

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. 8

3rd May 1963

EDITORIAL

DEFEAT BY DEFAULT

Von Clausewitz, the great Prussian military theoretician, once wrote that the political objective of military action determined the strategy, the tactics AND THE OUTCOME of the operation. All too often, the latter implication has been ignored by the makers of policy, and history provides frequent examples of disastrous outcome to action based on wishful thinking rather than reality. Thus, Hitler's belief that Germany could succeed in subjugating Europe without first enlisting the support of, or at the very least, placating the maritime powers of Great Britain and the U.S.A., inevitably led to disaster for him, for Europe and, in the course of time, for us all. This penetrating dictum applies with equal force to defensive as to offensive objectives; both may contain within themselves, the seeds of defeat and ruin.

The defence of Australia involves the preservation of political, military and economic autonomy, three fields which cannot, of course, be treated in isolation. Nor can we reasonably demand that our autonomy in these matters be absolute. The exigencies of alliances, treaties and trade agreements with other countries render this neither possible nor desirable. However, if the warning of Clausewitz is to be heeded, there is a point beyond which these autonomies cannot be attenuated, and no reality-based discussion of defence can afford to ignore this truth. For, with the growth of International Communism since Clausewitz wrote, the concept of attack has been utterly transformed. Today we must look to our security in the light of the knowledge that Communism never resorts to military action until the full resources of subversion have been exhausted.

The initial attack on this country will not be military. It will take place at the "bar of World Opinion" in the United Nations. The action will be initiated by the Afro-Asian bloc by whom the proposition will be advanced that, since Australia appears to be incapable of developing her Northern lands, she can no longer sustain any moral right to continue in their possession. In support of this, it will be said yet again that the majority of the world's people are undernourished or actually starving and that the admission of large numbers of the "underprivileged" would greatly relieve the position. Should Red China gain admission to the U.N., this attempt to force the gates of our northern lands may be expected shortly thereafter. It could very well succeed. That the majority of the human race is short of food is a proposition, which is either true or false. World population is forecast by the U.N. at 6,000 million in AD2000. Yet Professor Clark, Director of Agricultural Research Institute, Oxford, states that if the present-day standard of Dutch farming were to be applied to "good temperate agricultural land throughout the world", the earth would support 28,000 million people. His opinion is not an isolated one. If Professor Clark is right, then the U.N. is wrong. Australians should ask themselves why hunger exists where it does exist, and what effect the throwing open of the North to Asiatics could have on its mitigation.

They should also ask themselves whether World Hunger might not be a myth and, if so, why it is being propagated

by the U.N. Those having difficulty with this last question might profit from a view to the South. In 1958 another project was devised by the U.N. called the International Geophysical Year. In connection with this, the U.S.S.R. most generously offered to assist Australia with her researches in Antarctica. This assistance was accepted by our Minister for External Affairs, Mr. (now Lord) Casey, a man with no understanding of the methods of International Communism. As a result, the U.S.S.R. maintains to this day a base many times the size of our own on Australian territory. The postage stamp issued by this base shows the whole of the Antarctic continent as Russian territory.

QUESTION: What was the real purpose of the I.G.Y?

The *initial* assault on this country will nevertheless be the attempt to force Australia to waive her immigration policies in respect of her North. Those of us who have learnt anything from history need not be told that this will prove to be but the first move towards the takeover of the whole continent. Is it not therefore high time that our people and our politicians faced these facts?

Firstly, that we have failed to make the North a viable province.

Secondly, that our moral right to its possession is not, therefore, beyond question.

Thirdly, that at present, we are militarily incapable of maintaining ourselves there.

Until we face up to this position, there is little chance that anything material will be done to remedy it, yet remedy it we MUST if Australia is to survive. In the first instance, action must be taken to inform the Australian people of the reality of their danger. We must stop talking nonsense about the peaceful intentions of Indonesia in the face of the clearest possible evidence to the contrary. We must stop playing into the hands of Communism by caterwauling about "peace". And we must immediately equip our military arm with tactical nuclear weapons. In no other way can our population disparity with Indonesia be redressed. Even without the recent worldwide Easter outbreak of "Bomb banning", we are well aware of the outcry such a suggestion is likely to provoke. But Australia has this advantage over more populous nations, that

DECENTRALISED INITIATIVE

Among the keen younger South Australian women campaigning for realistic political economy are Mesdames Audrey McMurtrie, Nancy Paterson and Doris Phelps. No less alert at 82 is Mrs. Stegar, one-time Afghan War correspondent, and writer of humorous stories for several Australian journals, under the pen name "Winifred the Washer-woman". Following is the core of Mrs. Stegar's letter to Mrs. Jacqueline Kennedy, to be passed on to the President of the U.S.A.

