

THE NEW TIMES

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

Vol. 30, No. 18

18th September 1964

EDITORIAL

"CONTROLLED INFLATION" AND REVOLUTION

Last week Melbourne citizens were provided with a graphic example of the relationship between rising prices and preparations for physical revolution. Thousands of Trade Unionists marched up Bourke Street, brushed police aside and attempted to invade Parliament House to protest to the Premier, Mr. Henry Bolte, about recent price increases. Needless to say, those in charge of the demonstration made no realistic suggestions about how the problem of rising prices was to be solved. They did exactly the opposite. The policies suggested could only intensify the destructive social and economic effects of present policies. And this, of course, is just what the revolutionaries require.

Since the very inception of this journal we have pointed out, sometimes demonstrating in detail, how every attempt to make the economy operate without the threat of a major breakdown, similar to that experienced during the Great Depression, must inevitably result in progressively higher prices - - so long as present financial rules are blindly accepted as infallible. All Western Governments are, to a very great extent, "advised" by Fabian Socialist economists who support the theories of the British economist, J. M. Keynes, a man who masqueraded as one concerned with financial policies which would help the free enterprise system to survive against the challenge of Communism, but who in fact, as demonstrated by Eric D. Butler in his book, *The Fabian Socialist Contribution To The Communist Advance*, was advocating policies which would eventually erode the very foundations of the free enterprise economy and the free society.

"Controlled Inflation"

Anyone who doubts that the policy of any Government in the Western world is one of "controlled inflation." should attempt to obtain from a responsible Minister, or an economist, a firm assurance that there will be no further price increases. There has been a subtle form of brainwashing to convince people everywhere that a degree of inflation is "inevitable." It has even been stated that this "is the price we must pay for our prosperity"! But financial inflation is a direct contradiction of economic realities. Every business organisation, every primary producer, knows that measured realistically, his real costs of production have been steadily reduced. Measured in terms of man-hours worked, there is far more efficient production today than ever before in human history. The technological revolution has made it possible for a handful of men to produce today what took a multitude yesterday. Real costs of production per unit of production have steadily been reduced. Why, then, is this greater efficiency not reflected in a falling price level, increasing permanently the purchasing power of the consumer? We do not propose to go into this matter in detail here — there is literature available for those sufficiently interested — but we do want to draw attention to the basic truth that all attempts to expand financial credit under present financial rules must inevitably be reflected in higher prices.

Increased Wage Costs and Higher Prices

Anyone who doubts this should reflect on the last £1 per week increase in wages, awarded by the authorities responsible. They clearly indicated that this extra £1 per week was necessary for the wage earners. But when one totals up recent price increases of food, transport, power, and other items, the value of the extra £1 has been practically wiped out. Some claim that it has been more than wiped out. Now it is elementary that any organisation, whether it be run by free enterprise or a Government Commission, suddenly told that it must increase its total wage cost by increasing wages, must endeavour to pass that increased cost on in higher prices. An organisation employing 100 men now has an increased weekly wage bill of £100. It has almost certainly had to obtain an increased credit advance from the banking system in order to meet the increase. Now it must either attempt to recover the increased costs, and repay the overdraft, through an increase of prices, or it must accept lower profits. The great majority of organisations cannot operate on lower profits without risking bankruptcy. Those furthering revolution do not mind this. But neither do they mind increased prices --as this then provides them with the excuse to urge yet a further increase in wages, and the possibility of destructive strikes to seek the increase.

Not only does progressive inflation undermine social stability, it also fosters economic centralisation of power, which in turn makes political centralisation appear inevitable. Although Trade Union leaders are complaining that employers should have paid the increased wages bill, resulting from the £1 a week rise, out of profits, neither they nor anyone else can explain how this can be done to a worthwhile extent. Employees have, unfortunately, been brainwashed to believe that the profits of the organisations employing them can provide them with increased wages without increased prices. Those responsible for running business organisations without going bankrupt know different. Thus they resist every effort to increase wages. Here we have the basic cause of that "class warfare" which the Communist revolutionaries constantly claim is a major ingredient in the unfolding of a history, which leads inevitably towards a Communist world.

Continued on Page 4

WHAT IS MR. TOM MBOYA'S ROLE IN THE WORLD REVOLUTION?

