

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. 9

SEPTEMBER 1967

Design behind the Middle East Crisis, becomes clearer

The real story of what happened before and during the recent Israeli-Arab military conflict has yet to be told in full. But certain facts have come to light, which provide further confirmation of our view that the Middle East situation has been worsened, not improved, as a result of the conflict.

As reported in *Human Events* of July 22, the authoritative *U.S. News and World Report* has stated, "The Soviet Government, to further its purposes, faked intelligence reports to the governments of Egypt and Syria—that Israel was massing troops to attack Syria." If this is correct, then it explains why Nasser suddenly demanded that the U.N. forces be withdrawn so that he could attack Israel the moment Israel attacked Syria. The Secretary-General of the U.N., the Burmese pro-Communist, U Thant, has been criticised for so acting and precipitating the crisis by withdrawing U.N. troops. But before doing this U Thant had to consult with the most important official in the U.N. permanent secretariat, the Under-secretary for political and Security Council affairs. The under secretary is responsible for the control of all the military and police functions of the United Nations "peace-keeping" forces.

Soviet Union Precipitated War

The present under secretary for political and security affairs is Vladimir Pavolich Suslov, one of the most dangerous criminal Communists ever to come out of the Soviet Union. As revealed in *The Fearful Master* (\$1.10 from The Heritage Bookshop) it was agreed when the U.N. was formed that the vital position of under secretary for political and security affairs must always be held by a Communist. It is elementary that Mr. Suslov did not agree to the sudden withdrawal of U.N. troops from the Middle East unless this was the policy of the Kremlin.

If Nasser was misled by false Soviet reports, this could explain why his air force was conveniently left lined up on the ground to be destroyed by the Israelis before it could be used. Without any air cover Arab ground forces were the helpless prey of the Israelis. Yet to be confirmed are reports that much of the sophisticated Soviet equipment supplied to the Arabs could not be used because of the Soviet "failure" to supply the necessary firing apparatus. But there appears to be little doubt that the Israelis ignored the convention, which prohibits the use of the dreadful napalm bomb, using it against both civilians and armed forces. The Arabs claim that this was the dreadful weapon, which sent Arab soldiers wandering off from their units in the burning sun—having first torn their clothes off when struck by the blobs of burning jelly

from the napalm bombs, that in fact the use of napalm bombing was a decisive factor in the war.

Contrary to the widely held belief that the Soviet wishes to destroy Israel, Soviet leaders have made it clear time and time again that they do not support this policy. Comparatively few people read basic Communist journals and therefore do not know that in these journals the point is being made that the Soviet Union played a major role in the creation of the new State of Israel. This was a "progressive" policy. Communist strategy requires the irritant of Israel in the Middle East as the cementing factor to hold the Arabs together in a unity, which the Communists can exploit. Israel has been falsely described as a "Western beach-head" in the Middle East. It is in fact a Political Zionist beachhead. Israel could not exist without the constant support of a powerful international Political Zionist movement, which has deluded and exploited both Jews and Gentiles.

A Soviet-Zionist Dialectical Conflict?

Are the Communists and the Political Zionists, in spite of their verbal attacks on each other from time to time, running in a form of double-harness and merely engaged in a subtle form of dialectical conflict from which both believe they will benefit? Did the Communists deliberately produce a conflict, which they knew Israel would win and then so enlarge their borders at the expense of the Arabs that the Arab would become more dependent than ever upon the Communists for arms and economic aid? Whatever is the answer to this, and similar questions, the harsh truth remains that as the result of the conflict which the Soviet played a vital role in precipitating, the Political Zionists have expanded and the Communists appear to the Arabs as their only hope of redress. The Western nations offer the Arab world a little or nothing, with the natural result that the Arabs believe that the West is completely subservient to Political Zionism. The West has no hope of winning back lost prestige and support in the Middle East, and halting Communist expansion, unless it also takes a stand against the aggressive policies of Political Zionism, resisting the international financial and propaganda power of this movement.

