

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. 32, No. 7

JULY 1966

RHODESIAN RALLY HEARS ERIC BUTLER WARN ON FINANCIAL SUBVERSION "Financial and economic independence must follow political independence."

Speaking to a large and enthusiastic audience in Salisbury, Rhodesia, on Friday, June 10, Mr. Eric Butler warned that while Rhodesia, with the aid of a growing army of friends around the world, was winning the first round of the battle for political independence, it could still lose the war in which it was engaged unless steps were taken to ensure financial and economic independence. He appealed to Rhodesians and their political representatives not to allow financial orthodoxy to stand in their way of building a completely independent Rhodesia. Loud applause greeted Mr. Butler's remarks. Cabinet Ministers, Members of Parliament and many prominent Rhodesian public leaders were present.

Mr. Butler's Salisbury meeting was the final rally of a four weeks tour of Rhodesia during which 3,000 miles were travelled, over 30 meetings addressed, most of them with record attendances, and two national radio interviews given. He also appeared on a TV programme, while both radio and TV provided progress reports on his tour, at the end of which it was stated that, next to the Prime Minister, Mr. Ian Smith, he was the best known person in Rhodesia.

Mr. Butler's remarks on finance and economics at his final Rhodesian rally were of special significance because it is well-known that there is a growing realisation by many Rhodesians and Government Members, some of these Members of the Cabinet, that in order to weather the international campaign being waged against it the Rhodesian Government will have to adopt financial policies which will permit them to make full use of the nation's considerable productive capacity. Mr. Butler said that the "financial and economic independence must follow political independence." He dealt with the difference between real credit, a nation's productive capacity, and financial credit. He said that just as Rhodesia had given the peoples of the West new hope with its magnificent stand against International Communist global strategy now it could lead again by an offensive in the field of finance and economics. "New, bold, and constructive, thinking is desperately required in a field where our enemies have been consistently defeating us," he said.

FINANCIAL AND ECONOMIC MYTHS

Mr. Butler said there were two major myths in the field of finance and economics, which were aiding the expansion of International Communism. The first was that a nation could not develop its own resources without a flow of what was called foreign capital, and the second was that a nation became wealthier by exporting more than it imported. He asked Rhodesians to remember the old warning, "Beware of the Greeks when they come with gifts," and said that Rhodesia's greatest hour of peril could come, not from the threat of armed force, but from offers of huge financial loans from international power groups like the World Bank. Unless a nation required real capital from outside, such as equipment or raw materials, in order to help it develop its own

resources, borrowing internationally simply meant that in developing these resources a nation placed them under the control of outside groups. This produced national resentment, which in turn was exploited by the Communists.

Speaking about the fallacy that a nation became wealthier through a "favourable trade balance," Mr. Butler observed that this produced the incredible situation where Australia, for example, had troops fighting a Communist thrust into South-East Asia while at the same time it was exporting enormous quantities of food to the Red Chinese enemy. He recalled Lenin's famous prediction that the "capitalist" nations would commit economic suicide by competing to export their "surpluses" to the Communists, and would even provide the financial credits to enable this to be done. Rhodesia could give a lead away from the general acceptance of a philosophy of economic determinism, which was driving the Western world to provide increasing amounts of economic aid for the Communist Empire.

SUBVERSION IN EDUCATION

Mr. Butler also warned that the Western universities and educational systems had been deeply penetrated by the Communists and their Socialist blood brothers. Before Rhodesians accepted any proposed "crash" educational programme, financed by international loans or gifts, they should take a more realistic look at how the Western world had been undermined by various forms of intellectual poison fed through "modern education." He instanced how the Socialists in the U.S.A. had captured the field of anthropology, with the result that it had become widely accepted as a scientific fact that not only all men were equal, but that all races were equal. Africans

Continued on page 8

DE GAULLE IN MOSCOW

Patriot of France, or Kremlin Catalyst?

The following article is condensed from an analysis on the subject published in "The Review of the News,"
June 29, 1966.

