

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. 3

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

February 22, 1963

EDITORIAL

DISARMAMENT THE PRELUDE TO WORLD GOVERNMENT

Increasing numbers of students of international affairs are coming to the conclusion that the "American" policy, of which President Kennedy is the spokesman, to make all Western nations completely subservient to a Washington-directed nuclear defence programme, is a necessary preliminary to a deal between Washington and Moscow for the establishment of World Government. The fact that many sincere and well-intentioned people support national disarmament and World Government is but one further demonstration of how the forces of evil can use dupes to advance a revolutionary programme.

An independent nuclear defence force for the British Commonwealth is one of the basic essentials for upholding British independence. Military defence is essential until some financial and economic policies remove the basic crisis of war. Clear thinking is desperately required on the question of disarmament, and as a contribution to this end we republish an article by C. H. Douglas, which originally appeared in *The New Age*, of June 25, 1931. This article is even more applicable now than when it was written. Subsequent history has strikingly demonstrated Douglas's depth of understanding of the realities of international affairs. He wrote:

If there are still people who suppose that the disasters, anxieties, and disillusionment from which we are suffering, and the greater trials with which we are plainly threatened, and the result of uncoordinated forces, such persons must find the world a very depressing spectacle. A situation in which the threat of war grows daily, in which the stock markets of the world stagger from one crisis to another while prelates and politicians vie with each other in demanding still more sacrifices from a world which is but one continual sacrifice, would, if its condition were fortuitous, be the best possible excuse for universal suicide. There would from this point of view be so many and such widely varying defects in modern society that no reasonable space of time could be expected to produce a better state of affairs, even if there were any signs of progress in that direction. It would be a hopeless situation.

Fortunately, evidence accumulates daily that this is not the case. There is in existence at least one definite policy which is being pursued with great ability, and over a worldwide area. I suppose this policy is responsible primarily for most of the troubles with which the world is suffering, although secondary troubles have grown out of it, and its defeat will have results as widespread and far reaching as the troubles, which proceed from it.

The main outlines of this policy are familiar, and its objective, the establishment of world hegemony, has been recognised in many quarters. In passing it may be observed that, in addition to any fundamental question

as to its desirability there is probably an immense illusion at the base of the idea of world power—that by the centralisation of administration you obtain more control over an organisation. I suppose it is beginning to dawn upon a good many people in widely differing spheres of influence that exactly the opposite is the truth that the centralisation of administration results in the organisation obtaining more control over the administration. In other words, the larger and more centralised an organisation is the more impossible it becomes for its so-called "head" to deflect the organisation from a policy which arises out of its own inherent constitution.

However this may be, the strategy which is being pursued for the attainment of this world hegemony is becoming sufficiently plain, and the first constituent of it is disarmament, not merely of a military character, but in every plane of human activity.

Arms are merely a special form of tools—they increase the power of the individual over circumstances. If this be recognised, it will easily be grasped that there is no essential difference between the disarmament of an individual and the taking away from him of any other tools, and that fundamentally the desirability of such a line of action depends very much on whether you believe that the individual or the nation can desirably relinquish all specialised action in favour of some exterior organisation. Disarmament is simply dis-empowerment. If there is anyone who finds such prospect attractive, then Soviet Russia, or Fascist Italy, are the spiritual homes for him.

This idea that everybody knows better what is good for a man than the man himself, and that any external organisation is a better repository for a nation's power than the nation in question, would seem on the face of it to bear such strong resemblance to the fable of the fox, which having lost its tail in a trap, proclaimed the transcendent advantages of a tail-less existence, that one would not expect it to attract much support. But, in fact, it seems to lend itself to presentation in a form very attractive to the idealistic mentality. The Archbishop of Canterbury, re-

Continued on page 4

"THE STORY OF CHANG LAO" NOW AVAILABLE

We apologise for the fact that publication of this important book has taken a little longer than anticipated. However, the book is now available and all orders are in process of being fulfilled.

