

# THE NEW TIMES

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

Vol. 31, No. 8

August 1965

## EDITORIAL

### REAL PURPOSE OF COMMON MARKET BECOMES CLEARER

In our issue of June 12 of last year, we first warned of the long-term significance of President Johnson's claim that American policy was "to build bridges across the gulf that has divided us from Eastern Europe." We pointed out that increased American economic assistance was suggested because the Eastern European countries were becoming more "moderate." Subsequent developments confirm our view that the creation of the European Economic Community was a major feature of an overall strategy of centralising power on a world scale. The "moderating" policies in Eastern Europe are designed to persuade the non-Communist world that Eastern Europe can become the "bridge" between a highly centralised Russia and a highly centralised Western Europe.

There is no evidence whatever that the Communist control of the Eastern European nations has weakened in any way. The Communists in charge of these nations are the same Communists in the main who have been in power for years. They are still loyal to the International Communist conspiracy. The only significant change in these nations is the economic progress being made, much of it related to the increasing economic assistance financed by the West. It is important to stress that Communism is not opposed to economic development as such. Communism is concerned about effective control of the individual, not of depriving him of the material essentials of life. Slaves are quite often well fed.

#### Misrepresenting The Communist Conspiracy

When the European Economic Community concept was originally put forward, some of its supporters contended that a "united" Europe was essential to halt the Communist drive into Western Europe. This approach completely misrepresented the true nature of the Communist conspiracy, suggesting that the Soviet Union might make a direct military attack upon Western Europe. Subversion and demoralisation are the main features of the Communist conspiracy. And these are most easily advanced in a highly centralised economic and political structure. Finance is the principal instrument for centralising power, and it should always be borne in mind that the big merchant banking groups in London have been active in attempting to force Britain into the European Economic Community. International financial groups are also strong supporters of increasing Western economic aid to Eastern Europe.

Whatever the Communists may have *said* in opposition to the European Economic Community, they have in fact welcomed it as it furthers their concept of a completely integrated Europe. It should not be forgotten that Trotsky was one of the first to advocate a United States of Europe. It was Lenin who said that an integrated international economy was essential for the establishment of International Communism. We should not be surprised, therefore, to

find a French Communist writer, Pierre Joye, writing in the Communist *World Marxist Review* of May, 1964, stressing the Communist advantage in "international economic integration." Commenting on the European Coal and Steel Community, the European Economic Community, and the Euratom Atomic Energy Community, Joye said:

**"These centralised and bureaucratic bodies depend on the executive powers of the Six and preclude, by virtue of the present structure, any real intervention and any effective control on the part of the representative bodies of the member countries."**

#### Capturing a Centralised Europe

After observing that the three communities have a total membership of 4000 officials, Joye pointed out that "Many Socialists . . . are increasingly awakening to the need to fight *within the framework* of the 'integrated' Europe against the stranglehold of the monopolies and for social progress." Here was a typical example of Communist dialectics: while verbally condemning monopoly, Joye was really advocating that Communists work towards obtaining control of it. The more integrated Western Europe becomes, the easier it is for the Communists to take over key positions of power without most people realising what is happening. And if, under the guise of helping Eastern European countries to become more "moderate," they can also be integrated economically with Western Europe, the ground-work is laid for the ultimate Communist take-over of the whole of Europe. Communism is making steady political gains in most parts of Western Europe, particularly in Italy and in France, and within the next five years could become the major power through the Popular Front technique. A centralised Europe would then pass under complete Communist domination.

In considering all this steady drive towards progressive centralisation, it is always essential to bear in mind that the international financial groups have been consistently sup-

*Continued on Page 8*

## NEWS COMMENTARY

**Harold Wilson's Destructive Policies:** As Australian Fabian Socialists boast that Prime Minister Harold Wilson in Britain is a Fabian Socialist, we must presume that the policies being pursued by the British Socialist Government are favoured by the Fabians. The Institute of Directors has recently published a booklet entitled *The Assault on Private Enterprise*, in which the results of the Wilson Government's policies are listed. Businessmen are clearly regarded as enemies to be destroyed. It is increasingly difficult to get new capital. Savage and steeply progressive tax increases make it impossible to build up reserves. The capital gains tax makes no allowance for inflation "and is thus a recurrent capital levy which will mean the end of the small business during the owner's working life-time."

