

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. 31, No. 11

November 1965

THE PROMOTION OF "ANTI-SEMITISM"

A NEW ZIONIST-COMMUNIST OFFENSIVE AGAINST LEAGUE OF RIGHTS

Yet another major offensive, with Zionists and Communists running in double harness, has been launched against the Australian League of Rights, with a special vicious character-assassination campaign being directed against Mr. Eric Butler, the League's National Director. Once again the rank and file of the Jewish people, many of them opposed to Zionism, are the victims of a campaign they do not understand. When Mr. Isi Leibler, official spokesman for the Victorian Jewish Board of Deputies, said in the Melbourne "Herald" of October 7 that "Jews were becoming more concerned with Mr. Butler's activities", he was unfortunately furthering the idea that all Jews are Communists, or are sympathetic to Communism. In fact the total result of the campaign being run against the League of Rights can only promote "anti-Semitism". We suggest that the real promoters of this campaign know this.

Mr. Leibler says that he is gravely concerned about the progress that the League of Rights is making. But he and others attacking the League keep on claiming that the League's anti-Communism and support for the free society and private enterprise is only a "smokescreen" behind which "anti-Semitism" (whatever this really means) is being advanced. Unless Mr. Leibler is a victim of some form of hysteria, and has genuinely deluded himself into believing that the League of Rights is plotting to pop him into a gas chamber, the only logical conclusion is that he is deliberately attempting to halt the League's anti-Communist programme. We must take Mr. Leibler at his own assessment; that he is an intelligent man capable of researching any subject competently. The question to be studied, therefore, is why does Mr. Leibler, a Zionist, and an alleged anti-Communist, run a parallel campaign with the Communists against the League of Rights, making the same false allegations circulated by the Communists.

Last year Mr. Leibler was given space in *The Bulletin* to attack Mr. D. J. Killen, M.P., and Norman Banks, well-known radio and TV personality. It is not without interest that the associate editor of *The Bulletin* at present is Mr. Sam Lipski, who has also attempted to smear Mr. Butler in the past. He has also received praise from Mr. Leibler. Mr. Leibler's "line" was that there was an "anti-Semitic unity-ticket" between Butler, Killen and Banks. The main attack was on Mr. Killen, who was bluntly warned that there could be serious repercussions if he did not dissociate himself from Mr. Butler. Mr. Leibler admitted that Mr. Killen had never said or written anything "anti-Semitic" in his life. But he attacked publicly one of the most competent anti-Communists in the Federal Parliament. Mr. Leibler constantly attempts to create the impression that he is a strong anti-Communist, but we have seen no evidence of his anti-Communist activities. He appears to reserve his energies for attacking those who are engaged in dealing with the Communist challenge. Another interesting feature of Mr. Leibler's activities is that he is guilty of practising that which he claims to be attacking. Let us consider the subject of "unity-tickets".

Mr. Leibler's "Unity Ticket"

Mr. Leibler endorses the activities of the "democratic Socialists" responsible for the publication of *Dissent*. This quarterly has also smeared Mr. Butler. It has been favourably mentioned in the Melbourne Communist *Guardian*. The *Dissent* booklet, *Voices of Hate*, by K. D. Gott, is one of the most vicious attempts at character assassination ever seen in Australian politics. As Mr. Leibler has associated himself with this filthy attack on Mr. Butler, then he cannot complain about the inevitable reaction against it. And he cannot complain when it is pointed out that the Gott booklet, rejected by a number of printers, had to be eventually printed by a firm in which Left-wing members of the ALP are the principal shareholders, and has subsequently been favourably reviewed by the Communist and Left-wing press of Australia. Mr. Leibler is sharing a type of "unity-ticket" with the Communists he is supposed to be opposing.

We now turn to the attack on the League of Rights at the recent Melbourne Anglican Synod. The Rev. D. Pope, closely allied with the Solly Sachs mission to Australia last year, moved a motion at the Synod concerning "anti-Semitism" in Russia. This is a favourite subject with Mr. Leibler, although some of his fellow Zionists in other parts of the world do not agree with his interpretation of the situation in the Soviet Union. The Pope resolution reflected Mr. Leibler's views. The Rev. Pope made no reference to discrimination against Christians in Soviet Russia. But he did use the Synod to make an attack on the Australian League of Rights, falsely claiming that its members were "secretly infiltrating" the Churches to spread "anti-Semitism". He offered no evidence to support his outrageous views, but subsequently referred to the Gott booklet. Evidence of the Rev. Pope's alliance with Mr. Leibler was provided in an interview reported in *The Australian Jewish Herald* of October 15. Asked "What action do you propose to take against Butler?" Mr. Pope replied, "I am prepared to support any action that the Jewish community plan to take against the League of Rights." He recalled his association with

Continued on Page 8

THE GREAT BETRAYAL

By C. H. Douglas

Many of our newer readers will not have seen an essay bearing the above title which first appeared in "The Social Crediter" (England) in 1948. For the benefit of both old and new readers we are republishing most of this essay, in which the author provides both valuable historical background material and observations against which subsequent events can be more adequately assessed.