The Story of Chang Lao, by veteran Australian expert on the Far East, Dr. W. G. Goddard, does not make pleasant reading for Australians. A former official of the Peking Foreign Office, who managed to escape to Hong Kong, tells his story to Dr. Goddard. This is perhaps the most authentic picture yet given of Mao Tse-tung's China.

Chang Lao reveals:

- How Communist China is using an extensive drug trade to earn foreign credits.
- The clever perversion of Christianity and other religions to further Communism.
- The nature of "Maoism", a form of "spiritual imperialism".
- The role of Indonesia in China's strategy for taking Australia. Events in West New Guinea have graphically confirmed Chang Lao's story.

In a postscript, Dr. Goddard asks whether Australians can hold Australia for another generation. Is Australia as a nation riding into the sunset? Dr. Goddard expresses his grave fears, but puts forward positive proposals, which Australians can adopt to help save themselves before it is too late.

The Story of Chang Lao is the "book of the moment" as far as Australia is concerned. Price 10/8d., post free. Six copies at the rate of 6/9d per copy, post free.

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

THE MONEY POWER AND THE COMMON MARKET

The following organisations are known to us as in favour in some degree or other of joining Britain to Europe through the Common Market or other plans:

1. United Europe Association.
2. Britain in Europe.
3. The Common Market Campaign.
4. European Movement.
5. The European Economic Community Information Service.
6. United Kingdom Council of the European Movement.
7. European-Atlantic Group.

8. Federal Union.
9. The Federal Trust for Education and Research.
10. The Council of Europe.

In at least one case, the Inland Revenue gives tax-recovery status as an educational charity and all are believed to be richly-financed, some of the funds originating abroad. Typically, the Common Market Campaign is unlikely to lack money, if judged by the great affluence or influence of some signatories to its "Statement", embracing its Chairman, Lord Gladwyn (a director of merchant bankers, S. G. Warburg), and S. G. Warburg himself, Sir Edward Beddington-Behrens (financier, chairman of Ocean Trust), Kleinwort Benson Ltd., Sir Charles Hambro (of Hambros, merchant bankers), a brace of Astors (the Viscount and Major the Hon. J. J.), numerous directors of the Financial Times, The Economist, still more merchant bankers, financial interests and, of course, Boothby.

Such a collection of organisations, with the immense weight of money backing them, will not call a halt now.

—From the February issue of The British Anti-Common Market's Newsletter.

FOR LOYALISTS

Commonwealth Before Common Market:

This splendid booklet of 70 pages, well produced in every way, is literally packed with facts and solid argument concerning the Common Market versus Commonwealth controversy. Eminent authorities on various aspects of subjects associated with the Common Market question expose thoroughly the claims of the Common Marketeers and put the case for the Commonwealth. Price 2/-, post-free.

A Choice for Destiny, by Sir Arthur Bryant. In this splendid little book the famous British historian deals with the threat of the Common Market to the British heritage everywhere. Price 3/-, post-free.

The Common Market and the Communist Challenge, by Eric D. Butler. This little booklet, by an authority on Communism, exposes the falsity of the claim that Britain's entry into the European Economic Community would help to defeat Communism. Price 1/6, post-free.

The above publications may be obtained from The Heritage Bookshop, 273 Little Collins Street, Melbourne.

A NATIONAL CAMPAIGN TO DEMONSTRATE A REALISTIC LOYALTY TO THE QUEEN

We enclose with this issue two copies of a special brochure being distributed by the Australian League of Rights as part of a national campaign to demonstrate a realistic loyalty to the Queen. We urge every supporter to make immediate use of the enclosed brochures, by giving them to selected responsible people. But, much more important, supporters are requested to write immediately for further supplies for selective distribution. The League of Rights announces that it is making no charge for the brochures, but that small donations to help cover printing and posting expenses would be appreciated.

