

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. 7

April 19, 1963

EDITORIAL

DEFENCE OR DELUSION?

The proposal to permit the establishment by the U.S.A. of a radio tracking base in the North-West has thrown the subject of Australia's defence into the headlines. In the repercussions, which have followed, the Labor Party has shown to what extent it is dominated by the Communist line of a nuclear free hemisphere, while the Communist and fellow-travelling pack in universities, press, clergy and parliament have broken into full cry throughout the country. By and large, Australians have shown their thinking on the subject of defence to be hamstrung by two mortally dangerous delusions.

The first of these is that the whole world is permanently tottering on the brink of a nuclear holocaust and that we in the West must conduct ourselves with the greatest circumspection lest Russia and the U.S.A., in trying to destroy one another, destroy us all. This attitude is clearly set out in a recent letter from a clergyman to the *Melbourne Age*. "For me," he says, "it is sheer, stark realism that immediately such a base is sanctioned, Australia is plunged up to the neck in the East-West conflict with all its dreadful possibilities of nuclear destruction.

ATOMIC WEAPONS HAVE ADDED A WHOLE NEW DIMENSION TO POLITICS AND DEFENCE

"A base like the one proposed for North-West Australia threatens more than a few thousand soldiers in the front line; it threatens the lives of every man, woman and child in the country."

It is here implied that, at the present, Australia is NOT plunged "up to the neck" in the East-West conflict; that the lives of every man, woman and child in the country are in no peril so long as we refrain from the posture of defence; and, that with the advent of nuclear weapons, any form of defensive action is more or less synonymous with atomic annihilation. It is not clear what that new dimension is which has been added to politics. Could it, perhaps, be another name for appeasement?

It is quite untrue that the world stands in momentary danger of nuclear world war. Communists do not destroy that which they wish to attain, not, at any rate, while they are advancing at every point on an immense front; and nobody believes, surely, that the U.S.A. would initiate such a conflict. Since Hiroshima, atomic annihilation has been an enormously powerful threat, but it has been nothing more than a threat. It has successfully overshadowed that other ideological conflict which predates "the bomb", which will certainly postdate it, should it ever be used, and with which Australians are already involved "up to the neck" whether they like it or not. As to the lives of our people, may we remind this correspondent that there are other ways of dying much more horrifying and just as certain (though not as quick) as by atomic blast. These methods have been perfected in

the Congo, in Kenya, in Vietnam, in Korea, in China and, in fact, wherever Communist inspired or directed terrorism has been unleashed. That anyone, at this point of history, can be so naive as to suppose that we in Australia can avert the fate which Red China has in store for us by timorously refraining from anything which might "give offence" to Communism, is almost beyond belief.

And what is his solution to the problem of the proposed base? He adjures our politicians "to dissociate themselves and our country from any commitment from which there can be no return". One feels constrained to wonder whether this minister of the Gospel might not apply a similar proviso to his own commitment to his Master, should the occasion arise.

The second and, to Australians, more dangerous delusion is very widely held. It is that, in the event of an attack from the North, we shall be able to rely on the U.S.A. to come to our defence. In support of this view, it is pointed out that we have a long history of friendship with the American people with whom we share a common language and culture, and that, even without these sentimental ties, it would be natural for the U.S.A. to defend Australia for strategic reasons and to protect American investment here. To those who believe this, such events as this current proposal give further comfort.

History since the end of the war has not, however, supported the view that friendship with the U.S.A. is an infallible insurance against aggression. On the contrary, the U.S.A. has a long tradition of betraying its friends to aggression. Beginning with the mass betrayal of Eastern Europe at Yalta before even the war had ended and coming up to the present with the sell-out of Holland in West New Guinea, the list includes such costly treasons against Western Civilization as the betrayal of the Chinese Nationalists, finally achieved in 1948, of the Hungarian people in 1956 and of the American people themselves in the Korean War. The list is so long and inclusive that the American *National Review* has aptly summed up U.S. foreign policy since the war in the phrase, "FRIEND, GET OUT".