In the course of a speech delivered on April 12, 1948, in the Canadian House of Commons, Mr. Norman Jaques, M.P., said:

"Speaking of internationalism and the real purpose and motive of internationalism. I have made a few notes on the social credit analysis of the hidden motives behind this drive for internationalism. It is an essential strategy for world dictatorship. The central strategy is to gain the monopoly of credit and of world propaganda so as systematically and continuously to spread false doctrines and to exploit the inevitable confusion resulting from putting such false doctrines into practice. This exploitation takes the form of centralising every kind of control, the creation of greater and greater monopolies leading to the police state, and to the final step of world government by world cartels controlled by international financiers. Some of the meshes of this international net are U.N.R.R.A., Bretton Woods, emergency food board and U.N.E.S.C.O., by which nations surrender control of their credit, food supplies and propaganda; in other words, a world cartel of credits, propaganda and food to be used as sanctions against any recalcitrant countries.

"National sovereignty is an obstacle in the way of these international socialists and would-be dictators. An inner ring of internationalists, extending to many countries, repudiate loyalty to the country of their adoption; they give their loyalty to their international ring and its ideals. Through their control of financial policy they are able to exert a controlling influence over the governments of the countries in which they live. Their plan is to replace national with corporate government, the control being within the international ring. This is the empire of international cartels with the international financier as the emperor. With them war is a means to an end. War is 'the pursuit of policy by other means.' These internationalists work to a plan. Let me name some of them. Mond sets up a chemical cartel linked with Germany and America. Samuel recommends state ownership of coal. Isaacs (Lord Reading), negotiates a war debt settlement with Wall Street, binding the British to undisclosed terms. Sieff sets up political and economic planning, using the war as an excuse to overcome opposition. Cassel finances the London school of economics to train the bureaucracy for the future world socialist state. Laski preaches class—that is civil—war. The state assumes the ownership of coal and other real assets, and international finance involves the state in dollar debt. The socialists bankrupt the state, and the international financiers foreclose on the physical assets. In the meantime the people, forced into the factories under the slogan 'Work or

Want', are controlled by quotas and ration books, ticketed and dossiered by social security.

"That, Mr. Speaker, is a brief but, I believe, absolutely true picture of the real motives behind this drive for international government, and the surrender of national sovereignty to international control."

About the same time, a circular emanating from the publishers of a much advertised Foreign Affairs précis, remarked, "The public is not only ignorant of large facts, as for example the reason why America [*sic*] changed her whole foreign policy, but also of almost all constructive information . . . That we should be in want is fantastic. It is the result of utter incompetence, lack of vision, of Government by managerial mediocrities."

Now it would appear at first sight that Mr. Jaques and the author of the circular in question are putting forward mutually incompatible theories. Mr. Jaques is saying that the disintegration and betrayal of the British Empire is the outcome of internationalists possessing ability of the highest order, as well as immense, perhaps almost unlimited resources. The circular *seems* to contend exactly the opposite, that now, if not previously, "Britain" has come into the control of stupid "mediocrities" whose incompetence is a sufficient explanation of our discontents.

These two aspects of what is only one fact will be familiar, perhaps to the point of weariness, to the more serious students of Social Credit literature, to go no further afield. They relate, of course, to the utilisation of the proletariat to destroy the aristocracy for the benefit of High Finance. They can be synthesised in the statement that history is crystallised politics; it is not a string of disconnected episodes. It is not accidental that we are pursuing a suicidal policy under half-baked careerists trained by aliens sneering at patriotism; it was not accidental that such men as Mr. Benjamin Cohen and Mr. Schmucl Gilman (Sidney Hillman) spent much of their very valuable time in "Britain" when we were "in war, or under threat of war"; it was very far from accidental that Mr. Churchill adumbrated the liquidation of the British Empire in 1942, or that Mr. Attlee, who is reported to have said in 1934 "We have absolutely abandoned any idea of national loyalty, and we are deliberately putting a world order before loyalty to our own country," should have become Prime Minister of what we are so anxious to proclaim is a second-rate Power.