Early this year the Shah of Iran caused a stir by signing

Continued on page 8

RHODESIAN CHRISTIANS REPLY TO BRITISH COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

Anti-Rhodesian propagandists have made widespread use of the statement, issued in a booklet, by Joint International Department of The British Council of Churches and the Conference of British Missionary Societies. During his recent exhaustive survey of conditions in Rhodesia, Mr. Eric Butler found that the great majority of the missionaries, including some from Australia, were strongly opposed to "majority rule" at the present time, and expressed concern that their fellow-Christians in other countries should support policies without possessing any real knowledge of Rhodesian affairs. The following are extracts from a reply to the British Council of Churches by a group of Rhodesian Christian laymen:

The preface to the pamphlet refers to the two resolutions passed at the meeting of the British Council of Churches at Lambeth Palace on October 25, 1966. The first approves H.M. Government's declaration to see justice done to all the people of Rhodesia. The Government of Rhodesia is entirely in accord with this aspiration. But the resolution goes on to say that any settlement in Rhodesia must guarantee unimpeded progress to majority rule. Events elsewhere in Africa since the Council of Churches meeting have opened the eyes of the world to the fact that "majority rule" has not to date afforded in consequence "justice to all the people" of any African country. The second resolution instructed the Joint International Department to prepare a short leaflet setting out the salient facts concerning Rhodesia "as it sees them". This has been done in the booklet and the opinions set down therein have as much light to throw on the problem as would a pamphlet on the situation in Vietnam written by Mr. Kosygin or Mr. L. B. Johnson. It would still be an opinion at second hand to say the least, if not prejudiced and biased.

Rhodesians Live With Problem

The point to be borne in mind is that we in Rhodesia have to live with the results of our words and deeds. If we are wrong we shall suffer. If the situation is, as Mr. Wilson constantly reiterates, "a threat to peace" then the ensuing war will catch white Rhodesians, men, women and children, in the front line with no means of escape. Our critics might well put themselves in our place and ponder. What we are doing is being done because we believe it to be right. Because we are Christians we believe it to be right for our neighbour also—particularly so for that neighbour who is the more primitive.

We acknowledge that the British Council of Churches booklet stems from worthy Christian ideals also but we whose homes are in Rhodesia believe that the views expressed in it are due to information, which is sometimes biased, and indeed, on occasions, not true. The opening paragraph points the opinion of Canon Max Warren as if it were a statement of fact—a papal dogma of infallible structure. He said: "The Rhodesian issue is not primarily a constitutional issue. Essentially it is the race issue." Mr. Wilson for one certainly considers it to be a constitutional issue. The Afro-Asian bloc whose majority

rules the United Nations agrees with the Canon that it is a race issue. We, the peace-faring majority of black and white Rhodesians, consider that the world has been confused by those who presented the "racial" view as the problem. We know that it is a question of standards and of merit and ability.

No Christian Judgment On Rhodesia

Archdeacon Lewis of Inyanga writes of his doubt whether any great numbers of British Christians have attempted a specifically Christian judgment of Rhodesia at all. He refers to the reasons advanced by the British Council of Churches and says that they are identical with those of secular humanists. He asks, by what implication, whether the Christian mind exists in England any longer. What is the Christian's position faced with the fact that in Africa "legal" and "Constitutional" governments have led to massacres and misery, he asks, while in Rhodesia an "illegal" government has meant peace, stability and progress for the many? Further, asks Archdeacon Lewis, are Christians committed to the belief that political rights, as commonly understood at this moment in history, must take precedence over justice and good order? He begs British Christians to take another look at Rhodesia, and make a judgment about it based on Christian principles and not on the fashionable presuppositions of our time. UNO, the Afro-Asian bloc and New Commonwealth are not guided by principles, he declares. Archdeacon Lewis adds that it is an error to suppose that the wrongs that exist in Rhodesia are greater than those in Britain—though they are quite bad enough. They are different, not worse. It is the task of Christians in Rhodesia to tackle them, and this they are trying to do, but they are not helped by duress from overseas, least of all from Christians who should find ample outlet for their reforming zeal in their own country and in the countries to which their governments have so precipitately granted independence. Sanctions are very unlikely to bring down the Rhodesian Government—there would be nothing but tyranny and chaos to replace it if they did.

The Problems Of Race And Culture

But they do make the Rhodesian Christian's task of reconciliation well nigh impossible. Archdeacon Lewis admonishes that the most fatal and dangerous delusion of all is summed up in the words: "Let us do evil that

good may come". He reminds us that God is not mocked, and that Christian ends cannot be attained by un-Christian means.

