

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. 33, No. 8

AUGUST 1967

VICIOUS SOUTH AFRICAN PRESS CAMPAIGN AGAINST ERIC BUTLER

REVOLUTIONARIES FEAR DEVELOPING INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMME

Mr. Eric Butler's South African tour of three weeks, ending on July 21 before he left for Rhodesia, triggered off a vicious South African press campaign against Mr. Butler. Sections of the Afrikaans press, which is causing conservative South Africans great concern, joined with the English press in a smear campaign against Mr. Butler and those who had sponsored his South African programme. A close study of the campaign leaves no doubt that the international revolutionaries are becoming increasingly concerned about the strategy and tactics, which Mr. Butler has been promoting in recent years.

Further evidence of the revolutionaries' concern is the recent publication of a work by one Dennis Eisenberg, entitled *The Re-emergence of Fascism*. This book claims that Mr. Butler is the Otto Skorzeny-Martin Borman type, travelling all over the world "coordinating" what is described as the new Fascist International! The "new Fascist International" is in fact the new Conservative International now gaining increasing coherence and momentum as Conservative groups thrust against the international revolutionaries.

Not long before Mr. Butler arrived in South Africa, at least one Canadian daily published an article dealing with the alleged growth of "anti-Semitism" in South Africa, and mentioned Mr. Butler. The Canadian material was based upon a story published earlier in South Africa. It was not surprising, therefore, that when Mr. Butler arrived in South Africa there was an immediate press campaign against him. The *Sunday Express* of July 2 opened the campaign in the English press with a report that Mr. Butler had arrived for a tour, but that a number of organisations (not named) regarded him as a dangerous "anti-Semite." However, it was left to the Afrikaans Sunday newspaper, *Die Beeld*, to open up the major assault. Under the heading, "An Unwelcome Visitor," it said amongst other things that Mr. Eric Butler had at one time "admired" Hitler but had later turned against Hitler claiming that he was working together with International Jewry!

After a successful tour of the southern part of South Africa, Mr. Butler returned to Johannesburg on July 10 to be confronted with a story in the English evening newspaper, *The Star*, which repeated and added to *Die Beeld's* story. *The Star's* story appeared under the heading, "Friends of Rhodesia Under Attack." In a late edition of *The Star* a statement was published from Mr. John New on behalf of the National Executive of The Friends

of Rhodesia defending the action of the organisation of bringing Mr. Butler to South Africa in association with the National Congress against Communism. At the Johannesburg meeting that evening, there were a large number of press representatives present. The South African press therefore had every opportunity to hear what Mr. Butler was talking about. They also heard his scathing reply to the allegations made against him. But subsequent developments proved that the press was not interested in truth, but only in smearing.

A GOOD FRIEND OF SOUTH AFRICA Mr. Butler was introduced at the Johannesburg meeting by Mr. G. H. Beetge, Secretary of the National Congress against Communism, who warmly defended Mr. Butler,

**SPECIAL APPEAL NOTICE
SEE PAGE 8**

stating that he had known him for a number of years. He told the audience that so far from being an unwelcome guest Mr. Eric Butler was very welcome because he had been a good friend of South Africa. He had presented the truth about South Africa in all parts of the world. Mr. Beetge then revealed publicly for the first time that South Africa's security authorities thought highly of Mr. Butler and that he had lectured to senior officials of the South African security forces and to the police and armed forces.

In his opening remarks, Mr. Butler said that even if he had said anything in praise of Hitler in the 'thirties, he would have been in the good company of Winston Churchill, Lloyd George, Robert Menzies and many others who had expressed admiration of the material achievements in Germany under Hitler. But the truth was that he had always been critical of Hitler and National Socialism. He had in fact exposed that Hitler had only come

to power because of Stalin's directives to the German Communists. Mr. Butler then proceeded to give his usual address on Rhodesia in the context of global power politics. Not one paper published anything that Mr. Butler said, including his references to Hitler.