Perhaps, least of all, is it accidental that Earl Mountbatten, the son of a German and the husband of Sir Ernest Cassel's grand-daughter, should be the last Vice-

roy of India. When we examine even cursorily the fantastic financial transactions which have characterised the "defence" of India, the necessity for a Viceroy with the broadest possible views becomes evident, although it is equally evident that the British population "couldn't care less." The Soviet writer, E. Varga (*Foreign Affairs*, July, 1947), claims that "Britain" lost nearly a quarter of her national wealth, a figure he put at £7,500,000,000. These figures do not include war damage or depreciation.

In 1939 Great Britain had more (probably considerably more) than £1,500,000,000 in investments and credits in India. By 1946 she had lost all this and owed India £1,400,000,000.

The English middle classes are ruined, the "workers" temporarily are enriched, and permanently enslaved. We must not, however, make the mistake of assuming that no one has "won."

Even quite small traitors have done nicely.

II

It is almost certain that the genesis of the Parliamentary victory of the so-called "Labour" Party (in 1945) can be found in the conditions imposed on Mr. Churchill in 1940 after Dunkirk as a condition of "Labour" support, and the situation at this time can be synthesised by observing that *every party outside Mr. Chamberlain's group was being advised by the same international body*, and that the present interests of that body are geographically centred in New York. In consequence the complete elimination of Great Britain as a Power is essential to the role so engagingly recalled by Mrs. Roosevelt, that "Britain" is the first line of defence of the United States. "That," added Mrs. Roosevelt recently, "is true to-day." That is a proud thought for the survivors of the British Empire.

Obviously, every piece of advice, now practically amounting to an order, which was tendered by Mr. Roosevelt's entourage has been good advice—as viewed from Wall Street and Washington. And, in the main, Mr. Churchill took that advice, which probably included a suggestion to hand over the post-war baby to the trained arms of Mr. Attlee and the London School of Economics.

Briefly, then, the public at large may have lost the peace once again, Great Britain may now be "Britain" but with the aid of significant sections of all political parties, we have achieved the proud position of the First Line of Defence of the U.S.A., are in process of becoming a Work State on a standard of living arranged from Washington, America will be free to treat the world as her oyster while we fight for her mistakes, will take what she wants from us, and give us what she can't use herself, and it will, and has, become clear that as in Hitlerite Germany and Russia, only fools will work either manually or technically—all the knowing ones will be good Party politicians.

NEW TIMES, NOVEMBER 1965.

It has been the fashion in Bloomsbury, and in those places where the Fabians sing, to jeer at the British Empire ("pure Kipling, old boy, ha! ha!") and in general the ways of the Victorians. While many valid criticisms can be made both of the organism and the period, most of them traceable to that financial system the Fabians are so careful not to attack, it would be a cardinal error not to assess the significance of this attitude. Passing over the fact that the Socialist is not naturally a traveller or an adventurer, except in the less desirable sense of the word (the very roots of Socialism are antipathetic to individual initiative) he is a worshipper of logic—of pure reason, which he mistakes for intelligence. The Fabian Society itself is the descendant of the Encyclopaedists who ushered in the Age of Reason. That this is not a British trait—in fact, the typical Englishman distrusts logic to a degree which denies it its legitimate use—is only one of many indications of the alien philosophy sapping our native vigour. The *premises* for arguments in favour of the Empire are in the main hidden, and the deductive method does not apply. But the *proofs* are clear, even if to the man in the street, the reasons are not, that the British Empire was a far more admirable growth than any mechanistic League or Union of Nations, precisely because it was not reasonable—it was organic.

(III)

There is really no room for doubt as to the nature and origin of the attack on the British Empire. It is fundamentally a cultural attack intended to eliminate or at least minimise the conception of human "quality" by substituting "equality"; and a recognition of this fact is the only key to a situation which is otherwise a mass of unrelated contradictions. It is an international attack, utilising national forces.

Attempts to define a culture are always unsatisfactory and inadequate, and the explanation of this can, I think, be found in its nature, which is four dimensional—it has an extension in Time, or it is not a culture. The ruling culture of the British Empire, and the feature which distinguishes it from many other contemporaries is tradition, *i.e.*, it is a true, not a spurious culture; and it is tradition more than any other factor, which the sponsors of dialectical materialism, Socialism, Marxism, and Communism attack. There is little doubt that behind all of these is a Power which is completely aware of the reality of extension in Time, and of the immense dangers to which humanity is exposed by "a break with tradition." It is perhaps unnecessary to add that an extension in Time is only *one dimension*, but it is a *fundamental of quality*, ("My word shall *not* pass away.")

Perhaps as elementary an introduction to this subject, in the political sense, as any other, is afforded by Spain under General Franco.

