

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. 24

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

December 7, 1962

EDITORIAL

A BRITISH BY-ELECTION MAY HAVE DECIDED BRITISH COMMONWEALTH'S FUTURE

In our last editorial we wrote. "Because we have been in possession of information generally suppressed by the newspapers and the radio commentators, we have continued to express our faith that the Common Market battle was far from lost." The results of the recent five by-elections in the United Kingdom, particularly those in South Dorset, and subsequent developments, have dramatically confirmed our faith. It is not too much to say that just over 5000 electors in South Dorset who followed the advice of the Independent Conservative candidate, Sir Piers Debenham, to put Britain and the Commonwealth before party loyalty, may have made a decisive contribution to the future of the British peoples everywhere.

We have often expressed the view that our future will be decided not by the attempted mobilising of big battalions but by the example of men and women of integrity who are prepared to stand alone if necessary in defence of fundamental principles. After Mr. Macmillan and his minions had obtained their stage-managed vote on the Common Market at the recent Conservative Conference, it was generally hailed as a major victory for the British Government's proposed policy of betrayal of Britain and the British nations.

Even Mr. Menzies an opponent of the Common Market concept, expressed the view that the Conservative Conference vote made it almost certain that Britain would join the European Economic Community.

But Sir Piers Debenham, a cousin of Mr. Neville Chamberlain, a man whose roots go back deep in English history, was not impressed by the Conservative Conference vote. He did not subscribe to the doctrine of "inevitability." He believed that one man could do something, even fighting the Tory party machine in one of the safest Tory electorates in the whole of Britain. He had confidence in his fellow Englishmen, asking them to put the nation before party. He was supported strongly by another of Britain's natural leaders, the Earl of Sandwich, who had held the South Dorset electorate for the Tory party for 21 years. Lord Sandwich said he was taking the extreme step of entering the contest on behalf of Sir Piers against the official Conservative candidate, Mr. Angus Maude, stating bluntly, "I think it is more important to prevent Britain going into the Common Market on present terms than to keep Mr. Macmillan in office. It is of transcendent importance that this constituency shows the Government that the country is against the Treaty of Rome."

Lord Sandwich's entry into the South Dorset contest was an act of great courage. Although he had been consistently campaigning against the Common Market, it was something more difficult to turn against party colleagues and openly urge that a Government candidate be defeated. Lord Sandwich has left no doubt about where the pres-

sure on the British Government is coming from. In a recent address to a meeting of Westminster Tories, Lord Sandwich asked, "Are we to knuckle under because the United States threatens to make the Six the fulcrum of its policy in Europe?" He charged a fellow Tory, Mr. Aidan Crawley, M.P., a pro-Common Marketeer, as a man who was "obedient to the last detail to the American State Department." During the South Dorset by-election Lord Sandwich suggested that the Government was suffering from "some deadly fear," and he wondered whether President Kennedy was threatening to transfer atomic know-how from Britain to France or Germany, or was threatening that otherwise the pound would have to be devalued.

The famous British historian, Sir Arthur Bryant, a man who knows the influence of the Money Power in the shaping of history, also took his stand against the big battalions and urged a vote for Sir Piers. Needless to say, the Conservative party machine threw all its resources into the fight. Sir Piers was smeared as "a megalomaniac moron," and there was a threat of legal action if this rebel happened to win the election. But when the electors made their decision, over 5000 Conservatives, nearly 50 per cent of the vote for the official Conservative candidate, had enabled the Labor candidate, who had also criticised the Common Market, to win a victory, which staggered the Conservative Party. It could no longer be claimed that the Macmillan Government had a mandate from its own supporters to join the E.C.M., still less a mandate from the country.

Australian press reports have suggested that in the other four by-elections, where the British Government also suffered severe reverses, the Common Market had nothing to do with the results. This is quite wrong, as the evidence clearly demonstrates. A growing reaction in the British Conservative Party was summed up by Sir John Gilmour, M.P., who said that the party was in trouble because it had lost its principles, that it was now "high time"

Continued on page 4

INTEGRATION LEADS TO "RESEGREGATION"

At a time when centralisation of power and control are rampant, it is not without significance that the parallel process of "equalising" or levelling down of the community continues unabated.

