

THE NEW TIMES

Registered at the G.P.O., Melbourne, for transmission by Post as a Newspaper.

£2 per annum post free.

Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne.

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

Vol. 30, No. 14

24th July 1964

EDITORIAL

SOUTHERN RHODESIA AND THE FUTURE OF THE BRITISH COMMONWEALTH

The following article by Eric D. Butler deals with a question of the greatest importance to people in all parts of the British Commonwealth. Mr. Butler visited Southern Rhodesia just prior to the recent Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference in London. The attack on Southern Rhodesia at this Conference has brought to a head the question of whether the British Commonwealth can continue successfully without some basic rules, which all members must observe. Some realistic thinking and straight talking are urgently necessary.

As an Australian, I felt slightly embarrassed when, during my recent discussion with Mr. Ian Smith, Southern Rhodesia Prime Minister, the question was raised of why Australia had not been more sympathetic to Southern Rhodesia. I hasten to say that the Prime Minister was in no way critical, merely mentioning Australia's attitude in the course of our talk concerning Southern Rhodesia's relationship to the rest of the British Commonwealth. But this did not alter the fact that I knew of Southern Rhodesia's loyalty to the rest of the British world during the last war, when a bigger percentage of Southern Rhodesians volunteered for service than did the people of any other British nation. And I was talking to a man with a most distinguished record — a leader who wants his nation to continue as a loyal member of the British Commonwealth. I was therefore painfully aware that Australia and other Commonwealth nations have not been particularly loyal to Southern Rhodesia.

I observed to Mr. Smith that I was certain that the great majority of Australians knew little or nothing about Southern Rhodesia; that a false image had been projected by those whose business it is today to use a highly centralised and corrupted propaganda machine to create a hostile "world opinion" against countries like Southern Rhodesia and South Africa. And I informed the Prime Minister that my main purpose in asking him to do a taped interview with me was to enable him to present his own case, in his own words, around the British Commonwealth, particularly in Australia, New Zealand and Canada. Mr. Smith not only put his case in a direct and unambiguous manner; he did so in such a way that no one hearing him can fail to agree that, while a dedicated man, he is not a wild, unbalanced extremist, as often depicted by those who manufacture "world opinion."

The present state of the Commonwealth was graphically portrayed by the Prime Ministers' Conference when a degenerate creature like Kenyatta, of Kenya, whose Mau Mau terrorists committed unspeakable acts, not only against the British but against their own fellow Africans, attended a gathering from which the Southern Rhodesian Prime Minister was excluded, and there urged that force be used in an attempt to compel the Southern Rhodesian

Government to introduce immediate "majority rule." As Kenyatta is demonstrating in Kenya, his policy is to drive the European out of Africa. Events have proved that any partnership between the European and African which does not ensure the senior position for the European breaks down in chaos, bringing suffering to both African and European. The Europeans in Southern Rhodesia have no intention of experiencing another Congo. And if the British Government, supported in any way by Australia, New Zealand and Canada, insists that the Southern Rhodesians cannot have complete independence without handing political power to Nkomo and other African revolutionaries, which would certainly be the case under votes for all Africans, then I am satisfied that the Smith Government is going to assume independence — *even if this has to be achieved outside the British Commonwealth*. This decision would be forced upon Southern Rhodesia, and it could mean the end of any real prospect of saving the Commonwealth from complete disintegration. The Southern Rhodesian question is beyond doubt one which the people of Australia, the United Kingdom, New Zealand and Canada should clearly understand.