Times being what they are, it may be necessary to insist that I have neither intention nor desire to apologise for

General Franco, if he requires apology. What I do see quite clearly is that, with his associates, he defeated a primary attempt of Judaeo-Freemasonry, the Power which is using tradition to destroy tradition; that he stands as a protagonist, and a not unsuccessful protagonist, of the opposition to Judaeo-Masonic-Communism; that the culture of the British Empire, and its traditional basis, was a primary obstacle to the Masonic World Plan; and that, whether we like it or not, our natural ally in the present struggle is "Franco-Spain." And perhaps one of the greatest services rendered by the Canadian Royal Commission on Espionage was to uncover the existence of *e.g.*, *Englishmen*, "who placed loyalty to a (un-named) world Power above that which they owed to their own country"—a situation with which General Franco had to, and did, deal.

On April 17, 1948, the Washington (U.S.A.) *Times-Herald* published in a leader, portions of a correspondence which apparently passed between Sir Samuel Hoare, now Lord Templewood, then British Ambassador to Spain, and General Franco. So far as I am aware, this correspondence has not been published here. It may be noticed in passing that Lord Templewood belongs to a Quaker-Whig banking family, and that he was in Moscow at the time of the fall of the Czar.

On February 21, 1943, General Franco wrote to Sir Samuel Hoare:

"Our alarm at Russian advances is common not only to neutral nations, but also to all those people in Europe who have not yet lost their sensibilities and their realization of the peril.

"Communism is an enormous menace to the whole world and now it is sustained by the victorious armies of a great country, all those not blind must wake up.

"If the war's course continues unaltered it is evident that the Russian army will penetrate deeply into German territory. If this comes to pass, would it not be of the greatest danger for the Continent and for England, a sovietized Germany which would furnish Russia her secrets and war constructions, her engineers and specialists, giving that country the opportunity of building a huge empire extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific coasts?

"We think the situation extremely serious and we appeal to the British people's good sense to consider the matter; for if Russia occupies Germany nothing and nobody will stop her.

"If Germany did not exist, we Europeans would have to invent it, and it is ridiculous to think that she could be replaced by a confederation of Lithuanians, Poles, Czechs and Rumanians, who would rapidly convert to a confederation of Soviet states."

The test of science is prophecy.

Now listen to the sapience of the Quaker-Banker-Whig. He wrote:

"You say the greatest European danger is communism and that a Russian victory would mean the triumph of

communism in European countries that would bring the destruction of European civilization and of Christian culture.

"Our point of view is, on the contrary, entirely different..."

"The feasible situation at the end of the war will be thus: French, English and American armies will occupy the European continent. These armies will be supplied with the best war weapons and would include fresh, first order troops, not wasted and tired as those of Russia's armies.

"I dare to bear prophecy that, at the moment, **the greatest military power in Europe will without doubt be that of Great Britain . . .** Consequently, British influence will be the greatest ever seen in Europe since the time of Napoleon's downfall.

"This influence will be supported by an enormous military power . . . with it we shall maintain full influence in all Europe and will help her reconstruction.

"So I accept no fear of afterwar Russian danger for Europe. Nor can I accept the idea that Russia will, at the end of the war, follow an anti-European policy of her own."

(IV)

Perhaps it is desirable, at this stage, to bring again into prominence the practical importance of recognising the world's ills as the result of a long-term policy. A skilful propaganda to the contrary has been linked with anti-Christianity. Reference to the subject has been made before, but, *e.g.*, the course of events in Alberta demonstrates that it will bear constant recall.

The first point on which to be clear is that if we are *not* faced with a long-term policy, our position is quite hopeless. If every step in the industrial arts merely confronts us with more devastating wars, more restrictions and controls, and, except in the United States, a lower standard of life, mankind is so hopelessly perverse that his only tolerable future lies in early annihilation, more especially in view of our decreasing (average) intelligence. But if we are facing a satanic policy, our position, although very serious, is not necessarily irremediable. But we must first face the facts. No policy, no cure. Clear policy, clear problem. A problem clearly stated is half solved. The second aspect of this situation is equally indisputable. Policies *in vacuo* are a contradiction in terms. Policies embody strategies; you do not fight a strategy, you fight the human beings who are carrying out that strategy. "It's the system we're fighting not men" is one of those half-truths which are of the greatest assistance to the Enemy Generals.

Akin to this is the "anti-anti" or "anti-negative" propaganda. Without attaching too much importance to the fact that a double negative is a positive (*i.e.*, an anti-anti Jew or Russian is, by definition, a pro-Jew or Russian, not a neutral) it is fairly obvious that the main use of this technique is to stampede the innocent into disclosing

NEW TIMES, NOVEMBER 1965.

their position, thus being put on the defensive. The best defence is attack. Do you propose to allow your enemy a monopoly of it?

