

THE NEW TIMES

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

Vol. 32, No. 5

MAY 1966

THE A.B.C. AND "ANTI-SEMITISM" "FOUR CORNERS" USED TO SMEAR ANTI-COMMUNISTS

The national political commentary programme *Four Corners* on Saturday, 16th April, was used as a vehicle for smearing those conservative groups opposed to Communism in Australia. While there was some slight endeavour to present the programme as an objective investigation into these organisations who were active in exposing the blatant Communist slant of those organisations promoting the anti-Vietnam and anti-conscription campaigns, the commentator in charge of the programme set the pattern and the intention of the programme by referring to those organisations being interviewed as "the radical right." This was to establish that no matter how worthy it may be to be opposed to Communism, it is much worse to be so completely in opposition that you have progressed beyond the point of being correct to oppose Communism, your opposition has become extreme. Somehow this puts you beyond the pale as an opponent to Communism, and in fact as Mr. Isi Liebler, the public relations officer for the Victorian Jewish Board of Deputies, was at pains to explain to Australian taxpayers, these extremists moved into the position where they became an asset to the Communists.

There were a number of interesting aspects about this programme but the most important would probably be lost on most of the viewers unless their political background was sufficient to keep them in touch with the manoeuvres of the key propagandist in the programme, Mr. Liebler. Whether the A.B.C. knew they were providing a vehicle for Mr. Liebler to promote his favourite subject of anti-Semitism we do not know, but that he was given far more opportunity to air his views was obvious. Perhaps the censor's scissors were inadvertently mislaid when it came to dealing with Mr. Liebler's contribution. Be that as it may, other key figures in the interview were interviewed for lengthy periods but their contribution cut to suit the "extreme rightist" viewpoint which the editor was endeavouring to foster. The Assistant National Director of the League of Rights, Mr. Edward Rock, informs us that he was approached by the spokesman for the A.B.C. to comment on the demonstrations against the Government's policies in Vietnam. He readily agreed to the interview, and after the cameras were set up was informed that the questions to be asked would be concerned with the League and anti-Semitism, and the League's views on race and migration. The main endeavour of the editor of the videotape was to underscore the League's attitude to the Jewish question. At no time did the spokesman for the A.B.C. let it be known to Mr. Rock that Mr. Liebler would be on the same programme commenting, supposedly, on the government's policies on Vietnam, or expressing any views on Communism.

Promoting Anti-Semitism

However, with the advent of Mr. Liebler on a programme ostensibly designed to look at organisations opposed to Communism, it became obvious that Mr. Liebler was using his time to promote nothing else but his own

brand of anti-Semitism. In fact, judging by the busy journeying to and fro from Australia to America by Mr. Liebler and the campaign recently launched in America to brand Mr. Eric Butler, National Director of the League, as an anti-Semite it is apparent that Mr. Liebler is acting under orders from his counterpart, the notorious Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith to step up the campaign against Mr. Butler and the League of Rights.

Anti-Semitism is almost a dead letter throughout the world. But there is ample evidence that professional publicists such as Mr. Liebler are being employed to keep this a live issue. While on the one hand it is being used to create sympathy for the State of Israel, and a lever used to raise funds amongst the Jewish people; it is also being used for political purposes of which the Jewish people are on the whole quite innocent.

There is no doubt in our mind at all as to what this amounts to. Those for whom Mr. Liebler acts as agent and spokesman are more than concerned with the campaigns being waged in Australia to bring about a more realistic attitude amongst the Australian community to alert them to the dangers of international Communism. Mr. Liebler in his desperation even sought to portray himself as an anti-Communist who was being embarrassed by "these extremists." Those who have followed Mr. Liebler's gyrations on his public relations platform have never heard him advocate or support any policy, which would embarrass the Communists. Admittedly he has been careful to cover his tracks, but in his campaign against Mr. Butler and the League material similar to his has been liberally used in the left wing intellectual magazines such as *Dissent* and *Nation*.

Continued on page 8

DEFENCE AND AID FUND BANNED IN SOUTH AFRICA

Those who remember the visit of Mr. Solly Sachs in 1964 to Australia to campaign for funds for the South African Defence and Aid Fund when Mr. Sachs was sponsored by leading church men, including Archbishop Frank Woods of Melbourne, will be interested in the following report released from South Africa. At the time of the visit by Mr. Sachs his Communist affiliations were effectively exposed throughout Australia by the League of Rights resulting in his campaign to collect funds from the unsuspecting community being a miserable flop.

