

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. 34. No. 1.

JANUARY 1968

Editorial

The Destruction of Britain through Finance

A LONG-TERM OBJECTIVE NEARLY REACHED

Mr. Harold Wilson's policy of devaluing the pound sterling is but one more major step towards destroying, not only Britain, but that unique development in human history: an empire in which power was progressively decentralized with a resulting unity based upon loyalty to common traditions and institutions. This was a genuine evolutionary advance in human affairs, and was a reflection of the genius of the British in the field of political and constitutional development. But a development of this concept cut right across the concept of creating a One World in which all power was centralized at the centre. The British Empire, therefore, became the main target of those power groups, including the Communists, who support the One World concept.

During the Second World War the British Prime Minister, then Mr. Winston Churchill, complained that President Roosevelt of the U.S.A. was attempting to destroy the British Empire. He said that he had not been elected as His Majesty's First Minister to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire. But the liquidation went on just the same. The Socialists were brutally frank about their objective of destroying the British Empire and merging British sovereignty into a World State. Socialist Harold Wilson appears to be determined to complete the programme of destruction by making every surrender of British and British Commonwealth interest required to gain entry to the European Economic Community.

Socialists Serve International Finance

While the Socialists have been the principal administrators of the policy of destroying Britain, and the British Commonwealth, they have been but the instruments of international financial groups whose financial policies they have accepted as some type of natural law not to be even questioned. And so Mr. Wilson devalued the pound sterling, primarily so that Britain could overcome what is known as the balance of payments problem. But the devaluation policy, with its far-reaching implications, was also closely related to Mr. Wilson's determination to join the European Economic Community. Mr. Wilson's personal financial adviser is reported to be Sir Sigmund Warburg, a member of the well-known international banking family. Warburg did extremely well after coming to Britain as a refugee from Germany. He strongly

backs the Wilson campaign to join the European Economic Community. Across the English Channel President Charles de Gaulle has always had the strong backing of the Rothschild international group.

On the face of the situation it might appear that there is some conflict between two international financial groups. But this supposes that President de Gaulle is determined to keep Britain out of the European Economic Community forever. Mr. John Paul's *Political Intelligence Weekly*, which has correctly predicted in the past the policy of de Gaulle, carried the following significant item in the issue of December 7: **"Our Paris correspondent, who has frequently in the past demonstrated his accuracy in reflecting the prevailing views of his President, writes to say that we must be careful to distinguish between 'no' and 'never', in dealing with de Gaulle's views on Britain joining EEC. We should be guided, he insists, by this remark made by the General to a number of visitors on several occasions: 'Britain will come in, but she will be naked'."**

Since the first application was made by Britain, under the "Conservative" Government, to join the EEC, there has been a steady erosion of all the original conditions, which it was claimed, would be insisted upon. But with every new surrender, de Gaulle has called for more. Whether or not de Gaulle is regarded as an agent of the Rothschild section of the international financial complex, as an agent of Soviet strategy, or as an agent of both, the fact is that he has made it clear that the British Commonwealth concept has got to be killed, along with the complete destruction of sterling as an international

currency, and that the British will enter the EEC "naked".

Financial Hypnosis

Judging by the first statements of Mr. Wilson's new Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Roy Jenkins, this dedicated Fabian Socialist and supporter of World Government, is just the man to get the British ready for the proposed final surrender. He told the British House of Commons on December 6 that "The immediate future is bound to be hard . . ." Why? Because of the balance-of-payments problem. Mr. Jenkins explained how the International Monetary Fund had only granted the latest loan of \$1,260,000,000 by guaranteeing that Britain aimed at an improvement in its balance of payments of \$1,075,000,000 a year by 1969. In order to achieve this purely financial result, Mr. Jenkins must depress the standard of living of the British people still further. The British must consume less, and send more out of the country in exports while at the same time reducing imports. In the process unemployment must continue at a high level, resulting in less production than would otherwise be possible and, extremely serious, fostering a revolutionary situation inside Britain at the very time when a dangerous race situation has been produced.

