THE NEW TIMES

"Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free"

Vol. 30, No. 13.

EDITORIAL

CIVIL RIGHTS AND CIVIL WAR

The racial volcano in the U.S.A. is already in the process of early eruption, and minor bursts of destructive activity, such as that which only recently shook St. Augustine, Florida, presage, in microcosm, the holocaust to come.

The first rents in the American social fabric were torn with the passing of the Supreme Court's desegregation orders of 1954. The Supreme Court of the U.S.A. based its judgment on a scientific hoax, the so-called "researches" of Gunnar Myrdal, a Swedish Socialist sociologist, who in turn was influenced by Franz Boas, a German-Jewish anthropologist, who may be said to have founded the equalitarian racial dogma in the U.S.A.

The Civil Rights Bill, now about to be passed, and even though sharply amended, is intended to push desegregation beyond the schoolroom and into the hotel and factory, where it will, if realised, wreak still greater havoc, which is the Big Idea. Discrimination, in saner times accepted as an attribute of people whose intelligence and industry had raised them above the herd, is now to become a legal offence. The utter breakdown of American social life, and the Second American Civil War, are at hand. Out of the chaos, the dedicated, resolute, Communist enemy confidently expects to emerge triumphant.

CIVIL RIGHTS BILL A POWER GRAB

What are the implications for the Free World of an America ablaze? They are legion! What now can be clearly seen is that having created chaos the enemy will turn this chaos to his own advantage. Southern Senator Strom Thurmond has well said that the Civil Rights legislation is five percent Civil Rights and ninety-five per cent power grab. The enactment of sweeping legislation to destroy individual liberties and rights, IN THE NAME OF CIVIL RIGHTS, must be anticipated. It is indeed possible, if not probable, that in such a situation the Communist enemy could capture the already Communistriddled Administrative apparatus, and hold it against a scattered and confused patriotic wing. The U.S. army would be the decisive force here. Let us hope that the U.S. armed services are in the hands of loyal Americans, who are our allies.

We can be sure that the Kremlin and Peking will not be twiddling their Leninist thumbs whilst the over-ripe American apple is falling into their hands. With a U.S.A. thus virtually paralysed there cannot be foreseen any real defence of South East Asia by America and her allies. The prophecy of Lenin will then have come true; Asia would be lost and then the full Communist onslaught would be unleashed against Western Europe.

Perhaps this is where we should pause to take stock. It is still possible to defeat the Communist conspiracy, even at this eleventh hour. What is to be done?

HEALTHY RE-GROWTH OF CONSERVATISM

In the U.S.A. the forces of patriotic conservatism are growing. Thanks to devout, courageous, and brilliant men

there is now flourishing the John Birch Society, which after but six years of existence has actually forced the enemy onto the defensive. The phenomenal success of Senator Barry Goldwater, whether he gains the Republican Party nomination or not, is proof enough that a solidly based, grassroots movement is firmly implanted, and thriving. No such similar movement was in existence at the time of Senator McCarthy, who had the ground cut from beneath his feet, and was destroyed. The enemy is off balance, let us hope that he will make plenty of mistakes. One serious mistake has already been made — the Negroes have overplayed their hand; they cannot shake themselves free from their ways, even after their intimate contact with a European civilization lasting some three hundred years, and the obvious reaction against integration and the Civil Rights hoax is crystallising.

REGENERATE BRITISH COMMONWEALTH

The moment of truth for the British Commonwealth has come. If the Commonwealth stands firm everywhere (Malaysia is now to be the test of our strength and will) it is difficult to comprehend by what methods the enemy can rout us. We have the nuclear deterrent (and Australia MUST have nuclear weapons), we are strategically decentralised, and we are a homogeneous race of Christian people of proven courage. The failure of the Common Market Plot was a signal reverse to the enemy's purpose, as this was specifically designed to dismember the British Commonwealth. Even last century the British Empire, as it was then, was acknowledged by early Communists as a bulwark against the Red tide.

There is little comfort to be taken from the present jets of hot air whistling forth from the White House vents concerning a projected "tough" line in South East Asia. We must remember that this is Presidential election year and a big, hard, anti-Communist L.B.J. is required to keep the liberal, no-win, Democratic Administration on the retreat, to say nothing about pulling the rug from under Goldwater. The appointment of General Maxwell Taylor as ambassador to South Vietnam is unlikely to induce a fear-paralysis in the Vietcong. After the L.B.J. machine has been returned to office, a satisfactory, face-saving

NEWS COMMENTARY

A letter to the Editor of *Mail Times* in the Wimmera.