ATTEMPTED SPLITTING CAMPAIGN

After his Johannesburg address Mr. Butler was approached by representatives of *The Star*, *The Sunday Tribune* and *The Sunday Times*, asking for interviews. The representative of *The Times* was told that the attitude of his paper to Mr. Butler in the past had been such that no personal interview would be granted, but that Mr. Butler would supply written answers to written questions. The other two papers were told that they could only interview Mr. Butler if the interview was tape-recorded. This was arranged. However, the next day's *Star* carried such a distorted report of what was allegedly said at the Johannesburg meeting by Mr. Beetge and Mr. John New who had explained why the Friends of Rhodesia had brought Mr. Butler to South Africa, that *The Star* was told that the interview was cancelled. *The Star* report quoted Mr. New as having said that the Friends of Rhodesia was going to become "political," the inference being that it was going to enter party politics. This report was designed to embarrass the South African Government and to split the Friends of Rhodesia. On the eve of the National Conference of the Friends of Rhodesia, held on Saturday, July 15, *The Star* came out with an editorial attack on Mr. Butler, repeating once again the falsehoods, which he had already corrected.

When the written questions from *The Sunday Times* were received, it was clear that this paper was preparing a major smear article. Legal advice was sought by Mr. Butler on one question, which said that he, in fact, was a top-secret Communist who had come to South Africa under the guise of being an anti-Communist, and that he was making contact with Communists in South Africa. The question then continued, "If this report is not correct, how could this misunderstanding have come about?" Mr. Butler replied briefly that in view of the nature of the questions submitted, he had no desire to have any association whatever with *The Sunday Times*.

VICIOUS SMEARING CONTINUES

On the Sunday following the National Conference of the Friends of Rhodesia, July 16th, the South African press gave full treatment to the Friends of Rhodesia and Mr. Butler. *The Sunday Tribune* carried a story under the heading, Friends of Rhodesia Move Shocks Many." Not a word about what Mr. Butler said at the interview, or at any of his addresses. The whole purpose of the story was to frighten South African supporters of Rhodesia, and to prevent them from supporting the type of strategy recommended by Mr. Butler and accepted by the leaders of the organisation. *The Sunday Tribune* also had an editorial suggesting very subtly that it was a great pity that money collected to help Rhodesia should be used to bring this Butler character with "His 'Communist under

every bush' outpourings." No mention was made of the fact that Mr. Butler was, in fact, fighting the real battle for Rhodesia, which could not be won only by humanitarian activities, however worthy they were.

Although *The Sunday Tribune*, and other English journals, was bad, it was the *Die Beeld* that provided the highlights in smearing. It linked Mr. Butler together with other conservatives, and inferred that they were dangerous to the necessary growth of liberalism in South Africa. Other papers throughout South Africa picked up the story, and it was clear that the campaign was not only designed to influence South Africans, but also Rhodesians. However, it is certain that the campaign against Mr. Eric Butler has merely served to increase his standing and prestige amongst conservative South Africans. His tour of South Africa has been rated a tremendous success by large numbers of responsible people, with many invitations to return to centres he visited.

Mr. Butler reports that South Africa has many problems (and he will be writing on these, he hopes, at a later date) but that it has a group of patriots who realise that they must stand together with similar patriots around the Western world if their country is to be saved. The South African press campaign against him demonstrates that he is feared by the revolutionaries, and that the work he is doing is a major contribution to the saving of Western Civilization.

Continued from Page 4

force must recover it through a price inflated to that of the locally-produced article, which is already inflated by higher wage costs reflecting greater consumption of GNP in the longer time, and is borne by all who contribute to GNP, i.e., the people of the country, though not necessarily evenly.

Overall effect is the same if the money tax is taken from the people and paid to the local manufacturer as a subsidy so that his price can be reduced to below 'cost,' instead of the importer's raised: a claim to some GNP is transferred to the local concern through manipulation of taxes and prices. If the latter has good prospects of reducing costs to those of landed imports within reasonable time, the greater self-sufficiency would pay off in normal times when war is disrupting exchange in some quarter of the world.

But the benefits are not to be had within the existing framework where money flow is far below that of GNP. Say the ratio is 800 to 1000. Then, to take a tax of 10% from GNP (real income) 12½% must be taken from the money income! That is why taxers are reluctant to remove indirect taxes on income.