The Wilson Government is imposing a policy of monopoly. Prime Minister Wilson threatens further credit restrictions. In spite of talk about halting price rises, inflation continues. The savage attacks on the British aircraft industry were justified, not on a genuine economic basis, but because of a "financial crisis."

One of the interesting by-products of the Socialists' destructive policies in Britain is the stream of skilled tradesmen leaving the country, fortunately some of them to Australia. But it is interesting that many are going to South Africa, the country that the Socialists appear to hate above all others. Clearly those fleeing from the Fabian Socialists in London expect to find more freedom and opportunities in what the Socialists so often describe as a Police State.

Wilson's Socialist policies are not only destroying the British economy; they are further helping to undermine the character of the British people. No doubt this is what is really desired, so that Britain can be finished as a force in world affairs. The defeat of Harold Wilson would not of itself cure Britain's troubles. But no possible start in the right direction is possible until the Socialists are removed from office.

**Why Not Let IPEC Compete?:** Every reasonable person agrees that in the field of transport a rule of law is essential. The Government's role is to provide that rule of law, to ensure that individuals do not suffer through dangerous and unscrupulous practices. For example, it is legitimate that the Government establishes an authority to ensure that strict safety rules are obeyed by both buses and planes. But by sneaky arbitrary action the Federal Government has attempted to prevent Interstate Parcel Express Co. (Aust.) Pty. Ltd. (IPEC) from moving into the express airfreight business. IPEC has over the past 11 years provided a growing and most successful Australia-wide carrier network. This organisation is the result of the drive and initiative of one man, its Managing Director, Mr. Gordon Barton. He had only one truck when he set out carrying parcels interstate between Adelaide and Melbourne. Today IPEC has an annual turnover of more than £2 million.

Although Mr. Barton has overwhelming proof that business people throughout Australia would like him to move into the airfreight business, his application was rejected by the Federal Government, which did permit, however, Mr. Reg Ansett to import the very type of planes required by IPEC. Barton went to the High Court, which ruled that the IPEC must be permitted to operate an interstate airfreight service. The High Court ruled however, by a three to two decision, that it would not over-ride the Director-General of Civil Aviation decision not to issue IPEC with import permits. IPEC decided to go to Privy Council but just before the case was to be heard, the Federal Government changed the law, making it the responsibility of the Minister for Customs to grant permits instead of the Department of Civil Aviation. This was surely Government by regulation at its worst.

The major effect IPEC would have upon the two present airlines in Australia would be to force them to give better service in the airfreight field. If Australians want the third service, then they are entitled to have it. And it is the duty of a genuine free enterprise government to ensure that it is provided. The Opposition is always talking about monopoly. Well here is an opportunity for it to show it is sincere.

**The Racial Problem In Malaysia:** The Chinese make up about 30 percent of Sarawak's 800,000 residents. 8000 Chinese were ordered into five resettlement centres after Indonesian and Chinese terrorists had killed nine people on the Kuching-Serian highway on June 27. State officials are convinced that Communist influence is almost exclusively limited to the Chinese people. Communist influence is also almost exclusively confined to the Chinese in other parts of Malaysia. The theorists will, of course, reject this as a manifestation of "wicked racialism". But the facts must be faced. If some racial groups are more susceptible to Communism than other groups, then why should not this truth be openly discussed?

**Smearing Pope Pius:** With the presentation of Rolf Hochhuth's play, *The Representative*, in Australia, the smearing of Pope Pius continues. The outrageous charges against Pope Pius are, of course, pleasant music for the Communists, who want to keep alive for their own purposes fear and hatred of Germany. Some terrible things took place in Nazi (National Socialist) Germany. But Nazi Germany was destroyed 20 years ago. Today there is an even worse threat to free men: International Communism. Concentration upon past evils while ignoring or making light of present evils is dangerous.

The alleged crime of Pope Pius was that he did not protest against Hitler's murder of 6 million Jews. While many have attempted to defend Pope Pius, pointing out that he did much to help Jewish refugees, few have been courageous enough to suggest that Pope Pius could not protest against something he did not know about. The story of the 6 million Jews only appeared after the war.