One of the methods of reducing a community to a common "equality" is compulsory integration with the Negro or coloured section of that community, and there can be no doubt that this results in a general lowering of living standards and is in fact a levelling down process.

Washington, the National Capital of America, was one of the first cities in that country to be subjected to compulsory school integration. Among the results are a big decline in property values and a crime rate that is among the highest in America!

Another interesting result is that integration has in truth produced "resegregation," with Washington's schools becoming almost exclusively Negro, which simply demonstrates again that people everywhere naturally tend to segregate themselves. There is nothing "sinful" or "un-Christian" about this simple fact of human nature.

It is precisely because human nature revolts against integration that 150,000 white residents have left Washington since 1954.

We hear a great deal of unrealistic nonsense from well-meaning individuals about integration, particularly those who call themselves Christians. Such people are applauded by the "planners" and others who advocate a one-world collectivist state. This is because the levelling down process is an integral part of the totalitarian philosophy, which is directly opposed to anything Christian.

And the Christian concept is one of individual initiative and freedom combined with responsibility, a concept that obviously cannot flourish in a compulsory integrated society of steadily declining moral values and frustrated personal initiative.

THE MEN AROUND PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Two of the most important men in the Kennedy Administration are Walt W. Rostow, counsellor of the State Department and chairman of its all-important Policy Planning Council, and Adam Yarmolinsky, special assistant to the Secretary and Deputy Secretary of Defence. These men are two of the numerous numbers of Jews surrounding the President.

Yarmolinsky was one of the chief manipulators responsible for the halting of General Walker's programme of anti-Communist education amongst his troops, while the following significant information on Rostow was provided in a featured article in the Dallas, Texas, *Morning News* of June 20, 1962: -

Sen. Everett M. Dirksen, R-Ill., has suggested that Walt W. Rostow be called to the stand to testify. Mr. Rostow is counsel-

lor of the State Department and chairman of its all-important Policy Planning Council. If anyone can explain State's policy, he should be able to do it; Mr. Rostow, along with the President himself, has been a chief architect of that policy—whatever it might be.

The reason for Sen. Dirksen's proposal that Congress call Rostow to the stand is that the State Department counsellor is reported to be the author of a highly controversial document which has been making the rounds lately at the top levels of the administration. This document—286 pages long and entitled "Basic National Security Policy"—is said to be an outline of the administration's grand strategy for the conduct of foreign affairs over the next few years.

Three months ago *The News* reported the existence of this document. At that time all that was known of its contents was that it advocated the elimination of first-strike weapons in the U.S. arsenal.

For the past three months the administration has refused to release the document—even to congressional committees, which normally have access to such information. But in the past week several highly placed officials at the State Department and Pentagon who are displeased with the contents of the Rostow report have "leaked" its basic outlines to the press.

According to these reports and to the public revelation by Sen. Dirksen, the core of Rostow's proposal is an assumption that the Communists are "mellowing" and will give us peace if we are nice to them. Specifically, the policy statement is supposed to include these startling recommendations:

- Recognition of Red China by the United States and withdrawal of U.S. opposition to Peiping's admission to the United Nations.
- De facto recognition of East Germany as a separate nation.
- Pulling back armed opposition to the Communists along the borders of the Soviet empire.
- Coercion of Nationalist China to give up the offshore islands of Quemoy and Matsu.
- Unilateral de-emphasis of nuclear weapons and reliance primarily on conventional weapons and forces.
- Attempt to contain the spread of Communism but do nothing to stir up trouble behind its borders.

These are not simply suggestions for change in the administration's foreign policy. Many of them have been put into effect already at least in part. Moreover, the mere fact that they are being considered should have far-reaching impact on our allies and enemies alike.

Mr. Rostow's influence on the administration cannot be doubted. It is said that he was responsible for the administration's opposition to the B70 and Nike-Zeus programmes, that he authored the proposal to appease the Communists in Berlin, that he had an important part in drafting the U.S. disarmament scheme, which would have turned our arms over to a United Nations Peace Force.

NATURALLY PRODUCED POULTRY FOR CHRISTMAS

Melbourne supporters desirous of obtaining their Christmas poultry at the just price may do so through our office. This poultry has been produced under natural conditions without the use of antibiotic feed. It has been folded over organically grown pastures. The result is a first-class product of a flavour unknown in most poultry today. Orders must be made IMMEDIATELY.