It is still too early to tell what the practical results of de Gaulle's visit to the Soviet Union will be; however, there can be no doubt that he is merely continuing his lifelong role as a betrayer of the West. The American mass media prefers to ignore this aspect of the French President's character, which has been adequately documented since 1945. But the public is beginning to sense anyway that de Gaulle is hardly the great man of integrity he was touted to be by the same mass media for so long. The de Gaulle myth has disintegrated simply because the man's deceit, ingratitude, and treachery have become so obvious that even his most sycophant admirers can no longer hide the reality.

The creation of the myth itself is an interesting story. The entire fairy tale of the general's integrity and nobility of character rests on a radio speech of several minutes duration he made in June, 1940, after the military collapse of France in which he called upon Frenchmen to rally around him to form a resistance movement. Apart from that one specific speech, made from the safety of a London studio, there is nothing else to support the myth that de Gaulle was, is, or ever has been a man of integrity, honour, or noble character.

If there were ever any more conclusive evidence to offer that de Gaulle was a highly placed member of the world government conspiracy, it would be this peculiar phenomenon of his "image" as created by the American mass media!

The most devastating job done on the de Gaulle myth, however, was a book by Henri de Kerillis, a former Deputy of the French National Assembly who had sought refuge in the United States after the French collapse. De Kerillis joined the Gaullist movement soon after his arrival here. He was part of the politically active group of French émigrés who founded and published their own wartime newspaper, *Pour la Victoire*. He was, therefore, in a position to know what was going on. It didn't take him very long to discover that de Gaulle was interested in nothing more than seizing power for his own purposes. He wrote a book about it which was published in 1946 entitled *I Accuse de Gaulle*. In it he reviewed de Gaulle's ersatz "military" career as the leader of the Free French and he pondered about the incredible myth that sprung up around him.

"COMMUNIST SYMPATHIES EVIDENT"

Even before de Gaulle took power, before, in fact, the June 1944, invasion of France, it was commonly acknowledged that de Gaulle was a front for the Com-

munists. For example, the *Los Angeles Examiner* of April 6, 1944, published an editorial entitled "De Gaulle IS Stalin's Man."

Of course, despite Stalin's approval, there were a number of important Frenchmen who blocked de Gaulle's way to the top, but they were dealt with swiftly. For example, Admiral Darlan, who had threatened de Gaulle's hegemony by his close collaboration with the Allies in North Africa, was assassinated. And later, General Giraud, de Gaulle's only other serious rival, also became the target of an assassin's bullet.

Finally, de Gaulle achieved what all of his wartime machinations had been designed to achieve, dictatorial power over the French nation. In those days it was still possible for a large American newspaper to call a spade a spade. For example, the New York *Daily Mirror* of October 5, 1944, editorialized:

General de Gaulle's speech in Lille, his first pronouncement on France's future economic policy, was Communist in essence.

De Gaulle does not call himself a Communist, nor does he advocate out-and-out Communism. He is imitating the American branch—the Browder-Hillman branch—of the Kremlin and is trojan-horsing his objectives . . .

The Communists in France, headed by General de Gaulle, are deliberately driving a wedge between liberated France and the U.S.A. and England—on orders from Moscow, no doubt.

Everything indicates, then, that while Nazi Germany conquered France physically, the second conquest of France, economically and politically has been begun by the Red Hitler of the Kremlin and his representative—de Gaulle.

"PAVES WAY FOR MOSCOW"

De Gaulle's first move in power was to open the gates of his government wide to the Communists, putting five members of the French Communist Party into his cabinet, upgrading Maurice Thorez, the French Communist leader who had spent the war in Moscow. This was particularly shocking, since the Communists, during the Hitler-Stalin honeymoon, had sabotaged France's war effort and contributed greatly to the military collapse of France. With the Communists also came the terrible reign of terror, which resulted in the deaths of at least 100,000 persons.

Such were the blessings of Gaullist liberation! By 1947 the de Gaulle myth had soured so terribly that the First Resistor's usefulness to the Communist conspiracy was at an end. So de Gaulle abruptly "retired," leaving France

in one big mess. Of course, the question may be asked: if de Gaulle were a crypto-Communist, why didn't he Communize France in 1945 when he was virtually in the same position Tito was in Yugoslavia? The answer is that in 1945 the international Communist conspiracy was not yet ready to attempt the complete Communization of one of the major Western nations. The United States Army was occupying France at the time and would have no more permitted a full Communist takeover in France than the British did in Greece.