Only people hypnotized by financial abstractionism accept the dangerous myth that a nation becomes wealthier by achieving a "favourable balance of trade". The true purpose of exporting should be to exchange the genuine surpluses of one country for the genuine surpluses of other countries, to the mutual advantage of all. But a country, which persistently exports more wealth than it imports, is not becoming wealthier, but is becoming poorer. We recall how during the Great Depression years, one of Australia's eminent certified economists, Sir Douglas Copland, was explaining in his ponderous style to a public meeting how Australia could only solve its economic problems by improving its balance of trade position. He readily agreed in answer to a question that if Australia could increase its exports by 25 percent, while reducing imports, this would be a wonderful thing for Australia. He also agreed when the questioner said that there would then be an even bigger improvement if Australia could increase exports by 50 percent while reducing imports. But when it was suggested to him that surely the logic of his proposition was that if Australia exported 100 percent of its wealth and imported nothing, that this should result in the millenium, Professor Copland, as he was then, said that the answer was a lemon! We readily agree that the results of such a policy would be extremely bitter. That is what the British people are finding.

What "Favourable Balance" Means

There is no doubt that the real efficiency of the British production system can be improved. But to suggest that more production **as such** will solve basic financial and economic problems simply defies irrefutable facts. One

of the inevitable results of present financial policies is to increase prices. "More production" was the cry after the Second World War. The Americans set about doing exactly this in a manner never matched by any other nations. And the result? The price spiral keeps going upwards. Mr. Harold Wilson said that he was going to get increased production by rigid price and wage controls. He has failed to solve the basic problem, which is to ensure that individuals collectively receive sufficient incomes to meet the total prices of the goods they have produced. If they did receive sufficient then they would have no problems in purchasing those goods imported in exchange for their own surpluses. But for a long time now the British have been working to develop other parts of the world under the guise of obtaining a "favourable balance of trade". The prosperity, which allegedly resulted from this policy, was about as realistic as the prosperity, which resulted from the Second World War. Overnight hundreds of millions of pounds of new financial credit were made available to use unemployed men and resources so that the biggest export drive in history could be launched. This export drive took the form of military equipment, which every effort was made to "give" to the enemy! Enormous production was sent out of the country without any equivalent coming in, and in the process an increased volume of credit was made available for Australians to purchase what was available at that time in Australia. Many people started wondering why it had been necessary to wait for a war before making adequate purchasing power available to buy Australian production, or potential production.

Britain must, of course, export in exchange for raw materials and foodstuffs, which she cannot produce herself. Her main exports must be secondary production. Even with hampering financial restrictions, and restrictive economic and trade union practices, which stem from present financial policies. British technology still leads the world in many spheres. President de Gaulle is hopeful that as part of the process of stripping "naked", the British will also surrender their technological superiority in order to get into the European Economic Community. But in the world as it is, it would be common sense for the British to seek their raw materials and foodstuffs from British Commonwealth countries with the same basic traditions and interests. If Rhodesia is included, the British Commonwealth nations of Britain, Australia, New Zealand and Canada have between them vast sources of every necessary raw material, together with sufficient industrial equipment and skills, to be completely self-sufficient. A high standard of living could be provided, social stability increased and sufficient military strength provided to make the British Commonwealth a major stabilizing influence in world affairs.

Breaking Up Empire

However, internal financial policies which force every British country to export more than it imports, in order

to try to overcome an internal shortage of purchasing power, brings these nations into conflict with one another. This is being exploited to break up an association, which had the possibilities of showing mankind the way forward in genuine evolution. For example, the British Socialist devaluation has already set in motion a wave of reactions, which are disastrous. Australia will find it even more difficult to sell her primary production in Britain. Increased shipping costs resulting from devaluation have added still more difficulties. All this is being exploited to insist that Britain must turn to Europe away from the British Commonwealth countries, and to force the Australians and New Zealanders to also look elsewhere for markets to the exclusion of Britain. In a desperate effort to retain their British markets, the New Zealanders have also devalued, creating the fear amongst some Australians that cheaper New Zealand dairy products could invade Australia. On the other hand Australian manufacturers exporting to New Zealand are concerned that they will have greater difficulty in selling at the higher prices. There are many other aspects of this question, including the pocketing of \$30,000,000 by the Red Chinese who were owing the Australian Wheat Board approximately \$200,000,000 in sterling before devaluation. No doubt the Australian taxpayer will be called upon to increase his contribution in subsidies to the wheat industry so that the \$30,000,000 lost through devaluation is available for the wheat industry.

