

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. 15

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

August 23, 1962

EDITORIAL

CROWN AND COMMON MARKET

So much glamour surrounds the "Mother of Parliaments" at Westminster that it is easy to overlook the steady retreat of that body from the position it was originally designed to occupy. Occasionally, however, events make it difficult to hide the fact that British system of Government is not what it was. The attempt to lead Britain into the Common Market is such an event.

In a television interview following his return recently from Britain, Mr. Menzies was asked whether the succession of by-election defeats lately sustained by the Conservatives might not cause Mr. Macmillan to modify his eagerness to lead Britain "in". Mr. Menzies replied, after a brief reflection that since Mr. Macmillan had a large majority in the House and would not have to face an election before the middle of 1964, these reverses could hardly force a change of front. This rather cynical assessment seems to imply that under the present system, the Government of the day needs only concern itself with the wishes of the governed at election time. At a time when the issue before it concerns the very survival of the nation, such a parliament is a positive danger to the British people.

The British parliamentary system was developed over a period of many centuries in a society, which was overwhelmingly Christian. It was accepted that Kings derived their just authority from God so that this authority was not absolute but contingent on its being exercised in obedience to Natural Law. The other estates of the realm Lords and Commons countered any tendency towards absolutism. The Commons, at first, had no legislative function. They were called by the King as and when necessary to vote him subsidies, it being long established that the people of England could not be taxed without their consent. Indeed, it was the dearest wish of Englishmen, often expressed in their charters, not that new laws be made but that old laws be preserved. As for taxes, they were almost unknown except for purposes of national defence. The delegates sent to these early parliaments went for a session only, and their duty was merely to voice the will of those who sent them. Since parliament met irregularly, briefly, and, for long periods, rarely, it was impossible that anything like the professional politician of today could have developed. Further, the sessional basis of election assured the electors control over their delegate.

To these men, government was a mechanism primarily designed to uphold and to defend the rights of freeborn Englishmen. With the everyday bread winning activities of men it had no concern. Accordingly, just as the activities

of government were limited, so was the franchise. Only those with the learning and leisure necessary to an understanding of the constitutional issues involved in the maintenance of law and liberty were represented in parliament. Since one theory of government was accepted by all, there were no parties in parliament.

Today, all of this is changed. The transcendental justification of Kingship being no longer admitted, the power of the Sovereign has been destroyed, while the Church of England "by law established" has become an appendage of the State, its political power extinguished with that of the Lords temporal.

All legislative power is now vested in the Commons, while the electors have been progressively deprived of the policy making function by the Executive (Cabinet) and the party Caucus. Since the party system finally gained the field following the Reform Acts of 1832, the primary allegiance of the representative is no longer to the electors but to the party. The Member of Parliament today is secure in his tenure and remuneration however ill he represents his sponsors. By progressive widening of the franchise and the growth of the party system, the vote has become more and more valueless as a means of expressing policy. This is now made elsewhere; all the voter can do is to accept or reject it. His consent to taxation is no longer asked in any real sense; indeed with indirect taxation he pays a good deal of tax without knowing it.

With its philosophical basis destroyed, we ought not to be surprised that the function of British government has changed. Today, there is no department of human life into which government does not pry. The prevalent avidity for law making has even led parliament to delegate, unconstitutionally the legislative power itself to the multiplying boards, commissions and committees which, today tell Englishmen how to run their lives.

In England, even so short a time ago as Waterloo, the Home Office had a staff of twenty clerks, while the Foreign Office managed with twenty-eight INCLUDING the two