Meanwhile, the years of waiting could be spent refurbishing the de Gaulle myth, destroying the evidence of the past, and making France ripe for de Gaulle's comeback. American publishers did their share by publishing de Gaulle's own three-volume *Memoirs*, an incredible fabrication of rewritten history, which were breathlessly hailed by critics as masterpieces of stylistic elegance and important source books on World War II.

"STAGE SET FOR COMEBACK"

The time for de Gaulle's comeback arrived in May 1958, during the Algerian crisis, after extensive preparation by his agents, which included the attempted assassination of General Salan who was considered the one man blocking de Gaulle's return to power. General Salan had not forgotten the First Resistor's past. Yet, he was persuaded—against his better judgment—to open the path for de Gaulle. Thus, the French anti-Communists, duped by such clever Gaullist agents as Michel Debre and Roger Frey into bringing de Gaulle back to power in order to save Algeria from a sell-out to the Communist-led FLN, actually opened the gates to the fatal Trojan Horse.

Once de Gaulle was back in power he proceeded to do exactly what the Communists wanted. First he went to Algeria where he was greeted as the new saviour, proclaiming everywhere before huge gatherings that Algeria was French, that the Moslems would now and forever be equal as Frenchmen. Then he proceeded to dismantle the accumulation of patriotic, anti-Communist forces, which had brought him to power and put into operation his incredibly cynical plan for betrayal. It took all of four years to accomplish the task.

Of course, the American mass media had done its chloroform job on the American people. And Dean Rusk and Robert Strange McNamara, who today are so busy "fighting Communism" in Vietnam, hardly bothered about the fall of Algeria to the Reds. Most peculiar, since Algeria (1) has enormous reserves of oil, and (2) was a NATO territory. Wasn't the Rockefeller-CFR-Bilderberg crowd concerned? They obviously knew what *Oil Gas & Chemical Service* of June 8, 1959, reported:

Recent exploratory successes in North Africa and the development of sizable oil reserves in Algeria have directed

attention to the entire northern part of the continent of Africa. The vigorous exploration and development of oil reserves in the Sahara Desert areas of Algeria will bring France into the ranks of important oil producing nations . . . The proximity of North Africa's reserves to oil-consuming countries such as France, Spain, Italy and Germany can only mean a loss of oil production in the Middle East to make way for absorption of the new production in North Africa.

"AGENT OF INTERNATIONAL CARTELS"

You would have thought that de Gaulle, the supposed great French nationalist, would have relished the idea of France becoming a great international oil power, independent of the Anglo-Saxons. Yet, on the eve of France's petroleum independence, de Gaulle handed Algeria over to the Reds who now control 40 percent of France's supply. There were no protests from the Rockefeller-CFR-Bilderberg combine, nor from the State Department, or President Kennedy, or the Kremlin. It should be noted that one of the largest oil companies in France, if not the largest, is Esso Standard, an affiliate of Rockefeller-controlled Jersey Standard, and it gets its oil from its own sources in Libya and Saudi Arabia. Before the Red takeover of Algeria it had been assumed that France would soon no longer need much Middle East oil. In addition, French Algeria was to supply France with plenty of natural gas. Today, all of that has changed. De Gaulle's "independent" France is to get her gas piped from Northern Holland where the fabulously rich gas fields are controlled by Esso and Royal Dutch Shell (a 50-50 Rockefeller-Bilderberg partnership).

Had France retained French Algeria, the French would have been selling the gas to Italy and Spain, and French Algeria would still be a thriving, productive part of the "free world."

Of course, the betrayal of French Algeria was only the first step in de Gaulle's long-range plan to betray all of Western Europe. Once Algeria was disposed of—as well as the rest of French Africa—he embarked on the next phase of his programme: the big squeeze on West Germany. He put a wet blanket on the Common Market, thus thwarting Germany's chances of becoming the leading economic power in Western Europe. Then he began breaking up NATO, the alliance in which Germany finds herself securely tied to the United States. Objections from our State Department have been so feeble that one almost suspects that de Gaulle is doing exactly what Washington wants. He has recognized Red China and supplies North Vietnam with credits. And now the trip to Moscow. Is he not building bridges to the East, exactly what Dean Rusk and Lyndon Johnson have advocated? In fact, is there any reason not to believe that Paris, Washington and Moscow are basically in agreement?