The resolution by the British Council of Churches in its October resolution approves the reaffirmation of resolve that "any settlement in Rhodesia must guarantee unimpeded progress to majority rule." Rhodesians are chary of expressions such as 'a multi-racial society' with all the connotations which modern parlance tends to give it, and they have grave reservations about "majority rule". There is no Rhodesian alive who does not recognise that he lives in a country with a plurality of racial societies and it is necessary to create and preserve conditions so that all peoples can flourish and progress. It is true that Rhodesians consider that the phrase "majority rule" means black rule and blatant racialism. Have they not good reason? The policy of Rhodesians has been consistent, namely that it accepts that all persons can advance according to merit, ability and competence, and if these be the criteria then they alone should determine in whose hands government should be placed. To argue that those hands should necessarily be black because they are the majority and irrespective of the competence and ability of the persons concerned is a travesty of democracy. It is also a travesty to suggest that unless full integration is accepted as a national policy then that country is doomed or reactionary. Problems of race and culture contact are worldwide and have no more been resolved in Rhodesia than they have in America and other countries in the world, but it is abundantly clear that racial prejudice and consequential friction is a feature of human society which should be avoided at all possible costs and it is certainly not relieved, avoided or overcome by a policy of forced social integration.

A Moral Issue

The Council is right. "The moral issue is . . . primarily the difference between the haves and the have-nots." This problem is not unique to Rhodesia, but no country in the world can claim to have done more than Rhodesia to rectify this balance. There is no question of "putting" the weak in the hands of the strong. This is an unalterable issue of fact just as that in a family the children are in the hands of parents. The history of Rhodesia over the past eighty years proves it to have been worthwhile—population increase from 500,000 to 4 million; average earnings up from destitution to £ 120 per annum; internecine tribal warfare completely eradicated; disease wiped out; agricultural knowledge widely disseminated and put into practice; justice and law for all on equal terms in the place of indescribable barbarity **and** Christian missions abounding where once there was **nothing**. It would be illogical, senseless and most un-Christian, surely, to put the strong in the hands of the weak as the Council implies.

How could it honestly be called "moral" to remove an elected White Government, simply because it is "white" and replace it by a black one, simply because it is "black"

in a country where the predominantly greater part of the population is of a tribal affiliation and untrained for a "democratic" parliamentary system of Government. Surely the British Council of Churches is not consciously shutting its eyes to events elsewhere in Africa now "enjoying" "majority Government", or must one remind them of the Congo and the many countries where military or civil revolutions or brutal repressions have taken place, and which now suffer under "one-party rule" in which any political opposition is viewed, and punished, as treason?

How It Looks To White Rhodesians

The Council is right to state that until there are many more African graduate teachers, doctors, lawyers, etc., they cannot hope to run the country. But the stark choice is not, as it puts it, "Would you like a black living next door?" Doubtless fewer Rhodesians would really object to black neighbours who had reached an acceptable level of education, than, if the recent P.E.P. report is correct, do Englishmen. The question is surely one of standards. There is no "restricted franchise." All, of any race, can qualify.

How It Looks To Black Rhodesians

It is odd to see recorded in the paragraph under that heading that Africans "resent the fact that government decisions affecting their lives are made 'for' them, not 'with' them." This is exactly the moan that one hears from English rail-commuters on what the Labour Government is doing to 'them'. Mr. Wilson, having got in power despite the adverse vote of more than half the British electorate, does not consult them before he decides on any issue. Yet the Rhodesian Government is assiduous in consulting African opinion on major issues through the Council of Chiefs. It does so precisely because Africans have not yet qualified in sufficient numbers to express a voice for all in Parliament.

The Council says that Rhodesian Africans demand "one man, one vote". This is simply not true. This demand has indeed been made by a handful of urbanised Africans - - nationalist supporters. The overwhelming majority of Africans—three millions of them—live in tribal areas under tribal rule, have never heard of 'one man, one vote' and would spurn it if offered it. Majority rule is as foreign to the entire thinking of Rhodesian Africans as it has been so clearly demonstrated to the world to be so in other African countries. In how many is 'one man, one vote' persisted in now

An independent writer, Mr. Pierre Chamorel, in an article in the Swiss newspaper *Journal de Geneve* of April 18, 1967, refers to long discussions he had, on a recent visit to Rhodesia, with an educated African who was at the same time a lay preacher and an office clerk. This is what the Rhodesia African had to say in substance: "Naturally we want to govern ourselves one day, but at the moment we are not capable of doing so. A black Government now would not be any good. Our (African)

Continued on Page 8

THE CREATION AND EXPLOITATION OF RACIAL FRICTION

By D. WATTS

There is no more faithful spouse than a man wedded to his own folly. Because of this, in the U.S.A. it has come, perhaps belatedly, to an apologetic whiff of grapeshot. Anyone not either a moron or infatuated could have foreseen that catastrophe; but whenever it was pointed out that the policy being pursued in Africa would result in the kind of government there is in most parts of that country today, and that the U.S.A.'s racial policy would certainly lead to violence and bloodshed and intensified racial hatred, what was the response? "Sir, you are talking about the policy I love."