On March 12th we learned that U.S.A. has 32 millions on the verge of poverty. Next day we were told, "unemployment was America's No. 1 economic problem." Proportionate to population the same situation exists in Australia, but is not a problem except to professional economists, bankers, and monopoly newspapers.

Several years reading of U.S.A. journals such as *Time* and *Newsweek* has convinced me that U.S.A. Governmental advisers suffer from the same disabilities as our own.

Now poverty is inability to get a sufficiency of food, clothing, shelter, and gadgets. Your country's ability to produce these things is so enormous that you have restricted production of food, while clothing and gadgets are sent out of the country by ship loads. Obviously there is no physical reason why any of your people should be without adequate sustenance. There seems no need to increase production; but even if there were you have your millions of unemployed to do the job.

Your advisors are obsessed with the idea that no one in the U.S.A. should have access to the glut of goods except by working to increase the glut, or perhaps destroy it. Could anything be more ridiculous?

Actually, your inventors, engineers and scientists have solved the problem of overwork, but instead of treating the gain as freedom or leisure, you pervert it to what you call "unemployment problem". That is "crooked thinking" and mis-management.

With 32 millions on the verge of poverty you do not know how much of U.S.A.'s production can be beneficially absorbed by its own population. The logical and moral way to find out is to give the "unemployed" access to the glut. The only method, or rather, the efficient method is to issue the "basic wage" to each of the "unemployed". If, before long, you find that orders exceed the flow of goods from industry you can call on your millions of potential workers to establish a balance. On the other hand, if there is still a glut, the logical move is to distribute the leisure through a reduction of working hours. Enclosed literature gives the clue as to how the financing may be arranged.

In conclusion I would like to say that objections to the "takeover" of Australia by U.S.A. big businesses do not come from anti-Americans but pro-Australians. Assuring you of the best personal regards of the Australian people, I am,

Yours very sincerely,
WINIFRED STEGAR.

Mrs. Stegar travelled 50 miles to hear Mr. Eric Butler speak in South Australia recently.

NEWS COMMENTARY

British Stock Still Sound: The following comment while not perhaps in the best of taste, does confirm what we have long suspected, that there is inherent in the British peoples not only sound instincts, but also a soundness of physical structure which will no doubt stand the British people in good stead in the trying days ahead.

London (March 21). —Cannibals in Polynesia no longer allow their tribes to eat Americans, Lord Shackleton told the House of Lords last night. The reason: Americans' body fat was contaminated with chlorinated hydrocarbon. Lord Shackleton was speaking during a discussion on the toxic dangers of chemicals in food. He added: "We are rather more edible than the Americans. Recent figures published show we have two-millionth parts D.D.T. in our bodies, whereas the figures for Americans is about eleven-millionth parts."—*Melbourne Age*.

Treason In South Africa: We can thank God that there are men who have not fallen for the big lie, that of inevitability, "the winds of change", etc. Sir Roy Welensky has never hidden his disgust of the sell-out by supine politicians in Whitehall of the heritage of pioneering and hard work by the white populations of the various States in South Africa, to establish a basis of a society, which would enable the native peoples to be uplifted from the degradations of their tribalism and witchcraft. Sir Roy recently refused to sit down and eat at the same table as the lamentable British (one hesitates to give him the honour of being called British) Prime Minister, Mr. Harold McMillan and his equally lamentable Minister responsible for Central African affairs, Mr. R. Butler. "It was impossible for me to eat the food of people who betrayed me," he said. He told his fellow Rhodesians "The time has come for the closing of our ranks in Central Africa, because the very things that we stand for—the integrity and civilisation we have created, are in jeopardy." The Government of South Rhodesia has demanded self-government. The white population in this state has closed their ranks and is solidly behind their government and its leader, Mr. Field. Shades of 1776!

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.

THE UNCOMMON MARKET

By ELIZABETH DOBBS

We continue Mrs. Elizabeth Dobbs' article "The Uncommon Market". Mrs. Dobbs treats this important subject from the fundamental Social Credit viewpoint. These problems must be answered as the powerful promoters of the Common Market have made it quite clear that they will not rest until British Sovereignty is completely emasculated in a rigid form of International Socialism.