New Offensive Required

Ever since it was first mooted openly over six years ago that Britain should join the European Economic Community, there has been fought a bitter rearguard action by British patriots led by men like Mr. John

Paul, supported by Australians, New Zealanders and Canadians who have grasped the truth that the assault on Britain was an assault on themselves and their future. If it has done nothing else, and it has, this defensive action has provided President de Gaulle and his backers that the British are not yet "naked" enough to be forced into the Common Market. But battles are not won by continued defensive action. Eventually there must be an offensive. Writing under the title, "Contemporary Gibbonish" in *The Social Creditor*, England, of January 5, 1946, C. H. Douglas asked the question "Can it be that the Fall of the British Empire is a book-keeping transaction?" and concluded by observing that "If we are to see its disappearance in a cruder and untried organization, we are witnessing the most amazing triumph of unarmed forces that the world (so far as we know) has even seen." It is the "book-keeping transaction" which has been so successfully exploited to bring the British family of nations to the present point of disaster. A new vision is desperately required of a British Commonwealth showing the world how to break free of financial dogmas, which are more explosive than nuclear weapons. This group of nations could demonstrate the correct role of international trade. British thinkers have put forward practical suggestions. Some of these were embodied in a report issued 25 years ago, in 1942, by that eminent association, The London Chamber of Commerce. In spite of what has happened over the quarter of a century since this Report was first published, early in the Second World War, the basic principles are just as applicable today as they were immediately after the war. Here are principles upon which the British Commonwealth could be revived, and the threat of destruction by finance and revolution averted.

London Chamber of Commerce Report on International Trade

Under the heading "General Principles of a Post-War Economy", the London journal "The Engineer", in its issue of June 5, 1942, published the following extracts from a report by the London Chamber of Commerce, dated May 29, 1942.

The Chamber submits that constantly raised tariffs, the imposition of quotas and prohibitions, and other signs of growing economic belligerency between the nations in the inter-war period, were not the result of stupidity nor ill will, but were, on the contrary, imposed for most compelling reasons. They represented attempts by the nations to defend themselves against very real and pressing dangers. The Chamber is convinced that until those dangers are recognized and removed, a direct attack upon trade barriers can serve no useful purpose, but will, on the contrary, merely increase fear. In short, trade barriers are not themselves the disease, but merely the symptoms of the disease.

It is widely admitted that there was something radically wrong with our economic system. It was palpably absurd that nations should be desperately anxious to export more of their real wealth to other nations than they received in return. It was equally absurd that men in want of the necessaries of life should be denied the money with which to buy them because there was a superabundance of those necessaries, and therefore their services were not required to make more.

The limiting factor in the production of real wealth has been the failure to distribute to would-be consumers enough money to buy the potential output, and goods are not for long produced if there are no buyers. Mass pro-

duction implies mass consumption. We are driven, then, to investigate the mechanism for the provision of purchasing power.

The system of distributing purchasing power was evolved during an age of scarcity, i.e., an age in which there were not enough goods to go round. This system aimed, therefore, at ensuring maximum production with minimum consumption. Maximum production was achieved by a complex system of cutthroat competition for cheapness, both within the nation and internationally. The nation which could induce its workers to accept the smallest reward for their labour in relation to their efficiency could, other things being equal (e.g., equipment, transport, volume of output), undersell the other nations and compel them to lower the wages of their workers under threat of loss of markets and unemployment. In this way a downward pull was exerted on the standard of living of the masses in the advanced nations. On the other hand, the volume of output made possible by power production was exerting an upward pull, as it was clearly necessary to increase the purchasing power of the masses in order to provide buyers, without which the goods would not, for long, be produced.

