

# THE NEW TIMES

Registered at the G.P.O. Melbourne for transmission by post as a newspaper.

\$4.00 per annum post free.

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

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

Vol. 35, No. 2

FEBRUARY 1969

## THE PROGRAMME TO COLLECTIVISE THE FARMER INFLATION ERODING INDEPENDENCE

It was predicted many years ago that centralised, debt finance must ultimately lead to the centralisation of the economic system and prepare the way for Socialism. The dramatic concentration of the economic system in secondary industries has become commonplace, with hardly a day passing without a report of more amalgamations and take-overs. This development is now reaching out across national boundaries, with the development of international cartels. But in the last few years the drive towards centralisation has started to have dramatic and alarming effects in the primary industries. In spite of increased efficiency, the primary producer is finding that he is struggling against increased financial costs, which he cannot pass on to consumers. And all over the world there is an inspired campaign, which seeks to persuade the primary producer that the day of the small producer is over. Like the manufacturer and businessman, he must accept centralisation into bigger units as inevitable.

The following is a section of the notes of a recent address given by Mr. Eric Butler to a meeting arranged by a Victorian Country Party Branch, outlining the programme to eliminate the independent primary producer in order to create the completely Planned State:

The famous British historian-philosopher Lord Acton is best remembered for his famous statement "**All power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely.**" But he made another penetrating statement, which unfortunately is not as well known: "**Few discoveries are more irritating than those which expose the pedigree of ideas.**" If primary producers wish to retain their independence, then they had better start to examine the pedigree and development of the ideas, which now openly threaten their future.

Primary producers all over the world are facing a revolutionary movement, which is progressively eliminating the smaller producer, or forcing him to continue on his property with a decreasing standard of living. Skilful propaganda is urging that the traditional concept of farming must give way to progressive centralisation and "scientific control". It is claimed that this development into bigger units is "inevitable"; that this will result in "greater efficiency". The talk about the necessity for "greater efficiency" is dramatically disputed by the fact that there are food gluts in many parts of the world.

If the present primary producers, many of whom are allegedly "uneconomic", are producing, or could easily produce, surpluses which are difficult to sell at profitable prices, then how is this problem to be solved by eliminating the "uneconomic" producers and having a comparatively few big producing units creating even

bigger surpluses through the greater efficiency which it is being claimed results only from business? The truth is that behind the programme for progressively centralising control of primary production, there is a long-term policy, which has as its objective the elimination of the independent primary producer. The drive to centralise primary production is not the result of "inevitable trends", but of conscious effort to create the completely centrally planned society. Financial policy is the main instrument being used in the non-Communist world. Control of food is control of life.

### Farmers Barrier To Totalitarianism

Genuine farmers the world over, and throughout history, have been noted for their sturdy independence. As a section of society they have always manifest the highest principles of citizenship. When heavy taxation played its deadly role in helping to destroy the independence of the Roman peasantry, one of the great stabilising influences in the Roman Empire was eroded. Primary producers have always been stubborn obstacles to the plans of all totalitarians. The Soviet planners under Stalin were forced to liquidate millions of Kulaks who refused to co-operate with their totalitarian planning. All Communist regimes have had their biggest problems with their farmers. As will be shown, the Soviet planners were eventually forced to capitulate to realities by permitting those working on the State collective farms to also have their own smallholdings.

Most Australians, particularly primary producers, loudly proclaim that it is ridiculous to suggest that they would ever accept Communism. But no people in history has ever *voluntarily* accepted Communism; *it has been*

*imposed upon them.* It will be said in answer to this that Australians are not threatened with violent revolution. That is correct. However, there is a much more insidious form of revolution threatening countries like Australia. It has been described as *Sovietism by stealth*. A revolutionary policy is being imposed upon Australians through Fabian Socialist financial policies. It is these policies, which are producing results, which are the basis of the campaign to destroy the independent primary producer.