BACKGROUND HISTORY

Given the choice in 1923 of accepting self-government as a British Colony, or becoming a fifth province of the Union of South Africa, Southern Rhodesians at a referendum decided by a two-thirds majority to become a self-governing British Colony. Up until the creation of the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland in 1953, Southern Rhodesia's Prime Minister attended all Imperial and Conferences of Commonwealth Prime Ministers. This was a right, which was inherited by the Federal Prime Minister from 1953 onwards. Even Sir Roy Welensky, whom I discovered is not regarded with any enthusiasm by many supporters of the present Rhodesian Front Government, insisted during an interview I had with him in London, that when the Federation broke up at the end of 1963, Southern Rhodesia was automatically entitled to its original status and to have the Prime Minister at Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conferences. But permission for Prime Minister Ian Smith to attend was refused, some claiming by a unanimous decision of other Prime Ministers. It would be re-

vealing to know what view was in fact expressed by the Canadian, New Zealand and Australian Governments. If they joined with Kenyatta, Nkrumah and others in opposing the attendance of Southern Rhodesia, insisting that African majority government must be first implemented, then why was no opposition expressed in the past to Southern Rhodesia being represented, either in its own right or through the Federation Prime Minister? Why was Southern Rhodesia accepted as a self-governing Colony of the British Commonwealth up until 1953 -- when, incidentally, the Southern Rhodesian Constitution made less provisions for Africans voting than does the 1962 Constitution - - but in 1964 is told it is not eligible to attend Prime Ministers' Conferences? The harsh truth is that the Kenyattas and Nkrumahs, acting as part of the world conspiracy, objected, and that at least some members of the old Commonwealth followed the disgraceful lead of the British Government in attempting to betray the Southern Rhodesians.

It is instructive to recall that even the "United Nations, during its first session in February 1946, when discussing Non-Self-Governing Territories, did not list Southern Rhodesia for attention. It was at this stage generally agreed that Southern Rhodesia was enjoying internal responsible government. There is no doubt that, if the Federation had not been brought into being, Southern Rhodesia would logically have become a completely sovereign Dominion. But instead it became the key member of the Federation. In 1961, Mr. Duncan Sandys presided over all-races, all-parties conference which created a new Constitution for Southern Rhodesia. This Constitution liberalised the franchise to such an extent that even the extremist Nkomo accepted it — *only to repudiate it later*. In exchange for acceptance of this new Constitution, the British Government surrendered, with one or two exceptions, the reserved powers held, thus making it impossible from then on for Britain to intervene in Southern Rhodesia's internal affairs. Southern Rhodesia was therefore granted increased independence within the Federal framework, and I am satisfied that there can be no doubt about Prime Minister Smith's claim that a majority of Southern Rhodesians voted for the new Constitution at the 1961 referendum because they believed that this meant independence for their country. It was obvious then that the Federation was coming to an end. And Mr. Duncan Sandys must have known this.

When the British Government brought the Federation to an end - - Sir Roy Welensky's book, *Welensky's 4000 Days*, sheds some revealing light on the treacherous activities of Macmillan, Heath and Sandys - - thus enabling Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland to become completely sovereign States, the very British Government which accepted the 1961 Southern Rhodesian Constitution then refused to grant Southern Rhodesia the same complete sovereignty as the other two parts of the Federation, claiming that the Constitution was not acceptable. It is not surprising that Southern Rhodesians regard this as treachery of the worst possible type. But they are also beginning to learn that the present British leaders are merely demon-

strating, as they have done time, and time again in the past, they are always prepared to sacrifice the most loyal members of the British Commonwealth in order to try to placate the creators of "world opinion" and the powerful forces promoting world revolution.

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS FOR AFRICAN ELECTORS

In spite of the facts I have outlined, many will repeat the anti-Southern Rhodesian propaganda they have constantly had directed at them. "Why should a few hundred thousand reactionary white settler types be permitted to oppress 3,000,000 Africans? Majority rule, one-man one vote, must be introduced immediately. The British Government should refuse complete independence until majority rule is introduced." And some even go further and agree with Jomo Kenyatta that military force should be used against the Southern Rhodesians if they will not grant a majority vote immediately.