By D. Watts

Mr. Tom Mboya, for a fortnight the guest of the Australian Government, believes whole-heartedly in a Black Africa policy, but has strong doubts about the rightness of the White Australia policy. Again, after the pro-coloured racists have been almost turning red in their efforts to fool people into believing that the only difference between races is the colours of their skins and that this surface difference is of no importance, Mr. Mboya suggests that Negro social workers, experienced in racial problems, could help Australian aborigines. "Seeing someone of their own colour who understands their problems may be of help," he said. That is, skin-colour should be of no importance to whites, but it is important to coloured people.

Having smiled, one then turns a little cold at the sinister implications in Mr. Mboya's suggestion. To the majority of Kenyan Negroes, understanding racial problems means imbibing the teaching that the whites are the enemy, to be enslaved or slaughtered. One suspects, with good reason, that the proposed Negro social workers might present communism to ignorant, therefore impressionable, aborigines as the solution of their problem. Above all, the entry of Negro social workers into this country could be the thin edge of a wedge that would split the White Australia policy wide open, for we may be sure that the black missionaries would not confine themselves to succoring the aborigines. Mr. Mboya is to be congratulated upon shrewdly advocating African infiltration into the very group most susceptible to coloured influence - - the social workers interested in the aborigines.

Why Mr. Mboya's Concern?

We may begin by wondering why Mr. Mboya bothers about the aborigines and the White Australia policy, but a second look shows that beneath the amusing surface inconsistencies is a deadly consistency. Mr. Mboya gives the impression that he is ambitious for a Negro conquest of the white race; and anyone considering his past behaviour would find it hard to doubt that he sees himself as the Conquering Hero. It would be clever tactics of the kind approved by communists to get whites to destroy whites. Then all he would need to do would be to discover a vantage point from which to launch an attack upon a weakened self-immolating prey.

To have power; to have dominion — for that peoples and their leaders have fought from the beginning of history. For that today America, Russia, France, China, Indonesia and the international moneymen struggle; so why should not the Negro race have the same ambition and put up a fight to win the prize? From their own point of view there is no reason why they should not enter the contest; but from our point of view and, it is not conceited to say, in the interests of aspiring humanity, there is reason to discourage them.

Primarily this continual struggle for power is a physical one and the largest army or the one with the best weapons wins; but from time to time in history — and this is one of the times -- another factor enters. It is civilisation. Then the struggle involves the preservation or destruction of civilisation. This has been recognised. The contests between nations and peoples, even when they come to war, are nowadays said to be, not for power and glory, but for

democracy or for civilised values such as freedom or justice or even for civilisation's necessity, peace.

Civilisation Threatened

There has been much sincerity and much hypocrisy in those claims; but there is nothing but hypocrisy when a plain, physical conquest by barbarians of civilised people is said to be in the interests of civilised government and civilised values. Primitives and near-primitives, such as the majority of Kenyan Negroes, howling for justice and freedom — things they do not understand — really want crude power and physical conquest and the exhilaration of killing and plundering.

Among even the most civilised people there remain large barbarian elements, and these are always antagonistic to the more civilised ways of life, but are restrained by civilised laws and traditions and customs. Nearly always when a civilised people has been overwhelmed by barbarian hordes, there has been a preliminary conquest by the barbarian within. The progress of this internal conquest has been blatant in our time. There has been a glorifying of violence and a ridiculing of civilised behaviour, a worship of uncouth primitiveness and a wholesale and largely unjustifiable condemnation of the civilised races and nations. All this undermining of civilisation is praised as being civilised — as being democratic or humanitarian or liberal.

"Majority Rule"

Perhaps the greatest political blunder of our time, the one that has made easy the way of the barbarian without and within, has been the dissemination of the teaching that democracy is Majority Rule. Under the influence of that idea democracy and democratic procedures have been made ridiculous — so much so that if we are to preserve anything in our political development that is worth preserving, we may have to drop the term "democracy" altogether. "Civilised Government" perhaps has retained some meaning. Civilised Government is a form in which the power of the ruling person or body is limited by laws and regulated by the people.

Majority Rule, on which Black Africans stand, when established by vote is civilised in that it ensures the victory of the larger army without bloodshed. It goes no further towards civilised government than that. The majority of the people always support the powerful ruler, whether he has gained his power through inheritance or by force. It neither limits nor regulates his power, but gives him its unqualified allegiance. This is instinctive.

With organisational development, creating internal

complexity, there appears that superior psychical action which civilises. The complexity compels a distribution of power, which limits the power of the central government. Such democratic government is brought about, not by the majority, but by vigorous minorities. The Magna Carta, the Bill of Rights, the Habeas Corpus Act, were formulated by minorities. Cultural development is the work, in the first place, of individuals and minority bodies. Improvement in the conditions of any class is brought about by minorities. Eventually the majority benefits from the efforts of the minorities.