But who are the Fabian Socialists, This question raises the importance of "the pedigree of ideas". The importance of ideas cannot be stressed sufficiently. The ideas associated with Christianity fashioned the development of Western Civilisation. They are still a potent influence in human affairs. In 1848 a man called Karl Marx, and his colleague Engels, outlined in *The Communist Manifesto* ideas, which have changed the course of history. In this basic Communist document, Karl Marx listed his famous ten steps for communising a State. It was made clear that these steps were means to an end, not an end in themselves. *The Communist Manifesto* said that they will **"in the course of the movement . . . necessitate further inroads upon the old social order . . ."** As a former Canadian Communist Party Member, trained in Moscow, put it 100 years later, **" . . . one control tends to cause another, until, as a logical result, the State controls and finally owns everything."**

The following are seven of Marx's ten points.

- 1. Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.**
- 2. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.**
- 3. Abolition of all right of inheritance.**
- 5. Centralisation of credit in the hands of the State, by means of a national bank with State capital and an exclusive monopoly.**
- 6. Centralisation of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the State.**
- 7. Extension of the number of State factories and instruments of production; the bringing into cultivation of waste lands, and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan.**
- 8. Equal obligation of all to work. Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.**

### **The Conspiratorial Role Of The Fabians**

The Fabian Socialist Society was founded in Britain late last century by a group of Marxists who realised that the English-speaking people would not accept violent revolution. It is significant that the Fabian Society took its name from Fabius Cunctator, the Roman dictator who defeated the great General Hannibal by a policy of gradualness. The policy of the Fabians was one of permeating and infiltration. One of the most famous Fabians, George Bernard Shaw, an open admirer of Soviet Russia, frankly outlined Fabian tactics: **" . . . we urged our members to join the Liberal and Radical Associations in their district, or, if they preferred it, the Conservative Associations—we**

**permeated the party organisations and pulled all the strings we could lay our hands on with the utmost adroitness and energy, and we succeeded so well that in 1888 we gained the solid advantage of a Progressive majority full of ideas that would never have come into their heads had not the Fabians put them there."**

Note carefully the importance of ideas, and the fact that people can advocate ideas without knowing their pedigree.

In 1894 the Fabians launched the famous London School of Economics, an institution that has had an enormous influence right throughout the English-speaking world. It is significant that the Rothschilds and other international financiers contributed substantial sums of money to establish the London School of Economics. Lord Haldane explained why he persuaded the international financier Sir Ernest Cassel to contribute a large sum: **"Our object is to make this institution a place to raise and train the bureaucracy of the future Socialist State."** This close relationship between Big Finance and Socialist planning was demonstrated during the Great Depression of the thirties, when Sir Otto Niemeyer of the Bank of England visited Australia to impose a restrictive financial policy, which ruined many Australian farmers and inflicted great hardships on others. Niemeyer was "advised" by his travelling companion, Professor Theodor Emmanuel Guggenheimer Gregory of the London School of Economics.

The notorious Professor Harold Laski symbolised the worldwide influence of the Fabian Socialists through the London School of Economics. Laski visited Stalin in 1946 and said that while the British Socialist Government of that time and the Soviet were travelling on different roads, they had the same objective. In his *Appreciation of the Communist Manifesto for the Labour Party (1948)*, Laski wrote: **" . . . who, remembering that these (policies of high taxation and centralisation of credit) were the demands of the Manifesto, can doubt our common inspiration."** Here again can be seen the importance of knowing the pedigree of ideas.

### **A Programme Of Monopoly**

Early in the Great Depression the Fabians developed their conspiratorial tactics still further by the creation of an organisation known as Political and Economic Planning (P.E.P.). The severely restrictive credit policy of the time was eliminating large numbers of smaller and medium-sized primary and secondary producers. This was welcomed by P.E.P., which stated in one broadsheet that "The wastes involved in . . . retail shops . . . cannot be allowed . . ." This not only reflected the philosophy of the Socialists and Communists, but the philosophy of Mr. Israel Moses Sieff, a prominent figure in P.E.P., and also head of the Marks and Spencer, the big chain store combine in Britain. The major feature of Socialism is the will-to-power, but this will-to-power also manifests itself in the striving for centralised economic monopoly,

The result is that the Communists have some strange bed fellows in the Western world, business monopolists who believe that they can do business with the Communists.