Quite apart from the elementary fact that the great majority of Africans in Southern Rhodesia have neither the desire nor the capacity to exercise political power, the truth is that the present Constitution, which Mr. Smith's party pledged itself to operate before being elected, enables a much larger number of Africans to vote than is the case at present - - *if these Africans exercised their right to become voters*. When I first studied the present Constitution closely, I was astonished at the extremely liberal provisions enabling Africans to become electors, and to become Members of Parliament. Many supporters of the present Southern Rhodesian Government are of the opinion that they are far too liberal. I am not expressing any opinion about this, but recording the fact that it is a blatant falsehood to say that Africans are barred from exercising any political influence in Southern Rhodesia. The Constitution guarantees the Africans a minimum of 15 seats in Parliament. At present 14 of these are held by Africans, the other being held by a European elected by Africans. But the representatives for the 15 seats reserved for Africans were elected by a mere handful of electors, approximately 700. This fact of itself proves just how little interest the great majority of Africans have in voting. Africans are constitutionally able to contest every electorate in Southern Rhodesia if they desire.

As I trust that even the most brainwashed concerning Southern Rhodesia will readily agree that voting anywhere must be related to some standard of education and responsibility, I draw attention to the fact that the Constitution lays down minimum requirements for voters *irrespective of race*. There are economic and educational qualifications. Those framing this Constitution clearly did everything in their power to have the qualifications as low as possible. How can any honest person say that an income of £300 a year, plus four years' secondary education is a difficult attainment? When the present Constitution was accepted *by a majority of white electors*, the then Prime Minister, Sir Edgard Whitehead, announced that he expected some 50,000 new African voters to come on to the rolls. But in

spite of the Government running a special "Claim Your Vote Campaign," very few Africans availed themselves of their right to be enrolled. There are several reasons for this mass refusal by Africans who are qualified to enrol, but beyond doubt the main one is the campaign of terrorism initiated by men like Nkomo. Petrol bombs, whether used against human beings or homes, are a devastating weapon of intimidation. Prime Minister Smith told me that his Government knew for certain that Communists were financing much of the terrorist activity in Southern Rhodesia. And although Nkomo is known to have been associated with terrorist activities, mostly against moderate Africans who wish to co-operate with the Europeans, when the Government merely restricts his movements in one part of the country the promoters of world revolution organise an international protest in which gullible people lend their support to campaigns to free "the victims of political oppression" in Southern Rhodesia.

I have no doubt whatever that the main reason why Nkomo and his supporters are not making any attempt to increase their political power through the provisions of the present Constitution is that they realise that this process would take time. In spite of the steady increase in the economic status and the educational qualifications of the Africans, primarily as a result of the efforts of the Europeans, the extremists would have a difficult and long task to obtain complete political power by working within the Constitution. The programme of revolution for Southern Rhodesia cannot be held up. And the revolution directed against Southern Rhodesia has the ultimate objective of revolution for the whole of Africa.

INCREASING SUPPORT FOR SMITH GOVERNMENT

When the first Rhodesian Front Government was elected with Mr. Winston Field as Prime Minister, this result was a tremendous shock to the world revolutionaries and their dupes. It was claimed that a bunch of hillbilly settlers with reactionary policies had come to power in Southern Rhodesia. The truth is, of course, that Southern Rhodesians voted for the Field Government because they realised that they were being progressively betrayed by the Whitehead Government, which was refusing to take a firm stand against the growing pressures from all those assisting the revolution in Africa.

In its enunciation of principles, the Rhodesian Front affirmed its loyalty to the Queen. It proclaimed the principle of "the recognition of the family as the basis of society" and "the rights of the individual to private property and freedom of worship, speech and association within the framework of the law." It stood for opposition to "compulsory integration and recognises the right of government at all levels to provide separate facilities and amenities for the various groups to enable them to preserve their customs and ways of life." The Rhodesian Front convinced the electorate that it had the will to enforce law and order against the black terrorists. And it stated that it would "ensure the permanent establishment

of the European in Southern Rhodesia." The electorate supported the Rhodesian Front in spite of violent opposition from the press. Big finance, some of it coming from the U.S.A., was poured in, in an attempt to keep the Rhodesian Front out. Southern Rhodesians are extremely critical concerning the role of American officials in the country. Attacks on the American Central Intelligence Agency, strongly established in Salisbury, have been made in Parliament. I am pleased to report that Australian Trade Commissioners are highly regarded, but I wonder whether their reports on the situation ever reach the Australian Government without first being mangled by the Canberra bureaucracy.

