

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"

Vol. 29, No. 6

April 5, 1963

EDITORIAL

NOTHING TO GAIN BUT OUR CHAINS

The United Nations, surely by now world record holder in protracted insolvency, seems able in a miraculous manner to stave off that final disintegration which, in the more mundane business world, always follows. This chronic condition has served at least one good purpose in demonstrating before the world in the clearest possible terms, that the continued existence of the "World Body" serves the interests of the men who control the United States of America. If it did not they would hardly be willing to pay its debts. And this in spite of all the disasters, which the UN has visited on Western Civilization, including the hapless American people themselves.

By the Melbourne *Herald* however, these disasters seem to have gone unremarked. In a recent editorial on the subject of UN debt, the *Herald* says this:

"U Thant is reported to have decided to collect the amounts overdue for UN operations designed to keep the peace in the Middle East and the Congo."

Many Australians, including even many readers of the *Herald* will surely find it hard to accept the expression "peace-keeping operation" as an accurate description of the invasion of Katanga province by mercenaries of the UN. Worse, however follows.

"The most disturbing feature of the threatened insolvency of the UN," we learn, "is that countries which disagree with its policies are withholding money they could well afford to pay." And the editorial ends with: "It is a poor outlook for world order when members can thwart the will of the majority by refusing to pay for their share of work which does not suit them politically."

Now, isn't that a shocking state of affairs! Some nations, it seems, have actually had the cheek to refuse payment for dirty work they didn't want done.

But if this writer thinks that those who oppose the work of the United Nations do so on purely political grounds, he is seriously astray. For the detestation which the UN has earned in the regard of decent people over such actions as the recognition of the state of Israel, the betrayal of the Hungarian Revolution and, more recently, of Goa, or the "pacification" of the Congo to which the article specifically alludes, is based much more on moral grounds. To spell it out for the benefit of our newspaperman to whom the concept may be novel, these actions of the UN, whatever their political intent were, and are, morally WRONG.

The reference to the thwarting of the will of the majority seems a little strange in the light of an earlier passage from the same article, which states that, "the majority of UN members are seriously in arrears with either their regular subscriptions or extra assessments". This hardly seems to support the picture of a dedicated majority frustrated in their good intentions by a handful of tight-fisted narks. Perhaps the word majority means different things at different times. Or perhaps, like so many of the confused "liberals" who write for news-sheets today, our writer's remarks refer not to the world

we live in but that very different world of what-should-be which exists exclusively inside liberals' skulls.

The proposition advanced here means that if a majority of the members of the UN decide that Australia should admit unlimited numbers of coloured immigrants, then Australia should immediately agree to do just that—and, let us not forget, continue her contributions the while to keep the UN viable. And just as the Belgians were expected to pay to have themselves thrown out of the Congo, so, when our turn comes in New Guinea shall we be expected to defray expenses. Can anyone seriously believe that the majority of Australians are in favour of such an arrangement whereby a proportion of their earnings is handed over willy-nilly to an organization devoted to the overthrow of everything their ancestors laboured to create?

Has the one-man-one-vote poison really spread so deep that Australians will accept the principle of the right of the majority to do violence upon the minority? Parliamentary democracy was never meant to mean this. But then neither was it designed as an instrument to enslave free men, into which it is steadily being transformed. And if this charge applies to our own parliamentary institutions, as many will agree it does, how much more does it apply to the bogus parliament of the UN whose members do not even enjoy the advantages of a common language or culture or the status of being genuinely elected?

That a nation such as ours, heir to the glorious tradition of British Common Law and the system of government based upon it, should financially support the infamies which the UN has perpetrated since its misbegotten birth is hard enough to understand. But we are too, or claim to be, a Christian people. We believe therefore in the Christian doctrine of Individual Freewill, and we believe that free men, freely accepting the responsibility of their actions and living by the Law of Love are the only sorts of men capable of building a decent society here on earth. The United Nations, on the other hand, has shown by its every act and by its every pronouncement that the only law it recognizes is the law of Coercion, and that, on a world scale. And the law of Coercion produces not free men but slaves.

Continued on page 4

NEWS COMMENTARY

Jews and Communism: It is an irrefutable historical fact that there has been a special relationship between the Jews and Communism ever since the Jew Karl Marx formulated his philosophy of dialectical materialism. The current controversy amongst Jews in Australia concerning alleged "anti-Semitism" in Soviet Russia, has once again directed attention to this special relationship. Ever since the establishment of Soviet Russia, International Jewry has been divided in its attitude towards International Communism. But complaints by some Australian Jews that Jews are being persecuted in Soviet Russia cannot be allowed to obscure the fact that throughout the non-Communist world Jewish groups and papers have generally not played any strong role in the struggle against International Communism. Rather the reverse.