Continued on page 4

MONOPOLY - COMMUNISM

In a recent speech in Sydney, Bishop Muldoon, Auxiliary Bishop to Cardinal Gilroy, described the growth of monopolies as a "greater danger than Communism". He went on: "If this growth is not checked . . . it will surely breed Communism in the end. And perhaps that is the reason why the Communists are not particularly vociferous at the present time. They are wise enough to see that they have only to wait patiently for the day when the present system of monopolised capital will crack and then crash in ruins and leave the field for themselves." Although he later describes a state of affairs where a "few all-powerful men control the lives and the fate of many people", Bishop Muldoon clearly does not understand that Communism *is* Ultimate Monopoly, that it will be attained (unless we fight it) by a smooth progressive intensification of monopoly and centralisation on a wide front, and that our present financial policies must hasten its coming. The view that Communism will inherit a field left vacant by the crash of the present system is a most dangerous one, since it obscures the fact that Communism is Monopoly Capitalism pushed to its logical extreme with *all* the financial, economic and political power concentrated in the hands of a few men. This is precisely the position in Russia today. Bishop Muldoon describes what he suggests will happen following the "crash". "Then the present expropriators will themselves be expropriated for the masses will demand common ownership of land and of all the means of production, distribution and exchange."

The proprietors of today are *already* being expropriated; Communism is *already* being imposed on a still largely unsuspecting people, while nothing is surer than this — that on the day of the victory of Communism, the "masses" will be in no position to demand anything whatever.

WANTED - A NEW DICTIONARY

Everybody knows that words have differing meanings depending on which side of the Iron Curtain one is. To the Communist for example "peace" means the destruction of other nations without recourse to arms; "disarmament" means that all countries except the Soviets should destroy their military defences, and so on. In 1957, the "United" Nations appointed a special committee representing 21 nations to consider ways and means of opposing aggression. The first duty of the committee was to define "aggression". Up to the present the group has been unable to agree on a definition because the Red nations insisted the word was being utilised for dialectical purposes. So the special committee, unable to define "aggression", voted to adjourn for three years. When rested and refreshed they will again attempt to reach an agreement on a definition.

Webster's dictionary defines aggression as "an unprovoked attack; unwarranted inroad or encroachment upon the rights of another". It is quite understandable that since the Congo affair, such a definition might be rather close to the bone to appeal to any committee of the "United" Nations, but is it reasonable to hope that matters will be improved by a three-year adjournment?

HOLLYWOOD AND THE COLD WAR

Much is heard today about the evils, invariably unspecified, of censorship. William Mooring, film critic of the Brooklyn "Tablet", comments on the use, which Hollywood makes of the freedom which it enjoys.

"There is a slow burn on Capitol Hill over Otto Preminger's latest movie "Advise and Consent", a film which can serve only to blacken the cause of democracy at this crucial stage in worldwide ideological conflict. "Advise and Consent" is supposed to be fictional. On the screen it seems to be factual. Its contrived documentary "expose" of corruption, dishonesty and lack of integrity among members of our government involves dangerous and presumably deliberate distortions. Filling in real names for the "fictional" characters may easily become the pastime of critics all over the world. Although the characters include several honest men, heavy emphasis is upon political corruption and moral perversion. The Washington backgrounds are authentic. Who gave Preminger official permission to use government property and facilities, maintained by the American taxpayer, to produce, for private profit, this film smearing democracy and distorting our national image?"

He then asks:

"What will emerge from 'The Ugly American'? How do Hollywood insinuations of American diplomatic duplicity in South-east Asia square with current U.S. efforts to prevent Communist plunder in Thailand?"

"Were good Arab-Israel relations with the U.S.A. served or shaken by Preminger's 'Exodus'?"

"What mischief was done in West Germany by Stanley Kramer's 'Judgment at Nuremberg'?"

Finally he says:

"Does American freedom really mean that a few movie producers — some blunderingly ignorant, others more than half sold against United States policies — are to be free to say anything they choose, true or false, in movies that may color the opinions and reactions of millions abroad, as well as at home? Or does safety and freedom for all dictate the reasonable restraint of a handful of irresponsibles and rabble-rousers?"

The almost automatic opposition to all forms of censorship by the liberal-intellectual pack fails to take into account the fact that the Premingers and Kramers of the film world, and their like in other fields of mass information, are conspiring to impose a censorship of their making on us. At the present time it is their ideas and theirs alone, which can gain a hearing. Ideas, which they oppose, are not heard. Is this not censorship?