This report is also instructive in revealing the scrupulously fair procedures adopted by South African courts and the Government in dealing with those engaged in subversive activities against South Africa. It is the sort of information we are never supplied with by the big daily newspapers throughout Australia who continue their campaign of distortion and misrepresentation against South Africa.

In a proclamation published in the Government Gazette on 18th March 1966, the State President declares the Defence and Aid Fund an unlawful organisation in terms of the Suppression of Communism Act (Act No. 44 of 1950).

The Defence and Aid Fund in Britain were founded in 1956 by Christian Action, a body closely connected with the Movement for Colonial Freedom, the Africa Bureau and the Anti-Apartheid Movement. The co-ordinated activities of all these bodies over the years have been characterised by their avowed enmity and violent hostility towards South Africa.

The British-based Defence and Aid Fund of Christian Action is part of a network of extremist and closely interconnected organisations in Britain noted for the vehemence of their hostility towards South Africa. These organisations are supported by the Communist Party and in some instances have prominent Communists among their office-bearers.

In South Africa the Defence and Aid Fund is supported by the Communists and has made its finances available to the African National Congress and the Communist Party—both subversive bodies outlawed in terms of South African law.

Known Communists such as Vella Pillay, Rosalynde Ainslee, Abdul Minty, Ronald Segal, Raymond Kunene and Tony O'Dowd serve in the Executive Committee of the Anti-Apartheid Movement, which is linked with Christian Action and enjoys the support of the British Communist Party.

President of Christian Action is Canon Collins whose letter of April 19, 1963, to Walter Sisulu, convicted on charges of sabotage and conspiracy to overthrow the Government by means of violence and revolution, served as an exhibit at the Rivonia Trial in 1964.

In this letter Canon Collins informed Sisulu that Mr. Solly Sachs, a listed South African Communist, was in charge of fund raising for Christian Action's Defence and Aid Fund.

Canon Collins wrote:

"On my behalf he is now managing the appeal for the Defence and Aid Fund and I am glad to say there is, once again, a growing response. We shall certainly do everything we can to go on helping until the liberation movement succeeds in its purpose."

The Defence and Aid Fund in South Africa was founded to take over and expand the activities of the Treason Trial Defence Fund, originally established to cover the costs of defending a group of persons who appeared on charges of treason. The Treason Trial Defence Fund came into being at about the same time that Christian Action founded the Defence and Aid Fund in Britain.

The Defence and Aid Fund in South Africa has as its purpose the granting of relief and assistance to persons who allegedly suffer as a result of loss of human rights and civil liberties, whether by process of law or otherwise. It has branches in Johannesburg, Cape Town, Port Elizabeth, East London and Durban. Among its sponsors are ex-Chief Albert Luthuli and Mr. Alan Paton.

The constitution of the South African body tends to create the impression that it is an independent organisation. However, there is sufficient evidence to prove that it is no more than a branch of the Defence and Aid Fund of Christian Action. The South African branch, for instance, has been instructed to arrange for all funds raised abroad to be channelled through the London office.

According to a Defence and Aid report covering the years 1956-1963 an amount of R502,647 had been raised for use in South Africa.

Writing in the summer, 1964, issue of the publication, "Christian Action," Archbishop Joost de Blank surveyed the activities of the Defence and Aid Fund in South Africa and made the following comment: "It would be impossible to pay too high a tribute to the local committee in South Africa."

The Defence and Aid Fund in South Africa is connected with the Communist Party.

In a sworn statement made on October 1, 1964, a member of the South African Communist Party declared: "The Defence and Aid Fund which was at this junction (sic.) already in existence was extensively used for the purposes of the South African Communist Party. In turn cash advances towards the fund were made by the South African Communist Party. Who the persons were that served on this fund's committee I do not know, except that Rica Hodgson who was in fact a member of the Communist Party was serving on this fund's committee."

A self-confessed member of the South African Communist Party during August, 1964, took charge of the

funds of the Defence and Aid Fund in South Africa. Since that time a small portion of these funds was actually used for dependants of prisoners. The largest slice has been employed for the political activities of the outlawed African National Congress and the Communist Party. Salaries of officials of the Communist Party have also been paid from these funds.

The Defence and Aid Fund is striving to bring about social, economic and political change in the Republic of South Africa even at the cost of employing violence as a means to achieve this purpose.