The U.S.A. is the centre of the strongest Jewish influence in the world. And, of course, most of this influence is concentrated in New York. The treatment of Dr. Fred Schwarz, the Australian expert on Communist philosophy and its application, when he took his Christian anti-Communism Crusade to New York last year, is most revealing. Dr. Schwarz's father was a Jewish convert to Christianity. But this has not prevented Dr. Schwarz from being labelled an "Anti-Semite."

When Dr. Schwarz went to New York he approached the powerful Jewish Anti-Defamation League, convinced that he would get support for his anti-Communist crusade, particularly as he had previously opposed any suggestion of special Jewish influence in Communism. But the Anti-Defamation League refused to meet with Dr. Schwarz, but helped to smear him. Dr. Schwarz then decided to seek the support of the columnist, Mr. George Sokolsky, described as a right wing, anti-Communist Jew. Sokolsky was the man who got the late Senator McCarthy's confidence and persuaded McCarthy that the way to prove that he was not "Anti-Semitic" was to appoint the two Jews, David Schine and Roy Cohn, to his staff. Both Schine and Cohn proved embarrassing.

Sokolsky responded to Schwarz's advance by joining in the bitter attacks upon the Australian anti-Communist expert. He impugned his motives and cast doubts on his integrity. Then in his column of September 13, which appeared all over America, Sokolsky made the following revealing statement: "In the 5,000 years of Jewish history, the Jews have learned to fear the apostate. Many of the most outrageous libels against the Jews originated with the apostates. Dr. Schwarz's father was a Jew who became a Christian and here is his son who, when an operation of his fails . . . he calls it a Jewish conspiracy." Sokolsky's smear has been the signal for a nation-wide campaign in the U.S.A. by organised Jewry against Schwarz.

Most Jewish opposition to Communism is confined to complaining about the persecution of Jews in Russia. All Christians oppose persecution of any individual, or group of individuals. But opposition to persecution is not the same thing as opposition to the fundamental *ideas* of Communism.

To Socialism via "Full Employment": We have often stressed the fact that the philosophy underlying the policy of "full employment" is basically that of the Communists, who insist, "labour produces all wealth". Labour is an increasingly minor element in modern production techniques. The two major aspects of the production of wealth are (a) natural factors like solar energy, and (b) increasing knowledge of how to use natural forces. The important point is that man is an heir to a heritage. To insist that the individual is not entitled to any financial income without engaging in some form of economic activity, no matter how useless and destructive it may be, attacks the very essence of the inheritance principle. And it inevitably leads towards Communism if every advance in greater efficiency in production techniques (i.e. more production with less labour) is used as an excuse by Government to make "full employment".

Our view has received frank recognition from a most impressive witness: the arrogant Jew, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., key adviser to President John Kennedy. In an article entitled "The Future of Socialism", Mr. Schlesinger says that transition to Socialism "must be piecemeal." The classical argument against gradualism, he states, "was that the capitalist ruling class would resort to violence rather than surrender its prerogatives. Here, as elsewhere, the Marxists enormously over-estimated the political courage and will of the capitalists . . . The next depression will certainly mean a vast expansion in government ownership and control." The problem was to have the Government "ready". Mr. Schlesinger does not believe that Socialism will be brought about by the working class, but by "some combination of lawyers, business and labor managers, politicians and intellectuals."

Such views must encourage Mr. Khrushchev in his current policy of "peaceful co-existence". In case someone observes that Mr. Schlesinger's views were expressed in 1947, we point out that a prominent American commentator recently wrote to Kennedy's "adviser" and asked if he wishes now to repudiate his views. Mr. Schlesinger replied: "I neither withdraw nor apologise . . ."

ANNUAL SOCIAL CREDIT COURSE

The annual Social Credit training course for people in and around Melbourne will be held as usual this autumn and winter. The course will be held at the offices of The New Times and conducted over eight weeks. The starting date will be the first week in May on either a Tuesday or Thursday night. Would those intending to attend please contact the office to enable us to choose the most suitable night? We appeal to supporters with young people in their late teens or early twenties to get their sons and daughters to attend. Students of all ages are welcome.

CORRESPONDENCE COURSE

Enquiries are also welcome for the correspondence course. A small fee for postage will be charged.