ANNUAL DINNER WILL CLIMAX YEAR OF HISTORIC ACHIEVEMENT BOOKINGS SHOULD BE MADE IMMEDIATELY

This year's Annual Dinner, to be held on Friday, September 21, at the Victoria Palace, Little Collins Street, Melbourne, will mark the end of a year which has seen the most significant achievements yet in the long history of "The New Times".

All supporters are urged to make every effort to attend. Country and interstate visitors requiring hospitality in Melbourne are requested to contact us immediately. An even bigger attendance than last year's record would provide striking confirmation of the expansion of our work.

As usual, the Toast to "The New Times" will be proposed by comparatively new supporters, thus demonstrating the growth and vitality of our work.

Mr. Eric Butler promises the most important address of his career, one based upon the unique experiences of his recent Commonwealth tour.

A first-class dinner and appropriate entertainment will, we are sure, meet with the approval of all guests. Guests may arrive at 6 p.m. and the evening will continue until approximately 11 p.m. The donation to the Dinner will be the same as last year, 35/- per head. Those requiring fish dinners are requested to make this clear. Supporters should also indicate if they have friends with whom they desire to be seated at the Dinner.

MAKE CERTAIN THAT SEPTEMBER 21 IS ANOTHER ANNUAL ACT OF RE-DEDICATION

RELIGION AND COMMUNISM

In view of the recent United States Supreme Court ruling the following comments are significant,

"We Communists do not distinguish between good and bad religions because we think they are all bad."—(Earl Browder head of the Communist Party, U.S.A., 1958.)

" . . . By going among the religious masses, we are for the first time able to bring our anti-religious ideas to them." (Earl Browder).

"Religion is a kind of spiritual gin in which the slaves of capital drown their human shape and their claims to any decent human life."—(Lenin, Selected Works.)

"A young man or woman cannot be a Communist youth unless he or she is free of religious convictions."—(*Young Communist Truth*, October 18, 1947.)

"The materialist gives a more important place to materialism and nature, while relegating God and all the philosophical rabble who believe in him, to the sewer and the manure heap."—(Lenin.)

"We must make our school boys and girls not merely non-religious, but actively and passionately anti-religious." — (Madame Krupskaya, wife of Lenin.)

"We must combat religion. This is the ABC of all materialism, and consequently of Marxism. Down with religion. Long live atheism."—(Lenin.)

"The party (Communist) cannot be neutral toward religion. Anti-religious propaganda is a means by which the complete liquidation of the reactionary clergy must be brought about."—(Stalin, 1927, before an American labour delegation.)

"Communism abolishes eternal truths, it abolishes all religion, and all morality, instead of constituting them on

a new basis; it therefore acts in contradiction to all past historical experience."—(Communist Manifesto.)

"We must not rest content with the expulsion of religious propaganda (teachings) from the school. We must see to it that the school assumes the offensive against religious propaganda (teaching) in the home, so that from the very outset the children's minds shall be rendered immune to all those religious fairy tales which many grown-ups continue to regard as truth."—(ABC of Communism.)

The ignorance of the N.S.W. Health Minister: The N.S.W. Minister for Health, Mr. W. F. Sheahan, has been a persistently strong advocate of fluoridation of public water supplies. This does not mean that Mr. Sheahan knows anything about fluoridation. He recently said, amongst other things, that the children's teeth at Yass had greatly improved since fluoridation was imposed there six years ago. Neither Mr. Sheahan nor anyone else knows whether fluoridation has improved children's teeth at Yass. This is sheer propaganda without any scientific basis.