Another feature of the League's National campaign has been a letter sent to every newspaper in Australia, urging loyal Australians to consider seriously Australia's future during the Queen's visit. The League reports that this letter campaign has had a most widespread impact. Hundreds of papers, including most Provincial dailies, published the letter in full. Supporters would be rendering a valuable service to the League by forwarding any copies of papers containing the letter.

Late last week, on the eve of the Queen's arrival in Australia, the National Executive of the Australian League of Rights forwarded to Her Majesty at Canberra a loyal message from the League, its members and supporters.

"DEDICATION"

St. Paul writes in his letter to the Ephesians, Chapter 6, Verse 12: "For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against rulers of the darkness of this world, against Spiritual wickedness in high places."

No thinking person will deny that this is true of our own times. The world today is in a desperate plight, and it is indeed truly necessary to "take unto ourselves the whole armour of God, that we may be able to withstand in the evil day." We Christians must in fact dedicate ourselves to the task of eradicating the evils existing in this day and be prepared if need be to die in the defence of our freedom and our Christian way of life. We must never forget that our enemies are themselves dedicated; dedicated to the goal they have set, that goal being the extermination of our free society.

The following definition appears in my dictionary:

Dedicate - - devote to God's service; set aside entirely for some purpose; inscribe or address (book, etc.).

The last phrase is not relevant to my subject, so we will discard it. Since our enemies are not particularly concerned with God the Communist philosophy teaches that He does not exist, I think the second phrase may be applied to them. We as Christians must therefore define this word dedicate — devote to God's service.

If then being dedicated means we are devoted to God's service, it means devotion to Him in the broadest sense. "Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me." If we in our fear and anxiety forget that He is the vine and we are the branches, and

that without Him we can do nothing, then we fight alone. When we transfer our devotion from Him to a cause, irrespective of what that cause may be, then there is the danger that dedication will become fanaticism.

The Rev. Leslie Millin in an address to an Anti- Communist clinic in San Francisco commented on the difficulty of remaining true to the Christian faith whilst engaged in this fight against Communism. This is very true, because this evil thing can only have been spawned in the depths of hell, and when we become involved in the fight we want only to destroy, for we know that if we do not, then we ourselves will be destroyed.

There is therefore a very real need to constantly remind ourselves of His commandments to us. Mark 12:30, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength", and Mark 12:31, "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these."

We must not brush aside the needs of others, failing in compassion when in the words of St. Luke 21:26, "Men's hearts are failing them for fear, and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth."

We must fight this battle to the end, but we should strive daily for a close walk with Him without Whom we can do nothing, consciously seeking to do His will in this cause as in all things. When tired and dispirited and the sense of defeat is very real, pause to listen for His voice. He is always close by.

If we do not seek His direction day by day, then we have no right to ask for Divine intervention in our extremity.

—Shirley I. Dunn.

DISARMAMENT THE PRELUDE TO WORLD GOVERNMENT

Continued from page 1

freshed by his three months cruise with Mr. Pierpont Morgan, is asking for our prayers in favour of it. By a curious coincidence, American banking circles are firm in their contention that no reduction of the debts of Europe to America can be contemplated without corresponding reduction in European armaments.

Contemporaneously we have a blast of propaganda for what can only be described as "programitis". The very financiers who condemn Russia in public while endeavouring to organise loans to her in private, are enthusiastic about the desirability of the centralised planning of production. The centralised planning of production, if it means anything at all, means that some central authority shall decide both what the individual wants, whether he is to have it, who is to make it for him, and on what terms he is to get it. It is suggested that, however unpalatable superficially such a state of affairs might appear, it is the only way by which the individual can rapidly acquire material prosperity. Yet, curiously enough, the complaint by the same people made against what remains of the decentralised control of production, is that it has produced too much. In other words, whatever happens in the world at the present time, which is a world increasingly in the control of finance, is an argument for taking still further control out of the hands of the individual and transferring it to the power, which is demonstrably responsible for the trouble.