To realize that tariffs, quotas and exchange restrictions did mitigate, for the advanced nations, the devastating effects of a financial system which, both in its national and international aspects, was an anachronism, it is merely necessary to consider what would have happened had all the nations removed these barriers and accepted unrestricted free trade. By means of tariffs, quotas, prohibitions and exchange restrictions, the advanced nations have, in some measure, protected themselves from these extreme consequences of international competition for cheapness, but the stresses and strains are still present, although modified.

The London Chamber of Commerce submits that it is now essential, if greater disasters are to be avoided, so to change the system as to ensure that international trade . . . no longer constitutes a threat to the standard of living of any nation, but, on the contrary, must be used as a means of mutual aid and advantage to those participating in it. Competition, both within a nation and internationally, should remain, but should be reduced from a life-or-death struggle to healthy emulation.

The Chamber is also convinced that nations are in such different stages of development, politically, socially and economically, that any international trading system, requiring for its successful working a substantial measure of uniformity in these matters must be ruled out as impracticable. It believes that an over-riding factor in considering any scheme of post-war reconstruction should be the elimination of economic fear between nations. Economic relations should be a bond of union and not a source of fear.

The Chamber cannot, therefore, support any scheme, which, in the economic sphere, relies upon some supra-national authority (which in practice must mean the most

powerful nation or nations) to dictate to the weaker nations what their internal economic policy shall be. None of the nations, by the management of its own affairs, has given any indication of being competent to manage the affairs of other nations, whose conditions, aspirations and outlook would be entirely foreign to it.

It believes, on the contrary, that the largest measure of co-operation between nations will be realized when fear of financial and economic domination from outside is removed, and each nation is entirely free to co-operate or not as it wishes; the extent of that co-operation also being within its own control.

It is an obvious absurdity that nations should regard it as necessary to export their real wealth, not for the purpose of paying for imports, but in order to solve their domestic unemployment problem by passing it on to other countries. Exports with this end in view are nothing more nor less than an excuse for distributing wages to people who otherwise would be unemployed. This purpose would be equally well served if the goods were to be thrown into the sea or if the people were to be employed to dig holes and to fill them up again.

When, however, it is remembered that even wealthy nations have a large percentage of their population underfed, ill-clothed and ill-housed, it is clear that these would be the best recipients of this allegedly "surplus" wealth. What is necessary is to improve the technique for the internal provision of money, so as to convert this human demand into effective demand.

The Chamber submits that international trade must now be raised to its true function: that is, nothing more nor less than an exchange of goods and services of a mutually advantageous character.

Instead of trying to equate supply with effective demand, the Chamber advocates that, in future, effective demand should be equated with supply. There can be no such thing as general over-production, of which complaint was made after the last war, although, of course, there can be over-production of a particular commodity in relation to others. The real trouble is under-consumption.

The fundamental problems, then, which a satisfactory system must be designed to solve, are:

(1) The elimination of the fear and hostility resulting from the struggle of all nations to obtain an "active" favourable balance of payments, the penalty of the vanquished being economic servitude to the victor. This struggle has resulted in attempts by all the nations to restrict imports by barriers to trade, and to increase exports by subsidies and other artificial means, and by the use of political and economic pressure.

(2) The distribution internally of the purchasing power necessary to enable the nations to consume the whole of their own production; if this were done they could equally consume the goods of other nations which they might exchange for their own production. This problem is closely connected with (1) because an excess of exports over imports furnishes an excuse for increasing effective

demand within a country (through the distribution of wages) without increasing the number of goods awaiting consumption in the domestic market.

(3) The unwillingness, consequent upon their industrialization, of primary producing countries to receive after the war, imports of certain manufactured goods, which previously they had imported freely.

(4) Nations with different internal economic systems must be enabled to live in the same world without those differences constituting a threat to the continued existence of one another's internal systems.