THE UNCOMMON MARKET

By ELIZABETH DOBBS

Though the Common Market negotiations have broken down, the Conservative Government still intends to push us into Europe somehow. The people have not been consulted as yet. At the same time, the Labour Party is divided; Mr. Harold Wilson has suggested fighting a general election on the Unemployment issue and the Conservative Party has retaliated with Nationalisation. At this rate the electors will be given no chance at all to express their wishes on the subject of joining the Common Market. Before pressure is renewed, as it will be renewed, and before such an election practically disenfranchises him on this issue, it is urgent for the ordinary man to recognize the dilemma into which he is being jockeyed, and to take action to forestall it.

Our forebears sweated blood and tears to win us the privilege of making policy in the society we live in. Unless we can preserve a structure of society in which this is possible, anything we can say about unemployment or nationalisation will be irrelevant. Unemployment is important: but to keep the right to deal with it within our own jurisdiction is still more so.

Whence comes this determination to sell our sovereignty abroad without reference to us? How can we make sure it never happens again? How can we protect ourselves from a public relations technique directed to engineer consent to a policy, rather than interpreting it fairly so that those affected can make up their minds about it? How can we recognize and see through a publicity that sets out in cold blood to make us "want" a policy as if it were a new sort of cigarette, and regardless of its effects, even suicidal effects, on our interests, or of the integrity of the arguments used?

For instance, joining the Common Market was at first represented to the public as involving merely a few technical adjustments to bring our economics into line with Europe, thus gaining enormous new markets. It took a year or so of slogging by the few who saw through this presentation to the public before any mention was made of political changes required, and how they would affect the ordinary man. But it now appears that "it is for political reasons that Britain has sought full membership." (*Times* report, January 30th, 1963). And in his speech replying to President de Gaulle, Mr. Macmillan could say that, "We had made it abundantly clear that we accepted the Treaty of Rome and aligned ourselves with the political implications as well as the economic content of the Treaty. In particular, we had accepted a common agricultural policy and the common tariff." Mr. Heath, the chief negotiator for the entry of Great Britain into the Common Market, declared, "I must repeat that we wish to be part of a politically evolving Europe; we are not merely seeking some economic benefits from it."

Yet Parliament was told, in the last debate on the Common Market, that without committing us, negotiations were to be started solely in order to see what terms were to be obtained. This is what Mr. Macmillan had the

authority to do, and was supposed to be doing. No more. And the *Times*, after the event, was able to comment, "If the Brussels negotiations had moved rapidly the Government might have been able to maintain their original public appearance of a reconnaissance." (January 28th, 1963).

Again, the Government, Mr. Macmillan and the solemn press insisted that the Commonwealth and Europe are not alternatives. They made a great point *saying* this. Yet pro-Market economists declare as a matter of course that "naturally" New Zealand would take a nearly mortal blow; and that Canada and Australia must expect inevitably to become the preserve of the United States. If this is not dissolution, what is?

As the Conservative Government is certainly denying with its lips what it proposes to do in action, every man must assess for himself what joining the Common Market would mean *to him*.

THE ORDINARY MAN AND THE COMMON MARKET

The first thing for him to consider is, how would joining the Common Market affect him as an individual? His position as an industrialist, a tradesman, a businessman or a farmer has been forecast in detail; but not his position as an individual: significantly, perhaps, because everybody without exception is here competent to express a wish, because the sum of these wishes might well be formidable, and because all government in this country is in the name and on behalf of the ordinary man as an individual.

In making his assessment he has his own built-in touchstone to apply to complications—his own common sense.

What economic benefits, for instance, would he draw from joining, agrees that he would get a *rise* in his cost of living. Estimates of the amount differ, but a glance at comparable costs on the continent gives cause for thought. This increase in our cost of living is to be gained by raising the Common External Tariff of the European Economic Community against our cheap imports of Commonwealth and other food, and throwing overboard our particularly successful method of keeping prices down. (*The money produced by the Tariff would go to the Common Market funds, not even to the exchequer, incidentally.*)

Well then, what administrative or political advantages would he get? Again, all agree that he would be bound increasingly to *lose* control over his own affairs. Many economic decisions would be made in Brussels, and in order to regulate the economic product they are bound to regulate the ordinary man in his everyday work. "They" means some sort of bureaucracy centralised in Europe. This would not be answerable directly to the ordinary man, or even to his national Parliament. The exact pattern of its control is so far undecided, but would necessarily be further removed from him if only because the European Economic Community was specially created to *over-ride* national differences. At best, in fields of policy ceded to the Community decisions, British delegates would probably retain about 4/21 (our share of votes) of the control of our destiny. Further, the British Government would engage to approximate large sections of our law

to Common Market decisions, thus reading them into our system permanently. Policy and pressure would flow down from the top.