GOLDWATER-McCARTHY POLICIES DEFENDED

THE MAIL TIMES, June 12, 1964

SIR. —In your editorial (8/6/64) regarding Senator Barry Goldwater's success at the polls, it is stated that "Goldwater speaks for all the worst phases of American reaction" and "he is shaped in the McCarthy mould, and most Americans know how close that policy came to plunging the world into disaster."

Permit me to present herewith to your readers the opposite viewpoint.

It is interesting to note the fury that has been created in certain circles by Senator Goldwater's preliminary success for the Republican Presidential nomination. The interesting part about it is that those who usually act the great democrats (that is while they are winning) are now most undemocratic in the way they heap abuse on the Senator for winning himself.

There is, of course, no reason why Goldwater as a staunch Conservative should not win, except perhaps for a hostile American press, hostile because run by people who largely belong to the Liberal-Leftist school of thought, and who naturally favour one of this group to become President regardless of whether he is a member of the Democratic Party, like Johnson, or a member of the Republican Party, like Rockefeller.

A quick review of recent history shows that the American Liberals have had a fair chance to prove themselves. Since 1933 they have dominated successive administrations, regardless of which party was in power. Among their disastrous "achievements" (that is from an anti-Communist point of view) we find:

Diplomatic recognition of the Soviet Union and subsequent economic assistance (1933).

Betrayal of Poland (1939-45) to the Soviets. East Poland annexed by the Soviet Union up to this day.

Betrayal of the whole of Eastern Europe, North Korea and Manchuria to the Soviets (1945).

Betrayal of wartime ally Chiang Kai-chek to the Chinese Communists.

Betrayal of Hungarian freedom fighters by denying promptly all-important recognition of new Hungarian Government (1956).

Betrayal of British ally by threatening to impose economic sanctions over re-occupation of Suez Canal (1956) with the result that today the Suez Canal is patrolled by Soviet planes stationed in pro-Communist Nasser's Egypt.

Betrayal of Laotian anti-Communists by forcing them into a Coalition Government with the Communists. This is like putting a man to bed with a tiger. Note that the tiger is now satisfying his appetite.

Helping Communist Castro to oust anti-Communist Batista in Cuba under the pretext that Castro was a democrat and Batista a dictator. Betraying anti-Castor Cubans by first promising air cover for a landing on Cuba in the Bay of Pigs and then withholding it, unknown to anti-Castro Cubans, who ran into a deadly trap with Castro's army waiting on the spot where landing took place.

This list is far from complete, but it should help to explain why many Americans are disenchanted with the Liberal appears and traitors and turn to a conservative.

To normal people there should be nothing alarming about Goldwater's preliminary win; on the contrary, there should be satisfaction. To the Communists the world over, on the other hand, it must be a festering thorn in the eye.

A Goldwater win could mean that the tide will stop to run their way. Their efforts behind the scene to frustrate Goldwater's aim for the Presidency will be unparalleled and will dwarf even their clever persecution of Senator McCarthy whose book, *America's Retreat from Victory*, should be read by everyone who wants to be informed regarding the Communist conspiracy in America. If Goldwater does not attain his objective, or at least lead the opposition, it could well mean that the entire West will fall into the hands of the World revolutionaries by 1975 as the Communists predicted so confidently three years ago.

The American situation appears to be pregnant with our fate in the near future. —Yours, etc.

K. Moeller, 9 Jackson St., Horsham.

GOLDWATER ON THE U.N.

—Extracts from Senator Goldwater's book, "Why Not Victory?"

It is among the internationalists, of course, that we find the most vociferous of the U.N. backers. These people believe in a "world government now". They see in the United Nations "the only hope of the world", "the only wall between total nuclear war and us". They are as brainwashed as those who say we must stand alone on our shores and defy the world. Avoiding these two extremes, we must diligently pursue all courses that might produce some answers to serve the true interests of freedom. I say freedom, not peace, because peace without freedom is unacceptable to the American people . . . Commenting on the alternatives of internationalism and isolationist nationalism, Goldwater comments, "The meeting ground may be found in a new form of nationalism extremely sensitive to our own objectives, and at the same time cognizant that the ability of other free nations to resist the Communist thrusts is a matter of concern to Americans. Recognition by the President himself that victory over the Communists is a national goal - - held by all Americans to be in the vital interest of the country and the free world — would be the keystone of this new nationalism. Once we have come to this, I firmly believe that the extremes will largely disappear. With a common purpose, Americans and the free people will begin to make a world in which Communism will play a de-Continued on page 4

FREEDOM

By D. PHELPS*

"The price of liberty is eternal vigilance." That is a motto that we have all heard many times. Like all mottos, it loses a great deal of its meaning after it has been repeated a few thousand times; which is a pity, because it expresses a truth which should be heeded. It applies particularly to that most important of all freedoms, our freedom of thought and action.