Jewish casualties were heavy, but they have been grossly exaggerated. It is high time that the exploitation of Jewish casualties ceased. Australians do not go around constantly talking about the brutalities they suffered on the Burma railway or elsewhere. And they do not allow this unpleasant history to dominate their present relationships with Japan. All peoples suffered during the last war. It is right and proper that this suffering should not be forgotten. But the smearing of Pope Pius in 1965 can have no other result than help the Communists. We suggest that the Jewish people consider this point before accepting the smearing of Pope Pius.

**Beware Of "Anti-Semitic" Stories:** The recent revelation that an Israeli Jew as the principal "Nazi" in the Swedish incident where an alleged Nazi group was planning to murder all Swedish Jews, directs attention once again to the fact that much "anti-Semitism" is deliberately created by certain Jews so that the rank and file of the Jewish people can be exploited. Jewish leaders have been debating recently about the plight of the Jews in Soviet Russia. Dr. Nahum Goldman, President of the World Zionist Federation, has stated that accusations against the Soviet Union treatment of Jews were "too often distorted". Whatever the truth, students of international revolution fear that the "anti-Semitic" charges against the Soviet mask projected policies designed to help International Communism. Any exodus of Jews from the Soviet must be regarded with the greatest suspicion. We anticipate commenting more on this important subject at a later date.

## **CAMPAIGN AGAINST RED TRADE FORCES EXAMINATION OF ECONOMIC REALITIES**

League of Rights actionists have in recent months been urging that it is illogical and dangerous for Australia to be sending troops to help defeat Communist aggression in Asia while at the same time supplying wheat, wool and some minerals to Red China. These contradictory policies are being capitalised upon by the enemies of the Government, while they must tend to weaken the morale of the Asian people.

Many members of the Government Parties have replied weakly that while they are unhappy about exports to Red China, these exports help to "strengthen the Australian economy." League actionists have come back stressing that the war against Germany was prosecuted by applying all methods of warfare, including the economic blockade. There was no suggestion of sending Australian wool to Germany, allegedly to help the Australian economy. The point is being stressed that there are no "inexorable economic laws," that financial and economic policies can easily be modified to serve true national interests. It is dangerous to go on developing an Australian primary industry, and the many associated industries, on a Communist market, which can be lost at any moment.

NEW TIMES, AUGUST 1965

Australia should be first concentrating upon making herself as self-sufficient as possible. Genuine trade should be with friendly and like-minded nations prepared to accept international trade for what it should be: an exchange of surpluses to the mutual advantage of those making the exchanges. The Communist conspiracy wages economic as well as other forms of warfare. If the non-Communist world is to survive it is essential that it face up to economic realities. The Fabian Socialists in the Universities and Government bureaucracies will not assist.

## **FLUORINE THE KILLER**

A mysterious poison has been killing Queensland cattle. The Queensland Department of Primary Industries, in "The Country Hour" of the Australian Broadcasting Commission on 28th April, 1965, stated that their scientists had established the fact that fluorine from the soil, absorbed by the gidgee tree, was the cause of the death of cattle that eat the leaves of the tree in times of severe drought.

For many years, the mysterious deaths of cattle in the Georgina River Basin of far western Queensland have baffled graziers and scientists. The beast gets tired and listless, and when being driven in a mob, wants to stay behind. When stirred up and pushed, it drops dead. There are none of the usual signs of poison; only a dead animal without marks or signs of the killing agent.

The scientists have found that the poison is so powerful that it is only five parts per one million parts of the whole tree. They searched for a year to find an antidote for the poison without success. The fluorine affects so many parts of the body that no antidote is effective. —June 1965, issue of Rockhampton Anti-Fluoridation Association's Newsletter.

## **DON'T LEAVE THE DINNER BOOKING TOO LATE**

Bookings for the Annual Dinner, to be held on Friday, September 25, starting at 6.15 p.m., are pouring in. We must warn that it may be a case of "first come, first served." Donations for Dinner are 35/- per person. Supporters should indicate whether they require fish dinners and if they have friends with whom they wish to be seated.

Every effort will be made to provide interstate visitors with private hospitality.

## **DINNER MESSAGES**

Messages from country, interstate and overseas readers are a feature of every Annual Dinner. Those who cannot attend are urged to be present in spirit with an appropriate message. All messages will be on display at the Dinner and published in the special Dinner issue of "The New Times."