A step in the right direction could be achieved by abolishing tariffs, and where necessary, in the interest of self-sufficiency, substituting price reducing subsidies, not by depleting the already inadequate money flow, but by new Governmental Bank credit which would raise the taxing medium nearer to what it ought to be before any tax is taken, viz., the 'value of Gross National Product.'

Annual Dinner — Book Now!!

A TIME OF REDEDICATION AND INSPIRATION FOR ALL SUPPORTERS

The Annual Dinner is a unique event: it is not only a pleasant social function where supporters and their families enjoy an excellent dinner and fellowship; it is an annual rededication service of deep spiritual significance. In the twelve months since last year's dinner great historical events have occurred which underline the significance of our movement and make this historic coming together of great importance. Bookings are already heavy, so we ask you to help the organisers by sending in your booking early. Do not leave it until the last moment and so make the task any more difficult than it need be.

The following are a few of the highlights of this year's Dinner.

- **The distinguished Australian, Sir Raphael Cilento, who has taken up the gauntlet on behalf of Civilisation, will be present and speak to the guests.**
- **The proposer of the toast to "The New Times" will be outstandingly unique, in that it will be proposed by Mr. Phillip Butler, son of the Managing Editor of New Times, and National Director of the Australian League of Rights, Mr. Eric D. Butler. This is an historic highlight contributed by a young man who will return from overseas in time for the dinner. Our seconder of the toast indicates also the virility of our movement and comes from Western Australia where he is playing a leading role in the growth of our work there, this is Mr. Ray White, member of State Council, W.A.**
- **Mr. Eric Butler's annual address will bring highlights from his recent world tour, which marked the greatest advances in formulating steps to further increase the work of our movement throughout the world.**

FOLLOWING INFORMATION REQUIRED

When supporters book for the Dinner, they should indicate whether they require a fish dinner. Every effort is made to seat friends together, or to seat guests with fellow-guests of their own choice. As an increasing number of young supporters now attend the Dinner, all young people can be seated together. The donation for the Dinner is \$4.00. To minimise organisational problems, this must be made in advance, or at the entrance. Please note that no receipts are issued, unless requested, but guests may check at the entrance upon arrival.

DINNER MESSAGES WELCOMED

Country, interstate and overseas supporters who cannot attend in person are cordially invited to be present in spirit by sending a message. These messages are a feature of the Dinner and make a vital contribution to the spirit of the function. All messages are either read or are on display, and will be published in the special Dinner issue of "The New Times."

WHY NOT ACT AS HOST TO STUDENTS?

One of the most encouraging features of our work has been the growing number of young supporters, many of them students. Unfortunately, these students have severely limited financial means while studying, and the full donation of the Dinner is beyond most of them. Each year a special fund is therefore established from contributions by supporters, particularly by those who cannot attend the Dinner themselves, to subsidise young supporters.

PLACE AND TIME OF DINNER

The Dinner will be held in The Banquet Room, The Victoria, 215 Little Collins Street, Melbourne, on Friday, September 8. Cocktails will be served at 6.15 p.m. Dinner will be served at 7 p.m. Guests should study seating plan immediately upon arrival. For all information, write to Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne, 3001, or telephone 639749.

TARIFFS: FOR WHAT PURPOSE?

By G. K. Tavender

Speaking against entry to the European Common Market, a British industrialist pointed out that a situation which amounted to the exchange of Morris Minis for Renaults of similar size and performance, or, British cutlery, and so on, for equally good European, was of no advantage to either side, as in all cases prices would be inflated by freight charges. The community in toto would be doing, say, £1000 worth of work for only £800 worth of goods. This, or worse, always results from the 'official' substitution of means for ends, that is to say, making Trade, 'Expansion,' Employment, etc., ends in themselves instead of what they should be—the means to the only true purpose of industry, provision of the needs of consumers with the minimum of trouble. No, we are not overlooking capital goods. The ultimate purpose of capital goods is enhanced consumer service whether the needs be food, shelter, transport, entertainment, or what have you.

Since the sole purpose of production is consumption, not waste, the profit from production is in the act of consumption or usage. If your 'profit' on a deal is a crate of bananas and you neither eat, nor arrange for someone else to eat them, there is no profit. Without the 'profit motive' there could be no human race.

