

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 29, No. 2

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

February 8, 1963

EDITORIAL

BERNARD BARUCH ATTACKS GENERAL DE GAULLE

When Mr. Bernard Baruch, the powerful Zionist international financier, joined in the worldwide attack on General de Gaulle, he left no doubt that the French leader has, either consciously or unconsciously, caused a serious set-back to the grand design for centralising world power. Baruch issued a special statement in which he said that de Gaulle's attitude towards NATO, nuclear weapons and the Common Market was "weakening the shield which protects Europe."

Further evidence of where the real pressure was coming from to get Britain into the European Economic Community was provided when Mr. Herter, Wall Street spokesman, threatened in Brussels that the U.S.A. would apply economic sanctions to Europe unless the British were allowed into the Community. The British negotiator, Mr. Heath, flew to Brussels before the final talks eight hours earlier than originally intended, in order to have a private discussion with Mr. Herter before he and Mr. Herter then dined with the American Ambassador. And then President Kennedy made a final effort to avert the end of the talks when he intervened with a message through a personal representative at Brussels. But all to no avail. General de Gaulle and his representatives refused to modify the stand they had taken up. The Macmillan Government's attempt to join the Common Market under pressure from Washington was finished — at least for the time being.

WORLDWIDE CAMPAIGN

Immediately the end came at Brussels, there appeared as if at a given signal to people expecting it, a worldwide campaign that suggested that de Gaulle was personally responsible for wrecking a programme upon which the fate of mankind depended. Whatever his motives, the French leader was clearly out of step. Some of the world's press headlines bordered on the hysterical. De Gaulle had inflicted a "humiliating defeat" upon the British. In the torrent of propaganda, no reference was made to the fact that so far from feeling they had suffered a defeat, the majority of the British people felt that de Gaulle had helped them to defeat Macmillan and his associates. And right around the British Commonwealth there was a feeling of widespread relief that at least a breathing space had been gained in which an effort could be made to strengthen the Commonwealth as an independent group of nations.

Many explanations have been offered as to why de Gaulle took the stand he did, but little mention has been made of the statement by de Gaulle's representative, Mr. Couve de Murville, in the French National Assembly, when he made the significant statement that he doubted whether Parliamentary and public opinion in Britain "was ready to accept the provisions of the Common Market." Mr. Couve de Murville obviously realised that even if the

Common Market countries reached a unanimous agreement to permit Britain to join, there was no certainty that Mr. Macmillan could carry Parliament and the British public with him. All the evidence shows that British opposition to entry has increased steeply following President Kennedy's decision to deprive the British of an independent nuclear deterrent.

De GAULLE DISLIKED NASSAU AGREEMENT

It also appears highly probably that de Gaulle became genuinely convinced that Macmillan was such a willing puppet for Washington that should the British join this would extend American policies in Europe, which de Gaulle opposes. One correspondent claims that the major reason for de Gaulle's abrupt declaration that he would not welcome the British was that the Nassau agreement imposed upon Macmillan by Kennedy was a betrayal of European interests. De Gaulle rejected the offer of Polaris missiles and the conditions under which they were offered. And the French claimed that there was a secret agreement by Kennedy and Macmillan to sell out on Berlin.

However, whatever are the real reasons for de Gaulle's attitude, there is one thing very certain, and that is that politicians and generals may come and go, but while present finance-economic policies are continued centralisation of power is inevitable. In the economic sphere, the smaller and medium-sized businessman is either crushed or absorbed by the bigger business organisation. The trend is steadily towards monopoly. This is now becoming the case in primary as well as secondary industries everywhere. Economic and financial centralisation appears to make political centralisation inevitable. As both economic and political units become larger and more centralised, so does conflict between these units become progressively more certain. And the threat of conflict is then used to impose more centralisation as a "solution". The increasing attempt to solve internal problems by mounting export drives, is one of the manifestations of unrealistic internal policies. De Gaulle's policies are to a great extent governed by these unrealistic policies. He wants to make the French-

Continued on page 4

THE DANGERS OF INTERNATIONALISM

The following article by Arthur Kitson, early pioneer of monetary reform, first published in 1932, is most appropriate today:

Owing to the failure of the world's Governments to discover a remedy for the economic evils with which all nations are now afflicted, we are being told by our leading-politicians, economists and journalists that no nation is today, a master of its own destiny, and that the economic affairs of the world are so interwoven that a remedy can only be found in the union of all nations. It is proposed by various publicists that it will be necessary to have an international currency that all tariffs must be abolished, and Sir Arthur Salter goes so far as to propose a federation of the various European races. Apparently, these writers and speakers have given but superficial consideration to this whole subject or else they are the instruments of the financial group that is bent upon controlling the trade, industries, and even the politics of the world!