In a P.E.P. broadsheet issued on April 25, 1933, the following statement was made: **"Whether we like it or not—and many will dislike it intensely—the individualistic manufacturer and farmer will be forced by events to submit to far-reaching changes in outlook and methods. What is required . . . is the transfer of ownership of large blocks of land—not necessarily of all the land in the country, but certainly a large proportion of it—into the hands of the proposed Statutory corporations and public utility bodies and of land trusts."** It was significant that chain-store monopolist Israel Moses Sieff said concerning P.E.P. that **"The only rival world political and economic system which puts forward a comparable claim is that of the Union of Soviet Republics."**

It has been said, "ideas have wings". And so 35 years after P.E.P. said that farmers would be "forced by events to submit to far-reaching changes", a prominent Australian made the following comment during a panel discussion by the Institute of Directors in N.S.W. on April 1, 1968: **"The wool industry is hurt by the economic policies that the governments have decided to follow. I have no desire to criticise nor support the present policies, except that it is interesting to note that the Opposition doesn't really take much trouble to criticise basic economic policies. So I think it is reasonable to assume that even if there is a change of government, the basic economic policies that are now being followed by another form of government and, therefore, these are facts we will have to learn to deal with . . . There is no alternative but to approach the problems of the wool industry in the same way in which the problems of the dairy industry are proposed to be approached. That, I think, is to reconstruct the industry, which involves the government putting up sufficient funds to buy out uneconomic units from those who are willing to dispose of them, and then enable those who are prepared to stay in the industry to buy back those units and add to what they have got, so that we would end up increasing the size of the unit . . . If we can make units large enough so that they are economical, pliable units, then we will have less complaining wool growers."**

The above views were those of Sir William Gunn as chairman of the Australian Wool Board. Sir William says that it is Government policy that is hurting the woolgrower, that he does not propose to challenge this policy, and that the policy will continue irrespective of the label of the government. Therefore, as P.E.P. put it, the woolgrower, and other primary producers, will be "forced by events to submit to far-reaching changes" — towards collectivisation in all spheres of primary production. Sir William's ideas are, therefore, not original, and it is fair to ask how many of them came to him through his long association with Dr. H. C. Coombs as a member of

the Commonwealth Bank Board. For years Dr. Coombs played a major role in shaping the financial policies, which Sir William Gunn says are not going to change. Before being made Chairman of the Commonwealth Bank Board, Dr. Coombs was well known as a top Socialist planner in the Federal bureaucracy. Speaking at the Melbourne University on June 11, 1944, Dr. Coombs said that **"People could not expect complete freedom after the war . . . It would be necessary for some individual to be given the right to say what was best for the community."** Dr. Coombs was at this time supporting Dr. H. V. Evatt's drive to use the war situation to tear up the Federal Constitution in order that Socialist planning could be advanced.

#### **Inflation Offsets Greater Economic Efficiency**

Professor Harold Laski took a vital interest in Dr. Evatt's campaign. Evatt said he had been greatly influenced and inspired by Laski. But Dr. Coombs, son of a radical father in Western Australia, had, according to Laski been one of his most "brilliant" students at the London School of Economics. There is nothing "inevitable" about the financial policies, which are destroying the basis of the genuine free-enterprise system all over the world, and forcing amalgamations both in secondary and primary industries. Constant propaganda about "uneconomic units" obscures realities. Every primary producer knows that he has substantially increased his efficiency, whether measured in terms of production per acre or man hours worked. **Since 1953-54 Australian farmers have increased production by 44 per cent. This has been achieved during a period of three severe droughts and a reduction in the number of workers on Australian farms.**