FURTHER EVIDENCE ON CUBAN DEBACLE

Our front-page article of November 9 in which it was concluded that the real victor in the Cuban crisis was Mr. Khrushchev, provoked the view amongst some people that this was an extreme attitude. However, since then the evidence from the U.S.A. has proved conclusively that the West has suffered another major defeat. In exchange for taking away missiles which he did not propose to use, Mr. Khrushchev has obtained from President Kennedy a firm assurance that Cuba will not be invaded.

Political commentators in the U.S.A. now claim that President Kennedy used the Cuban situation primarily for political reasons. Republican Senator Kenneth B. Keating, Brigadier-General in the U.S Army Reserve, had warned the United States Government seven weeks before the Cuban crisis exploded that Soviet missiles were being set up in Cuba. Keating first warned Kennedy in a speech in the Senate on August 31 of the Soviet build-up. Between that date and October 12 he made ten more speeches on the same subject, while outside the Senate he made no less than fourteen public statements. He also repeated his warning on television. Senator Keating's warnings were echoed by many other public men throughout the U.S.A.

President Kennedy's Press Relations man Pierre Salinger, at first claimed that Keating was "inaccurate," but when he was pressed to substantiate this statement Salinger refused to do so. By September 4 Kennedy was compelled to admit at least part of Keating's case and said that, while it was true there were missiles in Cuba, they were ground to air missiles with a slant length of only 15 miles.

Keating and others replied to this by pointing out that these missiles were of the type that could be converted into longer length missiles by conversion of the launching pads. Keating once again challenged the White House on this question, but there was no response.

On October 10 Keating warned Kennedy there were no less than six intermediate missile launching sites under construction. The State Department completely denied this, but on October 22 they were forced to admit it was true. All the evidence indicates that the Cuban crisis was stage-managed. Striking evidence for this is provided in an article in *U.S. News and World Report*, November 12, 1962, in which it is revealed that news reporters were not only denied information on the Cuban crisis but in some instances were actually misled.

As we have pointed out in the past, Cuba is the main centre of Communist subversion for the whole of Latin America. It is Communism's forward geographical box in

the Western Hemisphere. This base for the Communist conspiracy was first established by the aid of influential individuals within the American State Department. The American Senate Internal Security Sub-Committee has reported at length on this matter. It draws attention, for example, to William A. Wieland, one-time Director of Caribbean-Mexican affairs, who now serves as a Management Analyst in the State Department's Office of Management. It is interesting to note that, although the Internal Security Sub-Committee severely criticised Mr. Wieland's record and conduct, the President, Mr. Kennedy, has denied the charge that Wieland is a security risk.

Kenneth de Courcey's *Intelligence Digest* of November adds to the picture with an extensive review of the revolutionary situation right throughout Latin America. The report states: "As far as Latin America is concerned, Russia is working day and night to create a situation which will divert the United States from its worldwide commitments and leave Russia a clear field in the Middle East, and China a clear field in South-East Asia." The review warns that the whole of Latin America could pass under Communist domination within a comparatively short period.

It is clear that the protection of Cuba was essential for Communism's revolutionary programme, and that Communism was faced with the problem of protecting this base against the mounting American public demand that direct American military action be taken against Castro. President Kennedy, with the support of the influences in the State Department, which brought Castro to power, has now assured the Communists that there is no likelihood of military action to remove their Cuban bases.

President Kennedy may be nothing more than a ruthless, power-hungry politician. But he is being manipulated by powerful forces working behind the political scenes.

A CHRISTMAS GIFT WHICH ARRIVES ALL THE YEAR

Why not give your friends a different kind of Christmas gift this year. One, which will remind him of you throughout the whole year? We suggest you take advantage of our Christmas gift scheme for *The New Times*. We make the special offer of a full years' subscription to *The New Times* for half rate -- £1.

Our next issue, the final for 1962, will be a special Christmas issue, and gift subscriptions will start with this number. Those desirous of taking advantage of this scheme must therefore let us know IMMEDIATELY.