Continued on page 2

In the West New Guinea dispute, the reason given for the U.S. support of Soekarno was that the possession of the country and all those dollars were a small price to pay to prevent 100 million Indonesians "going Communist". The dollars are still pouring in to enable Soekarno to buy more and more of the latest Soviet weapons. Can dollar aid to this contemptible opportunist scoundrel be regarded as the act of a friend? And what if the U.S. State Department should now discover that nothing would prevent the Communization of Indonesia so well as the gift of the rest of New Guinea or North Australia? Who in Australia today would dare to say that it cannot happen?

The school, which believes that reliance on the U.S.A. represents our best hope, also appears to have overlooked America's determination NOT to fight Communism either with nuclear or any other sort of weapons. This has been clearly demonstrated on many occasions, most notably over the matter of the Berlin Wall and in Cuba. In the latter case she has shown that she will not fight even to prevent the subversion of the South American continent, a subversion that must lead to her encirclement and eventual defeat by Communism. The world presents the spectacle of two bogus antagonists one of whom will not and the other of who need not fight to obtain his objective. (A clear distinction must be drawn here between the U.S. government and people.)

It is high time therefore that Australians took thought to their future and to the real aim of U.S. foreign policy. They should concern themselves with the relation between the U.S. and the U.N., for it is now quite obvious that the latter, as well as being a creation of the men who direct U.S. foreign policy, is also their instrument. The objective of the U.N. is World Government and, clearly, if this is to be achieved, Communism and the Free Society must reach some sort of rapprochement. Bluntly, one must triumph. IS THERE ANY EVIDENCE THAT COMMUNISM IS PREPARED TO COME TO TERMS WITH WESTERN CIVILIZATION? Of course not. But there is plenty of evidence of the reverse. Today, for example, we learn that the ever closer ties between Moscow and Washington may soon be strengthened by a direct Kremlin-White House telephone link. This is ostensibly to reduce the risk of nuclear warfare. But in a world in which disarmament has come to mean the disarming of every nation except the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. (and China), who can fail to see this except as a further step towards the World Slave State? Well, the press can't for one. And the depth of its moral degeneration is indicated by the comment of the *Melbourne Age* on the subject: "The current proposal has the ENORMOUS ADVANTAGE that it does not introduce policing, and depends solely on the personal judgment of the two most powerful and RESPONSIBLE men in the world." (Emphasis added.) If, sometime in the future, the history of present day Australia comes to be written an appropri-

ate title would be, "Fools' Paradise—The Final Phase". That is, unless the Australian people and their parliamentary representatives awaken to the hideous dangers of our present course.

COMMON MARKET "DYING"?

In a very frank statement in New Zealand on March 13, the Vice-President of the West German Meat Trade Federation, Mr. C. Freybe, said that West Germany wanted Britain to join the European Common Market "so that she could gain access to Commonwealth trade". Mr. Freybe also added his voice to support the campaign which stresses that it is "inevitable" that Britain must eventually join the E.C.M. Chairman of the powerful European Economic Commission, Dr. Hallstein, has also stated recently that it is "inevitable" that Britain join the Common Market. But he has also warned that French policy under General de Gaulle is contrary to the spirit of the Treaty of Rome. This warning is evidence of the truth that so far from the European Economic Community being the great success claimed by its supporters, there are clear signs that there are growing problems within the Community.

Further striking evidence concerning the failures of the Common Market is provided by the French economic and financial review, *La Vie Francaise*, which claims after weeks of research by its experts, that the Common Market is "dying". The findings of the French review confirm our warning that under present economic and financial policies, there must be increasing internal friction. The drive towards monopoly merely intensifies the friction. Common Market propagandists claimed that acceptance of the Treaty of Rome would prevent monopoly in industry. But only recently two large German semi-monopolies were permitted to amalgamate.

In an endeavour to solve their growing internal problems, the Common Market countries are concentrating more and more feverishly upon exporting, much of the exports being to the Communist bloc which the Common Market was allegedly designed to defeat. In view of the mounting evidence, the campaign designed to force Britain into a totalitarian structure already showing signs of serious internal strains, if not collapse, can only be regarded as one of blatant treachery and exposed and opposed as such.

Fortunately the breathing space which the Commonwealth has been given, can now be used to push for a revival of the British Commonwealth by the adoption of realistic economic, financial and trading policies. The British Commonwealth must not commit suicide by allowing the senior member to be pushed into a structure, which even the leading French financial journal states is dying.