THE INTELLECTUAL ESTABLISHMENT

(By D. WATTS)

Cheers for the brave bullocks as they come lumbering into the arena! How sturdily they trample the mouse underfoot; how belligerently they shake their heads at the barking dog; with what intimidating fixidity they stare at the bullfighter that is not there! Some members and protégés of the Intellectual Establishment in Australia have produced a symposium, "Australia and the Monarchy." They join in advocating the conversion of Australia into a republic. Ole!

For as long as I can remember there have been people criticising the Monarchy as an institution and monarchs, as persons, and arguing that Australia would be better off if she severed her ties with Britain. When the British Empire seemed to be firmly established and likely to endure for centuries, when crowns sparkled all over Europe and royal blood was held to be a sacred fluid very different from that which flowed in the veins of ordinary folk, to scorn kings and queens and talk of a Republic of Australia was shocking, though permissible so long as the radical just talked. In these days when, whether we like it or not, we must face the possibility that, in the not far distant future, Britain may declare her independence of the Commonwealth and Australians find themselves, with small alternative choice, citizens of a republic, the only startled thought that the voicing of thread-bare radicalism flushes is that, with no better protection than the Intellectual Establishment in Australia affords, a Republic of Australia could very easily become a People's Republic.

THE AUSTRALIAN INTELLECTUAL

The Intellectual Establishment, in Australia or elsewhere, is neither aristocratic nor radical. It is middle-class. It is dull and primly conventional and definitely from suburbia. This is somewhat obscured by the circumstances that its propriety is political, not social, so that in its nineteenth century smug respectability has been remodelled.

The members do not feel that they are complacent Philistines. Neither do the oft-derided suburban mum and dad feel as they are objectively seen. Their small doings are full of interest to themselves and the trivial events of their lives are, for them, full of drama. It is not the objective magnitude of experiences that makes them seem to those undergoing them important or unimportant, but the subjective response. Subjectively, the members of the Intellectual Establishment are suburban mums and dads wrapped up in respectable joys and hopes. Objectively, they are seen to be conventional persons, dressing their minds expensively or cheaply in the latest fashions, shopping for them, all at the same self-service stores, and entertaining them with the latest jazz or pop ideological music. Mentally they are very proper and they are shocked and condemnatory if anyone dares to say anything that, ideologically, is not quite nice. When they try to do something really dashing they are like the Edwardian hostess who would daringly add a little claret to the lemonade at a teenage party.

The Communists correspond to what used to be called

the Smart Set. They are not exactly immoral, but they are close to it. They are, my dears, fast. The proper mums and dads do not belong to this set and they do not mix much with those in it, at least not while the neighbours are watching. Papa may have a flirtation, or even a love affair, with Communism so long as he preserves a facade of respectability. That is, an intellectual may, with impunity, be a Communist so long as he calls himself a liberal.

PERVERSION TO PROPER VALUES

The out-and-out bad hats are they who are not leftists. Criticism of Leftism carries with it the odium that sneering at the British Empire did sixty or seventy years ago, but some of the irreverent outsiders of today actually aver that Majority Rule has become a dangerous fetish and that conventional egalitarianism covers a great deal of stupidity and hypocrisy. The response by the Intellectual Establishment to this is similar to that which would have been evoked a century ago in suburbia by rude remarks about Albert the Good.

Those beyond the leftist pale are often heard to say that some of the dear African tribes are uncivilised and that savages do not think and feel exactly as civilised men do and are incapable of understanding civilised values. The Intellectual Establishment and its admirer's feel that this is very ill bred and even—coarse.