(5) The movement of people from over-populated to under-populated countries. The objection of the latter to receive immigrants is due to unemployment of their own people and will disappear when that problem is solved, assuming, of course, that the would-be immigrants are of the right type.

The Chamber, having considered whether there is any system which would achieve, wholly or partially, the solution of all the above problems, generally accepts the principles laid down in "A Twentieth Century Economic System", especially in respect of blocked credits for the payment of international obligations.

It is felt, however, that there will be an undesirable time lag if measures to increase effective demand are not taken until an incipient slump has reached the point where prices have already started to fall. In many industries so much preparatory work has to be done after orders have been placed and before labour can be fully employed that a slackening of activity a year, or even two years ahead, can be foreseen. The Chamber, therefore, recommends that appropriate machinery should be set up to ensure that slumps may be forestalled, through close co-operation between industry and the central bank.

These proposals also have the merit that:

(a) Whilst revolutionary in effect, they involve, so far as industry and commerce are concerned, little change in practice;

(b) They require the minimum of agreement between nations;

(c) They can be put into effect even though some nations withhold agreement.

So long as nations were struggling for active "favourable" balances, agreement upon exchange rates was found to present insuperable difficulties. An exchange rate, which would give one nation an active "favourable" balance would necessarily give other nations "unfavourable" balances.

Under the system advocated, all the nations would be interested in finding the rate of exchange which would give each, of the one part, and the rest of the world of the other, equilibrium. They would, therefore, all be looking for the same thing and agreement should not be difficult; especially as the penalties for failure to make a correct estimate would not be disastrous.

As an undertaking by the nations to maintain their internal general price levels stable constitutes a guarantee

of the maintenance of an honest measure of value, not only to other nations, but also to their own people, it is not thought that the giving of this undertaking is likely to be opposed.

STRANGE?

"Those who have been insisting at the top of their lungs that the United States get out of Vietnam are shouting even louder that the United States must shoulder its responsibilities for the maintenance of the State of Israel even if it means war." Walter Trohan, head of *Chicago Tribune*, in Washington, D.C.

CHRISTIAN REALISM

"Mechanization should give us more time for human enterprises which cannot be undertaken by machines, the Anglican Dean of Melbourne (the Very Rev. T. W. Thomas) said in St. Paul's Cathedral yesterday. He said modern society was becoming more and more a push-button society. For this we may well give thanks to God, for there is no Christian virtue in drudgery which can be avoided." *The Age* (Melbourne), December 11.

This statement by a Christian leader makes a refreshing change from the general refrain that so far from increasing mechanization, leading to complete automation in some fields, undermining the "full employment" policy, it, in fact, makes it easier to maintain this policy. The policy of "full employment" runs contrary to the natural aspiration of men to free themselves from drudgery by means of the technological advance. It is not only a perversion of the true purpose of the production system, which is consumption, but is a manifestation of a materialism, which feeds upon itself. The end result is a type of ant-heap society. "Education" is increasingly geared to mould human beings to fit into this type of society.

It is claimed that to place the push-button revolution at the disposal of the individual, enabling him to have more free time from drudgery in the economic system, would be dangerous morally. It is unfortunately true that many have been so warped in the process of turning them into what has been described as "technical barbarians", that they are less than fully-developed personalities, that they would be lost if suddenly faced with a substantial increase in leisure time. Here is a question which the Christian Churches should take up, asking themselves what is the end of man on this Earth. Is it to use every mechanical advance to extract more and more precious minerals out of the earth to fire into outer space? Or to impose a highly sophisticated form of industrialism on peoples whose societies cannot sustain it, so that "full employment" can be maintained in the industrial nations? These are basic questions for those who are concerned about the end of Man.

The "push-button" society is one, which is the result of Man building up an increasing knowledge of how to use the various forms of solar energy. Each generation

is the heir to what has been discovered in the past. Clearly then the present generation should obtain some type of dividend from this heritage. However, those who control the policies of the modern state are opposed to the whole concept of heritage, except to exploit it in the interest of power politics. The Socialists are always shouting about exploitation, but they never come to grips with the worst form of exploitation: the robbing of the individual of his heritage.