## ACTION REPORT

### LEAGUE OF RIGHTS MAKES MAJOR ADVANCES DURING FIRST HALF OF 1965

Over the past seven months the Australian League of Rights has made the biggest advances in its history. Both as the result of its positive campaigning and the mounting smears against the League, the organisation is better known than ever before. The result has been a record number of new supporters. One of the major achievements has been the establishment of the weekly newsletter "On Target." This project has already proved a big success in every way. The circulation continues to expand steadily.

Coinciding with the launching of *On Target*, the League also published for selective distribution the special *Survey* showing how the world was being driven towards the complete monopoly of all power. It was anticipated that 10,000 copies of this special issue might be placed over 1965, but already this number has been distributed with most encouraging results. The maps in this special *Survey* issue have been mounted on heavy cardboard, so that they can be used for display purposes. They are available from the League for 2/6, post-free.

The Federal Government's decision to back the British in Malaysia and the Americans in South Vietnam, precipitated a national debate in which all the subversive forces mobilised themselves against the Government. The League stepped into this debate, not as a partisan supporter of the Government, nor to score any political points for any particular political party, but to clarify the basic issues and to unite public opinion behind a policy of national survival. The League launched its campaign at the Federal Hotel, Melbourne, on May 21, where a well-attended moving carried nearly unanimously three main resolutions on Australia's relationships with South-East Asia, one of these being an appeal to Labor members to put the national interest above party politics and to work to reverse Labor's present foreign policy.

#### Meetings In Four States

Following the Melbourne meeting, the League's National Director, Mr. Eric Butler, has subsequently addressed approximately 30 public meetings, in South Australia, Queensland and N.S.W., all of which have strongly supported military support for the British and Americans in South East Asia. Attendances have been most encouraging at all meetings, and there has been both concern and enthusiasm. Apart from public meetings, Mr. Butler has also addressed a number of service organisations and given a number of radio interviews. His address of the Roma (Queensland) Rotary Club was broadcast over the local radio station. Book sales have been heavy at meetings, and many new subscriptions taken. Press reporting has been excellent in many centres. One feature of the League's activities is the manner in which local RSL sub-branches are assisting with the sponsoring of meetings. In some cases it has also been pleasing to have the co-operation of the local clergy. Mr. Butler reports that it is many years since he has seen such good public meetings.

One of the League's Anti-Communism Schools was held in Adelaide, South Australia, and two in Queensland, in Dalby and Brisbane. These were conducted by Mr. Butler. The first Anti-Communism School in a Victorian country area for this year was recently held at Horsham. It was conducted by the League's Assistant National Director, Mr. E. Rock, and the Chairman of the Church Committee, Mr. Horton Davies. Approximately 40 attended the Horsham School, which was very successful. The local paper gave the school front-page coverage. League speakers have also addressed Church and other groups.

#### Organisation Growing

The League's organisational structure has continued to expand, new Voters' Policy Associations (VPAs) being formed, and older groups have in some cases intensified their activities. Already these action groups have proved that they provide the only basis for a successful grass roots movement in which individuals can associate to apply the principles of association and to obtain the increment of association. Organised and systematic letter writing has already demonstrated what can be done on so many public issues. These action groups provide the answer to the question so often asked "But what can I do?" There are many individuals who in these action groups have found for the first time in their lives that they as individuals can exercise power. It has almost been a spiritual rebirth for many. The League's grass-roots movement can decisively change the course of Australian history. No supporter can afford to remain outside these action groups, or to participate as an individual in the League's expanding activities. He should write immediately to Mr. John Ball (who is the National Director of the VPA structure), 22 Commercial Road, Lower Ferntree Gully, Victoria, asking for advice and information.

#### The League Reserve

The League Reserve, under the direction of Mrs. Janet Lambert, continues to make steady progress with members enjoying a variety of lectures from first-class speakers. The League Reserve's first Seminar, held on Saturday, July 30, was rated a big success. The theme of the Seminar was Fabian Socialism. Mr. E. Rock and Mr. A. McPherson presented Papers.

## "PERMISSIVE MORALITY'

Elizabeth Dobbs in "Housewives Today," July 1965.