Still keeping the reality distinct from the warped monetary reflection, we see that the real 'cost' of production is human effort, physical and mental, generally known as 'work.' Efficiency means minimising trouble, i.e., doing away with unnecessary employment. (Aware of Labour Unionist 'thinking,' we mention that if ALL consumer needs could be produced by one-tenth of the population there would be no rational or moral reason for the other nine-tenths being deprived of consumer rights. As Sir Edrich Bastyan said the other day, "Social problems are made by people and must be solved by people.") Work on trade and 'expansion' for their own sake, that is, beyond the ample provision of consumer's needs, is economic waste. It is another instance of doing £1000 worth of work to get a much lesser value of wanted goods, or, in the words of C. H. Douglas, "the purchasing power of effort is diluted." Let us emphasise that we are not railing against essential work but merely affirming that compulsory wasteful work is anti-social; it tends to debase the integrity of the individual.

The sugar industry in Queensland is one instance of the wastage resulting from expansion for expansion's sake. Thousands of work-hours, which could have been applied to essential projects, were diverted to production of a great mass of sugar to be 'sold' at a heavy loss overseas. In effect, about four-fifths of it was given away. This was no more the fault of the growers than of the rest of Australian electors; they only conformed unthinkingly to official policy. Then, in self-protection, they conformed to the filching from Australian consumers the means of keeping them in business. And that brings us to the 'favourable balance of trade' fallacy, meaning, losing more by export than we gain by importing.

In the economy of a free, enlightened people a favourable national trade balance would show no debt either way. Exports would be recognized as losses and imports as gains. In practice there would be fluctuations, but the aim would be balance. The present convention,

putting the emphasis on export, has its roots in superstition—the belief, still far from outgrown, in the magic properties of gold. Gold and money were mistaken for wealth, so every effort was made to get gold in exchange for the real profits—the useful goods for enhancing the quality of living. Had the gold bullion been sunk secretly in the deeps off Mindanao, and its place in the vaults filled with gilded pig iron, the fooling of the world's traders could have been just as effective as with the genuine gold. Today's mania for piling up the misnamed 'favourable balance' dilutes the purchasing power of effort exactly as did the pursuit of gold. Our so-called international trade problems are 'psychologic'—not economic. Keynesians refuse to recognize the truth that in all countries the wages and salaries distributed in the processes of production are far from sufficient for the purchase of the end products. They also see employment as an end in itself, rather than a 'cost' to be eliminated where possible. Within this confused ideology, frenzied export activity does create the **illusion** of increased prosperity because the money distributed as financial cost of ALL production is nearer to the sum required for purchase of the LESSER VOLUME of goods left in the home market. The effect is the same as produced by money (bank credit) created as debt and paid out for work wasted on over-expansion, white elephants, and war.

The enlightened community regards complete self-sufficiency, with no international transport costs, as the economic ideal; but impossible because resources are not evenly distributed. The policy then, is to import only those needs, which cannot be produced at home with less work than it takes to produce the exports as payment. Temporary departures can be advantageous. It is economically sound to use labour **reserves** at home to produce commodities hitherto imported even if at first the real cost in man-hours is much higher. This is the alternative to handing our industries over to foreign investors. It would be a valid reason for tariffs if steps were first taken to equate the flow of the taxing medium, money, with the flow of Gross National Product, from which ultimately the real tax is claimed.

Allowing for 'wages of capital,' **all** industrial costs are traceable to wage costs from mining or planting raw materials right through to the delivery counter. The money tax (tariff) is taken from the importer who per-

WHERE I STAND

A Christian Cleric Speaks Out

One of the most frustrating aspects of the battle against Communism which continually tests the loyalty of Christians who recognise the various stratagems and the propaganda of Communism for what it is — the incarnation of evil — is the inability of Christian clergymen — even those whose loyalty to God is sincere — to point out to their flock the dangers facing them. Many clergymen and priests are vociferous at pointing out how man has turned away from God, and that this generation is a Godless generation, but few, very few, have filled in their superficial appraisal of the situation with the details which underlay their general accusations. Were they to do so it would be at that point they would make contact with the true nature of evil, and in fulfilment of their vows take it upon themselves to challenge the forces of evil promoting atheistic Communism in its various guises. We thank God for at least one such man who has raised his voice, the Rev. A. G. Fellows of St. Paul's Church of England, Roma, Queensland, and it is with pleasure that we publish the following statement from "*The Maranoa Churchman*." We would also point to other voices raised to inform their Christian brethren in the book "*Your Church—Their Target*" advertised elsewhere in this issue.