But just to say that the price of freedom is eternal vigilance, is not enough. I have coined a new motto: "The price of freedom is eternal vigilance, a willingness to think for oneself, and a sense of responsibility."

The reason for the need of vigilance, is that the kind of people who wish to gain power over others are positive and pushing in their approach, and really work for what they want to achieve; whereas the ordinary citizen who believes in freedom, and "Live and let live," is perfectly willing to attend to his own affairs and let someone else keep watch to see that his rights are not violated.

The reason for the need to think for oneself is that it isn't much use being vigilant if one doesn't know what one needs to be vigilant against. The kind of person, who is forever suspicious and vigilant without doing any real thinking for himself, is the kind who helps at lynching and witch-hunts, and other festivities of a similar nature.

The reason for the need of a sense of responsibility is that we live in a democracy, which is supposed to be ruled for the people by the people. The power that can be wielded by ordinary people through public opinion and through their votes is a power that is not to be taken lightly. And yet many people do take it lightly. I am convinced that one freedom that no believer in democracy should wish for is freedom from responsibility.

GREATER FREEDOM BRINGS GREATER RESPONSIBILITY

When we were children, we longed to be grown up, because we thought that then we would be free to do as we liked. But now that we are grown up, we find that although we have more freedom of action in some ways, we can only retain it if we think before we act, and if we are prepared to take responsibility for the result of our actions.

When we look back and wish for the childhood that now seems to have been so free of responsibility, we are wishing for something that no proper adult could or should enjoy. Elderly people, who give up their own homes and go to live with their married children, return to this kind of a state. They are once more free of the need to make big decisions, to run their own homes, or to fend for themselves. And one has only to observe their unhappiness and their discontent, to realise that this is no fit state for an adult.

I expect that most people do realise that the proper kind of freedom for an adult to enjoy, is the kind that is accompanied and paid for by the acceptance of a certain amount of responsibility. They also know that if they behave irresponsibly, and without thought for the laws of man or of nature, they are quite likely to have their freedom forcibly curtailed. But I wonder whether they fully realise that this principle holds good in larger spheres than that of our own personal lives?

CONFUSION FROM THE EDUCATIONALISTS

In one of Professor Murdoch's articles, he said: "Is anyone as sure about the magic powers of democracy as we once were? We are not even sure what the word means." In *The Liberation of Mankind*, by Van Loon, I found this, "How many citizens of the United States, who have given the matter an hour's thought, can fail to see that a democratic instead of a representative form of government (as intended by the founders of the republic) must eventually lead to systematised anarchy."

My dictionary says that anarchy means "absence of government, disorder, confusion." As I was brought up to believe in a democratic form of government, it had never occurred to me before that any intelligent person could have doubts about it. Therefore it worries me to know that a historian, for whose opinion I have the greatest respect, thinks that democracy must end in anarchy.

But why should democracy, which to us means freedom, end in disorder and confusion? Why should it end at all if we wish it to continue? I believe that if it does break down, it will be because not enough of us are willing to accept the responsibility of being vigilant, and of thinking for ourselves. What most of us want to do is to have our favourite political party voted into power, and then sit back and forget about it until the next election.

Plenty of people say, "Oh, I'm not interested in things like politics. I leave that sort of thing to the experts." When they say that, they are saying in effect, "I don't appreciate living in a democracy where I can have my say in the governing of the country. I'd rather let someone else dictate what I'm to think."

It is understandable that we would rather follow the leader than take the responsibility of thinking things out for ourselves. It isn't so many generations, in the long history of the human race, since all people were living the kind of tribal life in which one strong man ruled each tribe. In that kind of set-up it was dangerous to have people thinking for themselves and stepping out of line. It was, in fact, necessary for the survival of man that anyone who did not conform, should be disposed of very promptly. For that reason, I am sure that most of us are descended from those who did not step out of line.