Most of us observe with dismay the change in morals that has been taking place in this country in the last thirty years. In this book\* Mr. and Mrs. Whiteley describe this change in respect of sex, parent-child relationship, the treatment of criminals and individual responsibility. They set us asking what these changes mean: how have they come about? Where will they lead?

The authors examine this complex of moral relationships in the context of the changing social background from which they have emerged — new modes of work, new relationships between workers and employers, new ways of living in the home, greater affluence. They detail modern achievements in the arts, modern doctrines of philosophy, psychiatry and education, and current practices in publicity, and show how all these mesh together to encourage and enhance what they call the Permissive Morality. The name is properly descriptive. They conclude that though all of these factors exacerbate the new laxity, none of them can be held to originate it.

Their argument traces the change directly to the transfer of responsibility for the results of action at work, from the individual to the institution or organisation, in all the fields of activity they survey: but primarily to the economics of how he earns his living. In the vast increase of mass-production in factories the individual has been purposely relieved of responsibility for the effects of his work. He earns a better living than he did. But the quality of his work no longer bears any intimate or immediate effect on either the end product, or the living he gains from contributing to it. The response he gets, in recognition and in money, no longer relates to the effort and care he puts into his employment. Responsibility has to a large degree been removed from his work, and with it most of the interest. Interest has shifted to concern for personal comfort in the doing.

This attitude, transferred to education, has resulted in the uncritical acquiescence in the objects and methods of education: the state is responsible for educating the children - They-know-best - - and the parent is only concerned that the process is comfortable and indulgent to children and parent alike. An indulgent and irresponsible atmosphere breeds indulgent and irresponsible — permissive — morals. Similarly, society is held to be responsible for the crooked growth, and so the crimes, of criminals, the aberrations of those misfits. They are no longer held to be responsible for what they have done, but must be treated, straightened, reconditioned to fit into the majority system as though they were machines or animals. In the Health Service, too, the doctor is held responsible for the health of his patient *to the state*, not to the patient himself. In every field the individual is "relieved of responsibility." As the authors point out, "If the ordinary person is to be relieved of responsibility, some few persons

\*The Permissive Morality by C. H. & Winifred M. Whiteley: Methuen. 15s.

in authority must undertake it on his behalf." They add that unless we do something about it soon the present Permissive Society is bound to develop into something closely resembling Huxley's Brave New World.

Mr. and Mrs. Whiteley restrict themselves to the change of morals shown by the individual's behaviour to other individuals. A look at the activity of collective institutions, and particularly the State, in the moral field, reinforces their conclusions only too strongly.

### Collective Institutions

The most obvious development is a tendency for the State not only to try to *be* people's conscience, but to push people into adopting collectivist dogma as their own morals. They are encouraged to regard the treatment of men as a collectivity as essentially *moral*, while dealing with men as individuals is regarded, almost, as *immoral*. The wish for different schooling for one's own children — public schools or a home education — or for private doctoring, instead of being regarded as interestingly original, is more and more decried as being immoral. Although the origin of this attitude is the argument that only some people can afford it, no-one suggests the obvious remedy, that *everyone should be made able to afford such a choice*: if only a marginal number of people chose such an alternative the State can afford an allocation of educational funds as subsidy; if large numbers proved eager to take advantage of such a system, it would certainly be time for the State system to wither away accordingly. Otherwise democracy is mocked: though collectivism, of course, is served. For the people who benefit from the deformation of morals are those who control the monopoly system of education. None of the next generation would escape indoctrination of some sort.

But interference by the State in the shaping of morals goes much further than verbal pressure. The hazards of breaking State regulations are, and to a growing extent, much greater than those of offending against the private individual. Boys who attacked a girl at a bus-stop were fined five pounds or so each; few civil regulations cost as little to break. Under the present law, murder the lady in the sweet shop in the process of robbing her, and you need not fear the hangman (unless you do it with a gun): murder a policeman, or a warder, and you are hanged however you kill them, —not because they are just people, but because they are State employees, and sacrosanct. Thus in the most practical way we are being led to regard offences against the State as far more serious than those against the individual man or woman. Once we accept this attitude, even if only by the oversight of not noticing it, the machinery is set up to operate a dictatorship of the most stringent type. On the one hand, people have been accustomed to an irresponsible lack of *concern* with what the State chooses to do—They-know-best—and on the other, penalties have closed in and they are afraid to protest.