Many of the ideologically immoral reprobates go so far as to say that the idea of racial tolerance wedded to leftist ideology produces a monster. Understandably, the intellectual mums and dads consider this suggestion to be positively indecent. Never mind, the Intellectual Establishment will deal with the bounders, and serve them right. If anyone wants to be just a wee bit naughty he can always be that, without offending the nice people, in a delicate, leftist way. And bullocks are so much more chaste than bulls, my dear.

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.

THE BALLOON GOES UP

ANNUAL DINNER AND SEMINAR

Get your booking early!

The dates to remember!

DINNER: Friday, 16th September, 6 p.m.

LOCATION:

The Victoria, 215 Little Collins Street, Melbourne. Donation: \$3.80.

SEMINAR:

Saturday, 17th September.

LOCATION:

Chevron Hotel, The Bamboo Room, 519 St. Kilda Road. Melbourne.

THEME:

The Race Question.

As has become our usual custom, we would like to hear from any supporter who cannot attend the Dinner but would care to subsidise a student with the amount of the donation.

We regret the donation is higher this year by 30 cents. We have reluctantly been forced to this measure by the continued rise in costs of basic charges.



Mr. Ron Gostick, National Director, Christian Action Movement in Canada.

Notable visitor and guest speaker at the annual dinner and seminar this year

Comments from:

POLITICAL INTELLIGENCE WEEKLY

London, W.1

A PECULIARLY DESERVED KNIGHTHOOD?

The inclusion in the Birthday Honours, in the Prime Minister's list, of a knighthood for Siegmund Warburg has been received with mixed feelings. Many of his fellow directors and associates, such as Grunfeld, Korner, Seligman, Whitman, van der Beugel, Spira, Stheeman, Scholey and Gladwyn are presumably pleased; some of the more traditional merchant bankers and others may be more critical.

Warburg was born in Germany in 1902, and did his training in banking in Hamburg, London, Boston and New York. He was a partner in M. M. Warburg & Co., Hamburg, from 1930 to 1938. He came to Britain before the war and is said to have been a refugee from Hitler.

In 1946, he founded S. G. Warburg & Co., and this merchant-banking firm subsequently became most prominent in many big take-overs - - with considerable success against some of the older, traditional City of London houses.

Features of many S. G. Warburg take-over activities included novelty, foreign control of British firms, unorthodox approach or hot or bitter contests.

Warburg's own personal directorships include a number of firms with continental and Israeli connections; he is a partner in Kuhn Loeb & Co. of New York, the name of which will be familiar to many as being the banking firm described in various publications as providing money for the Russian revolution before and during the first world-war. (A Mr. Warburg was a director of Kuhn Loeb at the time, as well). The ramifications of Warburg directors and associates cover a wide spectrum of British business — including banking, insurance, finance, property, defence, engineering, and shipping -- and the firm are advisers to leading press and television interests such as Thomson Newspapers and the Daily Mirror group, thereby having powerful connections with the opinion-moulding media.

Both press groups are strong supporters of Britain joining Europe, and this is one of the causes to which S. G. Warburg has given big support, including, some believe, providing a directorship for former-diplomat and leading 'European', Lord Gladwyn. There are those who regard Warburg's declared support of a campaign, which they believe would be the end of Britain's sovereignty and independence, as a bit of an impertinence, from a man who benefited before, during and after the war from the fact that Britain was a free, sovereign, independent and tolerant state. Some, in fact, may ask what has Warburg done for Britain, to be honoured with a knighthood?

On the face of things, Wilson's recommendation confirms the press reference a short while ago to Warburg's

Continued on page 8

IS McNAMARA INSANE?

America's Secretary for Defence makes totalitarian proposal

The following essay is a condensation of that which appeared in "The Review of the News," June 1, 1966.

Most Americans, who refuse to believe that there exists a centrally directed plan to impose totalitarianism on America, would regard McNamara's latest proposal to draft all American youth into some sort of National Service as merely another one of his cockeyed ideas.

The *Chicago Tribune* of May 20, 1966, editorialized as follows:

Robert S. McNamara managed to sound more like a social worker than a secretary of defence in his speech Wednesday in Montreal before the American Society of Newspaper Editors. He dusted off one of Eleanor Roosevelt's old schemes of 20 years ago in proposing that "every young person in the United States" be required to give two years of "national service" to the country.