Let us first take the subject of tariffs: The object of tariff protection is to limit competition mainly to the producers of the country in which protection has been adopted. Protection has been made necessary by the attempt to establish a universal monetary system. If we take the United States as an illustration: Their plea for protective tariffs has always been the protection of American labour for the purpose of raising the status of the working classes above the level of that of other nations. In this respect the tariffs have been unquestionably effective. In no country in the world has labour been more highly paid. Moreover, it is quite certain that had there been no tariffs, one of two things would have happened, either the United States would have been inundated with goods from the Far East, such as China and Japan and India, and many of her industries would have been destroyed; or else the American operatives would have had to live on a very much lower plane of existence.

Now, turning to the financial question — the effects of a universal currency would be, in the absence of tariffs, to reduce the working classes of all countries to one very low standard of living. The masses of mankind would be engaged in a life and death struggle for the possession of money and for the control of foreign markets, and the nation who could produce goods at the cheapest rate—in other words, the nation whose operatives could be induced to live at the lowest stage of existence compatible with their ability to produce goods—would become the most successful.

No greater calamity could befall the world's inhabitants than the establishment of the economic system, which the League of Nations is at present endeavouring to arrange. Both the financial and economic systems, which the League of Nations has championed, are fraught with the greatest disaster to humanity. We have already had the experience

of the evils of the League's establishing the gold standard throughout Europe. The present crisis is the result of that absurd policy.

Far from adopting a universal world currency, the most beneficial policy would be for each nation to have its own national paper currency—a currency that has no circulating power beyond the boundaries of the nation issuing it. *Such a currency forms a natural protection for its trade and industries.* It prevents the cutthroat competition which a world currency permits, and it renders international trade a system of barter - - that is, the exchange of goods for goods, which is the natural and rightful form of trade.

When England exchanges its coal and iron, cotton and woollen goods for products, which it does not or cannot produce—such as coffee, tea, spices, etc.—such trade is mutually beneficial to the countries engaged therein. But when Germany sends us cotton goods to compete in our own markets with our cotton goods, when America sends us boots and shoes to compete with our Leicester and Northampton shoe industries, and in return demands gold or our National Bonds, we are exposed to a two-fold injury: the importation of what we are already manufacturing injures our industries and thereby lessens employment here, whilst the export of gold which has been the basis of our currency causes a shortage of purchasing power and tends to raise our Bank rate which adds to our costs of production and lessens the demand for our goods in our home market. Similarly, the export of our National Bonds tends to make us a tributary country so that we have to export gold or other commodities as a tribute to the nation possessing the bonds for which we get no return.

This plea for worldwide or an international currency is of modern conception and has originated with the group of international money dealers who, to a large extent, control the money and credit of the world. This group have a settled policy, and all that is happening, and has happened for the last few years throughout the world, is *according to a definite plan, viz., the world's conquest.*

Until the beginning of the present century, the only known method of conquering the world was by military invasion—a very dangerous, expensive, and cruel system. But during the last half century it was realised that a far simpler, more effective and less dangerous method was possible by the control of money. By this method no armies or navies or munitions of war are required, no blood need be shed, and the public need know nothing of their danger until they are safely enslaved in the form of Debt. All that is necessary is to secure the control of the press and other channels of publicity such as the radio and leading publicists.

This has already been done. International finance controls practically all the channels by which the public is influenced. The world's safety will only be achieved by breaking the money monopoly that has been established by the laws of nations.

AN OPEN LETTER TO CHURCH LEADERS

On Anti-Christian Political and Economic Policies from a Small Group of Earnest Laymen

Gentlemen,

This is a revision of a letter originally sent to a prominent clergyman who is reputed to understand (1) The anti-Christ scheme for centralising world political and economic control: (2) The perverted financial, economic and publicity weapons employed.