Permissive and indulgent private morals, then, form one side of a most threatening pincer movement, and the changing standard of social morals the other. We have seen the same conditions in Soviet Russia and in Hitler's Ger-

many; we have no wish to follow through the process. The irresponsibility documented by Mr. and Mrs. Whiteley is the obverse of the totalitarian state. It is just as necessary an ingredient to totalitarianism as is the Strong Man himself.

What's to do about it? The authors, having with moderation and care tracked down the source of the change in private morals to the changed pattern of responsibility, go on to suggest that economic responsibility be developed in two ways. Firstly they recommend the production of a greater range of consumer goods for people to choose from, and that choice should be unhampered by over-standardisation or too biased advertising. And secondly, more important, they suggest that it should be arranged that each man has some measure of responsibility for the quality of his work in production, either individually or in a small group. Only in this way can his self-respect be maintained. They end, "We shall have to foster self-respect through individual responsibility."

However, on the preceding page these conclusions are disastrously qualified: —

"But it is probably the economic order which is crucial in setting the pattern of our lives and attitudes. And here it is clear that, however much we value liberty, economic liberalism is an out-of-date creed. It is impossible to restore to the freelance craftsman or professional or to the small independent entrepreneur their one-time importance in the economy. And it is certainly not desirable to undo what has been done by way of collective provision for individual misfortunes. We need the Welfare State. Now the Welfare State will only work if there is a high degree of organisation from the top, if industrial production and labour conditions are planned on a large scale and if social services are devised centrally and administered in gross . . . if in fact many formerly individual decisions are taken out of individual hands."

Here is a qualification, which makes nonsense of their conclusions.

Only if each individual automatically receives the response, both good and bad, from his own actions, will he come to *care* about the results. Only through caring will he develop any sense of morals, rather than expediency. This holds in both economic and personal spheres of his experience. It must be remedied in both. But he will care most, and most immediately, about the bringing up of his family, their health and his own, their behaviour, their education, their prospects and his own—exactly those personal issues at present removed from his decision by the Welfare State. These are the primary fields of responsibility, involving his affections and shaping all he works *for*. But Mr. and Mrs. Whiteley seem to be so mesmerised by the centralised *shape* of the present social services as to shrink from advocating alteration even where it maims people's characters.

## The Remedy

It cannot be too strongly emphasised that there is no *practical* reason why the Welfare State should not work along channels of responsibility for the individual. There is no *physical* reason why it should not make available to each man not merely what "it" decides is best for him, but what he chooses to choose. This is a matter of money, of tickets, of accounting systems—mechanisms that can be used, within the limits of physical possibility, to innumerable ends. The enormous physical resources involved could well be used to underwrite each person's choice as regards children, doctor and conditions of work, and could deal with each person as an individual capable of making the choice. It would be perfectly possible to invent an appropriate and efficient ticket system.

In such a situation, many would choose what they have now. But choosing it *responsibly* would affect the quality of the services offered. Others, who chose outside the norm (again within the limits of their share of the physical resources made available) would thereby issue a challenge calling out invention, ingenuity, initiative—all the opportunities people hanker after and for which they emigrate.

Of course people would make mistakes. But we cannot have it both ways. Either we are free to choose, which means we may choose wrong and must be allowed to choose wrong, and take the consequences; or, we may give up the choice (be "relieved of responsibility"), when someone else will do it for us in the same way that we do for our animals. We look after them well, but we make their major decisions for them.

The business of choosing is more difficult than it appears: the immediately seductive rarely proves to give the satisfaction that it promises. And this is where the Permissive Morality will, in the end, fail. When people observe by experience that licence does not make a satisfactory life, that happiness is something that cannot be got by direct search and only comes as a by-product in working for something else, for longer-term aims—then they will, with good sense, look round for long-term aims.

The expert on this sort of choice is the Christian Church: Christians believe that God created men with free will in order that, though free to choose wrong they should of free will choose good. The Christian aim is to permit the emergence of self-governing, self-conscious individuals exercising free will and choosing good *because* it is good. The energising factor is attraction, not compulsion. The Christian knows about long-term choice, and it is the practical application of this knowledge, both to the individual and to individuals acting together in communities, that is necessary today. The first requisite is to stop further centralisation of power to decide policy; the second to decentralise this power, as and where we can, so that people may make their own decisions, for good or bad, and in doing so sort out the kind of satisfaction that suits them. There is no need for any to starve in the process. There is no need for the less fortunate to lack protection. But unless the economy is geared to respond immediately and as of right to a

diverse and flourishing multiplicity of such aims, then the young people with life and ability and knowledge and zest will go somewhere else where they think these opportunities do exist, as many are doing now.