A political or social policy, which ignores human emotion, is doomed to cruel failure, but the policy, itself, should be shaped by knowledge and reason. However, a melodrama about goodies and baddies to the accompaniment of heart satisfying boos and cheers is hard to resist; and if the baddies be top-dogs, those in the peanut gallery feel that they are enjoying a personal triumph when the villains are foiled. The wicked lord and the poor, virtuous mill-girl; the snobbish bourgeois and the sterling slum-dweller; the arrogant whites and the simple-hearted, wistful Negroes—that kind of thing is appealing fiction, but it is not the reality with which policies have to deal. Yet the fiction has been treated as fact. It was possible to do that because fiction is usually an artificial arrangement of selected facts. There is bad in whites and good in Negroes, but also good in whites and bad in Negroes. That latter has not been taken into account in the emotional racial policies that have been adopted.

Having set the white up as the villain of the piece and the Negro as the hero, it absolutely ruins the melodramatic basis of the racial policies if the hero is ever at fault. So according to the fictioneers he never is. No matter how reprehensible a Negro's behaviour, he is always an angel forced into wrong-doing by the villainy of the whites, or by the environment which they, without any part in it by him, have created for him, or by—Heaven help the dotting soul and desperate imagination of the apologist—the weather! The love of melodrama has taken the pro-Negroes beyond delight in an imaginary world to a flight from reality.

Fundamental Differences Must Be Understood

Probably at least fifty percent of the quarrels between individuals or groups arise from the circumstances that people do not like those who are different from themselves. A sensible start towards tolerance of difference is to lead people to understand how much alike are those who are different. That is difficult enough; but the next step: to discover how to make the differences mutually acceptable is something that calls for more than enthusiasm and good intentions. It requires an ascetic honesty and wisdom. There has been neither the one nor the other. The "dodge-it" method has been to wipe off the problem of harmonising differences altogether by asserting that there are no differences; and since so many, vocal intellectuals especially, live in a world of political and social make-believe, they find no difficulty in accepting that proposition. They are obliged by disobliging Nature to admit that there is a difference of pigmentation between

whites and blacks; but argue that this is no more than skin-deep; and since they, themselves, never go deeper than the surface of the problem, they imagine that they have stated the whole of the difference.

In a good many things white and black are alike; but to deny the difference between them is to make them more acutely felt under the surface and therefore more important than they should be. The way in which the racist egalitarians have handled reality's flat contradiction of their racial sameness creed is by making a compromise. They preach that for white people all races are equal, but for black people races are unequal, the black being morally superior to the white. And people supposed to be well-educated and fairly intelligent thought that that theory would work in practice!

"The Real Objects Of The Freedom Rides"

Having thus separated the stage sheep from the stage goats, the next thing was to organise a parade of the virtuous before the iniquitous. This was ostensibly to shame the "wicked"; but if anyone thought that it would convert them he was a wretched psychologist. I suppose the real objects of the freedom rides and marches were (a) to exert political pressure, and (b) to give certain politicians an advertised justification for bringing in desegregation legislation; but it would be hard to convince me that the freedom marches and rides were not intended to be highly objectionable to the white Southerners, and that there were not, among the organisers, many who hoped that the whites would react with violence. Then they would have been able to say, "Here were the good, orderly Negroes peacefully demonstrating when, without provocation, the intolerant whites, with their hearts full of unreasoning hatred, cruelly attacked them."

If the white supporters of the "Civil Rights" marches, etc., never realised that the "peaceful" demonstrations would inevitably develop into violent ones, and that the Negro hatred that seethed beneath the peaceful front and that was being exacerbated by their propaganda, would be turned against the Northern as well as the Southern whites, I should like some of them to explain why they did not. Had xenomania with them reached the stage of madness? Were their brains pickled in alcohol? Were they so insanely in love with their make-believe that it had become more real to them than reality's self?