Addressing the United Nations' Special Committee on the Policies of Apartheid on June 7, 1965, Defence and Aid President, Canon Collins, lauded the United Nations for giving encouragement to the "victims of racialist policies" and to organisations such as the Defence and Aid Fund" in their efforts to relieve the oppressed and to bring about changes of policy." (U.N. Document A/AC 115/L 132 of June 9, 1965.)

"I believe it would be wrong to suppose that the work done by the Defence and Aid Fund is no more than a palliative," he said. "I think that, as well as bringing aid to the persecuted victims and relief to their families and dependants—and that thoroughly worthwhile job we have done now for many years, and will continue to do until the non-white in South Africa are politically, socially and economically free men and women—the Defence and Aid Fund has played, and continues to play, a vital role in bringing about those political changes so desired by all the people of goodwill."

In the same speech, Canon Collins stated that there is little if any likelihood of effecting the necessary political changes through normal and democratic internal political processes.

"In such a situation," he said, "it seems probable that only external pressures and the threat of execution of internal revolution will bring about the desired result. And of much importance in my opinion, is the fact that the contribution of Defence and Aid in this respect fosters the morale of the internal resistance."

Canon Collins concluded that he was encouraged in this opinion by the constant emphasis non-white political organisations in South Africa placed upon the importance of the Defence and Aid Fund in their struggle.

A footnote to the above statement says that in terms of Section 17 of the Suppression of Communism Act, the State President can only declare an organisation as unlawful after the Minister of Justice has considered a factual report in relation to that organisation made by a committee consisting of three persons appointed by the Minister, one of whom shall be a magistrate of a rank not lower than that of senior magistrate.

Free Legal Aid Available to Indigents

A background document on legal aid facilities in South Africa is available to persons in need of it.

Indigent persons, states the document, are afforded legal representation free of charge by members of the legal

profession whenever the circumstances merit such assistance.

A legal aid system organised by the Department of Justice in co-operation with the legal profession, functions in the Republic. Under this scheme, legal assistance in both civil and criminal matters, is given free of charge on a voluntary basis by South African lawyers. The system ensures that in all suitable cases indigent litigants and accused persons will receive legal representation.

In criminal cases where the sentence of death may be imposed, e.g., where the charge is one of murder, treason, rape or sabotage and where the accused is unable or unwilling to employ a legal representative himself, the court appoints an advocate to appear for him on a pro deo basis. In such a case the advocate is remunerated by the State at a fixed tariff.

At all centres where there is an attorney(s) who is willing to assist, a legal aid bureau has been established. Centres without legal aid bureaux are served by adjoining bureaux. The legal aid bureaux function under the control of local boards comprised as far as possible of: the local magistrate who is ex officio the chairman; the Bantu affairs commissioner who is ex officio the vice-chairman; a representative of the Department of Social Welfare; an advocate; and an attorney.

The functions and powers of the board are: to work out a means test and to amend it from time to time; to review any decision of the legal aid officer regarding an applicant's claim for legal aid and, if necessary, to vary such decision; in general to consider any problem concerning the scheme which may arise; and where necessary, to submit suggestions regarding any aspect of the scheme to the Secretary for Justice.

At every legal aid bureau an official of the State is appointed as legal aid officer, who can be approached by any person for free legal aid. His function is to do the administrative work of the bureau.

The procedure is for the applicant to be interrogated by the legal aid officer to ascertain the problems involved. An applicant may be referred to a government institution or other body (e.g., the Department of Social Welfare in the case of domestic difficulties) if it is found that they may deal with his case more effectively.

In problems of a purely legal nature the legal aid officer applies a means test, worked out by the legal aid board, in order to ascertain whether the applicant qualifies for free legal aid.

If, in the opinion of the legal aid officer, the applicant does not so qualify, he advises the latter to consider consulting his own legal adviser.

If, however, the officer decides that the applicant does qualify, he refers him to an attorney whose name appears on the roster and whose turn it is to assist.

Only members of the local board, the legal aid officer and the attorney to whom the applicant is referred, will have the right to inspect the report of the social welfare

Continued on page 8

THAT WHICH WE WORSHIP

By D. WATTS

Inspiration needs to be constantly refreshed. There is no idea so beautiful that time and the multitude cannot reduce it to vulgarity; no inspiration so sublime that it does not at last become petrified in wooden dogma. For want of renewed inspiration, political and social idealism has, in this century, become a worship of idols. It is strange that admirers of Francis Bacon should have come to this.