The necessary next step in social evolution is already well known—how to keep the control of policy in the hands of every man and woman in the nation even though increasing mass production demands some centralised control of the technique of production. We do not believe that the people whose culture was the seed-bed for these ideas will not have the common sense in the end to grasp the meaning of the experiences they are now undergoing: and build freedom on to them.

---

## "DRAMA" AT NEW ENGLAND UNIVERSITY

Just prior to Mr. Eric Butler's recent address at the New England University, Armidale, N.S.W., a few students with Nazi armbands on marched in, soon followed by another group dressed as members of the Klu Klux Klan. The Student's journal had attempted to smear Mr. Butler and the League of Rights before his arrival.

Waiting until the student laughter had died down, Mr. Butler said he was pleased to see that there was a drama group at the University and hoped that it would continue with its stage presentations! He then addressed the students, obtaining a good hearing. Opposition was led by a Mr. Christiansen, son of Professor Christiansen, pro-Communist at Sydney University and brother-in-law of Mr. Ted Hill, leader of the Chinese faction of the Communist conspiracy.

---

## ERIC BUTLER DEBATES AT MONASH UNIVERSITY

The hall was not large enough to accommodate all those who wished to hear Mr. Eric Butler debate at the Monash (Victoria) University on June 15. His opponent was Left-wing lecturer in history, Mr. Graeme Duncan. Mr. Duncan's debating methods may be judged by his observation that the League of Rights "was nasty, not Nazi." He has subsequently ignored written questions from Mr. Butler, concerning statements he made during the debate. This debate, and publicity in the Monash University paper, "Lots Wife", have resulted in Monash students becoming interested in the League and its activities.

### KEEP THIS DATE FREE

Saturday, September 25, is the League of Rights' Annual Seminar. This year the central theme will be Australia's relationship to the Communist threat in Asia. Three outstanding experts will present Papers. This function will be an absolute feast. All details in September issue of "The New Times."

## HAVE WE ABANDONED SOCIAL CREDIT?

From time to time we are still asked the above question, generally by people who never grasped the true essence of Social Credit. As the author of Social Credit, C. H. Douglas, never tired of pointing out, Social Credit is the policy of a philosophy. It is not merely some monetary reform scheme.

Writing in *The Social Crediter* of October 16, 1948, Douglas said:

"There is a certain body of opinion which is under the impression that we have abandoned the financial aspect of Social Credit. In this connection, we are reminded of a pungent criticism made some years ago, that the great disadvantage under which the Social Credit movement then laboured, was that it was largely composed of Socialists who wanted nationalisation of banking.

"People who hold this type of opinion have not taken the trouble to grasp the fundamental subject matter with which we have always been concerned, which is the relationship of the individual to the group. Thirty years ago, that relationship was predominantly a financial relationship. Quite largely through the exertions of Socialists, strongly assisted by the highest powers of International Finance, the Central Banks have become practically impregnable, and the sanctions, which they exert, have shifted from the bank balance to the Order-in-Council.

"It ought to be, but unfortunately it is not, apparent to everyone who takes an intelligent interest in these matters, that the fundamental problem has been greatly complicated by the developments of the past twenty years; and that the immediate issue is in the realm of Law and military power, not of book-keeping. That does not mean in the least that book-keeping is one penny the less important than it was when we directed attention to it; but it does mean that it is the second trench to be taken, not the first. For that, we have to thank in great part, the obsession with "nationalised" banking.

"The problem presented by the centralised ('majority') political vote is the same in its fundamentals as that of which it is only another manifestation—the monopoly of credit."