This raises the question of (a) The inimical objective; (b) The Enemy troops.

For clarity and brevity it would be difficult to improve on St. Matthew 8-9: "And the devil taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain, and sheweth him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them; And saith unto him, All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down, and worship me." That is an offer of World Dominion, on condition of the acceptance of collectivism—the worship of the group idea.

In these days we are fortunate in one thing, if in no more. We can actually see and read in our daily paper that the devil's offer has been accepted, and two attempts, the League of Nations, and U.N.O. have been set up. By their fruits, ye shall know them.

Now as to the troops. As Mr. Jaques so clearly brought out in his speech, much, and probably the most important part of the organisation of the World State is financial and industrial—the control of credit and raw materials.

While it is difficult to deny the existence of such organisations as the international chemical trust, the World Bank and international monetary fund and similar world cartels, because they are visible to the eye and mentioned in the newspapers, their relation to the world state is not so visible and not so easily exposed. But if we grasp the fact that the essence of Communism, which is the politics of the World State, is centralised vesting of the planet in an organisation expropriating and cutting across all local and personal sovereignty, we cannot be much in error if we identify internationalists, open or concealed, with treason to the individual and his race and country. In an earlier part of the speech by Mr. Jaques to which reference has been made, he remarked, "The hon. Member for Macleod said, if I remember correctly, that there are just two kinds of people in the Civil Liberties Association (a Canadian "Red Front"), traitors and stooges, the dupes." *Caeteris paribus*, it appears to me to be true that any organisation which is working to transfer sovereignty from those who are associated under a national constitution, to those who have secretly concocted an international constitution by the misuse of national resources, whether those persons are working inside or outside the country, are enemies of, and traitors to, believers in the national conception. Their motives may be diverse and obscure; but when you see an enemy soldier, obviously working for your destruction, you do not investigate his motives, you shoot.

There are myriads of organisations which are working to destroy nationality (*not* Stateship) ranging from the highly "respectable" Royal Institute of International Affairs openly financed by cartels (Chatham House, whose secretary, Dr. Townbee, said "we are working secretly, but with all our might, to undermine the sovereignty of our

respective nations") to the hundreds of Communist shop-stewards in industry working like musk-rats to cripple and disrupt local control. And, it should be remembered—there is a lucrative career in it.

The "Canadian" Broadcasting Corporation is notoriously "Red", and the genealogy of its parent organisation, the "B".B.C, as well as its peculiar form of extra-national management and its link with the patent monopoly of the Marconi network, can best be viewed as the functionalised monopoly of information. The London School of Economics has linked internationalists (frequently, but not always, Jews) in key positions in Canada, Australia, and New Zealand.

So far as the population of these islands is concerned, the triumphs of the traitors has produced swift and spectacular results. Mr. Attlee's Administration claims that there are more persons gainfully employed (*i.e.*, being paid paper money) than ever before. Not only that, but they are (so it is said) more efficiently directed, using more power and better machines and methods than would have been deemed possible in the time.

To which I should myself comment that not ten *per cent* of the population is really better off, by which I mean has more control over its material and spiritual destiny, than it had fifty years ago, and this includes the New Kommissary, and ninety *per cent* are not merely worse off, but their prospects are infinitely worse. That is where they have been brought by "traitors and stooges," in an era of unparalleled advancement in the industrial arts, directly and solely due to individual initiative.

If that were all, it would be serious enough. But the basic wealth of a nation is in its intangibles. It is faith which moves mountains, and the decline of faith is perhaps the most noticeable change in the general population. No-one believes in anything or anyone, any more. Let us eat, drink, and be merry in the Black Market, for tomorrow one more big racket will be put over on us. So far from the consumer being always right, he no longer has any rights, he merely has a few coupons. He doesn't give his orders to the shopkeeper, he gets what the "Co-operative" decides to let him have, of any quality or none, and if he doesn't like it, he mustn't throw it away—it's an "offence."

And if any explanation is required or given; it's the export drive. He is told to save, and his savings are taken off him by Government-stimulated rising prices, taxation, and down-right confiscation. He "buys" a house, and pays ten times what his grandfather did for the same house, and finds he hasn't bought it; it can be, and is, "requisitioned" at the instance of any obscure alien in a selected bureau. Until it is, and sometimes after, he pays in rates and taxes more than the original rent, for the privilege of "owning" it. If he murmurs, one of his conquerors tells him that "we" don't intend an Englishman's home to be his castle. In fact, "we" will see that it isn't. Why not emigrate? "We've plenty to replace you, and we are replacing you—you've served your turn."