Dear People of God,

In Synod last month I opposed a motion on Vietnam, which read as follows: —

"This Synod of the Diocese of Brisbane thanks His Grace the Archbishop for the lead he has given as Primate in his recent statement on the war in Vietnam.

This Synod, in the spirit of the Archbishop's statement, and fully recognizing the complexities of the issues involved in the Vietnam war—

- (a) calls upon all Christians to pray unceasingly that God may guide the participants in the war to a just and satisfactory settlement;
- (b) expresses its opposition to further escalation of the conflict;
(with two other clauses).

I moved an amendment, which reduced the whole thing to one sentence, thanking the Archbishop for his statement and urging all Christians to pray for God's guidance in the issues involved. On a division (the first I have seen in nine Synods in this Diocese) the amendment was declared defeated by 15 votes in a total of 209. After a second amendment was defeated on the voices, I successfully moved that the original motion be not put.

WHAT DOES 'NO ESCALATION' MEAN? It means—

- (a) That we leave the initiative entirely to the enemy. They will 'escalate' if it suits them, and think us fools for tying our hands.
- (b) That we can't hit the enemy as hard as we can where it hurts most, which surely is normal strategy when one is fighting a war.

- (c) That the conflict is thereby deliberately prolonged, with an ever-increasing casualty list.
- (d) That morale of both soldiers and civilians suffers, when it is known that maximum effort is not being put forth and that there is no intention to do so.
- (e) That there seems to be a fear of being sucked into a greater war with other powers. If this is so, then our policy is defeatist, and the initiative lies with the enemy, for the enemy has only to push harder here and more firmly there, or wave the big stick of "nuclear holocaust!", and back we go, step by step. It is ultimately a policy of surrender.

WHAT ABOUT A JUST AND SATISFACTORY SETTLEMENT?

What I want to know is - - do we never wage wars now to WIN them? We have been told again and again that our aim is to get the other side to the Conference table. Arthur Goldberg, the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, has said that we are not out for a military solution in Vietnam, but a political one. So there it is. Our boys in Vietnam are not there to win! They are there while we hope that the other side will sit down with us.

And what will that accomplish? The Communists sat down to truce negotiations in Korea **because they had to** (we had them on the run). But they managed to drag out those negotiations for so long that there were as many casualties after the negotiations started as there were before. And when the smoke and dust had settled, where were we? Back where we started — on the 38th parallel. And yet some still try to say that we won the Korean War. So many lives were given in vain, and the poor people of North Korea are still under the Communist yoke.

The Communists won't sit down to any conference table in Vietnam all the time it is seen we do not have a policy of **winning**. Even if they did, what value could we put on any agreement they signed? Past experience of their treaty breaking shows that the Communists observe Lenin's words - - "Promises are like pie crusts; made to be broken." It is no use our chiding the Communists for doing this, for we do not have the same basis of morality. To the Communists, anything that advances the cause of Communism is **moral**. So to lie, to kill, to break treaties, is good if it helps Communism along the road of conquering the world. The Vietcong terrorist who buries alive, or mutilates, or castrates a Vietnamese chieftain or headman, is acting morally, for his actions are furthering the domination of the south. And do you think that we are likely to reform a confirmed treaty-breaker by asking him to sign yet another treaty? No, let us pray for **victory**, as we did in the last war. If we are not careful that word will slip out of our vocabulary.

The mover of the motion said that Hanoi showed no signs of weakening. I am sure that one reason is that this kind of motion is moved up and down the country, all helping to lower resistance to Communism. The

Communists may know that they can't get a military victory in Vietnam, but they also know that they stand a fair chance of winning the game in this country and the U.S.A. For if we can be persuaded to think that the war might last 10 to 20 years, then they hope we might get tired and want to call it quits, as the saying is. 'Peace' parades, banners, demonstrations, are all grist to the Communist propaganda mill of Peking radio, which can be heard gleefully reporting (and distorting) these things. So the average North Vietnamese is encouraged to fight on, and the South wonders if we are "fair dinkum." It is interesting to note that the virtual defeat of this motion rated not a word in the Press, but we can imagine the headlines if it had been voted on and passed.