I believe it is true to say that Mr. Field lost his position as leader of his Party for two reasons: His unfortunate personal approach to his Cabinet Ministers, and a feeling in his Party that he was not resisting strongly enough the pressures from the British Government. Even so, Mr. Field had said not long before being replaced by Mr. Ian Smith "I do not believe that the British Government is at this time concerned with the justice of our cause and a negotiated settlement before the next United Kingdom will amount to nothing more than a hand-over to African nationalism at our next elections."

Immediately upon becoming Prime Minister, Mr. Smith has given both his party and the country much more vigorous leadership than did Mr. Field. Prime Minister Smith is no demagogue using oratorical tricks to sway the electorate. He is an earnest man of obvious integrity, and there is no doubt whatever that by his series of meetings around the country, explaining the independence issue to Southern Rhodesians, his standing with the electorate is extremely high. Public support for the Smith Government is increasing daily, and all the screaming in the international press cannot alter this fact. I would say that Prime Minister Smith is learning fast, that he is not going to permit himself, if possible, to be tricked into some rash action by his powerful international enemies and their Southern Rhodesian agents and dupes. And that, while determined to gain the complete independence, which his country must have to end the present uncertainty, he is ensuring that his electorate is strongly behind any step he may have to take. And I am pleased to report that he has the advice of men who really "know the score."

I express no views concerning the approach of Mr. Smith and his Government to the race question. The Government is well qualified to deal with problems, which it understands far better than international critics. But I should observe that both in his talk with me, and in various statements, Mr. Smith has made it clear that he has the welfare of the Africans genuinely at heart. He believes in a form of partnership, but with the European accepting his responsibilities as the senior member of that partnership. He believes in advancement on the basis of merit and qualifications, not on the basis of race or colour. However, the grafting of civilisation on to a primitive people is a long, slow process. It is true that Mr. Smith believes that the present Constitution should be modified, and that

the Africans should play their part in politics in a manner more suited to their traditions. For example, I note a statement by Mr. Smith recorded in *Newsfront* on January 10 of this year when, in answering a question, he said, "I think we should make changes which would mean that African members would more truly represent African opinion Our predecessors in office . . . would not allow the Chiefs to take part in politics. We, on the other hand, would like to see them play their proper role as the traditional rulers of their people. This must be considered part of our over-all plan."

HOUR OF DECISION APPROACHES

In spite of the fact that the present British Government has resisted all proposals for external interference, either by itself or U.N.O., in Southern Rhodesia's internal affairs, it has also betrayed its moral obligations to Southern Rhodesia by refusing to agree to Southern Rhodesian independence on the basis of the Constitution which it virtually forced upon the Southern Rhodesians only a few years ago. The Smith Government has therefore been forced into the position where it must proclaim independence before too much more time has passed. A change in British Government following the coming British elections will not help it. The international campaign against the country is being stepped up. Increasing pressure must come from the Africans to the North, as Communist influence grows. No internal change of policy will appease the world revolutionaries except those, which destroy all law and order and plunge the country into chaos.

Southern Rhodesia has become yet another greatest issue, not only for the British Commonwealth but also for civilisation. If the Nkrumahs, Kenyattas and others declare they will leave the Commonwealth if Southern Rhodesia assumes independence, then now is the time to wish them farewell, and the time to start reviving the British Commonwealth upon the basis of rules which uphold civilisation. Every possible moral and other support should be mobilised around the British Commonwealth for the Southern Rhodesians who are holding one of the front lines in the world struggle today. Southern Rhodesia could be the final test for the British Commonwealth.

NEWS COMMENTARY

INDIAN SUPPORTS "WHITE AUSTRALIA" POLICY

We trust that Australian opponents of Australia's traditional immigration policy, which has saved Australia from the racial troubles of so many other countries, have taken careful note of the recent address at Canberra by Indian research fellow in the Department of International Relations at the Australian National University, Dr. Ushe Mahjani. Speaking on July 8 at a symposium organised by the University's International Club. Dr. Mahjani strongly supported Australia's immigration policy.