(V)

If there is one claim made by Socialists more confidently than that their *credo* is that of the "common good," it is that they are the torch-bearers of progress, and the champions of "science" against reaction—a word used to dispose comprehensively of any views not held by the London School of Economics. It is significant, therefore, that what is perhaps the most operative principle in the workings of natural forces on this planet—entropy—is never mentioned by them, and is perhaps a conception which their minds dare not entertain, in view of its implications.

The rigid definition of entropy is "the quantity of heat in a closed system, divided by its *absolute* temperature" and this implies that it is a numerical expression which increases as energy loses availability, because, energy is only available for useful work where there is a fall of potential (a waterfall is the most obvious example). Consequently, if we are to introduce the analogy of physics into Socialism (and there is no intrinsic *social* science worthy of the name) we derive two ideas from entropy: (1) that, of the total amount of energy (initiative) in the world, it is only that which is above the average, is not standardised, which can be expected to produce results. (2) To the extent that Socialism tends to produce social equality, it increases social entropy. It is in fact the technique of social death.

So far as I am aware, there is no instance of an individual who has accomplished anything which is not routine, while retaining abiding belief in equality as a social principle. There are numbers of instances (Karl Marx or Mordecai is one) of schemers and revolutionaries who have used "equality" as a catchword with which to demoralise their enemies; but practically all of them, including Marx, have left on record their contempt for their dupes.

There is therefore an analogy if nothing more, between the principle of entropy in thermo-dynamics and the social forces (for want of a better term) tending to reduce humanity to a dead level in which nothing can be done—there is no difference of potential. If that state is attained, it would not be fanciful to characterise it as one in which social entropy was a maximum.

It is desirable to recognise that we are familiar with a certain type of repetition-analogy in what we call physical forces. The octave in musical sounds repeats from the lowest audible bass to the highest audible treble, and there is an octave in the light scale, the spectrum. While we have no proof, of the rigid nature which can be measured by instruments, as in the case of temperature-entropy, that a social dead-level exhibits the same kind of relation to a highly diversified civilisation that a stagnant pond does to Niagara Falls, there is much to suggest that it may be so.

Fortunately, the Socialist habit of giving to words a meaning which does not correspond to anything realisable, while it has a disruptive effect of serious importance,

ensures its own exposure. "Equality" in action always raises the question of hierarchy in function. No one in possession of average intelligence supposes that one man could be at once a cricketer equal to Bradman, an engineer equal to Brunei, a mathematical physicist of the order of Eddington, and a General such as Lord Wavell. This being obvious, on what function do you equate him? And when you have decided on the inequality of his functional excellence, how do you deal with the inescapable hierarchy of function? Does anyone suppose that, on the one hand, only one man could build the Tower Bridge, or on the other, every engineer would be equally successful?

As Mr. Christopher Hollis, M.P., remarks in another connection, "Simply to say that we must get rid of privilege is to mistake a phrase for a solution" (a common socialist procedure). "Few of the valuable achievements of life are the achievements of a single generation; if this principle were advanced as a principle of biology rather than of politics, it would be hailed as a progressive principle. But whether biological or political, whether progressive or reactionary, it is at any rate, a true principle."

If we realise that the outstanding necessity of our times and our culture is to minimise social entropy, to raise available individual potential (and not merely economic potential); and at the same time we observe that immensely influential agencies have financed propaganda and organisation on every plane of society directly and skilfully designed to produce the degradation (in the exact sense of the word) to which the British people are being subjected, only one conclusion is possible in regard to that situation. Every person involved is at the best a dupe of a national enemy; or otherwise is a traitor, and should be dealt with according to his merits.

(VI)

One of the reasons frequently and reasonably advanced against what is called the world plot theory is that it postulates a degree both of organisation and discipline which is out of all proportion to anything with which we are familiar on the necessary scale.

It would be possible to answer this objection on its own ground, because there are several aspects of religion, secret societies and commerce which are not too greatly disproportionate to such a task. But, in fact, it is highly probably that the proof does not lie along those lines, and that permeation and perversion, the product of education, observation, and patronage, is the technique mainly effective. A little elaboration of this theme may be useful.