It was suggested that the new Anglican Prayer Book could be more like "an introduction to Christian Wisdom and a more abundant Life", and containing instruction to enable Christians to recognise the ideology, policy, and methods of our enemies, and how to counter with a policy in alignment with Christ's concept of the preciousness of the individual.

A wise husbandman knows that full-orbed development of a plant or animal requires the correct association of elements, i.e., environment. The mind through which we learn of God cannot conceive of His willing anything less for His supreme creation, Man.

As Sunday school teachers some of us felt that it was wrong to teach that all TRUTH was given to man long ago through the Bible. Religion should encourage a persistent search for truth with frequent re-examination of beliefs in relation to, *not* new truths, but new discoveries of the truth that has always existed.

People at all age levels, if they think at all, are confused by the condemnation of "material mindedness". How can there be any "spiritual mindedness" if the physical basis is not kept alive? they ask. Accepting the idea that "spirit" concerns the state of mind, they still argue that it depends upon chemical action of the body.

Spiritual mindedness would seem to be an impossible attainment for any who do not think straight about the material. Should not the two be regarded as integrated? B. C. Best's definition, though incomplete perhaps, is useful: "Spiritual mindedness consists in the ability to perceive the presence, or absence of truth in any given situation" (as distinct from the penchant for jumping to false conclusions).

In contradiction of God's plan for individual development some preachers urge self sacrifice (logical end is suicide) and selflessness (non-existence) as aims to be pursued.

Children so conditioned are then entered in the "rat race" where those who unselfishly practice what they are taught are trodden underfoot and often branded as failures by the people who indoctrinated them. They are told also that pride is a sin, then find in real life that lack of pride is highly censurable. The resultant spiritual problems are mental illness, delinquency, etc.

We should not be ashamed of being as God made us. Why then shrink from the truth that all humans are

motivated by the need for self-expression? Every "self" is different, so self expression produces different results ranging from sainthood to gangsterism. Selflessness is neither possible nor desirable but it should be possible for all youngsters to learn that reasonable consideration for others yields a far higher quality of satisfaction than a policy of interference, vandalism, etc., does.

Mis-use of derivatives of "self" leads to disharmony in society. A recent radio session provided an instance. The interviewer deplored the fact that opposition to the merging of producers unions was motivated by self-interest. That of course was true, but the speaker saw it as a fault in the other fellow and a virtue in himself and others who wanted gains from amalgamation. Neither side had a clear understanding of the issues involved so there were different ideas as to what was best for all. Not self-interest, but the thinking given to its direction or purpose was at fault. We all know of the situation in which Joe selfishly refused to do what Sam (selfishly) wanted him to do.

Mis-use of the word "sacrifice" adds to the confusion. Joe cannot go swimming and attend church at the same time. He prefers church. He does not "sacrifice" the swim in the interest of virtue; he merely makes a choice. Effort towards a desired objective is not sacrifice.

We are acquainted with several sets of parents who claim to be agnostics; some of their children are married and have young families. The children were encouraged to enquire about religion. The parents' answers were according to the findings of the minds God had given them. They taught that God is within you. "Love your God with all your heart and all your soul and all your mind", which means respect your own integrity first, foremost and always. Integrity means self-expression, self-respect, wholeness, and arising therefrom, individual initiative and responsibility.

When you have learned to respect your own integrity "with all your being" then direct the same quality of respect to the integrity of other people, i.e., "Love your neighbour as yourself". The individual is more important than any institution — "The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the institution". All of the parents and children living according to the code are a testimony to its merits.

In the knowledge that 100 years to man is as a moment to Eternity we do not look for spectacular advance in the evolution of religion. Rather, we feel that our small contribution may be the equivalent of a few grains of mud to the beach of religious thinking 50 years hence.

As group representatives we are,

Yours sincerely,

C. H. Allen,

G. K. Tavender,

(Mrs.) W. Stegar.

(The above letter has been sent to a number of clergymen with some encouraging results. This example of decentralised initiative is one to be emulated—Ed., N.T.)

