is respected, you see something of British patience, ingenuity and, yes, sacrifice.

I defy, I challenge, I dare, anyone to deny that the articles of the Rome Treaty as they are presently written mean but the end of Parliamentary Government. And I feel overwhelmed with a sense of utter shame that any Britisher with a thousand years of splendid history behind him would contemplate support for such an obnoxious proposal.

I have torn at my mind and believe me, at my heart, for a solution to the manifest problems that press so terribly and urgently upon an anxious humanity. I have found no solution other than that men of good will should show good will, nurture its qualities, protect its harvest and seek to spread its bounty. But I see nothing in the Rome Treaty that meets that requirement. Possibly I am in error, but my anchorage to the concept of Parliament is so firm that I cannot forsake it.

### **WHOLE COMMONWEALTH FACES CRISIS**

What I invite the House to consider would be the effect on the Commonwealth of a British Parliament reduced in status to that of a mere local government, its sovereignty plundered, and its Monarchy presiding over a political vacuum? These questions in sombre isolation apart from other considerations are surely sufficient torment. The Commonwealth is in a twilight zone of crisis.

This House always has been, and I pray will always be, tolerant of what may appear strange notions. Can I impose upon that tolerance to say that I see through the mists of the past—mists that are kind to the failures of our people, and yet generously reveal their triumphs—a firm figure of a man who will live as long as our language lives. I see him at Stratford on Avon, and he is saying of his native land, of the heart of the British world:

"This island never did, nor never shall  
Lie at the proud foot of a conqueror  
But when it first did help to wound itself."

It is yet my hope that others will see him, and, yes, will listen to him.

---

*The New Times* is published by New Times Ltd., Third Floor, Pressgrave Building 273 Little Collins Street, Melbourne. Subscription: £2 per annum, post-free.