The Role of The Minority

Majority Rule, as it works in civilised government, is ultimately minority rule. It is not only that minorities determine the policies to be offered to the people and subsequently implement them, but also it is that a minority of the people decides which policy shall be adopted. In the majority of the people the instinct to support, not to check, their leader persists. Most of them vote for a particular Party because they feel it is their Party. How often do we hear of people who habitually support one particular Party going to the polling booth angrily determined to give their support to the other and when they are there, finding that they simply cannot bring themselves to vote against the Party to which they feel they belong! As to which Party finds itself with the majority of the votes — that is determined by an independent minority, which adds its number to that of those adhering to one Party or the other. Majority Rule, then, can be civilised if there be a free, critical minority able to exercise some power.

In a country with a population such as central and southern Africa the civilised white minority would be unable to influence political action or moderate barbarian despotism if opposed, officially, by Negro leaders supported by black majorities, for there has been developed among the Negroes no tradition of check upon the despotism of leaders or majorities, and their idea of Majority Rule is the elimination of minorities. Their cry for freedom comes less from indignation at being oppressed than from a desire to do the oppressing.

But what a boon to an ambitious man whose chance of a military victory is small, would be the instituting of Majority Rule when it gives him, without the risks of combat, that which he covets. The insistence of most Negro leaders on a Black Government in South Africa and in South Rhodesia is not inspired by ideals of freedom and justice but, as the uncensored speeches and common behaviour indicate, by a thirst for power.

Mr. Mboya Speaks

Let us hear Mr. Mboya, himself, speak. At one time he says, "It is impossible for any African State to be indifferent to the sufferings of Africans in South Africa."

With what longing the poor wretches must think of the benign rule of the Mau Mau! Or do they hear the call of the wild and so find the superior conditions they enjoy in South Africa very trying?

However, on another occasion this tenderness for the sufferings of Negroes in South Africa evaporates. Says Mr. Mboya. "There is frequent argument that sanctions

against South Africa would mean that Africans themselves would lose jobs and would suffer in many other ways. Our attitude is 'so what' . . . The objection to South Africa's policies cannot be judged on suffering, but rather on results."

Savages do not need the communists to teach them that the end justifies the means; but civilised people realise that the end, itself, must first be justified, and that there must be a just proportion between the desirability of the end and the severity of the means used to attain it. It is not justifiable to burn down a house in order to roast one's pork.

To the ruthless, ambitious leader, his own victory and magnificence justifies all the agony and desolation it costs others. So thought Gengis Khan and Tamerlane and Alexander and Napoleon and all the host of Destroyers. To such as these and their devoted armies a military triumph was worth more than all that art and science can give; and among backward peoples a peaceful victory is inconceivable. This was shown in the Congo when, given to understand that their own race had scored a victory over the white race, the Negro triumph was, as a matter of course, accompanied by all the ghastliest trimmings of a military victory. So it was felt in Morocco and Zanzibar and Rwanda that the natural thing to do was to crown a success over rivals with a satisfying massacre.

Violence Preferred

Since the uncivilised elements predominate among the African Negroes, only a person grimly refusing to face reality could believe that, given a choice, the majority of them would not prefer a military adventure with all its violence to a negotiated victory, and would not celebrate the latter kind of success with slaughter, pillage, rape and holocaust.

Mr. Mboya, having declared, "If we fail to get results by peaceful means we are left with no alternative; it will be brought about by violence " at another time naively remarks that the South African Government was arming itself -- the money it spent on arms was greater than in the whole of the rest of Africa, commenting, "We find it difficult to believe that this spending is necessary simply for internal policing purposes."

The mental inaccessibility to the idea that a country should arm itself in the face of open threats of aggression when those threats come from himself, or that results could possibly be any but those which he dictates, betrays the solipsism which is psychologically characteristic of young children, of unimaginative, self-centred adults and of all tyrants. Mr. Mboya and his allies and sympathisers want to stop the sale of arms to South Africa for a reason, which is glaringly obvious. They would like a politically nonconformist, white people to be completely helpless before an invasion by barbarian armies. As to the unspeakable suffering inflicted on Negroes and whites by the murderous swarm: as Mr. Mboya says, "So what. This would be so small if it brought about a change."