It has been taught by humanists and tacitly approved by humanitarians that it is better for men to serve mankind than to serve God; but what men without God have done is not to serve their fellowmen, but to worship a graven image, which they call Humanity.

The degeneration, which follows spiritual starvation, is biological and political quite as much as it is religious. Nietzsche remarked that Nature is concerned to save the species not the individual. That impression is from the fact that a species persists longer in time than does an individual of the species; but really Nature is as little concerned to preserve a species that is an evolutionary failure as to preserve a degenerate individual. Even the human species will be with the dinosaur if it fails to evolve. In human beings, evolutions, at their stage, is psychical and spiritual rather than physical.

If mere physical survival were the biological aim, it would have been better had life remained in protoplasmic forms, for these are less vulnerable than are the forms that have evolved and so become more complex and more richly endowed with faculties. Mental, ethical and aesthetical evolution implies that there is another purpose than that of physical survival. Purpose in Nature further implies a purposive Force. Whatever the particular purposes, Purpose, itself, are psychical, and ultimately it is Will. It is Will in psychical expression.

Purpose and Will is of God

Denial of the conscious nature of Purpose leaves us with the conclusions of the materialists who have held that it is automatic response to environmental stimuli or else a determined direction given to behaviour by past impulses, which were instinctive. If, however, there be consciously willed purpose in natural behaviour, there must be a Will directing that behaviour. Indeed, it is only because there is a super-human Will behind manifestation that men have wills of their own; for man is made in God's, or Nature's, image and cannot do or be or have anything outside that Reality which is the actuality of either.

A man may conceive this super-human Will as being embodied in a Divine Person, or as a Spiritual Force in which there is personality, but which is not limited within a person, or even as a Natural Force provided he recognises that the Force is a psychical, and not merely a mechanical, one. Any of those conceptions should enable him to realise that he cannot go against the Will of God (or Nature) but that, having a will of his own, he can go against God's (or Nature's) purpose.

Denial of Spiritual Evolution Brings Damnation

From what we can read in biology, it seems that mankind can evolve mentally and spiritually, or refuse to evolve and so degenerate; but that it cannot defy God's Will which is that it must evolve or deteriorate till it perishes — in religious terms, man may serve God's purpose of spiritual evolution and be saved, or refuse to serve it and be damned.

To perish is to cease to be in a particular form, but not to be annihilated, and it seems probable from what we can observe of the results of degeneration that to be damned well may be to sink at last back into a sub-human state which would be full of woe if the soul remembered that once it had reached the human stage.

On first coming into this world, life's immediate purpose is to create a vehicle in which it can exist here and which can be evolved into an instrument of experience. In the primary evolutionary stages there are no individual wills, but the Will that impels and compels the creatures seems to be external to them. We may say that it is the Divine Will that directs them. After there has been considerable evolution, Will does, in a small way, become individualised, but there is still no individual consciousness of purpose. The conscious purpose is God's. When the human stage is reached, the power of the individualised Will increases and, for the first time, there is clear individual consciousness of purpose.

Not only has man conscious, individual purposes, but because he realises their importance in giving meaning to experience, he has an urgent need to know that life, itself, has a purpose. He wants to be assured that there is a Universal, or Divine, purpose, and so some seek Truth and some seek God. The depths of pessimism are reached, and all meaning is taken out of individual purposes, when a man is convinced that there is no Universal Purpose.

Reality and Divine Purpose

It is inconceivable that all reality could come into man's brief and circumscribed experience in this world, and if it does not, he cannot reach any final explanation of reality or know what is the complete universal, or divine purpose. He can, handicapped though he be, by striving to know truth, gain some inkling of the biological and human purpose. From what emerges in the evolutionary process it appears that that purpose is to increase psychical power in order to have expanded experience of such worlds as are revealed to him.

Spirit in the physical universe struggles to become more conscious there, and psychically ever more powerful in the individual and, at the same time, to realise in the individual its oneness with the universal Spiritual Power. Even though the mind does not always consciously formulate that latter purpose, the soul acknowledges it in its yearning for the good and the beautiful.

All our knowledge of the physical universe, all the good material conditions that we have created for ourselves, will not save the human species if it fails to fulfill the Divine Purpose; and it will not fulfill that purpose by worshipping man, whatever love there be with the service.