The basic question which the primary producer must ask himself is: "If a farmer was economic ten years ago, and has substantially increased his production in this period, how is he now said to be uneconomic?" The answer is of course, not simply that in some cases prices for his production have fallen, but that his *financial* costs have increased. A progressive increase in financial costs has offset increased production and greater efficiency. Now if all financial costs are to continue increasing, and no less an authority than the present Federal Treasurer, Mr. W. McMahon, has said that he has no alternative to increasing inflation, then it is elementary that the elimination of farmers described as uneconomic today will solve nothing because in a few years the amalgamated units will then also be "uneconomic". And so present financial policies, of which inflation is a major feature, mean that progressive centralisation, ultimately leading to the elimination of traditional farming, must continue. Karl Marx and the Fabians are being proved correct. The steps they recommended are, as predicted, necessitating **"further inroads upon the old social order."** The well-known Fabian Socialist John Strachey, one-time Communist Party member, said something similar in his *Programme for*

*Progress.* He explained that inflationary credit expansion policies were "an indispensable step in the right direction" because "the policy will lead on to further measures. The very fact that no stability, no permanently workable solution can be found within the limits of this policy will ensure that once a community has been driven to tackle its problems in this way, it cannot halt at the first stage, but must of necessity push on to more thorough going measures of re-organisation."

### A Campaign For Collectivism

As Minister for Primary Industry, Mr. D. Anthony has been active in conducting a campaign to convince Australian farmers that they have got to face up to some "thorough going measures of re-organisation". And like Sir William Gunn, Mr. Anthony promotes the Fabian argument that it is "inevitable events" which are making amalgamation necessary. At a meeting at Warragul, Victoria, in 1968, Mr. Anthony said that "It hurts me to have to say that farms should get bigger if our farmers are to make a decent living in today's situation." But in a statement issued on November 6, 1968, Mr. Anthony said that it was "inevitable" that **"the size of farms would tend to increase. Farming would become more mechanised, would require more capital, and demand a higher degree of skill in management. This may lead to an increase in the number of company-owned farms . . ."** *The Queensland Countryman* of November 1968, quotes a Professor who put the matter more bluntly: **"This problem of clearing the country of clodhoppers and hayseeds is a human problem. We're caught in forces, which are international, and enormous—if we stand up and try to stop them, they will overwhelm us, we have to soften the blow in economic and human terms. The people who remain on the farms are also going to be syndicated, corporations, companies, etc. What has happened to the broiler industry is setting the pattern for other industries."** The collectivist philosophy underlying this type of comment is obvious. The Marxists of all types, including the Fabians, approve of it.

As countries like the U.S.A. and Canada are following the same type of financial policy being imposed in Australia, it is not surprising that the same problems are affecting the farmers in those countries. There is nothing original in Mr. D. Anthony's proposals for Governments to finance the further centralisation of farming. This concept has also been advanced in Canada. And the Communists are taking advantage of the developing situation. In an article in the Autumn, 1968 issue of *Horizons*, the Marxist Quarterly published in Canada, reference is made to the growing "militancy" amongst farmers, that "Requirements for capital can no longer be met from within the Agricultural community itself . . . Relationships based on *petty-bourgeois ownership* are breaking up...

The majority of farms have become unprofitable, riot just the smallest ones. The entire group of medium-sized farms is in trouble." Not surprisingly, it is stated, "The Communist Party has done some work in developing a farm programme."

### Eliminating American Farmers

*The Land Newspaper* of August 15, 1968 carried the heading, COST PRICE SQUEEZE FORCES OUT SMALL FARMER IN U.S. The article underneath said: "The United States is going through a painful transition . . . Farmers are reeling from the dual impact of inflation and high interest rates . . . Unlike businessmen who have a product for sale, farmers have not been able to pass on higher costs to buyers . . . At the same time inflation has been driving up the cost of virtually everything the farmer has to buy—from work gloves to diesel tractors. The result is a cost-squeeze that is clamping down on farmers like a steel vice. Farm debt is rising faster than at any time since the period during and just after World War I. Adding to the burden are the highest interest rates in a generation or more . . . "Either get big or get out"—that's the way you hear it explained on one farm after another. Somewhere in America this year or next, when a farmer calls in an auctioneer and sells out, the total number of U.S. farms will fall below three million. In 1960 there were four million. Predictions are heard that the family farm is disappearing to be replaced by corporation-operated farms. The farm families fight to hold on. In a surprising number you find wives working in the fields to help cut expenses. There is a rising tide of bitterness among farmers . . . The outlook for mid-western farmers was summed up this way by Mr. Sayre of the Continental Minor's Bank of Chicago: 'The fellow who is thinly capitalised is in real trouble. Every year the marginal operators are chopped off the bottom until the fellow who I was in the middle of things eight years ago may be pretty near the bottom now'."