It was not that they were inspired by a love of justice, though they may have tried to fool themselves that they were: for had they really been, they would have evinced more detachment. They would have recognised that humanity to some which is inhumanity to others is

spurious humanitarianism, whoever the some and the other may be; and that it is possible to improve the lot of Negroes (or Aborigines) without inflicting humiliation and vexation and, not seldom, injustice and actual suffering upon white people. But the lovers of melodrama would not like it that way. They must have a villain who is soundly trounced.

The Production That Went Wrong

With the well-implanted conviction that Negroes can do no wrong and that the whites can do no right, and the officially blessed organisation of offensive marches, the stage was set for riot. Something went wrong with the production. The riots were not begun by the whites and they often occurred where theoretically they should not have done. When the bad thing was done by the stage goodies, the besotted could not bear to face the fact that off the stage the "goodies" could be bad. Hastily they cast about to find an explanation that would serve as a justification calculated to leave the rioters pure in heart and victims still. Exasperation by heat and slum conditions! There could not be a more palpably contrived excuse than that. Hot weather is no new phenomenon and masses have never gone on the rampage on account of it; besides, Negroes, with their dark skins, should be better able to endure it than are whites. Almost always there are slums as soon as there are cities; yet there have not been yearly outbreaks of mass vandalism until recently.

The thin excuse was needed, not only to absolve the lawless Negroes of their crimes, but also to spare those in love with their own racial policy and propaganda the pain of being obliged to admit that they are in any way responsible for what has happened. President Johnson has set up a Commission to inquire into the causes of the disorder, but I shall be pleasantly surprised if it does anything so heartless as to suggest a separation between the "liberal" and his beloved policy. It will, no doubt, find that bad housing unemployment, poor education, the delay in implementing the Civil Rights program and maybe even the weather caused the disgraceful behaviour; but if it mentions it at all, it will doubtless touch lightly on the abuse by journalists and other publicists of their unforgivable exploitation of mass suggestibility in the case of a race even more prone than some others to mass hysteria. It will be interesting to see if it even so much as censures that unprincipled purveyor of sensationalism, the television, for presenting the Negro leaders most likely to inflame passions in preference to the more responsible ones. I, for one, will be amazed if it draws attention to the enjoyment, not confined to Negroes, of jungle ferocity and the hope of loot.

The Need For Sense

Certainly population congestion makes it very easy to form mobs and incite them to violence, and a sense of inferiority is compensated for by arrogance and self-assertion; but we cannot solve problems by selecting

some factors and ignoring others; though the enamored cannot help doing that.

The greater the problem the greater the need for sense, not emotion, to do the steering. The racial problem, always difficult, has been worked up to be out of all proportion, and emotion has set a course towards the rocks. It is urgent that commonsense should now take over. The beloved racial policy of the egalitarian has proved to be his evil genius.

JAMES NICHOLAS KIDMAN

With the passing of Mr. James N. Kidman, who died suddenly in Sydney on July 30, we lose yet another of the pioneers of the Social Credit Movement in Australia. A member of the well-known Kidman grazing family, Mr. Jim Kidman was essentially a countryman, even though his business activities kept him in Sydney during the later years of his life.

After serving in the Pacific during the last war, Mr. Kidman went to Canada where he was associated with the Social Credit Movement, meeting most of the prominent Social Crediters of that period, men like the late Mr. Norman Jacques, who never deviated from the policy and tactics of C. H. Douglas. Upon returning to Australia he was closely associated with Social Credit stalwarts like the late Mr. John Macara, and made many excellent contributions to Social Credit activities.

Although at home in the bush, Mr. Kidman was also a man with a deep artistic temperament. He was extremely fond of music, and played the violin. He had hoped this year at long last to have attended a "New Times" Dinner and to have played for guests. Jim Kidman will never make a "New Times" Dinner now, but he made a contribution to the cause for which the "New Times" stands that will live on into the years to come.

We salute his passing. Another valiant soldier has left our ranks. However, it is the Jim Kidmans who have pioneered the way for those who are constantly coming forward to ensure that our cause is never neglected.

FIRST W.A. LEAGUE OF RIGHTS DINNER

The first Annual Dinner of the West Australian Council of the League of Rights, held in Perth on Saturday, August 19, marked a major step forward by the League in the West following recent re-organisation. The Dinner was an outstanding success in every way. The guest speaker was Mr. Eric Butler, who spoke on his recent international tour. The Assistant State Director, Mr. Ray White, is typical of the new young supporters now coming into the League, The League Office, at 544 Hay Street, is now open on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays, and it planned to also have it open shortly on Tuesdays and Thursdays.