When the history of these days is written in years to come (unless history is to be forever re-written, as in Orwell's "1984"), God forbid that it should be shown that a weak and defeatist attitude on the part of Church bodies helped to hand over about 14,000,000 Vietnamese people to Communism, and even paved the way for our own country's enslavement. Our Archbishop has said that he doesn't believe in peace at any price, and I think most Australians agree with him. He has also asked us all to join with him in saying at 12 noon each day the following short prayer, which will be known by some of you already, and I commend this to you—

"O Saviour of the world, Who by Thy Cross and Precious Blood has redeemed us, save us and help us, we humbly beseech Thee, O Lord."

THE QUEEN, THE GOVERNMENT AND OURSELVES

Harold Wilson and his colleagues have done more to discredit the Monarchy than any preceding British government, not even excepting Harold Macmillan. The threat of the use of force against Rhodesia inserted in the Queen's speech given in Jamaica is the most outstanding example. It is surprising that the whole of the blame for this has been put on the Queen, by our overseas friends. We in this country, who have been more in touch with her, cannot believe that she is a different woman now than at her Coronation, when she appealed to us for help with the great tasks that lay before her.

That was a time of national communion which inspired us with devotion to the ideals our country has always cherished. We knew that our Queen accepted those ideals as we did, and in the Coronation service was pledging her life to them. We understood them, emotionally and spiritually; but the third aspect of these pledges, the practical side, was obscure. Hence it is that as the years passed the vision faded.

It is still there, and must be recaptured. Harold Wilson has many able assistants, in his design of reducing the Monarch to a puppet, responsive to his string pulling. A paper published abroad tells us that at a recent diplo-

matic dinner there were present Princess Margaret, the Spanish Ambassador, his wife the Marguesa de Santa Cruz and the Foreign Minister of Great Britain, the Rt. Hon. George Brown. Three times Brown cried out, in a loud and boastful manner to the Spanish Ambassador: "We'll see if you ever take Gibraltar!" Her Royal Highness had to ask him, "Please have the goodness to be quiet."

There are many things of which we are ignorant, but one thing we do know. Our Queen told us that she needed our help. That help has been lacking over the years. We have lost heart. And perhaps it is not surprising. We are under a dictatorship. At every general election vital questions are kept in the background, they never appear in party programmes, nor in the press which connives in their suppression. For example, in 1966 we were not consulted regarding joining the Common Market, indeed, Wilson and others had given the impression that they opposed joining, save on terms which obviously would be unacceptable to the Six. Nor on the Rhodesia question. These matters were ignored by all Parties. But when the election was over, we were told we had given mandates on both to the winning Party.

What now? Are future elections to be similarly rigged?

It is vital that Rhodesians should understand that we are in worse case than they are. This government has about two years to run, perhaps longer. Supposing that in spite of the growing opposition Our Dictator persists? To whom can we turn?

We have always been a Constitutional Monarchy. During the critical years before the next election we have one protection, the Crown.

In a Republic do people turn to the President? This query provokes painful thought.

What is the meaning of our corporate life?

"A Monarch is the personal centre of an order rooted in freedom, and one that defies all possibility of mechanical or mathematical explanation. A Monarch involves an ideal of life at once social and personal. Indeed it can be said that it expresses not simply an ideal of human life, but the *ideal*; the truly human ideal of life. Deny its true expression and one is then under compulsion to set up a hydra-headed array of substitutes."

Do we want these substitutes? We can see them standing there in the shadows, waiting for the rush forward to try for first place.

We have no president to whom to appeal. Would it be any use if we had? We have a Queen. Some of us many have been disappointed in her, but is it not our own fault? We have not helped her. If we now put our trouble before her, as our Sovereign Lady, may it not be that this help will be from each to each?