If you want to catch mice, you don't specialise in canaries, you keep a cat. If long observation has convinced you that success in politics or industry is impossible unless a certain hierarchy of function is preserved, and you wish to destroy a rival, you don't, at least at first, order him to consult his office boy before making a major decision—you stimulate the formation of Trades'

Unions, permeate the schools, take great care that words such as policy, administration and ownership are mixed up so that they can mean anything or nothing, and secure executives in the Trades' Unions who are both ambitious and technically ignorant. In fact, you hypnotise everyone into agreement that the office boy knows it all. If you can ensure that Trades' Union policy is based on the assumption that the object of life is full employment you have an almost omnipotent monopoly ready made. The leisure class is, you say, living on the worker, and consumption being a mere by-product of production, the consumer should be given less and less and the production process absorb more and more. You will almost automatically develop a state of affairs which requires supermen to run it. Then abolish all principles of law, morals or politics on some theory such as the divine right of majorities and the omnipotence of Parliament, and you may be confident that your Materialist State, which requires supermen to run it, will elect for that purpose demagogues ignorant of the elements of the problem with which they are required to deal. Quite naturally, they fail, and still more "sacrifices" are suggested. Quite a small organisation of conscious, trained traitors can bring about this situation. It takes time, and "wars or the threat of wars," but it can be done. It has been done in the British Isles, and the evidences of it are indisputable.

The defence against it is to expose the strategy, minimise the demand for labour, maximise the availability of consumption goods, and break up every monopoly whether of goods or labour.

These policies are only possible inside the framework of a Constitution which has an organic relation to reality. For instance, if it is once established, as it is being established, that the primary object of the Constitution is to demolish the rights of the individual ("Parliament is supreme—it could, in its wisdom, decree that all blue-eyed babies be destroyed at birth") and so centralise them that they can be transferred out of the country and the nation, which is the exact opposite of the Constitution envisaged and re-enforced by Magna Carta, the measures I have just suggested lose all meaning. They would be the last method by which to establish the centralised world, which is neither organic nor realistic. It is mechanistic, static, and abstract. There seems to be small doubt that its primary agency has been, and still is, the Financial System which has been increasingly a conscious and lying aberration of a magnificent instrument for good. By its agency, Constitutions, Governments and Peoples have been corrupted. "Ye are of your Father, the devil. He was a liar from the beginning."

The plight of the British is not a consequence of the war, neither, in the true sense, does it originate in the so-called Labour Party. All the ingredients of defeat can be found, active and conscious, in the Baldwin-P.E.P. reign of the Armistice period. Their shop window is redressed—that is all.

NEW TIMES, NOVEMBER 1965.

TIME TO THINK OF CHRISTMAS GIFTS

As Christmas time approaches once again, it is time to start thinking about Christmas gifts. Readers can solve their Christmas gift problem easily by giving their relatives and friends either an annual subscription to *The New Times* or a book. Such a gift is most appropriate at a time when all that Christmas stands for is being attacked by the forces of organised evil.

We have a special subscription rate for those wishing to give an annual subscription to *The New Times* as a Christmas gift: £1 for one subscription, 30/- for two subscriptions, £2 for three subscriptions, and 10/- per subscription for four or more. A card can be sent with the first issue, the Christmas edition, if desired. A gift subscription to *The New Times* is a different kind of Christmas present, and one which will remind your friends of you throughout the coming year. Many of our best supporters were first introduced to *The New Times* through a gift subscription. Here is the way to solve your Christmas gift problem while at the same time extending our influence.

Books also make a splendid Christmas gift, and are of permanent value. Either make a selection from the enclosed list, or call at the Heritage Bookshop to make a selection from the wide range of books available.

Supporters can assist us with our organisational problems by ordering their gift subscriptions and books as early as possible.

LEAGUE OF RIGHTS HANDBOOK

The League of Rights has published a handbook which will answer most of the questions asked about the League. The handbook lists the League's Objectives, together with an explanation of these Objectives, provides a brief history of the League, its structures and journals, describes its journals and the various services it provides. Those interested in joining the League, or of expanding its work, should obtain a copy of the handbook. Available from The League of Rights, Box 1052J., G.P.O., Melbourne, price 2/-, post free.

"THE SECRET LIFE OF ERIC BUTLER"

The above is the title of the first major smear article on Mr. Eric Butler, first published in *Nation* in 1959. Mr. Butler subsequently wrote a full reply to this smear, in which he dealt thoroughly with the many charges made against him, and outlined his philosophy of life and what he is attempting to do. In view of the mounting nationwide attacks on Mr. Butler, it is essential that every supporter has at least one copy of his book in his possession. It makes a vital contribution to Australian history, and exposes the type of tactics which have been used against him for a quarter of a century. Order from The Heritage Bookshop, 273 Little Collins Street, Melbourne. Price 5/8, post free.

Mr. Leibler last year when he refused to meet Mr. Butler in a radio or TV discussion.