Mr. Sheahan's greatest gem, however, is his claim that since the World Health Organisation had endorsed fluoridation, "nothing had been heard from two scientists—one in Adelaide and one in Melbourne—on whose statements the small section of the community opposing fluoridation based their case." Mr. Sheahan is, of course, referring to Sir C. Stanton Hicks in Adelaide and to Dr. P. Sutton in Melbourne. It may interest the N.S.W. Minister for Health to know that the World Health Organisation endorsed fluoridation years ago, and that both Sir Stanton Hicks and Dr. Sutton have given their views since this. It is obvious, of course, that Mr. Sheahan is merely a parrot for the totalitarian bureaucrats in his Department.

CROWN & COMMON MARKET

Continued from page 1

Under-Secretaries. Remembering that every document had to be copied by hand, it will be appreciated that the administrators of the day had little time to regulate the lives of other people.

Reflections such as these make the "Mother of Parliaments" look more and more like a sham, but a sham, which is studiously preserved. The present position of the Sovereign indicates how far the sham has already been carried. From the Encyclopedia "Britannica" we learn that "though the veto of the crown on legislation has long been obsolete, bills passed by the two houses only become law on receiving the royal assent". Lest anyone should think that this represents the ultimate in silliness, it should be added that there are those who maintain, with Mr. Macmillan, that Britain can join the Common Market and still retain both her sovereignty and her Sovereign! Let us hope that the reaction to Mr. Macmillan's recent despicable repudiation of the Ministers of his policies may yet lead him to the repudiation of the policies themselves. Perhaps public opinion is not as powerless in this issue as Mr. Menzies supposed?

THE EQUALITY DOGMA LEADS TO COMMUNISM

By D. Watts

In this brilliant essay the author exposes the equality dogma as one of the most dangerous of the twentieth-century myths, and one, which is paving the way for International Communism. This essay is a closely reasoned reply to the claim that "all men are equal" and a demonstration of the truth that the organisation of human beings into masses destroys the individual.

Order from The Heritage Bookshop, Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne. Price 2/-, post-free.

USE ENWITE SPECIALITIES

TEXTIT waterproofing compound. SOLVIT paint remover. AQUAC wood putty. BRYNAC enamel for resisting water, acids and alkalis. FERROSOL, the rust killing paint. RUSTEX for removing rust from motor bodies and metal work. THERMEX, the silver paint.

ENWITE PTY. LTD.

84-86 Cromwell Street, Collingwood,

Vic. Phone: JA 5967.

ERIC BUTLER RETURNS TO AUSTRALIA

Mr. Eric Butler returned to Melbourne on Friday of last week after his Commonwealth tour. He was accompanied by his wife and Dr. Graeme Williams, who met him in New Zealand upon his arrival from Canada on August 7. After giving a press and radio interview upon his arrival in Melbourne, Mr. Butler immediately settled down to deal with the more urgent matters arising out of his tour.

On Saturday evening he addressed a group of Melbourne supporters, providing them with a most comprehensive report on his tour. He left on Sunday evening for Perth to open his Western Australian campaign. Mr. Butler will be returning to Melbourne early next month.

Both the Canadian and New Zealand tours were most successful, stimulating, as one Canadian supporter put it, "new conceptions of what can be done". Mr. Butler met Social Credit political leaders in Canada, while in New Zealand he was received by the New Zealand Prime Minister for 45 minutes. A stream of letters has poured into our office from all places visited by Mr. Butler. At the final meeting of the New Zealand tour, held in Auckland on Thursday night of last week, a most enthusiastic audience rose to its feet and sang "For He's A Jolly Good Fellow". Many demands were made for a longer visit. The League of Rights has now been established in New Zealand, and readers desirous of co-operating should contact Mr. John Armstrong, P.O. Box 2067, Christchurch. Mr. Armstrong will shortly be issuing a comprehensive report on the New Zealand tour for all New Zealand contacts.

The address of the League of Rights in the United Kingdom will be 2 Stephney Green, London, E.I.

Upon Mr. Butler's return from Western Australia, a confidential report will be posted to all those who subscribed to the fund to send Mr. D. J. Killen and Mr. Butler to the United Kingdom. We will also be carrying a special review by Mr. Butler of the whole of his Commonwealth tour. We can assure readers that this will make stimulating reading.

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