SUCCESSFUL CAMPAIGNING IN SOUTH AND WESTERN AUSTRALIA

In three weeks of intensive campaigning in South Australia and Western Australia, the National Director of the Australian League of Rights, Mr. Eric D. Butler, gave 18 addresses, two radio interviews, two press interviews, and had a large number of personal interviews with individuals. In a report prepared on the eve of leaving for South Africa, Mr. Butler said that in both States the League was continuing to expand in influence. Its prestige was growing amongst responsible sections of the community.

Mr. Butler pays a high tribute to the South Australian and Western Australian League Councils, which are doing splendid work. He stresses that State Councillors, most of whom hold responsible positions in their private lives, are giving liberally of their time and substance to the League, and that supporters should co-operate to the maximum with them.

Although public meetings do not today attract large audiences, Mr. Butler expresses the view that those attending are people of quality. "I detect a much more serious note at meetings, and a far greater number of questions than in the past", says Mr. Butler. Literature sales and financial contributions at meetings have been exceptionally encouraging. Bestseller has been *The Story of Chang Lao*, by Dr. W. G. Goddard. This book is now starting to have a big impact as sales grow and the book circulates.

After conferring with South Australian State Councillors and supporters on Sunday, March 24, Mr. Butler opened the South Australian campaign the following day with a radio interview during the day and an address to supporters in the evening. After another radio interview on Tuesday morning, he left for the Barossa Valley accompanied by State Councillor Mr. E. C. Finn. Keen questioning was a feature of the public meeting on the Tuesday evening in Nuriootpa. The public meeting at Loxton the following evening also produced some very keen questioning which continued until a late hour. Local supporters at both the Nuriootpa and Loxton meetings took tape recordings to use later.

The long trip from Loxton to Kadina on Thursday, March 27, was well worth the meeting held that evening. Although the local organiser was disappointed because he did not have the numbers he expected, the quality of the meeting was particularly good, with a very high standard of questioning. Keen discussion followed for some time after the meeting.

The South Australian tour concluded with a public meeting in Adelaide on Friday night, March 28. The meeting was chaired by prominent R.S.L. leader, Brigadier T. C. Eastick, one of the driving forces behind the R.S.L.'s anti-Communist campaign. Approximately 180 people listened with rapt attention as Mr. Butler made a powerful appeal for a revival of the British Commonwealth as a necessary contribution to the saving of Civilization against the forces now perilously close to destroying it completely. He said that Australia must not reject the nuclear deterrent, which could be essential for Australia's survival. Two tape recordings were made of Mr. Butler's address, considered by some to have been one of his best, and these are available from the S.A. Council of the League.

W.A. CAMPAIGN

The Western Australian campaign opened on Sunday, March 30, when Mr. Butler conferred with W.A. State Councillors. During the first week he gave eight addresses in six days, the final one being to the excellent supporters' meeting on Saturday evening, April 6. A number of country supporters came long distances to hear Mr. Butler give a confidential report on current League of Rights' activities. The liberal financial response from this meeting, and the heavy literature sales, left no doubt about the reaction to what Mr. Butler had to say. There was an air of intense enthusiasm. During the buffet supper supporters had an opportunity of meeting both Mr. and Mrs. Butler and asking questions.

Last week, although a short one because of Easter, saw another intensive speaking programme, both in the country and city, with most encouraging results. A number of personal interviews also helped to advance the League's work. A taped interview with a prominent Christian missionary who saw Communist China will be available shortly.

Mr. Butler writes enthusiastically of the progress being made in Western Australia. He states that he is impressed by some of the younger people being attracted to the League and the fact that more of the clergy are starting to take an interest. One Perth Rotary Club requested that they be permitted to tape record Mr. Butler's address in order that it could be circulated amongst country Rotary Clubs who have difficulties in obtaining good speakers. Already some requests have been made for Mr. Butler's services when he visits Western Australia next year. In the meantime the W.A. League Council is consolidating the results achieved during the National Director's 1963 visit.