I suppose that this policy has obtained such momentum that we are condemned to witness its pursuit to its inevitable and catastrophic conclusion. But in the meantime a little plain speaking may perhaps not be out of place. Those who in the present state of the world's business are endeavouring to weaken such independent centres of power, as for instance, Great Britain, by propaganda for disarmament of a military nature, or active or disguised action for the reduction of her power in men and tools, are either the victims of muddle-headed illusion, or are dangerous criminals. It is to be hoped that some effective method of presenting this point of view to them will be devised. The Long Gallery of the Tower might be considered.

The way to stop wars is not to institute a centralised tyranny worse than war—it is to take away the reason for war. When that has been done, armaments will go out of fashion. Perhaps the Archbishop will take another holiday with Messrs. Morgan, Mellon and Stimson, and put it to them.

PAGE 4

RHODESIAN FRONT'S AMAZING ELECTION VICTORY

The Rhodesian Front's amazing and spectacular election victory in Southern Rhodesia on December 18 was remarkable for a number of reasons.

Here was a new and untried political Party without even the benefit of a daily Press -- a Party which was opposed by the combined weight of the powerful Argus newspaper monopoly, all the financial and mining houses, the state radio and television services, and by the full weight of Britain's Government and Press. And yet it succeeded in turning out of office the Party of Sir Roy Welensky. Sir Edgar Whitehead and Lord Malvern, namely, the United Federal Party — a Party which had been in power in one form or another for 33 years and which had come perilously close to clamping its fraudulent partnership policy on the White electorate.

The Rhodesian electorate has, by its vote, clearly shown that no matter how insuperable the odds might be, and might seem to be, the forces of Liberalism, Fabianism and International Finance are not invincible, providing the electorate is armed with facts and providing there exists the courage, the instinct, and the will to fight back and to survive.

In rejecting the United Federal Party and its territorial Prime Minister. Sir Edgar Whitehead, a Fabian Socialist, the Rhodesian electorate has established a precedent which could well serve as an inspiration for the beleaguered peoples of the West.

For, with the same courage and the same will to fight back, the British and American peoples also have it within themselves, albeit at the eleventh hour, to throw out of office the traitors Harold Macmillan and John F. Kennedy, also both Fabian Socialists.

—S. E. D. Brown in *The South African Observer*, January.

THE CANADIAN ELECTIONS

Although we have received preliminary reports on the Canadian political situation, we content ourselves with recording briefly at this stage that International Finance desperately requires a victory for Mr. Lester Pearson and the Liberal Party, but we are informed by a reliable commentator that there is a wide-spread view in Canada that the elections will not give any Party a clear-cut majority.

If a combination of Conservative politicians can keep Pearson out, there will be deep dismay in Wall Street.

"In the ideal of the Commonwealth we have been entrusted with something special. We have in our hands a most potent force for good and one of the true unifying bonds in this torn world. Let us keep faith with the ideal we know to be right..."

— The Queen in her 1962 Christmas message to the peoples of the British Commonwealth

THE QUEEN'S VISIT AND AUSTRALIA'S FUTURE

The Queen's visit to Australia and to New Zealand has come at a time of crisis, not only for these two British nations, but also for the association of nations called the British Commonwealth. A realistic loyalty to the Queen demands that thinking Australians ponder deeply on the question of Australia's future not only as a nation, but also in relationship to other members of the British Commonwealth.

The present British Government's attempt to enter the European Economic Community generally described as the Common Market, and the statements by its leaders that it was prepared to accept the far-reaching political and constitutional implications of the Treaty of Rome, has caused a profound shock in all parts of the British Commonwealth. There are growing doubts about the future of the British Commonwealth, doubts fed by the many strange voices proclaiming that it is "inevitable" that the British Commonwealth should disintegrate; that there is no place for it in the modern world.

Quite clearly the Queen does not subscribe to the defeatist view that the Commonwealth is doomed inevitably to disintegrate. In her last Christmas message to the peoples of the British Commonwealth, she appealed to them to "keep faith with the ideal we know to be right."