We have always adhered to the view that there are potentially great dangers to regimentation in the forced enrolment of the youth in a government-run "front." The duty to bear arms in the nation's defence is an inescapable obligation of citizenship. But there is no duty to be exposed to political indoctrination under the direction of a central government, which has attained such dimensions of grasp and power that it is the principal internal threat to liberty.

There was no mistaking it. Every libertarian understood McNamara's proposal for what it was, a naked bid by government to control our youth. The same had been done in Nazi Germany through the Hitler Jugend, and the same is done in all Communist countries where youth is controlled through organizations like Pioneer Youth. Universal national service is so obviously part and parcel of the totalitarian state that it is downright fascinating to observe the mental gymnastics of those Americans who are for it.

CIVILIAN CONSCRIPTION OBJECTIVE

For example, the *New York Times*, suddenly forgetting the history of Nazism, Fascism and Communism, commented with a straight face in its editorial of May 22, 1966:

We warmly welcome his (McNamara's) endorsement of the principle of two years of national service for all of the nation's youth. Service in the Peace Corps or in community work in this country cannot be equated in hardship and danger with combat duty, but at least universal service would reduce the inequities that have developed under Selective Service.

In Congress, the same clique of totalitarians came out in favour of the proposal.

But the man who really picked up the ball and ran with it was none other than the "liberal" Senator from New York, Jacob K. Javits. According to the *New York Times* of May 22, 1966:

Senator Jacob K. Javits strongly endorsed yesterday

a proposal that all young Americans be asked to serve their country either in civilian duty or in military draft . . .

The New York Senator praised as "wise and intelligent" a speech by Defence Secretary Robert S. McNamara proposing a two-year draft for all young Americans to correct the "inequity" in the present Selective Service system . . .

Senator Javits, a leading spokesman of liberal Republicans who lately has generally been in agreement with President Johnson's policies, is known to be considering a formal proposal to substitute a universal national service for the present Selective Service system . . .

Noting that he has long advocated the concept of a national service, on either a civilian or military level, he recalled that in 1959 he proposed that the United States commit one million young men to serve in undeveloped countries for one year . . .

Mr. Javits said he now believed that a more determined effort must also be made to bring young women into national service agencies "to fill the pressing needs being created day by day in our growing cities in the fields of health, education and social work."

An expanded role for women and the need to give broader access to unskilled youths to non-military services was proposed here in May 6 by the first National Service Conference, an ad hoc group of prominent educators and manpower experts.

NATIONAL PRESS ENDORSES TOTALITARIANISM

So it didn't all start with McNamara's speech in Montreal. The drive for universal national service has been underway for some time. In fact, if we go back to the *New York Times* of May 8, 1966, we find that the totalitarians had just about reached the point where they could surface with the idea and see how the American public would respond. The *Times* of that day had published an article on the National Service Conference, which had been convened at the Princeton Club in New York on May 7, 1966. According to the *Times*:

Donald J. Eberly, chairman of the meeting, said the conference would begin a comprehensive review of the military draft, including the possibility of establishing a compulsory national service . . .

Some 30 representatives of universities, student organizations, government agencies and private foundations participated in the meeting, which was organized by Mr. Eberly, executive associate of the Overseas Educational Service.

Who is Mr. Eberly and what is the Overseas Educational Service? Mr. Eberly is a typical product of the Harvard-Federal Government—Private Foundation syndrome. He graduated from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology

in 1950, then served in the Army for two years, then taught high school in Nigeria for four years, spent two years in Turkey and in 1960 returned to Harvard to get his Masters' degree in Education. He then spent another two years in Nigeria. In 1964 he joined the Overseas Educational Service, a non-profit organization that recruits American teachers for African universities. The O.E.S. is an affiliate of Education and World Affairs, a satellite of the Ford Foundation. In 1963, Education and World Affairs, described in the Ford Foundation's Annual Report as an "agency to strengthen the role of higher education in international affairs," received \$1.6 million from the foundation.