'SOCIAL CREDIT' VERSUS 'STATE CREDIT'

By T. V. HOLMES

The difference between 'Social Credit' and 'State Credit' is the difference between a Market and a Planned economy. A Market economy is one in which "people by their purchases make clear what they want and do not want"; a Planned economy is one in which the people "are accommodated to the needs and convenience of the producer." (Prof. Galbraith) *Economic Democracy*, Douglas's first book, made proposals for so adjusting the money and price system as to make it "continuously register the opinion of the consumer, as to the respective merits of the articles submitted to his choice."

It is the difference between an economy in which sovereignty resides in the Individual, and one in which it resides in the State. The Briton today finds himself deprived of his Common Law rights by statutory process of law. His liberties have been 'institutionalised' and he now finds himself at the mercy of a Credit Power whose fief the political Establishment has had to become as a consequence of unpayable debt. Such 'institutionalised' sovereignty can be transferred to a *foreign* authority as and when its Credit power overlords may decide. Has it not ever been a time-honoured right of the creditor to dispose of a debtor's credit, property and even person without question of treason or betrayal? Does not "force majeure" take precedence over 'majority rule', 'public opinion' or the Common Law? Has not the Briton squandered his ancestral estate and its credit in two 'world wars', which have left him, bankrupt beyond hope of redemption? And does not even the Queen's First Minister declare that "he is not worried about loss of sovereignty" which he has always regarded "as advancing civilization"? (Walter Farr, *Daily Telegraph*, 2/2/67.)

How different was the society envisaged by Douglas under the term 'Social Credit', a society in which "every man shall sit under his vine and under his fig tree; and none shall make them afraid" (Micah. iv 4); a society where "Systems were made for men, and not men for systems, and the interest of man which is self-development, is above all systems, whether theological, political or economic." *Economic Democracy*.

Douglas's Philosophy

Hugh MacDiarmid in *The Company I've Kept* quotes a passage from Douglas's writings that strikes the very keynote of his philosophy, a passage that strikes the author of aligning Douglas with "all that is best in Scottish thought from the Declaration of Arbroath to the present day." Douglas wrote: "There probably never was a time in which disinterested legislation was so rare, just as there probably never was a device which was so effective in silencing criticism of interested legislation as this idea that self-interest on a worldly plane must necessarily be wicked. I would therefore make the suggestion, in order to add to the gaiety of nations by creating a riot at once, that the first requisite of a satisfactory govern-

mental system is that it shall divest itself of the idea that it has a mission to improve the morals or direct the philosophy of any of its constituent citizens. Sir Walter Fletcher said: 'We can find safety and progress only in proportion as we bring our methods of statecraft under the guidance of biological truth.' I think that this is one of those remarks, which illuminate a subject much as the skyline is illuminated upon a dark night by a flash of summer lightning. **We know little about ourselves and less about our neighbour, and almost nothing at all about the nature of a healthy Society. Nor do we display any particular anxiety to increase our knowledge in these directions.**

"Yes there is, nowadays, none so poor that he is not prepared to produce at short notice the plans which will put every human being in his place, within the space of a few short weeks. Preferably with the aid of a few good machine-guns. It is no less than a tragedy that **the inductive method, for which, in particular, the English temperament is specially suited**, is not in itself a reliable instrument in this emergency. The physical scientist, who wishes to obtain a sure foundation for the formulation of laws, begins by standardising his re-agents.

"Temperature would be meaningless if we had not something to call 'Zero'. But in regard to biology we are in a difficulty. We do not even know how unhealthy we are, though we have a strong suspicion that we are very sick indeed. To those, then, who are anxious to make a definite contribution to the salving of a sick world, it may not be impertinent to suggest that the natural creative forces of the universe might plausibly be expected to produce at least as good results if left alone to work themselves out through the agency of the individual, as may be expected from planning which is undertaken without any conception of the relation of the plan to the constitution and temperament of those who are affected. If all history and all observation have not been misread, there is implanted in the individual **a primary desire for freedom and security, which rightly considered are forms of the same thing.** There is no such thing as a freedom and security, which is held upon terms, whether those terms are dictated by the State, a banking system, or a World Government. Until it can be shown that, with the resources which science has placed at his disposal, the individual is incapable of making freedom and security for himself, this multiplication of organisations whose interference he cannot avoid will only make a world catastrophe more certain."