Those loyal to the Crown should therefore carefully heed what the Queen had to say about the value of the British Commonwealth. To accept the progressive disintegration of the British Commonwealth as inevitable is not only defeatist; it is a manifestation of the

philosophy of materialism. The growth of the British Commonwealth was the product of countless men and women of faith in a certain conception of life. What is the faith of Australians today?

What is the national ideal towards which they work today? Do they see their future as part of a flow of a history of which their Queen is a living symbol? Or have they succumbed to the deadly propaganda which would have them believe that they can ignore their past and traditions, can cut themselves from the roots which nourished them? These are the type of questions, which a realistic loyalty to the Crown demands. Australians of all ages will undoubtedly demonstrate their great personal affection for the Queen, but a far deeper loyalty than this is required at this critical time in the nation's history. The Monarchical system requires loyal subjects of the Monarch. But a realistic loyalty must be one, which is based upon some understanding of what the Crown means, what it stands for.

One explanation of the Crown is that it is the symbol of unity of the British Commonwealth. If this is accepted as true, then all those really loyal to the Crown should at this present time be using their best endeavours to help revitalise the Commonwealth, to demand of their politicians that they take appropriate action to develop a



Her Most Gracious Majesty, Our Sovereign Lady, Elizabeth the Second, By the Grace of God, of The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and of Her other Realms and Territories, Queen, Head of The Commonwealth, Defender of The Faith.

Continued on page 3

CHRISTIAN MONARCHY

Queen Elizabeth II is Queen of Australia as well as Queen of the United Kingdom. The Prime Minister, Mr. Menzies, was right when he said in a T.V. interview in London last year that the great majority of Australians are Monarchists, not Republicans. "We are the Queen's men," said Mr. Menzies. But the Queen is a Constitutional Monarch. What does this mean to a people who have been increasingly taught that any concept of Government, which runs contrary to the counting of heads — the "majority vote" - is anti-democratic?

The process of voting is, of course, important in a free society. But in order to avert tyranny under the guise of "the majority will" it must be related to a constitutional idea, or ideal, in which is enshrined values rooted in reality. The primary ideal of British constitutionalism is a Christian Monarchical order based upon the sanctity of each individual person and in the personal ideal of freedom.

At the Queen's Coronation Service she was asked, "Will you to the utmost of your power maintain the laws of God and the true profession of the Gospel?" The Coronation Service reflects the Christian concept of Monarchy.

In the following extract from an address given in Vancouver, British Columbia, Mr. L. D. Byrne brilliantly outlines the historical background of Christian Monarchy:

The Christian revelation and the emergence of Christendom resulted in far-reaching changes in the concepts of nationhood, kingship and the place of the Church in society—stemming directly from Christian teaching. In Medieval Europe the constitutional ideal probably reached its highest form of expression in the British Isles, having the roots of its growth deep in the soil of a rich history.

This ideal was a development of the traditional conception of the nation as a family. In the same sense that a person is a member of his family, so the extension of the relationships of persons and families to the wider family of the nation was conceived as an organism, which was an integral part of the greater organism of humanity—the larger family of nations.

In more specific form the Christian ideal conceived society — Christian society — as belonging to the Mystical Body of Christ, all being "members one of another", one with the past existing in eternity and one with all Creation. The purpose of Life—and, therefore, of Society — was to worship God and to be obedient to His Will as revealed through the Church.

It was accepted as a matter of course that God had ordained that there should be races and nations, and that to the latter He had given in trust the countries which were their homes, to be used to their benefit and His Glory—substantially the view voiced by St. Joan in Shaw's play. The King was the head of the national

family—dedicated from birth to the service of God, to whom he was personally responsible for the welfare of his people and the integrity of the nation. As trustee of Divine Authority in the temporal affairs of his people he was responsible for its disposition. This disposition of temporal authority was divided between an aristocracy, who, from the rich experience of centuries, were found best fitted to the responsibilities involved if conditioned to them from birth - - and, therefore, was hereditary; and a judiciary chosen for their integrity to administer justice in the King's name.