According to Mr. Eberly, who was questioned by this writer over the telephone, the idea for compulsory universal national service goes back to William James, the Harvard professor of philosophy and psychology, whose famous essay *The Moral Equivalent of War*, published in 1910, advocated the establishment of some sort of national service through which the nation's youth could be disciplined and channelled toward a higher purpose. As usual, the philosophers get upset when they see large numbers of unregimented people leading their own lives. They have to start organizing them to serve some higher purpose (usually defined by the philosophers if there are no dictators around), such as "global understanding." They have to start ordering individuals around, getting them to "march," like masses.

We examined the list of thirty participants quite carefully. None of them are well known enough to the public. However, they make up an interesting cross-section of lower-echelon totalitarians, "liberals," social workers, educators and the like.

It would be interesting to find out how the substance of the National Service Conference's deliberations of May 7 found their way into Secretary McNamara's speech of May 18. In his speech the Secretary said:

With respect to a "community of effort" let me suggest a concrete proposal for our own present young generation in the United States.

It is a committed and dedicated generation: It has proven that in its enormously impressive performance in the Peace Corps overseas; and in its willingness to volunteer for a final assault on such poverty and lack of opportunity that still remain in our country.

As matters stand, our present Selective system draws on only a minority of eligible young men.

That is an inequity.

It seems to me that we could move toward remedying that inequity by asking every young person in the United States to give two years of service to his country—whether in one of the military services, in the Peace Corps or in some other volunteer developmental work at home or abroad.

McNamara's "suggestion," of course, was nothing more than a trial balloon. Had Mr. Eberly made a similar speech, nobody would have listened. But when McNamara

the great, the wise, the brilliant and the all-powerful, says it, everybody listens and the nation responds immediately. The totalitarians need no longer guess. They can size up the opposition, get the public to start talking about universal national service, and start injecting into the mass media the ideas they want the public to absorb, so that by the time a proposal for national service comes up in Congress, the nation will have been softened up for the kill. Of course, the *New York Times* of May 20, 1966, reported:

The Johnson Administration quickly made it plain today that it had no plans to draft young Americans for civilian duty or to let such duty become an alternative to military service . . .

Some hearings on Capitol Hill seemed likely, but the White House and other official spokesmen said the Administration was not seeking new legislation.

This, naturally, gave the impression that McNamara was speaking merely for himself. However, the *Washington Post* of May 20, 1966, reported:

The White House said it had received a rough draft of the speech in advance, but refused to say specifically if President Johnson read it, or if so, what he thought of it . . .

State Department Press Officer Robert J. McCloskey said: "It is fair to say that the speech in toto had the approval of the Department of State."

Other sources said Secretary of State Dean Rusk had examined the speech in detail before it was delivered. There definitely was some softening of the original McNamara phraseology, it was learned, as varying drafts of the speech circulated in the Administration.

In other words, McNamara has not gone insane or lost his equilibrium. He was simply doing his small but key part in the elaborate plan worked out by the totalitarians to foist universal national service on the youth of America. If the American people want to nip this encroachment on their freedom in the bud, they'd better start waking up fast.

INSPIRING MESSAGES FOR FINAL RHODESIAN RALLY

One of the outstanding features of Mr. Eric Butler's final Rhodesian rally on June 10 was the large number of inspiring messages received from all parts of the English-speaking world, including the U.S.A. These messages demonstrated to those present at the rally that the Candour League of Rhodesia was an influential member of the growing number of non-party grass-roots movements around the world which are the advance forces of the first genuine international campaign against the forces of World Revolution.

We are pleased to report that messages for the Rhodesian rally were received from all States of Australia. We wish to thank all those who took the trouble to send messages, because in this way they demonstrated that spirit of co-operation, which is so essential in the struggle in which we are engaged.

Continued from Page 1

were basically the same as Europeans, only they had been out in the sun a lot longer and had not been taught how to read and write. True, scientists have proved that this is the most dangerous rubbish, and yet this rubbish was accepted as science by the American Supreme Court in its famous decision that all public schools in the U.S.A. had to be compulsorily integrated. The results of this integration were becoming progressively disastrous, both for the Negro and the European.

Mr. Butler said that UNESCO was one of the most subversive of the international agencies associated with UNO. Loud applause greeted this charge.