Many Britons were sick with anxiety over Rhodesia when the crisis broke two years ago. Think back to the last Armistice Day Service with the Salvation Army Band at the Cenotaph. Rhodesia has weathered part of the storm. Will she now not give us help in return? Will

she not support a Petition to the Queen, that *our* sovereignty shall not be submerged in the United States of Europe or America—just as Rhodesia's sovereignty shall not be destroyed by the United Nations.

This petition, properly handled by those familiar with statesmanship, could save Rhodesia, ourselves and the Monarchy, without which British civilisation stands a poor chance of survival.

B. M. PALMER.

Dr. COOMBS AND A NATIONAL BALANCE SHEET

INTERESTING CORRESPONDENCE

The following letters were printed in the Melbourne "Herald." The refusal of Dr. Coombs, the Governor of the Reserve Bank of Australia, to supply the information asked for reveals the necessity to have our representatives asked that this be done in increasing numbers. Any reader doing so should forward results to us.

It was reported (16/6/67) that the Federal Government might be forced by the Senate to set up an inquiry into medical and hospital costs in Australia.

But in holding such an inquiry, the Senate is seeking to treat the effect rather than the cause of high costs.

We are told constantly that the country's economy today is stronger than ever. Why, then, are people unable to meet their cost-of-living expenses and find it impossible to save either for old age or for an emergency?

This shortage of purchasing power is evident everywhere, from young people trying to establish a home to retired people trying to live on their superannuation.

The answer surely lies with our economic system, and it is this, which should be urgently inquired into by the Government, to ascertain why every wage increase is swallowed up in an effort to meet the increased cost-of-living expenses, which inevitably follow.

I recently wrote to Dr. Coombs asking for a copy of the national balance sheet. After much correspondence I was eventually told by Dr. Coombs that he did not have a national balance sheet, setting out the assets and liabilities of this country, because "compilations of this type would involve an immense amount of complex statistical work."

How long could a business survive if the accountant were ignorant of its assets and liabilities? Imagine then the chaos into which our national economy must have drifted, when the country's economists are ignorant of the assets and liabilities of Australia!

Is it any wonder that the people of this community are struggling from one week to the next to balance the family budget, and are left without any reserves with which to face medical and hospital expenses.

Dr. Coombs' "balanced" economy is, I fear, in need of immediate stabilisation.

—Monica Lennie, Spruzen Av., North Kew, 21/6/67.

EXCUSE IS WEAK

Dr. Coombs's reply to Monica Lennie, Herald, 21/6/67, "Compilations of this type would involve an immense amount of complex statistical work," on her request for a national balance sheet, is about the weakest ever.

With modern equipment available, such as computers, this would not present any serious problem, and it appears to me as a weak excuse for not doing the obvious.

As Monica Lennie pointed out, this is a matter of great urgency. As a pointer to the seriousness of the situation, take the effects of inflation on life insurance and superannuation funds.

The Commonwealth Statistician's consumer price index number for the six capital cities shows: Year ending 1950 . . . 66, year ending 1966 . . . 135.2.

These figures represent an increase of just over 100 percent and this, applied to a policy worth \$20,000 in 1950, means that it would be worth less than \$10,000 today.

To reflect the physical facts, this policy today should be worth something over \$35,000, because in the period

SHIPMENT OF IMPORTANT BOOKS ARRIVES

Your Church — Their Target. \$2.10 post-free.

Contributions by thirteen leading American Christian theologians and Church leaders exposing the sources of attacks being made on the Christian Church, and the means by which the Church is being used to further the cause of Communism. An important book.

TWO IMPORTANT PUBLICATIONS ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

Essays on THE DEATH PENALTY. \$1.27 post-free.

This book contains contributions by Christian spokesmen who put beyond doubt the rightness of Capital Punishment in a Christian society.

The Death Penalty, by E. L. Hebden Taylor, M.A.(Cantab.), L.Th.(A.T.C.). 30 cents, post-free.

A remarkably clear exposition of the validity of Capital Punishment as a fundamental function of Christian government. Rev. Taylor is also the author of The Christian Philosophy of Law, Politics and The State, published this year. A handbook for the advanced student, priced \$10.34 cents post-free.