The hierarchy of the Church, as successors of the authority vested in His Apostles by Christ, exercised authority not only in the spiritual life of the nation, but they had a responsibility to God in those temporal affairs which bore directly on the spiritual life of their flock. They were in a very real sense the check of spiritual authority to ensure that the King and the Lords Temporal were true to the trust they held from God.

(Out of this indeed, in course of time, evolved Parliamentary Government by the King acting "by and with the consent of an elected House of Commons and a hereditary House of Lords—government by the King in Parliament, advised by an executive of Ministers.)

Throughout the structure of the nation, authority involved corresponding responsibilities, and power was tempered by checks and counter checks.

The relationship of the individual to the nation was determined by the organic concept of society and by his relationship within the Mystical Body of Christ. Every person as a "child of God" belonging to Christ was a sacred personality. The social objective was essentially spiritual with "the common good" and personal freedom within that "state of life to which it shall please God to call" the individual, as means to that end. Integrity ranked higher than merely "this life", considered as but an aspect of life eternal.

This traditional Christian ideal accepted all knowledge as Divine revelation emanating from God and to be used to His Glory. The Church was naturally its custodian and, therefore, responsible for education. The purpose of life being to glorify God and to live in obedience to His Will, conse-

quently, in ordering their temporal affairs men must seek to find His Will as manifested in the Universal Canon governing Creation, and to bind back their lives to it. To the extent they succeeded they would realise the more abundant life and "find the truth and the truth would make them free"—free from the restrictions of physical environment and human limitations; and to the extent they adhered to Divine Law, this would be reflected in human law - - "that government is best which needs to govern least". In the political and economic spheres the test of the rightness of policy was the degree to which there was freedom from arbitrary controls and regulations in the life of the national family — the operation of government and the economy automatically yielding the desired results.

Such was the ideal, which was at once the heart of the British Constitution and the inspiration of the British nation for centuries. Notwithstanding the extent to which human frailty fell short of its achievement, and despite the abuses of intrigues and violence to which it was subjected, it remained the ideal which called forth the highest aspirations of the nation—aspirations which were enshrined for posterity in such national heirlooms of the cultural heritage as the unique Parliamentary System and much of the British concept of justice.

THE QUEEN ENCOURAGES COMMONWEALTH TRADE

"I am told that about a quarter of all trade between nations is between those of the Commonwealth . . . by working together through your membership of the Commonwealth you can help to increase the flow of this trade and bring employment and prosperity to people all over the world."

—The Queen in her speech opening the Twenty-first Congress of the Federation of Commonwealth and British Chambers of Commerce, on May 21, 1962.

The Deputy Chairman of the Congress, Mr. Haskell Anderson, of New Zealand, said that the Queen's speech "gave us a splendid send-off and restored confidence in the future".

QUEEN AGAINST COMMON MARKET

"Time & Tide", the British newsweekly, 1-12 February 1963, reports that the Queen has been opposed to the proposed entry of Britain into the Common Market. Her Majesty is clearly more conscious of her responsibilities concerning the British heritage than are some politicians.

CROWN OR PRESIDENT?

"In an address to a large Rotary Club in British Columbia, Canada, in 1962, I said that I hoped that American guests present would not be offended if I suggested that even if the British Crown were regarded as nothing more than the equivalent of the American Presidential Head of State, the method whereby the Monarch was appointed was far preferable than that used to appoint a President. I recalled some of the more vulgar electioneering techniques used by candidates at the last American Presidential election, the entry of so-called popular entertainers into the campaign, the bitter abuse, the intrigue to obtain the support of influential minorities, and the ugly allegations at the end of the campaign that it was probable that voting in certain States had been 'rigged'. I compared this with the lack of such national division in a nation which has the Monarchical system, where the hereditary principle automatically decides who will be King or Queen, and suggested that there was something to be said for the dignity of the British Coronation service compared with a Presidential election.