Important Priority in Commandments

To love God and to love one's neighbour are scientific as well as religious commandments. To love God but not one's neighbour can lead to fanaticism and to cruelty in the name of God. To love one's neighbour but not God has led in these days to a tenderness for human evil, to a preference for human inferiority, to the offering up of human sacrifices to the idol, Humanity.

Because we have worshipped man, but not God, our present-day literature, especially our fiction that purports to mirror the human scene, is pessimistic. Writers are fascinated by squalor and sordidness, violence, cruelty and vice. The inspiration is often so feeble that, to make the depressing work readable, the writer must resort to lurid obscenity.

The finest social efforts are on behalf of the dregs of society and the least civilised of peoples. Love is for men who are evil or backward or of inferior quality. The slip-back towards a sub-human state is here evident.

The goodness of men can be said to be the Spirit of God working in them. In the world as it is today we need a reverence for human goodness more than we need compassion for human poor development and evil, not because there should not always be both, but because the latter has become such an obsession that for the sake of our mental balance encouragement to value good human quality has become imperative.

If we love goodness we are loving God; and a love of good men comes inevitably with that devotion. There are different ideas about what goodness is. Most men relate good and evil to themselves. Humanitarians of today have realised that, but they have fallen into the error of believing that what is good to any man, however depraved he be, is justly and humanly good, and that society should accept the man who does evil at his own valuation.

Evolving Standards Never Too High

It is a long time since I have heard it said that there are different levels of good, and that the standards of right and wrong should be on the highest level. That is sound social and political doctrine, and it is Nature's law. Evolution is achieved by means of a continuous reaching up towards that which is just beyond present grasp. In these days the aim has been to bring the

standards of good down till they are within easy reach of the spiritually least developed and most indolent.

That is anti-evolutionary. The fool's logic that defends the evil movement is that since all men are equal, all men's moral standards are equally good. Already the spiritually backward, who are naturally in the van of the anti-evolutionary movement, are being regarded as superior to the spiritually most evolved. These latter are consequently sinking back to the level of the morally retarded in order to be considered as at least their equals. The dark, sub-human depths are yawning, not far from humanity's feet.

It will perhaps be said that the evil being done in these years with a clever conscience or with self-justification is no worse than the evil that has been done in the past. That is not the whole story. The worst men in a civilised community are as bad as the worst men among barbarous peoples; but the finest men in a barbarous community do not equal the finest men in civilised communities. When men worship God and goodness they realise that the quality of a society is to be judged by the quality of its best, by the proportion of men of good quality whom it produces and by its moral standards.

Worship the Measurement of Morality

We find our moral position in history, not by comparing our worst with the worst of other ages, nor altogether by measuring our best against the best of previous generations, but mostly by comparing what we worship with that which was worshipped in other centuries. Is our tolerance of inferiority better than respect for superiority? Is the "democratic" lawlessness and violence of demonstrators better than an ordered, aristocratic freedom? Is gross self-indulgence better than self-discipline? Is political expediency better than justice, and an ideology better than virtue? Is it worse to set civilised men over barbarians than to set barbarians over civilised men?

How is it that good on a lower level has come to be preferred to good on a higher level? Those who set the standards have no doubt in their minds that the kind of behaviour that they present as being exemplary is good, for indeed it is good—at a comparatively low level. To the savage the savage virtues are the highest possible ones.

Worshipping False Gods

If there truly be, as almost certainly there are, conscious spiritual powers that may be particularised as spiritual beings directing, inspiring and urging their creatures, it is quite possible that these Beings are, themselves, at different stages of evolution, so that, in that case, the God of animal man becomes the Devil of spiritual man. When spiritually advanced men worship the God of animal men they are denying their own God and dragging their fellow men that they profess to love down the anti-evolutionary path into the realm of lost souls. You may take what is said above metaphorically; but it may be just as right to take it literally.