After pointing out that Asians were very fairly treated by Australia, that Asians marrying Australians were permitted to stay, and that Asian children born in Australia had full

rights, Dr. Mahjani observed that "That is more than can be said for a number of Asian and other countries. . . . None of us can criticise Australia for the policy when we look at its other policies in Asia." Dr. Mahjani said that the Australian policy did not affect India because India was not interested in immigration to Australia.

As a striking contrast to this refreshing common sense from an Indian, Sir Allan Watt, a former Secretary of the Department of External Affairs, and now a research fellow at the Department of International Relations at the Australian National University, told the Canberra symposium that "The White Australia policy should be abolished and officially interred. A mixture of races could be beneficial. While not advocating an open door -- which would not solve the problem — I think a restricted immigration policy could be worked out to retain Australia's homogeneity without offending other countries."

We do not know what "problem" Sir Allan Watt is talking about solving. The only "problem" is the one he and his fellow opponents of the present immigration consistently propagate. But it has no basis in reality, as Dr. Mahjani indicated. So far from race mixing as a national policy being "beneficial," it would be one of suicide and madness. We suggest that Sir Allan extend his research studies to those countries where there is race mixing, and then report on whether or not he thinks the results encouraging.

We realise, of course, that many opponents of Australia's present immigration policy are not interested in solving problems, as they claim, but are interested in producing problems, which can then be exploited for subversive purposes. Sir Allan Watt could, with profit, have a discussion on this subject with the Communists, long-time agitators against the "White Australia" policy.

EXPLOITING "THE NEW MORALITY"

The following report of a speech by Dr. Morris Martin, M.A., D.Phil. (Oxon), former Harmsworth student, Merton College, is reprinted from "The Scottish Housewives' Association Bulletin":

"Serious as the brain drain is today, even more serious is the character cave in.

"At this moment there has arisen from many quarters the phenomenon of the 'New Morality.' It sounds as if it is just what is needed for our new age of power. Quite simply, its partisans feel that the old standards of morality are no longer able to cope with the problems facing modern men and women, especially the youth. But it is not so much the demands and needs of youth with which they are concerned as with promoting a theory of man's life and destiny, which is being put forward and developed by definite men and women in the life of Britain and the world today.

"This theory is that man is an animal, one of a high order, highly intelligent, but that he can be understood, measured, tested, investigated like any other animal and the springs of his consciousness, the origins of his physical

life explained and controlled to fit and adapt him for his efficient functioning in a political new age of power.

"There are three groups today who act upon this theory and are making a deep mark upon our lives. First, the 'Goodtime Charlies.' These people maintain that the power now in man's hands is intended to increase his comfort, enjoyment of physical life and personal, cultural and aesthetic pleasure. They have concentrated on an area of life, which is most vulnerable to this philosophy, the sexual morality of modern man. They say, 'we have controlled venereal disease and we have perfected the contraceptive pill. It is now in our power to separate sex as a form of pleasurable activity from sex as a means of propagating the human race.' Who is going to decide whether this is 'good' and 'right' or 'bad' and 'wrong'?"

"To the voices of the scientists such as Professor Carstairs and Dr. Comfort, are added some voices from the churches and education -- two of the forces most relied upon for the moulding of the next generation. Sir Edward Boyle's protégé, Dr. Peter Henderson Chief Medical Officer to the Ministry of Education, has become notorious for his advocacy of premarital sex and early instruction in contraceptive methods. Professor Carstairs and Dr. Alex Comfort likewise. The atmosphere of "permissiveness." created by these geneticists and doctors, is encouraged by the woolliness of some bishops and clergy who by appearing to admit premarital intercourse and to reject chastity, add moral authority to 'permissiveness'. So the new mode becomes the new morals, the new look, the new law; it becomes something not merely physically possible, but morally right.

"My second group is the *majority moralists*. They calculate the rising trend of illegitimacy, promiscuity, unfaithfulness in and out of marriage; they take into consideration the pressures upon young people today from television, films, stage advertising, and come up with the solution that, because young people find the standards harder to keep, the standards should be revised downwards to make it easier for young people to keep them.