"After the Rotary luncheon was finished, one of the American guests present approached and thanked me for my address, stating that he was appreciative of my remarks concerning the Monarchical system. He then made the significant remark: 'But some of you people in the British Commonwealth don't really appreciate what you have'. I am certain that that American was right." —Eric D. Butler in *Why I am a Monarchist*.

A COMMONWEALTH POLICY

I suggest that a Commonwealth economic and trade conference, meeting for a worthwhile time, should direct its attention to a consideration of the following:

- Securing Commonwealth initiative in getting the G.A.T.T. amended so as to enable greater flexibility in Commonwealth trade.
- The drafting of proposals aimed at a comprehensive review of the Ottawa Agreement.
- The establishment of a Commonwealth Payments Union.
- The setting up of a Sterling Area Board.
- The establishment of a Commonwealth Development Bank.
- The formation of a Scientific and Technical Resources Committee.
- The undertaking of a survey of raw materials throughout the Commonwealth similar to the Paley Report.

—D. J. Killen, M.P., in
In The Commonwealth Cause.

QUEEN'S SOVEREIGNTY THREATENED

Many eminent British Constitutional authorities have warned that if Britain were to accept the Treaty of Rome, which is essential to join the European Economic Community, the Sovereignty of the Crown would be progressively undermined. The position of the Crown is not only of vital importance to the people of the United Kingdom: it concerns the peoples of all parts of the British Commonwealth. The sovereignty of the Queen cannot be seriously affected in one part of the Commonwealth without affecting it everywhere.

Last year *Time & Tide*, London, commissioned distinguished constitutional lawyers to give their considered opinion on the question of how the position of the Queen might be affected if Britain accepted the Treaty of Rome. In giving their opinion, the lawyers stressed that a European Federation was the inevitable outcome of adherence to the Treaty.

The following are the major points made in the lawyers' opinion:

- The status of the Sovereign would be diminished.
- The Queen's prerogatives would be greatly altered.
- There would be new Federal criminal offences not open to the Queen's review or mercy.
- Her appointment of ambassadors and consular staff would probably cease.
- The right to declare war, or to end it, would not longer be the Queen's.

- Even the "Queen's Commission" might cease to exist.
- The Paramount Head of State in Europe could declare a state of emergency in Britain and the Queen could not overrule him.
- The Sovereign's power to alter U.K. currency and her sole power to coin money would probably cease.
- Property in Britain could be compulsorily purchased by the European power and the Queen or her judges would not be able to interfere.

* * *

Prime Minister Menzies, in his address to the Liberal Party of Australia on November 13, 1962, made it clear that he believed British entry into the Common Market would have a serious effect upon British sovereignty. It is significant that although Mr. Menzies' views were those of a constitutional lawyer, they were suppressed by the Australian press.

Mr. Menzies said "... 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."

If Great Britain were to become a mere State in a European federation, then clearly the status and sovereignty of the Crown would be seriously undermined.

God Save the Queen!

THE QUEEN'S VISIT AND AUSTRALIA'S FUTURE

Continued from page 1

new purpose and coherence for the Commonwealth.

Without vision a people perish. A national ideal of life is essential for a people to survive and to transmit to the future the values it has inherited from the past. Australia is an independent member of an association of nations, which, having developed organically is the most successful example of true internationalism the world has yet seen. The growth of the British Commonwealth has been a demonstration of a unity in diversity. Each nation has developed its own characteristics, but unity has been maintained by loyalty to a common

heritage, of which the Crown is a major feature.