Britain In Peril

Great Britain, its monarchy, constitution, common law and credit, have never stood in greater peril than they do today. And the reason is that its church and state, its schools and universities, its sense of equity and justice, have lain so long under the influence of a false philosophy of society as to acquire a false conception of Christianity. It was for this reason that they were incapable of recognising that the voice of Douglas was the voice of political

and economic realism. They were unable to recognise that the Credit System, which dominates our economy, notwithstanding its gold mystique and veneration, is a dominion of force and make-believe. They were unable to recognise that this perversion of God's bounty was driving even the Home of Magna Carta and the Mother of Parliament down the road to serfdom and into the arms of World Communism. They were unable to recognise that they were the heirs of a vast national Real Credit, which was being usurped and appropriated by an extra-national cabal, or 'Credit Monopoly', and that unless this 'Monopoly Credit' could be replaced by the real 'Social Credit', there could be no redemption from the tyranny of false debt, which held them in its grip. And that, in effect, meant that there could be no end to the universal conflict which at present confronts society—the conflict of worker against management, wages against prices, business against business and nation against nation, which has already brought European civilisation to the verge of disintegration through two world wars, and a conflict which now threatens to achieve its final fulfilment in the menace of the H-bomb or, alternatively, the prison house of the Communist State.

They were incapable of recognising that in Social Credit lay Christendom's only hope of reinstating the Market Place, with its primacy of individual choice, and the Common Law, with its primacy of individual rights; that in Social Credit lay the only guarantee of a tax-free, dividend-secure community of property holders, enjoying the benefits of science and invention in ever-lower prices in their shops and ever-greater leisure and freedom in the home; that in Social Credit lay the only hope of escaping the toils and snares of the Financier/Communist conspiracy which at this moment seeks to effect the destruction of our national sovereignty and independence through our absorption and obliteration in what is called the 'Common Market', or the 'European Economic Community'. The supposed 'corridors of power', which are little more than the 'corridors of bureaucratic privilege', have succeeded in fascinating our 'educated' careerists more than faith in God's freedom and security within the confines of God's Common Law.

Communists Fear Social Credit

Molotov is reported to have said in 1936 that Social Crediters were the only people that the Communists feared, and that the policy and philosophy of Social Credit could alone prevent the supposedly "inevitability" of the policy and philosophy of Marxism. But he meant the genuine 'Social Credit', as laid down by Douglas, and not the 'State Credit' version of Social Credit. A 'State Credit' may eventually have to be applied by World Communism in order to make its Great Society viable. But it will be a 'State Credit' of concession, and not of right, the Credit of serfs and not of free men. It will be the 'State Credit' of Communism, which Douglas defined as "the politics of the World State" which seeks "the centralised vesting of the planet in an organisation appro-

priating and cutting across all local and personal sovereignty", the essence of which is "that the group giveth, and the group taketh away; blessed be the name of the group. Anyone with experience of life knows that the group giveth; yes, in exchange for the soul."

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.

NATURAL VITAMIN E (alpha-tocopherol) 200 i.u.

Supply your need of this essential vitamin! It is estimated the average diet gives 15 units daily. The estimated minimum requirement is 85 units a day. Therefore, it is not surprising to see in people over 40 the rapid increase in coronary and other problems. Vitamin E should be in every home!

100 tablets, \$2.58, 7c postage

250 tablets, \$6.00, 10c postage.

VITAMIN B GROUP (complex)

For general tonic value for nerves especially, increases appetite, aids digestion.

100 tablets, 52c, 4c postage. 200

tablets, 95c, 4c postage

VITAMIN C 50 mgm. (ascorbic acid)

For resistance to colds, infections. Promotes energy.

100 tablets, 50c, 4c postage

VITAMIN C 250 mgm.

100 tablets, \$1.32, 4c postage

YEAST TABLETS

For rich source of natural vitamin B complex.

100 tablets, 45c, 4c postage

200 tablets, 82c, 4c postage

KELP TABLETS

For mineral deficiencies. Tonic value, mental fatigue, rich in organic iodine.