The Role of Rev. D. Pope

Mr. Leibler is well aware of Mr. Pope's services to current pro-Communist activities in Australia. Mr. Pope not only supported Sachs, the former South African Communist leader last year; he has been actively associated with the campaign against Australian military intervention in South Vietnam. Mr. Pope visited Moscow earlier this year and has spoken favourably about the Soviet Union. He also attended the Communist-promoted Helsinki "Peace" Conference. This is the Left-wing Anglican Vicar who is prepared to do whatever Mr. Leibler requires in an attempt to destroy the Australian League of Rights. Mr. Pope's attitude towards a fellow-Anglican is clearly revealed in the following statement reported in *The Australian Jewish Herald* interview: "Eric Butler feels that the Anglican Church is a good stomping ground for him. He is no longer the vulgar slanderous type of bigot (this is the Leibler line, too) and therefore he can move dangerously in respectable circles and have a far wider appeal by appearing to be a God-fearing anti-communist." Mr. Pope is also concerned about the activities of the League of Rights' Church Committee. He has pledged himself "to expose Butler", but warned that "I believe that only occasional strikes at Butler will be effective as we must be careful not to give him too much publicity which he may be able to capitalise upon." No doubt, Mr. Pope, echoing Mr. Leibler, was bearing in mind that the League of Rights scored heavily in the press, radio and TV publicity following his "disclosures" at the Synod.

In his statement to the Jewish press on the campaign against the League of Rights and Mr. Butler, Mr. Leibler claimed that he "welcomed" the press "exposures". The total result of these "exposures" has been to provide the League with some of the most valuable publicity it has had for a long time. It may be that Mr. Leibler is so arrogant that he believes that he is damaging the League. But his very attitude is engendering anti-Jewish feelings amongst people who never previously had such feelings. Mr. Leibler reveals that he was aware of the recent campaign in Melbourne to frighten a business man into withdrawing his sponsorship of Mr. Eric Butler to speak at a dinner of a combined group of Melbourne Lions Clubs. This incredible campaign failed and left a lot of unpleasant feeling. The Jewish community can thank Mr. Leibler and his associates for any anti-Jewish feeling if they are going to continue as they have been.

The Real Promoters of "Anti-Semitism"

But perhaps Mr. Leibler and his associates wish to keep the Jewish community in a permanent state of turmoil? There is no question whatever that the Communists welcome and encourage the Jewish people to believe that "anti-Semitism" is a great danger. This enables Jews to be used for Communist purposes. But what about the Zionists? We merely record at this time that there has appeared in the U.S.A. a book by the distinguished American Jew, Alfred Lilienthal, *The Other Side of the Coin*, in which it is alleged that there has never been any investigation into the background of the real promoters of "anti-Semitism" because such an investigation would show that the Anti-Defamation League and other Jewish organisations have in fact been responsible

for keeping the Jewish people in such a state that they can be suitably exploited. When the Melbourne Synod attack was made, Mr. Butler told the Melbourne press that he strongly favoured an exhaustive investigation into the promotion of "anti-Semitism."

After many years of experience in studying the forces of revolution, we are satisfied that a thorough investigation of "anti-Semitism" would reveal that this is a weapon used by both the Communists and the Zionists. Mr. Leibler's persistent efforts to discover "anti-Semitism" where none exists may, of course, be merely to try to show the Jewish community that he is an effective public relations officer. But while he and his associates continue to attempt to smear the League of Rights, thus assisting the Communists, their motives must remain suspect.

Mr. RON GOSTICK'S VISIT

One of the highlights of new year's activities will be the visit of Mr. Ron Gostick, editor of *The Canadian Intelligence Service* and Director of the Canadian Christian Action Movement. The date of the Annual Dinner, which Mr. Gostick will attend, will be September 9. We ask supporters to mark this date on their 1966 calendars as soon as they get them. The date of the Dinner has been brought forward in an endeavour to avoid clashing with Melbourne Show week. The League of Rights Seminar will be on Saturday, September 10. Mr. Gostick will be one of the speakers.

In order to make the best use of Mr. Gostick's visit, long-term forward planning is essential. We would appreciate hearing from all who can co-operate. This includes New Zealand supporters, as Mr. Gostick will be travelling to Australia via New Zealand.

A Correction

In our last issue we inadvertently said that *The New Times* was published by the League of Rights. This is not so. The League of Rights publishes *The Intelligence Survey* and *On Target*. Our mistake arose as a result of using a summary of the League's Objectives from *The Intelligence Survey*.

THE EQUALITY DOGMA LEADS TO COMMUNISM

By D. Watts

In this brilliant essay the author exposes the equality dogma as one of the most dangerous of the twentieth-century myths, and one which is paving the way for International Communism. This essay is a closely-reasoned reply to the claim that "all men are equal" and a demonstration of the truth that the organisation of human beings into masses destroys the individual.

Order from The Heritage Bookshop, Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne. Price 2/-, post free.