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

Continued from last issue

THE THEME UNDER ATTACK

No wonder the theme, the policy and achievements of the Commonwealth have been under constant attack from each centralised power as it emerges and expands—from Germany, from Russia, and, for the past twenty years, more disastrously from the United States. The Commonwealth has been eaten away to its core: as long as its members were confident in the loyalty to each other, and had absolute faith in their principles, this was not vital. But in Britain since the war, the conscious intellectual expression of the theme, let alone its development, has been so denigrated as to be made disreputable among those who form the climate of opinion in which policy operates. In Britain, love for one's family, one's people and one's country, *as an accepted basis and objective of political thought and growth*, are completely out of fashion. Among semi-intellectuals Englishry is indeed regarded as the "last infirmity of Blimpish mind".

Fortunately for the ordinary man, this particular theme and policy do not depend entirely on words. They are partly, as President de Gaulle has it, the result of our geographical position, and partly they reflect the very grain of our minds, and so are inherent in the sort of institutions we produce. The form of our local government, the pattern of our constitutional monarchy with its Parliament which is the mother of parliaments, the Commonwealth into which our collection of colonies grew under the impetus of United States' secession—all these bear the same imprint. They aim to ensure the continuous decentralisation of power, policy and responsibility to the individual. That we have so nearly let Mr. Macmillan and his Government push us into political union with the opposite policy shows how badly we have lost hold of aims, and even more, of the sense of the vital importance of the endeavour. This endeavour, a tendency to try to develop organisations for *distributing* power and responsibility to the individual is our unique contribution to Western civilisation. Just now it is the critical one. It alone carries the seed of a viable future for the world, and for us—the only safe thing to do with power is to distribute it. Concentration of power is bound to give rise to tyranny on an ever more gigantic scale until an explosion occurs—or the alternative is worked out: of how people can associate together freely so that each man can choose and get what he wants within the physical limits of the society he lives in.

EXPORTING TO LIVE

The third argument put forward for joining the Common Market is that to do so would open to us the markets of Europe.

Everyone knows that we have to sell abroad enough of our goods in the right places to be able to buy in the tre-

mendous amounts of food and raw materials we need. Until recently we sold manufactured goods to the Commonwealth (by and large) and got from them our daily bread and butter, cheese, fruit and meat. Denmark joined in with butter, bacon and cheese, and luxuries and French Cuisine we brought in from the Commonwealth. This left the Commonwealth nearly independent of the political "blocs", East and West.

But there is another less well-recognised role of exports, which bears closely on our everyday lives. It can best be discovered by considering what factories are *for*, and what people think they are for, which is not necessarily the same thing.

People who use and buy (for example) cars think a car-factory is simply there to make cars. On the other hand, those who work in them, think their important function is to give employment for which wages are paid. In fact the factory has dual functions: on the one hand it is there to make cars; on the other, to give employment. But for 60 or more years engineers have been doing their level best to invent ways of making cars, and everything else, with *less* work, fewer man-hours of employment, less specialised skills. They have succeeded beyond their wildest dreams. With modern developments in automation the actual production of wealth has become enormous and the potential capacity for production even greater, and all for a very small expenditure of human work. However, when automation does the work, men lose the means-of-living that employment produces. (Machines don't get wages or spend money.) So that the less human work is needed to make a product, the less means people have of buying it. Every improvement in technique of manufacture increases this disparity.

Various mechanisms have grown up to try to bridge this gap. Exporting is one of them. Others are excess bureaucracy, advertising, rocketry and in the last resort, war (the ultimate of exporting—by force).

Within this scheme of things exporting is understandably the most popular. If we can make more things than we want, and if we can sell them abroad, the work done in making the export-things gives employment, and so wages for which pay for goods-not-exported. So, paradoxically, the more we manage to export, the more we can get for ourselves at home. This is why the urge to export is so frantic. It also explains the lure of the Common Market—at the moment Western Europe is one of the fastest growing markets in the world, although, what is not often mentioned, it is much *smaller* than the Commonwealth Market.

Great Britain is not alone in this need to export. All industrial countries share it. All of them *must* export more than the minimum needed to pay for their imports, or they will not be able to circulate among their own people even a modest share of the things produced. If the Common Market puts us inside their trade barriers, it also lets them inside ours.

To be continued