100 tablets, 45c, 4c postage

200 tablets, 82c, 4c postage

Continued from Page 3

Members of Parliament think nothing but their career. Besides, the gap between our two political parties proves that we are not ready for political life." Mr. Chamorel adds, in explanation to his readers, that the heads of these parties, from different tribes, view politics as a tribal rivalry. This educated African further told him: "We do not like responsibility." Mr. Chamorel also states that the blacks themselves recognise that they are not yet ready and that black government today would mean civil war between the two great tribes. The Rhodesian African state belongs today, he continues, to a tribal system and the Iron Age.

Mr. Chamorel, in reference to the question about consulting Africans to find whether the majority prefers this or that constitution, says that for the average Matabele or Mashona the idea of a constitution is as clear to them as the problem of nuclear physics is to the average European. One can face him with the problem but to ask his opinion on it means nothing because he does not comprehend the working of it.

Britain's Responsibility And Human Rights In Rhodesia Before U.D.I.

The Council refers to 'discriminatory legislation such as the Land Apportionment Act'. This Act stems from British action. In 1914 the Secretary of State for the Colonies appointed the Native Reserves Commission to go into the land question. Its motivation was to protect Africans' interest. The commission set aside 21,600,000 acres as Native Reserves. The remaining area remained open to purchase by anyone of any race. The British Government was a party to this apportionment, which was intended to be final. In 1925 the Morris Charter Commission was appointed "to inquire into the expediency and practicability of setting apart" areas for occupation by African and Europeans respectively. In 37 different centres over 1,500 Africans and a number of Europeans gave evidence and the commission found that the "overwhelming majority" of the people who took the trouble to give evidence were in favour of the establishment of separate areas for the two races. One should remember that land set aside in the new "reserves" was free. Land in the remaining areas was subject to purchase. At each revision of the land question most of the remaining unassigned area of land was given over to African occupation. It must be borne in mind that the 40 million acres of Tribal Trust Land is free. This constitutes a discrimination against the whites, who have to pay for theirs, and whose considerable agricultural investments are important to the country. Moreover, many Africans reside, at this moment, in the European area. The African people in Rhodesia have more land per capita than the Africans in many of the countries to the north of us. Yet, were it not for the implementation of the Land Apportionment Act all these years, they might well have found themselves with the ownership of no land whatever.

Continued from Page 1

a major economic agreement with the Soviet Union which involved a large flow of Russian military equipment for Iran. This agreement was a major blow at the West's policy of supporting Iran, along with Turkey, as their major buffer against Communist expansion into the Middle East. The Shah explained that he was turning to the Soviet because of the failure of the West to assist him. Caught between the pressure of Israel and a Communist-dominated Nasser, King Hussein of Jordan found his position impossible. He also complained that he had no firm assurance from the West. Pro-Western leaders of the past have been butchered because of the failure of the West. The price is now being paid. And an even more disastrous price will yet be paid unless the West can take a stand against Political Zionism.

Israel Only An Instrument

In order to grasp Israel's role in the scheme of things, it is essential always to keep in mind that this State is but an instrument, an agent, but certainly not a principal. It is the agent of International Political Zionism. Internally it is a Socialist State, while its foreign policy has been pro-Communist. Israel's voting record at the United Nations is a most revealing one. Bearing this in mind, and the fact that there is a Soviet-oriented Israeli Communist Party, a statement made by former Israeli Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion after the Israeli-Arab conflict should be carefully pondered. In an exclusive interview with United Press International on July 8, Ben-Gurion stated that without Soviet interference there would be no Mid-East war. He described the Soviet's man, Nasser, as "a patriot and a statesman. But if he continues getting arms from Russia he will certainly prepare for another round of fighting against Israel." Then Ben-Gurion observed that within ten to fifteen years Communist China would be the world's most powerful nation, and that only an alliance of the Soviet Union, a united Western Europe (the Common Market will help!) and the United States could deal with this problem. In other words, the threat of one Communist nation should be exploited to absorb the rest of the world into Communism.

An early leader of Political Zionism observed that the creation of Israel was merely a peg upon which to hang a far-reaching design. This design is now starting to emerge: The creation of the World State through progressive centralisation of power.

SHORT DEFINITIONS

We are asked frequently, "What is meant by 'the rat race'?" and, "What is the difference between Socialism and Communism?"

Our answers: "Rat race" seems to mean the persistent effort to get more money to keep up with prices. Money incomes are "financial costs" of production from the payer's angle; so, he must fight to recover them through higher prices. Reason has no part, hence the adjective rat. We dislike rats, but in our opinion they show more social intelligence than the promoters of the contest.