Perhaps the Dean of Melbourne might preach another sermon, developing this question? He could outline how the Christian Church should have some views on the educating of Man to fit into a different type of society, one in which the economic system served Man.

INFLATION FOREVER?

The decision by the Arbitration Commission granting substantial wage increases to all those employed under the Federal Metal Trades Award, has sparked off the usual type of futile controversy. When employees do not receive what they have asked for, they criticize the arbitration "umpire". But when they do the employers criticize the "umpire". On this occasion a Minister of the Federal Government Mr. Bury, has attacked the "umpire". The situation is, however, that the Arbitration authorities cannot please **both** employer and employees under present financial rules.

As C. H. Douglas demonstrated first over 50 years ago, modern industry, with its progressive development towards the displacement of labour as a major factor in semi-automatic production based upon various forms of solar energy, distributes insufficient purchasing power in the form of wages, salaries and dividends to meet the prices of what it produces. The system has only been kept operating by a progressive expansion of new financial credit for still more capital production which does not immediately produce consumer goods, but which does distribute incomes, to finance exports for which there are no corresponding imports, for public capital works, including armaments, and for growing time-payment systems. As Douglas warned, credit expansion in this manner is inherently inflationary. No matter how efficient production becomes, inflation must continue indefinitely under present financial policies.

Demands for wage increases are an attempt to offset inflation, which is a reduction in the value of the unit of money. But under present financial rules all wage increases, generally financed out of further credit creation, must be charged into higher prices. And so the process goes on and on — until there is collapse. The problem is basically the same in every industrialised country. In Washington on December 6, President Johnson urged business and labor leaders to "meet their responsibilities" by "curbing wage and price increases". The President said, "Nobody benefits from a wage-price spiral." He went on, "I say it's everyone's responsibility" (to

break the price spiral) including the Government. Governments are primarily responsible for financial policy. But all of them are wedded to the concept of "controlled inflation." And who sponsors this concept? The Fabian Socialist economists who "advise" most Governments.

President Johnson is wrong when he says that no one benefits from the wage-price spiral. In his book, *The Fabian Socialist Contribution to The Communist Advance* (45 cents, post free from The Heritage Bookshop), Mr. Eric Butler shows how eminent Fabian Socialists support inflationary credit expansion policies because these policies must inevitably produce social instability and revolutionary conditions. There are some who say that those responsible for financial policy are only stupid, and that all they need is some educating to show them how new credit can be expanded without increasing wages and prices. But the truth must be faced that during and after the war until 1948 a price-subsidy mechanism, admittedly rather crude, did provide for comparative wage and price stability. Instead of improving this system, it was quickly abolished.

If the members of the community wish to protect themselves against their common enemy, they will unite to demand a solution to the inflation problem which will benefit all, instead of playing the Marxist game, which is to maintain and intensify divisions, and then to call this evidence of the "class struggle."

KEEP FIT WITH ORGANIC HEALTH PRODUCTS

Modern denatured foods are not sufficient to maintain complete health. Deficiencies can best be overcome with organic vitamins and minerals taken regularly. Health can be protected by the expenditure of only a small financial outlay per week.

Dietary Health Products can meet your basic requirements. Price lists available upon request. Support for Dietary Health Products is financial support for the work activities endorsed by this journal.

Dietary Health Products, 273 Little Collins Street, Melbourne. Telephone: 639749.

THE TRUTH ABOUT RHODESIA

Actionists can help spread the truth about Rhodesia and the world revolution by obtaining copies of the League of Rights special eight-page brochure, in which photos are published of the frightful results of black nationalism in Africa. This publication is the quickest selling one ever published by the League.

Prices for bulk supplies are: \$1.00 per dozen; \$3.00 per 50, \$5.00 per 100; \$9.00 per 200. Order from The Australian League of Rights, Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne.