The Results of a Negro Conquest

There would be results. Yes, but what results? Not those, which the flattered and cozened African leaders believe would come. Not thrones and tribute and pomp and

power. For one thing, it is doubtful if any Black African has the ability to organise, without help, what has been bloodily conquered and, for another, however much ability the leaders may have, they have not in their followers the stuff of constructive action. No leader is ever stronger than the mass of his followers, and no organisation is of better quality than the individuals who comprise it. All that would come of a Negro conquest of South Africa or South Rhodesia would be political disintegration and civilisation degeneration.

Those who would like to see that state of affairs come to be are the communists. It would give them a chance to set up puppet Negro rulers; but these leaders would not be those who created the chaos in which a communist take-over might be possible. The type of man who can create disorder is rarely the type capable of establishing order — even communist order. Centralised communism, not disorder presided over by troublemakers, is the final result desired by communist leaders. The liquidation of Negro catspaws would be considered a very small thing by them in the course of achieving the result.

Towards Communism

Communism, the parasite feeding in Africa upon the efforts of puerile political theorists and ambitious Negro demagogues, is beginning to display its gaudy, red flowers. Mr. Mboya made a not too subtle threat that refusal to give the Negroes all they want might send one of the Negro States (Kenya?) into the arms of the Soviet. Communist influence is known to be strong in Kenya, as in other African States. Mr. Mboya, himself, has often seemed to emanate a rosy glow. All that considered, one would very much like to know the true politics or the mental state of a correspondent of a certain newspaper who coyly suggested that "... his (Mboya's) talents could prove of great service to the United Nations or in the Organisation of African Unity to which his presence would almost certainly bring a new impetus." Does the infatuated promoter see Mr. Mboya as a useful communist tool in those organisations or as a modern Attila in the latter? If not to him, to others who could swallow that rank morsel, Kenyatta, without gagging. Mboya might appear to be a great statesman or a possible militant messiah. If we set a low enough standard we can class Simple Simon as a genius.

Continued from page 1

Employers generally have shown little more initiative in coming to grips with this question, than have employees.

A Consistent Policy

While we readily agree about the widespread acceptance of the very economic determinism which the Communists preach, we do not accept the view that there are not economic "advisers" who could, if pushed by a determined Government, easily put forward a practical policy for increasing purchasing power without setting off another spiral of price rises. The problem is in essence relatively simple. Even though crude and cumbersome, the price-

subsidy mechanism introduced during the war years demonstrated how there could be an expansion of new financial credit against economic realities without progressive price rises. But the economic "advisers" lost no time after the war in attacking this policy. All the evidence indicates, not that the revolutionaries are being supported by blindly ignorant "advisers" who do not know what they are doing, but that in fact the policy of "controlled inflation" is a conscious part of a revolutionary strategy. Once this truth is grasped, it will be seen that mere education about the mechanics of finance will not alter the situation. Sweet reasonableness is not going to halt the policy. Only sufficient political pressure applied to Members of Parliament, urging them to demand that the economic advisers solve the inflation problem or get out, will make any impact. The problem is basically political. The people must organise themselves to unite against the revolutionaries. We are prepared to show them how to do this.

In the meantime, we predict yet once again that the price level will continue to rise, irrespective of what Governments do within the framework of present financial rules.

MRS. ANNE NEILL FOR SYDNEY AND BRISBANE

Mrs. Anne Neill, of Adelaide, who served Australian Security as an undercover agent in the Australian Communist conspiracy for seven long years, will be visiting Sydney and Brisbane later this month with Mr. Eric Butler, National Director of The Australian League of Rights. Mrs. Neill's success as an undercover agent may be judged by the fact that she was selected to make a trip behind the Iron Curtain.

Mrs. Neill is one of the best-informed people on Communism in Australia today. Sydney readers are asked to note that Mrs. Neill will speak in the "Auditorium," C.E.N.E.F. Centre, Cnr. Bathurst and Kent Streets, on Thursday, September 24, at 8 p.m. They should not only attend themselves, but also bring their friends. Those requiring further information should contact Mr. Roy Gustard, State Director of the League in N.S.W., Box 2957, G.P.O., Sydney.

Mr. Butler will propose the vote of thanks at Mrs. Neill's Sydney meeting. He will be speaking on his recent international tour late in October on his return from Brisbane.

Apart from lecturing at two League of Rights Schools in Queensland, Mrs. Neill will also be addressing one public meeting, which readers may attend. Details of the Brisbane programme may be obtained from the Queensland State Director of the League, Mr. Don Martin, P.O. Box 3, Paddington, Brisbane, Queensland.