BARUCH ATTACKS GENERAL DE GAULLE

Continued from page 1

German alliance sufficiently independent economically as a base for his political and military policies. But unless he is prepared to challenge accepted finance-economic policies, he must also attempt more and more exporting and less and less importing. This conflicts with what the Washington policy makers are attempting, who also desperately seek exports to attempt to solve internal problems.

BRITISH WORLD A BARRIER FOR WORLD MONOPOLY

It can be argued that the Western world is threatened with an inevitable series of internal conflicts only because of the attempted operation of financial and economic policies, which are unrealistic. While it is certainly obvious that most participate in the conflict without any long-range objective, some only in order to defend themselves, there is a mass of evidence to show that there are groups who see in the inevitable developments of present financial and economic policies the means whereby they can ultimately obtain complete World Power. Mr. Bernard Baruch and similar international financiers are the spokesmen and representatives for these groups. These groups have long sought the elimination of the British world because it was in more ways than one a barrier to the obtaining of World Power. Its internal social structure and its culture provided the requisites for the implementation of policies, which would challenge the threat of a World Dictatorship. Every suggestion in the British world for modification of economic and financial policies has met with the fiercest opposition, while a long-term policy for destroying the British world has been steadily pursued by the directors of International Finance. Forcing Britain into the European Economic Community was to have been the deathblow for Britain and the British Commonwealth. Thus the howls of rage because de Gaulle has upset the programme of Mr. Baruch and associates.

A TEMPORARY SETBACK FOR BARUCH

Although temporarily thwarted by de Gaulle's policy, the enemies of the British Commonwealth, including the traitors within, are not permitting their anger to prevent an immediate counter-attack. The big city press throughout the British world, with no exceptions that we have been able to discover, has lost no time in making it clear that there is no hope of a Commonwealth policy. This campaign provides further revealing evidence of the real objective of the Common Market: to destroy forever the British Commonwealth. The main "argument" against any suggestion of a revival and strengthening of the Commonwealth as an independent group of nations, is that this is economically "unreal". And it is being stressed that the setback caused by de Gaulle is only "temporary".

The current worldwide campaign of vilification of de Gaulle, and the almost hysterical insistence that the failure of Britain to join the European Community must not be regarded as an opportunity for a revived British Commonwealth, should at last convince many of those skeptics who have refused to see any grand design behind world affairs. Our view is that our enemies have suffered a disastrous, but temporary, set back. Mr. Baruch revealed far more than he realised with his attack on de Gaulle. It will be instructive to note if any effective sanctions can now be brought to bear against de Gaulle. But whatever is done about de Gaulle, the peoples of the British world, who have fought back magnificently against the Common Market plot, and who even without the sudden action of de Gaulle, would almost certainly have defeated Macmillan this year, must immediately take advantage of the breathing space they now have in order to take the offensive.

NOW FOR THE COUNTER-OFFENSIVE

In the face of the so-called inevitable trend, we and our associates around the British world have demonstrated once more the power of the dedicated few. We continued to maintain our faith in the face of all the propaganda power of the Big Battalions. We have gained new and powerful allies. We have helped to clarify more clearly the battle lines. But we must now go on to the offensive. During the immediate future we must foster and encourage a growing demand that the Commonwealth nations come together to evolve common trade and defence policies. The case for the Commonwealth must be presented with greater vigour. Politicians must have it made clear to them that positive support for constructive Commonwealth policies is expected. We may now be presented with our last chance to act effectively. With the unconscious assistance of de Gaulle, we can claim to have won a major battle. But we can still lose the war unless we make every possible use of the situation now presenting itself. "Once more unto the breach, dear friends, once more", should be our immediate reaction to the dismay in the ranks of the opposition.

HOW THE U.S. STATE DEPARTMENT HANDED CUBA TO CASTRO

"Red Star Over Cuba" tells the shocking story of the part played by subversive influences in the U.S. State Department in the establishment of the first Communist base in the Western Hemisphere.

A former Communist authority on Latin America, Nathaniel Weyl, belonged to the same cell in the thirties as the notorious Alger Hiss. He gives Castro's long Communist background. This book is compulsory reading for those wishing to understand what happened in Cuba—and to learn the appropriate lesson while there is time.

This well-produced book of 242 pages contains an excellent index. Price: 45/- post free.

Order from The Heritage Bookshop, 273 Little Collins Street, Melbourne.