PRIME MINISTER'S IMPORTANT STATEMENT SUPPRESSED

BRITISH BY-ELECTION MAY DECIDE THE BRITISH COMMONWEALTH'S FUTURE

Continued from page 1

In his address at the annual meeting of the Federal Council of the Liberal Party of Australia, held at Canberra on November 13, the Prime Minister, Mr. Menzies expressed a number of views on domestic and international affairs with which we are not in agreement. Most of these views were widely publicised by the Australian daily press. But Mr. Menzies' considered views on the political implications of the European Common Market, which we believe to be irrefutable, was barely mentioned in several papers and completely suppressed in all the others. This provides further evidence of the concerted and powerful drive to convince the Australian people that it is "inevitable" that Britain will join the European Economic Community.

Mr. Menzies' suppressed statement is of such importance at present that we place it on the record:

"What effect that (British entry into the European Common Market) will have on the Commonwealth structure I have spoken about at great length with considerable emphasis, and I don't want to argue about it. Personally, as you know, I think that loose confederations either break up or that they get closer. They end up by dissolution of the idea or they end up as federations. Thus has been the history in the United States; it has been the history in the West Indies, where they began to think they had a federation but, because the pulling apart forces were too great, it broke up and now we have a series of separate Commonwealth countries in the West Indies. In the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, where Sir Roy Welensky is struggling hard to preserve the Federation though the odds appear to be slightly, at any rate, against him, the pulling apart movement is on. Therefore, I have resolved all this constitutional thing in my own mind by saying, 'Well, you go into Europe, you tell us, and I believe you, that you don't want to go into a federation, you don't want to become a state in a federation of Europe, but you do want to get the advantages that can be got out of an economic union, out of an increased home market, out of all the prospect of greater efficiency and lower costs and more things to sell around the world. Well. I understand that, but if you go in like that you must want it to succeed, you must want to get the highest possible measure of economic unity, and the more of that you get the nearer you are to a political federation.' Well, I hope I will be wrong on that matter, but, as nobody would engage in the nonsense of going into the European community with the idea of breaking it up, but only with the idea of building into it and helping it to build itself to more and more unity and more and more strength, then it seems to me to be practically inevitable that federal political principles will come to be applied, that there will be a considerable concerting of political policies of all sorts and that, in the result, Great Britain will tend to become a State in a European federation. That is not a view that is universally held. I hold it myself very strongly and have expressed it in the Conference in London as clearly as I could."

to put forward alternative plans for action if Britain did not join the Common Market.

Even worse than the clear-cut evidence of British public opinion on the Common Market issue, as provided by the South Dorset contest, is the news that the anti-Common Market forces are now going over to the offensive in a big way with the threat of a large number of Independent anti-Common Market candidates entering by-elections and all marginal electorates at the next general elections. Many of the candidates are offering to pay their own expenses. All this has happened because *one* man. Sir Piers Debenham, led the way and demonstrated by his courage and resource just what could be done.

Increased pressure from the Commonwealth nations can now keep the tide flowing away from the disaster, which the faint-hearts saw as inevitable. But greater efforts must be made to advancing a genuine alternative to the Common Market. The initial steps for a Commonwealth-wide campaign have been taken, and we once again appeal to readers to demonstrate their faith by supporting in every way the campaign or survival and ultimate victory. Five thousand electors in South Dorset, England, responding to the lead of one man, have shown that victory is possible.

CLERGYMAN SUPPORTS "INHERITANCE" PRINCIPLE

An excellent letter by the Rev. John Graf, of Rushworth, Victoria, appeared in the Melbourne *Age* of November 16.

Mr. Graf, replying to Bishop Sambell, who said it would be scandalous to pay a pension to somebody with an income £2000 a year, pointed out that on All Saints Day the Church recognised that the labours of those who have gone before have made it possible to enjoy the spiritual, cultural and material blessings that are ours today.

Mr. Graf went on to say that we should also recognise those who have reached a generally agreed age and are retired from their former active participation in our society. He also said that why the Bishop should think it "scandalous" to pay a pension to someone whom God has entrusted in his old age with so much wealth in whatever form that his income is above average, was hard to see on theological grounds and that it was up to the recipient to refuse his pension or donate it to charity.

It is refreshing to find a clergyman stressing a principle, which leads to increasing individual freedom, a principle that has suffered greatly through the idea that increasing individual freedom from the inheritance principle must be controlled.