DIALECTICS: COMMUNIST INSTRUMENT FOR WORLD CONQUEST, by Eric D. Butler.

The most valuable little work yet published on Communist "thinking," strategy, and tactics.

Price 60c; 5 copies \$2, post free.

THE FABIAN SOCIALIST CONTRIBUTION TO THE COMMUNIST ADVANCE, by Eric D. Butler.

This valuable little work, just off the press, shows that Fabian Socialism, far from being a moderating influence on the worldwide revolutionary movement spear-headed by the Marxist-Leninists, has played a decisive part in advancing the revolution.

Price 60c; 5 copies \$2, post-free.

DIETARY HEALTH PRODUCTS

Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne

Telephone 639749

The following products are available and recommended. Send for complete list of products.

NUTRITIONAL LECITHIN

Obtain your quantities of this health supplement rich in Poly — Unsaturated — Protein — Vitamins — Minerals — Delicious in flavour also.

20% Lecithin.

21% Protein.

4% Minerals.

Composed in all of 17 selected health promoting ingredients.

ORDER in following sizes:

8 oz. — 75 cents. Postage 10 cents.

16 oz. — \$1.35 cents. Postage 20 cents.

40 oz. — \$3.00. Postage 30 cents.

NATURAL VITAMIN A

For health of mucous membranes; resistance to infections.

100 tablets, \$1.95, 4c postage.

Special items in our range of natural health products.

Send for a complete list of our products.

GEV. E. TABS.

A balanced daily course of 26 vitamins and minerals. A 32 day course containing 64 capsules.

Price \$3.07 posted.

SUPER B.12'S.

At last, organic B.12, and at a price cheaper than the usual synthetic. **Price \$2.89 posted, 100 tabs.**

ALFALFA TABLETS.

Contains natural calcium, vit. A and Chlorophyll. **Price 100 tabs. 49 cents, 200 tabs. 86 cents posted.**

KELP TABLETS.

For mineral deficiencies and mental fatigue. **Price for 100 tabs., 49 cents, 200 tabs., 89 cents posted.**

COMFREY OINTMENT.

For sprains, swellings, bruises, and ulcerated conditions. **Price for 2 oz. jar, 69 cents posted.**

SILK OINTMENT.

Wonder ointment with the vit. E. base.

For burns, skin rashes, etc. **Price for 91 gram jar, \$2.17 posted.**

COMFREY TABLETS.

Natural vitamins and minerals from deep rooting comfrey. **Price for 100 tabs., 74 cents posted.**

Continued from page 7

under review we have had a progressive increase in both the volume and efficiency of production that would have more than offset this inflation.

This policy, to say the least, is not very honest, and if allowed to continue, for want of an intelligent approach to our financial arrangements, will progressively undermine the social and moral fabric of our society.

—W. J. Carruthers, Marlborough Road, Heathmont, 27/6/67.

INTERIM APPEAL FOR FUNDS TO BOOST NEW TIMES CREDIT WORTHINESS

New Times readers are more aware of the importance of credit than most. The New Times is no exception in its need for increasing credit. No political organisation can survive without subsidisation in the form of gifts from supporters.

Although we will be making our annual drive for funds later in the year as usual, the impact of operating in an increasing inflationary economy makes our task harder and necessitates an interim appeal at this juncture.

As we know, the inflationary weapon is designed to destroy the independence and the resistance of those opposed to the evil monopoly of credit and the news media. Those with faith are called upon to make increasing sacrifices.

Our front-page article indicates the vital importance of the work of this journal and the influence it exerts. The campaign against Mr. Butler in South Africa indicates that the Social Credit analysis of the international conspiracy provokes the revolutionary element to show their real hand where otherwise they would seek to work more discreetly.

If each supporter receiving this edition sent \$2.00 it would be of tremendous assistance.

Knowing this may not be possible for those in special circumstances we ask those answering this appeal to send what they can afford. The great and the little should combine to help solve our problems.

IMPORTANT:

- Send your donation to
New Times Ltd.
Box 1226L,
G.P.O., Melbourne, 3001.
- Make your cheque, money order, or postal order to
New Times Ltd.
- Attach to a slip of paper marked
"Donation to New Times Appeal."