To treat men as being but physical creations of the physical environment is to betray life. That is why Communism is not merely erroneous but actually evil. To destroy the civilised order for the sake of aggrandising the backward is to betray evolution. **That is why the policy, which has been followed in Africa, is not merely mistaken, but devilish. To rest upon inferior good is to betray God and Man. That is to create a Hell.**

Look at the Rhodesian affair and it will be seen that there is, there, more than a conflict between men of different opinions and irreconcilable ambitions. Implied in it is a struggle between civilisation and primitiveness, between the evolutionary and the anti-evolutionary forces. The spiritual fate of mankind may be in the balance. It behoves men with a reverence for God's purpose to throw their weight upon the side of superior good. Our little island of evolutionary gain is being denuded by the great seas of human inferiority, so that very precious are all small groups and all individuals working frantically, with the inimical expanse before their eyes and the roar of its surf in their ears, to build up retaining dykes. That is why I have mentioned Rhodesia in this essay. The worshippers of the animal God and of human inferiority are many and strong, and the human race, now that it has just begun to go into an anti-evolutionary spin, is lost if it fails to preserve its superior elements.

DANGEROUS SUGGESTION ON RACE RELATIONS IN CANADA

A recent report from Canada gave the findings of a special committee set up by the Federal Government. The committee was reported to recommend new criminal laws in Canada to stop the dissemination of hate propaganda aimed at ethnic or religious minorities.

A similar recommendation was made in England, which resulted in the Race Relations Bill, which caused widespread concern and opposition throughout Britain. A brochure entitled "Freedom of Speech" by an Anglican Vicar, the Rev. Stacey H. Taylor, has been widely distributed as part of the campaign against the Bill. We would not agree with every point made by Reverend Taylor, but we support his right to make them. And he said some things, which need saying at a time when freedom is under attack everywhere. The following is the text of the brochure:

Under direct pressure from the Jewish community in this country (*Daily Express*, January 15th) the Home Secretary, Sir Frank Soskice, has now introduced his infamous Race Relations Bill which if passed into law will make incitement to racial and religious hatred a criminal offence.

No true lover of freedom will deny that incitement to racial and religious hatred should be deplored and resisted by all good men. But to make such incitement a criminal offence would be a denial of the very principle out of which the English belief and practice of toleration has grown. For the essence of that principle is that men should be free to

speak and write what is in their minds without the interference or interdict of those politicians who happen to be in power. Once that principle is denied, in the name of whatever virtue, freedom of speech and thought must very quickly cease to exist in England as it has now ceased in Soviet Russia and Red China.

All public expression of opinion is an incitement to a state of mind, and that that state of mind may be hatred is, I am afraid, an inevitable concomitant of human nature. No less a person than the Lord Jesus Christ Himself stated "You must not think that I have come to bring peace to the earth; I have not come to bring peace, but a sword. I have come to set a man against his father, a daughter against her mother, a young wife against her mother-in-law" (St. Matthew 10:34, 35). Every Christian at his baptism promised to hate and "to renounce the world, the flesh and the devil." Does the Government intend to prosecute Christians for trying to carry out their baptismal and confirmation vows? Does the Home Secretary intend to ban the sale of the Bible because it requires hatred of human wickedness and sin by God's Church?

A speech or pamphlet by an ardent Socialist or Communist may cause people to hate all Tories. Does Sir Frank Soskice intend to apply his law if passed against every Socialist who preaches the doctrine of the class war and who incites people to hate the rich? Does Sir Frank Soskice intend to prosecute certain Protestant groups whose speeches and pamphlets may cause those hearing or reading them to hate the Pope or the Roman Catholic priesthood? Does he intend to gaol Roman Catholics who incite fellow believers to hate Protestants? Where does he intend to draw the line? Today the Home Secretary might be imprisoning the propagators of racial hatred, but tomorrow it will be the Jehovah's Witnesses, then the Plymouth Brethren, then the members of the political party in opposition.

The British Government cannot by legislation prohibit hatred. Hatred is a state of mind, and the human mind cannot be forbidden what it wants to think or the human heart what it wants to feel. All the Government can prohibit, and has any constitutional right to prohibit, is any action, which causes outward physical injury to others. If by his speaking a man incites a crowd to hurt some other person, then he is guilty of incitement to criminal violence, and he should be punished as though he were himself committing that violence. Such a law already exists on the statute books.

The current demand by Jews in this country for the suppression of our historic right to freedom of speech and of writing, has been caused by the propagation, by a small and unimportant minority of anti-Jewish and anti-coloured propaganda led by such Neo-Nazis as Colin Jordan. As a result of certain remarks various street brawls have taken place up and down the country. But it is surely something of a non sequitur to use these incidents as a reason for prohibiting ALL expression of opinion that could give rise to hatred against men of a different race or religion.