The European market is highly competitive. Do we really believe that we shall gain huge markets in Europe's home ground, competing with France, Germany and Italy in their own back yards when they specialise in the same type of industry? European wages are lower, their hours are longer, less time is lost in strikes and at the moment anyway they give more thought and imagination to picturing what the consumer needs and wants. Where is the British cheap, handy weatherproof car built to need no garage, and easy for the non-expert to keep in order? We import Volkswagens as we have imported scooters from the continent, jet-aircraft from the United States and have watched the Japanese supply the world with transistor radio sets. We might have developed all these, but we didn't have the practical imagination.

COMMON SENSE THE TOUCHSTONE

It is time to insist that nominal employment can no longer form the exclusive title to wealth. Engineering has made it impracticable. Every person should be entitled to a share of this increasing wealth unconditionally, an increment to his freedom irrespective of earnings or employment.

That this should be so is accepted implicitly by the British workman in a pattern of life that takes in its stride on-and-off strike pay, sickness benefit and public assistance. Recognition of it lies at the root of his willingness to strike for what seem quite trivial reasons, a willingness that is exploited by the Communists for the furtherance of their own policies. Still, with his customary realism he is well on the mark in recognising as correct that his living need not come *only* through employment.

It is suggested that as a nation we should recognise the real element of this attitude, thus relieving people of the demoralising pressure of a false situation. To do so would also emancipate the employer.

Instead of the whole complex and expensive apparatus of doles, conditional on not working characteristics of the Welfare State, let an amount of new credit carefully based on and tied to the increased productivity calculated over a fixed period be shared out between the inhabitants of these islands—the wages of the machine, if we think of it that way. This credit must not be raised by taxation. Part of it should go direct to the consumer, and without conditions (unlike for instance, unemployment pay, which demands you be unemployed, or sickness benefit, for which you have to be sick); and part be used to keep down prices by the proved method of subsidy.

Besides relieving industry, both labour and management, of the appalling inefficiency and friction implicit in employment as an *objective*, measures such as these would let us buy as much of our own product as we wanted, without being forced to engage in supernumerary exporting or bureaucracy or war. In this way we should bypass the whole miserable series of mechanisms for stopping the gap between work-necessary-to-production and employment-necessary-for-earning-a-wage.

Under these circumstances, there is no reason at all why we should not negotiate special trade relations with Europe, without surrendering sovereignty, and without becoming wholly dependent on her.

The Commonwealth is uniquely placed to make this step in social evolution, a step that will have to be made, soon or late, if the world is not to be governed or exploded by the Nuclear Bomb. Yet, at the critical moment, we are being driven to renounce movement in this direction; to give up, for instance, the technique of price support, which has kept our food prices and cost of living below any of the same standard in Europe, and far below metropolitan America. The practical results of the device, which we all grasp, as every single person pays less for his food—are so successful that it would seem natural to develop rather than reject it. But reject it we shall have to if we opt out of the Commonwealth, within which we have the freedom to do things like this to *decentralise* power; Europe is intent on centralising it.

AND SO WHAT NEXT?

And if we succeed, as we shall succeed, in keeping our country free and independent, what is the alternative to being swallowed up in Europe?

That the question, in this inverted form, should even be asked is a sign of the immense and deliberate propagandist effort which has been made in the last very few years to undermine the normal and natural beliefs and expectations of the ordinary British public. Until this colossal blast of the trumpet started against the Commonwealth only a few years ago, this great Association of Nations, embodying the historic British contribution to world peace, prosperity and security-in-freedom provided the main basis for that hope, patriotism and confidence in the future which as recently as 1940 enabled Britain with the aid of Commonwealth partners to save herself and Europe by her courage and her exertions. Nothing essential has changed, except that the spirit of confidence and courage has been shaken by the dreary and frightening sounds of the propaganda machines. If the Commonwealth is to collapse and disintegrate, it will be the greatest triumph in history for the Jericho technique.

Let us consider once more the *real* facts. The Inner Commonwealth, that which is bound by loyalty to the Queen, in itself has enormous economic resources, larger than those of Western Europe, and a potential which is altogether greater, since only Britain is an old long-developed, heavily populated country. The others possess still those "wide-open spaces" and the potential for de-

velopment which Europe needs for its expansion, but Britain alone has retained by allowing "colonies" to develop into independent but loyal "dominions". Britain would be mad indeed to turn her back upon this vast, hopeful and unique advantage and cast in her lot with the other crowded nations of Europe; relying in emergency on the "loyalty" of Germans, Frenchmen and Italians.