"Because the pressures on people today, both young and old, to adopt lower standards and give up the moral battle are greater, it does not prove they are to be given in to. *The Times* not long ago had a correspondence on the subject of the alleged lower age of puberty, in the course of which a wise Harley Street doctor wrote. 'There is no such thing as irresistible impulses. There are only impulses that are not resisted.'

"Very many school teachers and ministers, physicians and nurses, know the cost of what used to be called sin and now is called anti-social behaviour, in the lives of patients and pupils and parishioners. What are statistics of disease, illegitimacy, abortion or divorce for others are for them human tragedies, involving natural, living, breathing, and suffering people. They react vigorously not merely against the problems raised by the old morality, but against the solutions offered by the new. They also resent most powerfully the arrant hypocrisy of the men who make vast sums out of doubtful literature and do so in the name

of enlightenment. The honouring of Sir Allen Lane, of Penguin Books, by my own University of Oxford, just after the comic opera proceedings of bishops testifying to the virtue of Lady Chatterly, and the acceptance without protest of Mr. Calder's announcement that he intends to attack 'the backward puritanical attitude to sex' and break the censorship barrier, are both highly irresponsible. Respectable publishers have tapped a source of considerable financial profit, which is now increasingly being exploited by publishers about whose motives there is no doubt whatever. The third group of men who accept with both hands the theory of man as an animal and use it to serve their own ends are the totalitarians.

"Because we are a tolerant people who consider our creed is to live and let live, we will find it hard to believe that the State could claim the right to use slaughter-house, torture chamber, lash and whip to control the zoo over which it presides. But implicit in the theory of man which our thorough-going materialists in the scientific field are advocating must also be the use of force by a privileged few to control, direct, and if necessary restrain, maim and kill the stubborn fools who differ from them by holding to God, conscience and the moral destiny of man as the final controls of society.

"What, then, is needed for this new age?"

"A wise statesman put it this way:

" 'When bad men combine, good men must associate.' It is even more important that good *women* should associate.

"Don't hesitate to raise our voices to deal with the extreme cases of nonsense morality from professors, publishers, or preachers, especially when propagated by the press and the BBC and ITV. If we keep on expressing our views, even the BBC may have to repent of its ways.

"Don't be fooled by hypocritical arguments of publishers and peddlers of pornography. Keep asking 'to whose advantage is this? Who is making money out of this?' Get everybody to join in cleaning up the streams of garbage, which flow into the nation's thinking. If the garbage sellers say: 'That is Puritanism,' or attack John Knox, then thank God for the puritans and John Knox. Don't be ashamed of a good robust row and in public.

"We must restore greatness of vision to this nation — a world view and a world responsibility. The ideals that underlay the Empire and the Commonwealth are not dead. They need to be revived."

ISRAELI'S HELP AFRICAN REVOLUTIONARIES

In recent years there have been increasing reports of African revolutionaries either being trained in Israel, or of Israeli's actually assisting in Africa. The London *Daily Express* of June 9 carried a revealing report of how Jomo Kenyatta, speaking at the inauguration of his British-trained Kenya air force on June 1, had sniped at the Royal Air Force when he said he would not allow foreigners to fly Kenya's planes, and had then gone on to say, "I should like to reveal a little secret to you which I could not do

Continued on page 6

NEWS COMMENTARY

Continued from Page 5
so before. Some of these young men you see in front of you had training abroad before the British left this country. We are grateful to the Government of Israel, which received and trained these young pilots. We were doing it underground, but today we are free and can do what we want." Kenyatta said in Swahili, "We were not really asleep while the British were here. We were doing things underground."

Further to the above report, a featured article in *The Star*, Johannesburg, South Africa, of June 25, deals with how Dr. Banda of Nyasaland, now devoting himself to building a complete dictatorship in his "liberated" country, has called upon Israel to supply him with army instructors. The article states: "Israel . . . is desperately keen to win allies in Africa. And this (sending army instructors) was the type of aid she was most fitted to give."