TALE OF TWO COUNTRIES

By Lord Graham, Rhodesian Minister for *External Affairs*

The following address by the Rhodesian Minister for External Affairs and Defence, Lord Graham, given at an anniversary ball on October 28 of one of the great Rhodesian pioneers, Sir James McDonald, is one which compares the plight of Britain under the Welfare State with the exciting vistas offering in Rhodesia.

My wife and I are both very honoured to have been asked to join you this evening as your guests of honour, and I am particularly pleased to have been asked to address you for a few minutes because I had the pleasure of knowing your founder, Sir James McDonald, himself, when I first came to Rhodesia as a young man. There were, in those days, many still alive who had been personal friends of Cecil John Rhodes, the founder of our country, and one had not to talk to any of them for long to realize they were all imbued with the spirit of Cecil Rhodes, himself, that is so well depicted in the well-known statue entitled "Energy", a man on a horse sheltering his eyes from the sun and looking forward to great achievements, not only to the founding but to the continued building of a great and prosperous nation, north of the Limpopo.

Undermining The British

Sir James McDonald grew up as an ordinary little highland boy in a glen in the northwest of Scotland. His father, I believe, was a gamekeeper, and many a man who has written his name in the pages of history has come from just such a humble home, particularly. I may add, with the usual humility of a Scotsman, from the land of the heather.

Many of us look not only with dismay but also with complete puzzlement at what is happening to the young people in Britain today, particularly the young people in the towns. How can it be, we ask, that ordinary young people abandon morality of all kinds, take to drugs, wear extraordinary clothes, with young men putting flowers in their hair, and apparently abandon all sense of purpose in life. But if you talk to people who have come in contact with these young people, you begin to realize that, in the course of their education and upbringing—particularly where parents have done nothing to counteract this, they, in very truth, see no purpose in life. They swim, as it were, vacantly, like goldfish in the bowl of the welfare state. There appears to them to be nothing to build and no point in achievement of any kind. And how did all this come about?

It began many years ago at the beginning of the century with a few people imbued with the idea of one day establishing a one-world socialist government, or world communism, who realized that the most successful long-term approach would be to infiltrate, wherever they could, educational systems, and to remove from the minds of coming generations the will to resist this idea.

One of such men was a certain John Dewey who in a book published as long ago as 1897 saw the destruction of a child's individualistic traits as the primary goal of education, and suggested that the group idea should be the nucleus of progressive education. No child must be permitted to forge ahead; nobody must be left behind because of poor work, lest the sacrosanct "group" should be disturbed. Children must be given the idea that personal excellence and trying to go ahead is not worthwhile.

That this pernicious system has now got the United Kingdom and the United States of America by the throat is all too evident and its results are there for all to see.

The Vista Before Young Rhodesians

How different is the vista before young people in Rhodesia! We have a land to build and everybody of every race can shelter his eyes from the sun and with "energy" seek out where he can with a sense of purpose, best apply his efforts. It is almost a hackneyed phrase now to say that we have not yet scratched the surface of Rhodesia. In its agricultural potential this is literally true—we have not scratched the surface: in its potential of minerals beneath the ground: in its potential of manpower: in its potential of hydroelectric power: in its potential of industrial development—in all these things we still have not done more than scratch the surface.

Here is a land crying out for the individual, crying out for the man with more energy than his brother, to go ahead and do something, and to leave his mark in developing Rhodesia for the good of all and to reap rewards for himself commensurate with his efforts.

Young men and women born in Rhodesia, young men and women fed up with the decadence of older lands who come here, see before them far horizons and a nation waiting to be built. In the open spaces around them, in the tall white clouds, the thunder, the rain, and the sun, their belief in God is renewed and refreshed—all this a complete reversal of the concrete jungle where the teaching of religion is removed from the schools, and swing services are held in the churches.

Where individualism has been killed, and, as I read in the paper the other day, the typical young girl, among her other attributes—if you can call them that—is completely devoid of all ambition.