Furthermore, around this solid core of the inner Commonwealth are still grouped the great and various non-British nations of the Commonwealth which have achieved independence with at least greater goodwill and less bitterness than the former colonies of the European empires.

Some of these may leave, and some adhere to the Commonwealth, but in the general atmosphere of anti-British propaganda we do not realise, for instance, how much real goodwill towards Britain exists in a great country like India. Nor does it seem to be realised how much the right to *contract out*, which is embodied in the Commonwealth and specifically excluded from the European Community, *strengthens* a political association by making sure that the tensions within it do not outgrow a certain level. If the E.E.C. can be presented as a rapidly expanding, progressive union, this is merely a reflection, not of the economic realities, but of *financial* realities; and it is the financial stranglehold, which is at present preventing the full development of the economic potentialities of the Commonwealth. This can be removed as soon as the *will* returns to the British people to ensure that finance is made to correspond to the economic realities, and not the other way round.

The Commonwealth also embodies power to *contract in*: and when it is restored to health and confidence, some of the E.F.T.A. nations, and especially some of those who share with us the historic attachment to monarchy, might well choose to join this free Association.

The advantages for nuclear strategy of the dispersed nature of the Commonwealth make it the safest kind of organisation to belong to; and unmistakably on the side of peace. No part of the globe can escape its eye and its long arm: but at the same time, England is so close to Europe, and Canada to the United States, that they give a measure of protection to these land masses.

Lately a lot of nonsense has been talked about "Greatness", which Britain is supposed somehow to have lost, and must regain—by political maneuvering to sit down at the highest summit tables, or by inserting ourselves into Europe, or into the United States. Such suicidal clap-trap merely abuses a word. If the word means anything, Britain and the whole Commonwealth are precisely as great as her people are true, each and every one of them, to their own idea. We know the way to go, by our majestic innovations of Parliament and the Constitutional Monarchy, of the Commonwealth itself; and so, on to the next.

Let us go on specialising in modes of organisation that bind back power and responsibility, economic and political, to the individual: so that every man may command the independence of action to achieve his own ends and desires, to pluck them out of his mind and project them

into material.

This depends not on Cabinet, nor on Government, nor on Party, but on each of us. The first step is to use the power of binding back we still possess, the vote. If we do not use it to impress our *will* upon these politicians, that we refuse to tolerate the betrayal of the Commonwealth and all it stands for—we shall lose it. If we do not tell the Government where to get off, they will tell us. And that will be the end of us, as free individuals.

It is both pitiful and absurd that Britain, the cradle of parliamentary democracy, of Constitutional Monarchy and of the glorious idea of a worldwide Commonwealth of free, independent Nations, should seek to turn her back on the majestic path in which she has led the world, in favour of the dreary continental conception of a centralised and remote control by a majority of irremovable and absentee aliens.

CONCLUDED

DEFEAT BY DEFAULT

Continued from page 1

nobody in their right mind could possibly accuse us of aggressive intent in arming ourselves with either nuclear or any other type of weapons. And if we prove unable to deal with duffle coats, then the whole question of defence had best be left, to our ultimate ruin, in continued abeyance.

The nub of the problem will still remain if nothing is done about the North. And nothing tangible will be achieved there until money is made available to construct an all-weather transport system and until the freehold basis of land tenure is substituted for the leasehold. This last, the fruit of Henry Georgian political philosophy, has undoubtedly been the major factor in retarding the development of these territories. The problem of finding money for this project under a sane financial system is of course no problem, but even under the present system it is no more than a matter of priorities. Of a total projected government expenditure of £2,092 million, less than £7 million is earmarked for the northern areas of Queensland, Western Australia and the Northern Territory. Yet £12 million is to be spent on an ornamental lake at Canberra. How much effect will this have on keeping Australia Australian?

Populating the North with Europeans hardly constitutes a problem either. To mention but one possibility, there are in Germany today some millions of farmers expropriated from their lands in what is now Poland, who would be only too eager to settle in Northern Australia. With them they would bring those inestimable talents, which have made of the Barossa Valley one of the show places of this country. All they would ask is the prospect of success. This, owing to the insane policies of past and present governments, must be denied them. We are all well aware of the extraordinary difficulties, which attend the agricultural exploitation of our arid and tropical areas. Governmental policies, which exacerbate them must be reversed. Think about it today, not tomorrow. There is not much time left. Or do you prefer Asiatics?