The increasing indebtedness of Australian farmers tells its own story. **In the seven years from 1960 to June 1967, the nett indebtedness of farmers increased by 727 percent from \$76 million to \$629 million.** The major factor responsible for this growing indebtedness is increased financial costs stemming from a financial policy which is imposing increasingly greater debt and taxation burdens, reflected in increasing price rises, upon the whole community. Even if farmers could pass on their higher financial costs in higher prices, this is no more a solution to the basic problem than is the progressive increase in wages. Higher food prices would merely stimulate inflation, leading to an intensification of a vicious circle from which there are no real benefits. What is required is a challenge to the basic financial policy afflicting all.

## TREMENDOUS LEAGUE OF RIGHTS EXPANSION

League of Rights activities are rapidly gaining in momentum with every day that passes. Work by Mr. Edward Rock and Mr. Eric Butler in Victorian rural areas reveals a big upsurge of interest in the financial policies now so seriously affecting the primary producers. An address by Mr. Butler in the Western District was widely publicised. Developments of the greatest significance are under way. A new booklet, *They Want Your Land*, is in the course of preparation. A nation-wide distribution of a special eight-page brochure, *Australia's Front Line In Southern Africa* is under way. Copies may be obtained from The League of Rights, Box G.P.O., Melbourne, 3001, at 10 cents each. Mr. Butler has just concluded a trip through to Sydney, Northern N.S.W. and Queensland on special activities related to training more competent Social Crediters. Mr. Jeremy Lee and Mr. Don Martin and their associates are working at top pace on many fronts in Queensland and N.S.W. There is a massive programme of lectures and schools planned to run right throughout the whole year, covering all States.

All this requires a guaranteed flow of financial support. Once again we request that those who have not contributed to the 1969 League of Rights Fund, to do so immediately. Every little helps.

---

## WHAT DOES THE INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS STAND FOR?

Don Jough (pronounced Joe) had read of the formation of the Institute of Public Affairs some 25 years ago. Occasional press references to comments from IPA satisfied him that its purpose was to uphold the belief that, "A nation must not become physically richer except by increasing its financial debt." Professor D. Copland said something similar in the 1930's. Only recently, Don made direct contact with IPA literature. He was amazed to learn that its avowed purpose was the same as he had been working at for 35 years—"The radical reform and improvement of the free enterprise system to make it more attractive than socialism."

Don found further that IPA philosophy was closely aligned to his own which he termed Social Credit philosophy. He condensed it as follows:

"Material advancement can be the means to a better way of life. It can be the instrument of progress; but the quality of our life is more important than the quantity. Real progress is self-development in the highest sense, and that is something for which each individual is responsible (one responsibility is not to hamper the development of another). No one man is a repository of all truth. Everyone has something to contribute to the total of human knowledge. Wisdom is often found in unsuspected places.

When institutions suppress ideas they don't like, they weaken themselves and go back on their ideals. It is seldom there is not some particle of truth in the dissenter's viewpoint. Those who claim the right to dissent must grant to others the right to dissent from them. The truth is not revealed through the hysteria of self-righteousness. It comes, if at all, *only through the arduous process of study and thought*. Controversy should be encouraged; but we should be able to air out differences without wanting to punch the other fellow on the nose (or smear him)." Parentheses are Don's.

Long experienced in psychology, Don understood why his own efforts were suppressed or misinterpreted. But IPA personnel was closely linked to the directorate of Big Business, Press and other avenues of communication of ideas—why could not such an influential body check the drift away from its professed ideals? He found much of the answer in the IPA pamphlet, "Better Living Standards, the Key to Productivity".