Lastly, which perhaps should come first, would the individual perhaps gain intangibly, spiritually?

Let him think back to his last conversation with, say, a Frenchman, and his last talk with, say, an Australian. Talking to a Frenchman, most people are casting about for something their knowledge of French allows them to say. Talking to an Australian, they are soon eagerly comparing sameness of habits, and differences-based-on-sameness. This roughly summarises the difference: association with the one is a matter of painstaking, wary compromise, which limits action; with the other, an eager exploration of possibilities, which liberate it. This is natural, because we have in common an acceptance of first things and a way of thinking, our institutions and the aspirations they embody, —we are all part of the great stream of northern culture, which sprang originally from our own energy and actions and ideas, and now nourishes other nations too. To abandon this stream would mean leaving kith and kin so badly in the lurch as to strip the best part of their living from them; an unforgivable betrayal of them, and of the ideas we have lived by, and of *ourselves*. Each of us would carry the spiritual resultant of this betrayal, like a scar, all our lives; collectively, the country would never recover from it. It is going to take a long time to live down the mere suggestion.

The ordinary man's touchstone of common sense shows him, then, that in all directions he would become worse off.

"CONSERVATIVE" REASONS

In the face of this, and equally in face of President de Gaulle's opposition, *Mr. Macmillan and his men are still determined that we shall worm our way into Europe*, whatever we have to throw overboard to do so. What powerful force can be driving them to insist like this? What reasons can they have? What arguments do they use?

Firstly, they say that such a political union is inevitable: This is a well-known technique of psychological conditioning carefully calculated to sap opposition. No action needing a decision is inevitable; but if people can be made to think it is, they will not oppose it.

Secondly, it is said that such a union is necessary to preserve world peace: If this were true we should most of us be for it, which is why the assertion is made. But the weight of evidence and experience is against it.

The leaders of the European Economic Community want to make Europe into a supra-nation comparable in size, centralisation and power with the United States and the U.S.S.R. This is the continental tradition from Rome to Napoleon, and Napoleon to Kaiser William and Hitler; but we should notice that these were ways towards *world government*, not noticeably to peace. A rival that Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Khrushchev can recognise is either an enticement to takeover, or a challenge to war. And in atomic war great centralised powers are helpless, perfect targets, completely vulnerable, set up for easy obliteration.

The British Commonwealth of independent countries, on the other hand, holds in common a broad nexus of deep policy based on free association and deriving from the (often unexpressed) conviction of its people that the only way by which the highest civilisation can be attained is by making it impossible for the state or any other body to apply overwhelming pressure to any individual.

The mere existence of such an organism, with such a policy, potentially self sufficient as regards food, raw materials and manufactured goods, dispersed all over the world and adequately armed with nuclear weapons, makes any attempt to establish world dictatorship impossible. Defensively, the threat to centralised power crops up as truly and forcefully in small as in large nations, all over the world, in almost every field of action. None of the big foci of power are out of range, nor can they attack any part of it without fear of other members hitting back. Yet so scattered and decentralised are its members that to obliterate them all would be impossible. Further, this formidable power must be sheerly defensive; it could not be used in first attack, as Britain, herself so vulnerable, stands as a hostage offshore from Europe, while Canada lies next to the U.S.A. There is protection for Europe and the States here too: a Commonwealth minding its back can't afford a nuclear bomb on Paris or New York. President de Gaulle, who of all continental politicians had most reason to know the dynamic effect of the tie between Commonwealth countries, undoubtedly realises that Britain as a part of the Commonwealth serves as a safeguard for Europe. Integrated into Europe she would be just another extension of the vulnerable landmass.

To be continued

FLUORIDATION LITERATURE

The Australian League of Rights has published an eight-page brochure on the fluoridation issue. This compact but comprehensive publication, in which the views of eminent medical, scientific and dental experts are listed, is excellent for those wishing to campaign against fluoridation. The price of the brochure is 6/- per dozen, post-free. Single leaflets 7/- per 100.

NOTHING TO LOSE BUT OUR CHAINS

Continued from page 1

As St. Thomas Aquinas has said, "The highest manifestation of life consists in this: that a being govern its own actions. A thing, which is always subject to the direction of another, is somewhat of a dead thing. Now a slave does not govern his own actions, but rather they are governed for him. Hence a man, in so far as he is a slave, is a veritable image of death."

One wonders how much longer we must wait to hear a voice from within the Christian churches denouncing the United Nations and its plans to make of us all "images of death".