RHODESIAN OFFENSIVE NECESSARY

In the concluding part of his address, Mr. Butler made an appeal, described as the most inspirational ever heard in Rhodesia, for Rhodesians to move from the defensive to the offensive. He urged Rhodesians not to allow their natural bitterness against the shameful policies of the Wilson Government in Britain to blind them to the fact that they belonged to the stream of history, which flowed out from the British Isles. He said, "Because the Wilsons have betrayed our traditions, have besmirched our institutions, does not mean that we in the newer parts of the British world should turn our backs upon those traditions and institutions. It should be our mission to revive those traditions and institutions, to make them come alive again. And why should not little Rhodesia, which has already thrilled the world with its courage, initiate action to revive the real British world?"

Mr. Butler said that Rhodesia's problems were basically the same as those of Australia, and New Zealand. He appealed for a much closer alliance between Rhodesia, South Africa, Australia and New Zealand, all attempting to uphold European civilization in the Southern Hemisphere. He also felt that the Portuguese would also welcome such a progressive move. In this part of the world a group of European nations could build a bastion from which the whole strategy of International Communism could be turned back, and the Western world shown how to save itself.

LORD GRAHAM'S TRIBUTE

At the conclusion of Mr. Butler's address the large audience rose as one in a tremendous standing ovation, which continued for some minutes. The Chairman announced that after such an address it would be an anti-climax to bother about any questions and he was going to ask Lord Graham, Minister for Defence and External Affairs, to propose the vote of thanks to the speaker. In a most generous address, which went far beyond mere formalities, Lord Graham said that he was certain that all present had been deeply moved, as he had been, by the great challenge of Mr. Butler's address. He was delighted that Mr. Butler had stressed the importance of preserving proven traditions and institutions. Mr. Butler had carried the flag of the Rhodesian cause right around the world and would always be assured of a warm welcome in Rhodesia.

Continued from Page 5

personal links with members of the socialist Cabinet. Perhaps he has joined television tycoon Sidney Bernstein and solicitor Lord Goodman as the Prime Minister's closest personal advisers.

COMMUNIST ACTIVITY IN GHANA

From a source connected with the new regime in Ghana, we learn that documents now being studied there reveal that the toppled dictator Kwame Nkrumah was actively being helped by Communist powers to seize power over the entire Black Continent. The emergent African States were to be united in a federation headed by him.

In a special espionage school in Accra, camouflaged as a "scientific institute", young Ghanians were being trained to infiltrate and subvert other African countries. In many exercise books, which have now been recovered, notes can be found relating to such lectures as: "How to assassinate a Head of State" or "How to seduce a woman". The school was run by two officers of the East German Communist regime — Major Jurgen Rogalla (alias Kruger) and Captain Rolf Stollmayer. Both had been seconded to Ghana by the East German Ministry for State Security and both managed to escape from Ghana when the Nkrumah regime was overthrown.

The two Communist officers gave specialised instruction in such espionage techniques as using invisible ink, mid-get cameras and electronic listening devices. Western Embassies and their personnel were used as testing material for Ghanians attending the school.

The most important information emerging from Nkrumah's documents is, however, this: East German security officers in Ghana had complete access to all data collected by the country's intelligence services. It is a well-established fact that these services covered every individual State in Black Africa. Information thus obtained by the East Germans was systematically shared with Moscow agents.

Ghana was paraded, under Kwame Nkrumah's regime, as one of the leading unaligned nations of the developing world. Documents now show that it was a tool of Moscow and world Communism. This lurid fact ought to be kept in mind by all emergent and inexperienced nations hob-nobbing with Moscow or Peking. The governments in Rhodesia and South Africa are well aware of it, but their knowledge gains but little credence in London and Washington.

LEAGUE HELPS RHODESIAN VICTIMS OF TERRORISTS

Mr. Eric Butler announced at his final Rhodesian rally that he was making a donation of 25 dollars on behalf of the Australian League of Rights to the fund for the children of the young Rhodesian couple who were recently murdered by Chinese-Communist trained and equipped terrorists. He also announced that one-tenth of the collection from the rally was being donated to the fund.