ERIC BUTLER RETURNS TO AUSTRALIA AFTER TREMENDOUS SOUTH AFRICAN PROGRAMME

Immediately upon reaching Perth, Western Australia, on July 7, after the long flight from South Africa, Mr. Eric Butler plunged into another intensive campaign during which he attended twelve meetings in ten days. Highlights of the W.A. campaign were a TV interview by the ABC, a meeting with a group of leading Perth businessmen, and a special meeting of the Air Force Association. Following an excellent meeting of supporters, the League of Rights in W.A. will be expanding on a much more highly organised basis, and individual supporters are expected to participate in an expanding programme of activities on a much more regular basis. Those desirous of participating in the League's programme should contact the State Director, Mr. Ray King, Box 1131N, G.P.O., Perth.

Mr. Butler reached Adelaide, South Australia, on Friday of last week, July 17, and opened the League of Rights" programme there with an address to supporters that night. Melbourne and Victorian supporters and friends will have the opportunity of hearing Mr. Butler give a survey of the world situation at the Empire Room, Federal Hotel, Collins Street, on Friday, Aug. 14, at 8 p.m. This survey will be based upon his extensive first-hand experiences over the past six months in Canada, the U.S.A. the United Kingdom, Ireland, Southern Rhodesia and South Africa.

FULL PROGRAMME IN SOUTHERN RHODESIA

Although his programme in South Africa and Western and South Australia forced Mr. Butler to decline pressing and generous offers to stay longer in Southern Rhodesia, during the comparatively short time he was there he was able to meet many responsible and key people, give a TV interview which caused widespread favourable comment, a radio interview, a press interview, and address an enthusiastic meeting. But the highlight of his visit was a rather lengthy personal interview with the Prime Minister,

Mr. Ian Smith, during which Mr. Butler obtained an excellent taped recording of Mr. Smith's views. Arrangements have been made for a quantity of *New Times* and a selection of booklets to be distributed in Southern Rhodesia.

SPECIAL RADIO INTERVIEWS IN SOUTH AFRICA

The intensity of the South African programme may be judged by the fact that Mr. Butler gave no less than 21 addresses during the 15 days he was there. He spoke to some of the most influential groups in South Africa, including top security officers, police, cultural organisations, army and air force trainees. His largest meeting was a group of 650 trainee teachers at a teachers' college. The Anti-Communist Congress, which arranged many of Mr. Butler's meetings, estimated that he spoke directly to approximately 3,300. But he reached his largest audience in a series of three radio interviews on International Communism arranged by the South African Broadcasting Commission. These were broadcast in both English and Afrikaans at the peak listening time. Judging by the attempted smearing of Mr. Butler by a section of the South African press, his nation-wide broadcast interviews caused grave concern in some circles. Mr. Butler also gave two shorter interviews to the SABC.

Large quantities of League of Rights publications have been ordered for use in the growing upsurge against Communism and subversion in South Africa, particularly Mr. Butler's last three booklets.

BOOK NOW FOR ANNUAL DINNER AND LEAGUE SEMINAR

Every Annual *New Times* Dinner is an event which those attending long remember, but this year's Dinner, to be held on Friday, September 18, will be of special significance, as will the League of Rights Seminar following it on Saturday, September 19. The Dinner will follow closely upon the conclusion of Mr. Butler's historic six months' tour, and his Annual Dinner address will therefore be of greater significance than ever. All supporters are urged to make every effort of attend, to sustain and to inspire one another to keep the good fight going. Early bookings for the Dinner would be greatly appreciated.

Will country and interstate supporters requiring hospitality in Melbourne please contact us immediately?

The third Paper at this year's League of Rights Seminar will be given by Mr. D. J. Killen, M.P. The theme of the Seminar this year will be "A New British Commonwealth," a most appropriate one following the recent Prime Ministers' Conference. Mr. Killen will be making positive proposals to meet the changing nature of the Commonwealth. The first Paper will be given by Mr. Karl Moeller: "A Non-British Migrant Looks at the British Commonwealth." Mr. Eric Butler will give the second Paper: "The British Commonwealth or The United Nations?"