Just as individuals cannot live unto themselves in society, but must learn to live in harmonious relations one with the other, so must nations learn to live with one another. Successful example is a far superior teacher than windy theories. With all its faults, the British Commonwealth has provided Civilisation with an example of true unity without the curse of centralised power. The British Commonwealth can play a unique role in the saving of Civilisation - - **but only if sufficient subjects of the Queen heed her appeal to "keep faith with the ideal we know to be right."**

THE SOUL OF THE NATION

"The essential soul of a nation is in its character, its culture and tradition. The King (Queen) is the natural embodiment of Honours and Sanctions—of Culture and Tradition and, as such, is naturally the Supreme Commander of the Armed Forces."

—C. H. Douglas in
Realistic Constitutionalism (1947)
* * *

". . . when we speak of the Queen as the Queen of Canada (Australia) it is no mere empty formality but a simple affirmation of the fact that we have a royal and not a republican form of democratic government. And that is no idle distinction but one, which relates directly to every aspect of our social life. For it represents at bottom a different idea of social order or system.

"It is not a new idea. It is as old as human civilisation itself, and for that very reason provides the surest available means of preserving, not only our civilisation as such, but all true humanity as well. Being British or being loyal to the throne is no mere matter of sentiment: it has to do with a basic ideal of social life, and with a fully enlightened attachment to the highest ideal of democracy that the life of man has ever known. Nor has that ideal essentially to do with any single land or language or class. It is an ideal of universal significance relating to man as such. That we and others should find it enshrined in the British monarchy we share is due, not to any claim that the ideal of itself is the monopoly of the British, but to the historical fact that it is in the British monarchical order that a certain universal ideal has been preserved and most highly developed."

—John Farthing in
Freedom Wears a Crown

HEREDITARY MONARCHY AND HONOURS

"A hereditary monarch owes his position to the simple and indisputable fact of birth. He is pledged to nothing except the discharge of his special function. His descent from his predecessors brings memories of the past to enable the duties of the present: and his children are the promise of a future continuous and congruous with both. The ceremony with which he is surrounded, whatever may be its cost (there were once critics of the cost among us, but their voices have long ceased to be heard), repays the cost in a rich return of the political sentiments and emotions, which serve and sustain a community. It is good to have cheap administration — provided that it is also efficient. It would not be good to have a cheap or common system of monarchy. Life has its pomps and solemnities; and in politics, as well as in other matters, it is the better for having those pomps.

"The British Monarch, on the formal or ceremonial side of our internal life, is the fountain of honours; and his court is the centre of 'Society', in that sense of the word in which it means *le grande monde*. Should there be a system of honours, fixed and conferred by the King, and should there be a high society of which his court is the centre? These are questions which may logically be asked in an age which is moving towards more and more equality, and of which the motto becomes increasingly, 'A man's a man for a' that'. Yet there seems little disposition among us to quarrel with the system of honours, or to challenge the general idea of court and society. Even on the ground of logic, a system of honours is logically

connected with the general appeal to sentiments and emotions which is now the basis of monarchy. If a man has responded to that appeal, by rendering military or political or other services, why (it seems natural to ask) should he not be honoured? The system of honours does not mean any privileged class. Honours are spread nationwide."

—Sir Ernest Barker in
British Constitutional Monarchy

THIS IS A LEAGUE OF RIGHTS PUBLICATION

This brochure is produced by the Australian League of Rights, a national non-party organisation, to commemorate the 1963 visit of Her Majesty, Queen Elizabeth II, to Australia, and to help stimulate a deeper and more understanding loyalty to the British Crown at this critical time in the history of Australia and the British Commonwealth.

It invites all Australians to help demonstrate their loyalty to the Crown during the Queen's visit, by widely distributing this brochure. Adequate supplies may be obtained from the State Councils of the League, whose addresses are given below:

Queensland, P.O., Box 3, Paddington,
Brisbane.

N.S.W.: Box 2957, G.P.O., Sydney.

W.A.: Box 1131N, G.P.O., Perth.

S.A.: Box 1297L, G.P.O., Adelaide.

Vic.: Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne.

"People will not look forward to posterity who never look back to their ancestors . . ."

— Edmund Burke