Add to this the fact that due to our immigration policy where only people with some skill can come here, we have

virtually established an elite European community, with greater average potential than European communities in the older parts of the world that spring from unselected populations.

"Progressive" Education Outlawed

And you can, perhaps, begin to understand why the protagonists of world socialism, and make no mistake, it is from these that come the leaders of any form of socialism, so hate us? We stand for everything they have spent half a century trying to destroy.

As an example of what I have said, let me remind you that it is an avowed aim of U.N.E.S.C.O. educational programmes to eliminate in a child not only that respect for individual effort and achievement about which I have already spoken, but to eliminate also, for instance, any sense of high regard for the history of his people, any pride in his country, any sense of patriotism, and if possible, any faith in his God. Such things are merely labelled "habits of prejudice" and "impediments to world mindedness."

As you know we have sent the U.N.E.S.C.O. types packing from Rhodesia. We have a job to do and we believe this kind of teaching has no place here, but it is in a club for young people such as this that you must discuss such things—you are the parents of tomorrow. I belong to an older generation, and, while we are holding the fort for you young people, it is you who will, in the not-too-distant future, have the fate of this country in your own hands. It is you who will make the decisions, and one of the essentials, if you are to give this country the great future that it can have, is that you should know your enemy and how he operates, and save your country and future generations from destruction by forces completely alien to the best of Christian civilization.

WHY SEPARATE UNIVERSITIES IN SOUTH AFRICA

The following item from the South African publication, "Education for Success," put the South African case for separate universities for the Europeans and the Bantu:

Two of the three Bantu university colleges were created in terms of the Extension of University Act of 1959. They are the University College of the North and the University College of Zululand. They opened their doors to the first students in February 1960. The third, Fort Hare, received its first students in 1916, but has been catering exclusively for the Xhosa people since 1960.

Why their own universities for the Bantu people of South Africa? The realities of Africa have conclusively shown that no black African people is prepared to be recast in a European mould or to become pseudo-Europeans. Rather do they insist on a full and unfettered

expression of the "African personality". Thus black Africans and people of European stock have nowhere in Africa been successfully blended or reconciled in one political or cultural system.

On the basis of these fundamental premises South Africa has opted for a policy of separate development for her disparate peoples. And these three university colleges are cornerstones of this policy, for it is from them that must come the Bantu leaders that will inspire and direct the progress of their respective peoples. And apartheid sets no ceiling to this progress, for it envisages that each of the Bantu peoples should become self-sufficient, ordering its own affairs at all levels of national activity. In such a programme these colleges will naturally play a vital role.

To cater for an ever-increasing number of Bantu students who gain university passes the facilities at these colleges are being continually expanded and the scope of the courses offered widened almost every year. Meanwhile any Bantu—or Indian or Cape Coloured—student who wishes to follow a course not yet provided for at his or her own university college, can do so at the universities of Cape Town, Natal, or the Witwatersrand. Alternatively, he can enrol with the University of South Africa.

Because the University of South Africa lays down the standards of tuition and also examines the students, the syllabuses followed at, and the degrees conferred by, these colleges are identical in standard to those of any other South African university. All the independent universities of South Africa, in fact, once had this filial relationship to the University of South Africa. Like them these three new colleges will also one day be autonomous universities—the focal points for the national development for the people whose needs they now provide.

The reputation of the three Bantu university colleges already extends beyond the country's borders. Many applications for places have been received from students in Lesotho, Botswana, Swaziland, Malawi, Zambia and Rhodesia. So many, in fact that it has been decided to award places at these colleges for a limited number of foreign Bantu students. In 1966 there were four students from Rhodesia studying at Turfloop and three at the University College of Zululand.

(Mr. Eric Butler supplies the following footnote to the above: "During my 1967 visit to South Africa I had the opportunity of making a thorough examination of the University College of the North, and I was staggered by the effort and money being spent by the South African Government to provide the Bantu with the modest modern university facilities. Many of these facilities are far superior to those in the universities for the Europeans. No one can truthfully say that the Bantu does not have an adequate opportunity for higher education in the Republic of South Africa.)