Does Sir Frank Soskice intend to make a public criticism of the Government's policy over Vietnam a crime? And

if an inhabitant of say, Bradford or Smethwick considers it wrong that the immigration officers should allow large numbers of coloured persons to be forced upon the native British community which is already suffering from a grave housing shortage, is he to be forbidden to put his views into speech or on paper merely because the expression of such a view—one held by thousands of English victims of such overcrowding—might incite racial hatred in all ill-educated or prejudiced minds?

However deplorable such ill-education or prejudice may be, to put a stop to PUBLIC discussion of controversial topics because of their effect on certain vulgar minds will most definitely lead to the establishment of the very NAZISM and COMMUNISM most Britons deplore. As a better-informed American Jew Supreme Court Justice Brandeis, well says: "If there be time to expose through discussion the falsehood and fallacies, to avert the evil by processes of education, the remedy to be applied is MORE free speech, NOT enforced silence." No doubt there are some dreadful people enjoying liberty of expression. But if we allow the Government to pass its Race Relations Bill, how can we be sure that one day when YOU or I express an unpopular opinion we shall not be committing a criminal act?

The only reason why the advocates of religious and racial persecution have failed in the past to win popular support for their vile creeds in England, as they so tragically have succeeded in doing in other lands, is because the people of England under prodding from the Scottish Covenanters at the time of the Civil War insisted that the Queen's Government must allow freedom of speech instead of suppressing it as the Stuart King Charles and Archbishop Laud tried to do. Thanks to Oliver Cromwell the Jews were allowed to return to England and they were granted full religious toleration. (J. R. Tanner, Constitutional Conflicts of the 17th Century, p. 181).

It is liberty, said William Gladstone, that alone can fit men for liberty—freedom, that is, for every Englishman to express his own opinions freely, however unpopular, foolish or wrong headed they may be. The Jews in England demand the freedom to express their opinions; then let them allow the same liberty to others. The test of a love of freedom is a person's willingness to allow the same liberty to others to express opinions that he detests and despises. If the Jews cannot accept this British and Protestant doctrine let them return to Eastern Europe and stop tampering with our historic rights.

As freeborn Protestants we pride ourselves that it was our Puritan ancestors who first achieved real toleration and full freedom of expression before any other society in human history. If the Government gives way to this Jewish pressure we shall be in very great danger of losing our historic Protestant birthright. The measure of the validity of one's respect for toleration and freedom—for neither can exist for long without the other—is very simple. It is this: Does one wish to stop the expression or to penalize the exponent of views which one regards as de-

NEW TIMES, MAY 1966

testable; for if one does, as apparently the Jews now do in this country, then though one's views may be 100% correct such a person or group of persons does not really believe in freedom as that term has been understood for 300 years by English Protestants.

The true believer in toleration is the person who defends from persecution and victimisation the very opponent whose opinions he most strenuously opposes. As Daniel Webster summed it up in his immortal words: "Though I may disagree with everything that you say I will fight to the death for your right to say it." That is what freeborn English Protestants understand by respect and love for freedom of speech, and it will be a terrible day for England if we ever lost it. That day it seems is now almost here!

ANNUAL DINNER AND SEMINAR

The date of the annual dinner and seminar this year is as follows.

DINNER: The VICTORIA, 215 Little Collins Street, Melbourne.

SEMINAR: CHEVRON HOTEL, The Bamboo Room, 519 St. Kilda Road, Melbourne.

Notable visitor and guest speaker will be Mr. Ron Gostick of the Christian Action Movement in Canada. Mr. Eric Butler, National Director of the Australian League of Rights is at this moment lecturing in Canada under the auspices of the Christian Action Movement in Canada.

Mr. GOSTICK'S TOUR OF AUSTRALIA

Mr. Gostick, Leader of the Christian Action Movement in Canada will be touring Australia from 27th August when he arrives in Brisbane from New Zealand. Those wishing to make use of Mr. Gostick's services and can arrange meetings please contact us at the earliest possible moment to enable us to arrange his itinerary.

Watch for further announcements regarding the above functions.

USE ENWITE SPECIALITIES

TEXTIT waterproofing compound. SOLVIT paint remover. AQUAC wood putty. BRYNAC enamel for resisting water, acids and alkalis. FERROSOL, the rust killing paint. RUSTEX for removing rust from motor bodies and metal work. THERMEX, the silver paint

ENWITE PTY. LTD.