Continued on page 4

Continued from Page 3

STABILITY OF CIVILIZATION BASED UPON SOUND PRINCIPLES

Van Loon has pointed out that it was not until man began to realise the relationship of cause and effect that it was possible to make any progress towards individual freedom. While men believed that everything good or bad that happened to them was caused by the action of various gods or demons, they had no choice but to take notice of the witch doctor's instructions and taboos, because they had no means of measuring their correctness.

But once a few people began to realise that everything that happens has its underlying rational cause, they were in a position to start thinking for themselves, because they had the yardstick of logic to go by. This was when the foundation was laid for the freedom of the individual.

I am afraid that the yardstick of logic is still used very imperfectly by most of us. Although the understanding of cause and effect has grown a great deal in the comparatively short time since its principles were first understood, we are still inclined to ignore it far too often for our own safety.

We say that we want to retain our democratic way of life, and yet we become impatient when our national problems take a long time to solve, quite ignoring the fact that the mills of democracy must grind slowly. If we want quick solutions to our problems, and quick decisions by our government leaders, we shall have to give them more power, and sacrifice some of our democratic freedom.

HASTY DECISIONS GROW FROM FEAR

We grow weary of the tenseness and fear in the international situation, and we long for a solution. We want a solution that will come quickly, and we want one that will absolve us from further responsibility. I am sure that this is why the idea of World Government has become so popular. Many people seem to think that if all nations would forego their national sovereignty and hand over to a world government, we could all relax and live happily ever after.

But is it possible that this is just another attempt to free ourselves of problems by handing them over to somebody else?

If a world government were really to be able to prevent all war, which is the argument always advanced in its favor, it would have to be given an awful lot of power. And I use the word "awful" in its literal sense. It does fill me with awe to think of all that power being concentrated into a few hands. In history, whenever there have been positions of great power, that position has been coveted and fought over by people who like power for its own sake. And if all the power in the world were gathered together into one government, what a target that would be for the power-lusters to aim at!

I am very much afraid that if world government ever comes into being, it will not be long before we have only one freedom left — the one freedom we should not desire —freedom from responsibility.

FREEDOM RESULTS FROM DISCIPLINE

As I see it, the only way to retain freedom and to increase it, is for people who care about it to keep on working for it, steadily and persistently, fighting each encroachment as it occurs.

In the film, "The Nun's Story", the nun (played by Audrey Hepburn) tells the Mother Superior how hard she finds it to observe the self-discipline that is required of a nun. She says, "I thought that after a time it would become easier. I thought that one would come to a sort of resting place." The Mother replies, "There is no resting place."

I believe that this is the attitude we must develop if we are to retain our democratic freedom. It will always be in danger, as long as we are looking for a resting place. Vigilance will always be needed. Thought will always be needed. A sense of responsibility will always be needed. We will never be able to say that the job is finished. There is no resting place.

*Mrs. D. Phelps is a daughter of Mr. & Mrs. W. G. Ahrens, pioneer Social Crediters of the Barossa Valley. In her "spare" time from running a citrus block with her husband she gives radio talks, addresses meetings, and writes to the press. Needless to say she is a keen student of Social Credit writings.

NEWS COMMENTARY Continued from Page 2

creasingly important role and freedom will emerge as the guiding force of destiny . . ." "The politically powerful clique in our midst which looks not at what the UN accomplishes, but only listens to what it promises, will not agree that there are inherent weaknesses in a group such as the UN. In agreement with this clique will be found a large segment of the press, some professors, the big foundation executives, and quasi-political associations, all of whom exercise a considerable influence over public opinion in this country . . ."

"The UN now is quite a different organization from the original conception of what it would be. I venture to say that had the originators told the Senate of the United States what their baby would grow into within fifteen years, the Senate would have voted no on the proposition that we join it."

SUCCESSFUL INTEGRATION!

Of 3,000,000 Negro children in 11 Southern States, only 30.000, or 1 percent, are attending school with white children despite the Supreme Court edict ordering desegregation.

—Century, 5/6/64.

EDITORIAL

Continued from Page 1

formula will be found for an American withdrawal; the United nations will oblige, for sure.

Time is on our side! The enemy, for the first time, is facing an enlightened and organized opposition. To finally affect his ancient plan the enemy must now move quickly. We Social Crediters must see to it that he is impeded on all fronts.