If Douglas believed in 1948 that "The immediate issue is in the realm of Law and military power," then clearly this is still the major issue 17 years later as the world is convulsed by the strategy of international revolutionaries. No realistic financial reform is possible if the basis of Civilisation is subverted. Once inside the World Police State, irrespective of the label, discussions on financial techniques would be merely of academic interest. This does not mean that knowledge of finance and economics is not essential for a complete grasp of the world situation. Our Social Credit Training Course is available for those wishing to study it. But our most urgent immediate task is to defeat the more militant manifestations of the conspiracy against Civilization. Military strength is a first essential.

porters of this drive. The famous Prussian Bismarck, another supporter of centralisation, made the pertinent observation concerning his relationship with the German Socialists that "We march separately, but we march together." The international financiers and the Communists may march separately, but they are certainly marching in parallel formation towards the same type of objective. Consider for example the role of Fabian Socialist Walter Lippmann, one of the most widely read publicists in the whole world. Lippmann has consistently supported the policy of an "integrated" Europe and never during his long career has he attacked the anti-social and revolutionary policies of the controllers of the Money Power. No realistic study of world revolution is possible without a study of both International Communism and International Finance.

### **Monopolists Fear Competition**

The main fear of all monopolists is competition from those outside their control. The creation of an integrated Western Europe, the first and essential step towards integration with Eastern Europe, received powerful backing from the revolutionary groups in the U.S.A. backing President John Kennedy. But the big problem was how to bring Britain with its political and constitutional traditions to enter the European Economic Community. Britain as the senior member of a group of similar independent nations, constituted a serious potential threat to the monopolists. The first attempts to bring Britain into an integrated Europe failed for a number of reasons. They provoked tremendous resistance in Britain and throughout the British Commonwealth. President de Gaulle of France temporarily ended the controversy when he applied the French veto against the British attempt to enter the Common Market. But in retrospect it could prove that this step by de Gaulle in 1963 provided the revolutionaries with more time in which to "soften up" the British nations from within before making another major attempt to force Britain into the European Economic Community. Britain's financial difficulties are being exploited in an attempt to force the British to commit suicide as an independent nation.

Even if an integrated Western Europe is eventually taken over by Communism successfully operating the strategy we have outlined, complete Communist domination of the world could still be denied by an independent Britain leading an independent British Commonwealth in association with the U.S.A. and South Africa. Decentralised military power, based upon decentralised economic power, still makes the British Commonwealth one of the most formidable barriers to the final Communist take-over, as Dr. Sukarno and his Communist backers are discovering in Malaysia. This power would be even greater if more realistic financial and economic policies were pursued by British Commonwealth nations. Britain's present difficulties are serious enough. But how much more serious these difficulties would have been if Britain had gained admittance

to the Common Market and were now involved in the increasing internal frictions inside the European Economic Community. So long as some freedom of action is retained, the British Commonwealth can still operate as a barrier on the periphery of the expanding Communist Empire. But once that freedom is lost, the end is in sight. If that happens, the Americans would face their fate alone.

### **Still Time For Salvation**

If the peoples of the British Commonwealth and the Americans realise the end the Common Market is serving, they will unite in rejecting all policies of economic integration with the Communist Empire, realising that such integration is in fact a major step towards the World Communist State. At present the sad truth is that they are competing between themselves to further this economic integration: Australia and Canada, for example, by building their economies on expanding wheat and other exports to Red China, while the Americans extend increased economic assistance via liberal credits to the "mellowing" Communist regimes of Eastern Europe. There may be just time in which to halt the present policies of death and to move towards saner objectives.

### **A WARNING!**

Year by year the Annual Dinner of "The New Times" has been expanding. It is anticipated that a record attendance this year will place a serious strain upon seating accommodation. Those intending to attend, particularly interstate visitors, are therefore urged to make definite bookings as early as possible. The donation for the Dinner will, in spite of inflation, be held at 35/- per person.

This year's Dinner will be held on Friday, September 24, and will, as usual, coincide with Melbourne Show Week. The principal guest of honour will be an outstanding expert on international affairs, who will present a Paper at the League of Rights Seminar the following day, September 25.

Last year a number of non-earning University students were able to attend as the guests of supporters who very generously donated to New Times Ltd. for this purpose. We suggest that many supporters might act similarly this year, thus enabling some of our growing number of students to attend this important annual function.

As usual, country and interstate visitors requiring hospitality are asked to let us know as soon as practicable.

We must stress that should seating capacity be over-taxed by the number wishing to attend, we will have no alternative to allocating seats to those who have made firm bookings first.