**84-86 Cromwell Street, Collingwood,
Vic. Phone: JA 5967.**

Smear Campaign Extended

No doubt Mr. Liebler wished to appear quite magnanimous when he said he did not advocate legislation to stop the activities of the League and others like the Friends of Freedom or the Australia International News Review; "education" was all that was necessary. We could not agree more, Mr. Liebler's activities should be exposed to the full light of day. We have no doubt that his credit rating would drop considerably if this could be arranged. But we have no doubt as to the type of education Mr. Liebler has in mind. In an article in the March-April issue of Quadrant written by Mr. Liebler and called "Australia's Radical Right," quite coincidentally of course, Mr. Liebler spent much of his space berating the Australian International News Review, and by suggestion trying to drive a wedge between the proprietors and its main contributors. We also have no doubt that the courageous individuals who support this journal which has been such a blow to the leftists as a whole, will be subjected to the type of education which is the lot of all those who do not conform to the policies enunciated by those for whom Mr. Liebler speaks.

Anti-Semitism will of course be Mr. Liebler's main weapon again. It was used against such people as the late Dorothy Thompson and Professor Arnold Toynbee when they committed a similar crime to those supporting this journal in questioning the justice handed out to the Palestinian Arabs when they were robbed of their farms and homes and the State of Israel was created out of their property. This type of education lost Dorothy Thompson a number of contracts for her column famous throughout America, "On the Record."

In his article Mr. Liebler referred to the paucity of advertising in Australian News Review, gloating over the probability that they must be operating at a loss, and expressing doubt that support for such extremism would be forthcoming from traditional advertisers. It would not be the first time that the battle against evil has been fought against great odds. Given the will to survive the next twelve months we have no doubt that News Review will get the advertisers necessary to enable it to go on and put a few more nails in the coffin of Communism. We wish it well, the antagonism it is attracting to itself is sufficient indication of its worth.

COMMUNISM VERSUS CHRISTIANITY

By Edward Rock

The many readers who enjoyed Edward Rock's article in the Christmas issue of "The New Times" will be pleased to know that it has now been published in booklet form so that it may reach a much wider audience. This booklet will make a valuable contribution to an understanding of the basic clash in the world today.

Order from The Heritage Bookshop, 273 Little Collins Street, Melbourne. Price 10 c, post-free.

officer. The report is regarded as absolutely confidential.

Any decision of the legal aid officer regarding an applicant's right to free legal aid is subject to review by the local legal aid board.

As will be seen from the above, no distinction is made between offences involving subversion and sabotage and other offences. As a matter of fact, during a relatively short period pro deo advocates were appointed in 48 different sabotage trials.

RACE RIOT REPERCUSSIONS

The Negro riots in the district of Watts in California last year is still having wide repercussions in America. Mr. Stewart Alsop who is widely reported in Australia's newspapers as an independent commentator, was evidently another disillusioned observer who previously had adopted the attitude that the Negro question was largely the result of "white supremacy." The following editorial is from one of America's important periodicals, The Tulsa Daily Tribune, and the writer is the editor, Jenkin Lloyd Jones.

Stewart Alsop, long sympathetic to Negro civil rights aspirations, recently revisited last summers' riot-ripped district of Watts in Los Angeles and came away jolted to his molars.

Writing in the November 6 Saturday Evening Post, Alsop quoted a number of Negro bystanders as expressing virulent hate of all white men and avid for a shooting showdown. A Negro newspaperwoman struck at what she called "the awful deceit practised by the Jews" and claimed the whole civil rights movement is a branch of Zionism.

One man, according to Alsop, asserted, "The first thing we want is we'll kill every g.d. white capitalist — starting with Mr. Lyndon Johnson."

Another said: "Shootin's gonna come from both sides, and a lotta people gonna get killed. We don't fear dying — it's our specialty."

Well, perhaps the time has come to drop the polite talk and the euphemisms and the political obfuscation. Let's all speak bluntly. The theory, so frantically embraced by civil rights sentimentalists and many Negro leaders, that everything wrong with the Negro is the white man's fault, and the counter-theory, cherished by white supremacists, that the Negro is hopeless if not inherently sub-human will each lead us into a Greek tragedy.

A bloodbath could, indeed, eliminate America's race difficulty. There are about 173 million white Americans and 22 million Negroes. Assuming equal casualties, a total race war would leave 151 million whites and zero Negroes. All persons not willing to buy this solution had better start thinking further — and fast.