This, and other well got up "literature" is packed with statistics and statements, which, taken one by one, are almost incontrovertible. But there is no evidence of "arduous study and thought". You can identify engine parts as piston, valve, crank, and so on. What you say is true as far as you go; but the parts do not make an integrated whole unless they are arranged in correct association with each other. That's how it is with IPA propaganda—right conclusions are not arrived at because statements and facts, true individually, are not correctly associated. For instance, while it is true that productivity is essential to better living standards, it is not the key. Production goes into the store, but the key enabling consumers to get at it is money. Our "arduous thinkers" are ever willing to explain to IPA how purchasing power can be arranged to come into existence at the same rate as production, and go out at the rate of consumption, without the Keynesian evil of "cost" and price inflation.

In all probability the heads of the 700 companies financing IPA sincerely believe they are helping to "state the case for free enterprise in a responsible way". In our opinion they are being misled through "advisers" who lean towards totalitarianism. As they have it—"The guiding principle which the IPA follows is that of the broad, national interest, in the belief that what is best for the nation and people as a whole will, in the end, prove to be in the best interests of its components." That is the collectivist's concept: the State, or other authoritarian body decides what is best for you and me. Our only say is whether we prefer one Party, or the other, to wield the whip.

The genuine "free enterpriser" would put it—"What is best for each individual, as chosen by himself, is in the aggregate best for the nation."

—G. K. Tavender.

## THE ENEMIES OF DEMOCRACY

By D. Watts

**Among the more civilised peoples of today the most deadly enemies of democracy are those politicians like Mr. Wilson and Mr. Heath who believe that democracy begins and ends at the polling booth, and those journalists and other writers who have been careful never to learn anything new since the days of their opinionated youth. The reaction to Mr. Enoch Powell's speech on coloured immigration has revealed how very little respect for democracy and freedom have many of those who have paid it the most lip-service. Also it gives rise to the reflection that one of the most unpleasant combinations is that of hypocrisy and arrogance.**

The genuinely democratic form is the most highly civilised one so far evolved and, as is to be expected from that, it is the most difficult one to establish and maintain. In it the needs and opinions and feelings, not exclusively of the majority, but of all the people are duly considered and taken into account when making decisions. This necessitates freedom for all to present their points-of-view. Just how hypocritical has been the sanctimonious talk of equality is apparent when we note how unequal has been the amount of freedom to present ideas and opinions enjoyed by different sections of our society. Yet this is an equality, which has validity which other proclaimed equalities have not. A partial suppression of the freedom vital to democracy has made arrogant autocrats of many political leaders.

Consider Mr. Heath's declaration that the tone of many of the letters on the subject of coloured immigration received by him showed him how right he was in dropping Mr. Powell from his shadow cabinet. That is the response of an arrogant, stupid man. A more astute politician would have read a warning in the support given Mr. Powell (Mr. Heath has subsequently apparently realised this — Editor). Even if a political leader does not believe in democratic rights for any except those who agree with him, he should at least know that if a lid be held down too tightly on a boiling cauldron there will be an explosion. One of the advantages of a democratic State is that in it great pressures do not build up because, through the freedom of speech permitted, the governors are informed early where a modification of a policy is wise.

### **Mr. Wilson's Arrogance**

Highly and lowly placed members of the British Labour Government are every whit as autocratic and arrogant as any Tory is or ever was. Of course Mr. Wilson never did know the difference between strength and obstinacy, any more than he seems to know the difference between firmness and tyranny. His own will, not the will of people affected, is his guiding star. He appealed to the people of England not to bring the racial issue into politics. The stunning effrontery of what may seem like sweet reason to those autocrats incapable of understanding any but mock democracy and so who are in the process of developing into despots. When Mr. Wilson brought forward his anti-discrimination legislation he, himself, introduced the racial issue into politics. He evidently thinks that he can make a political issue of the racial question,

but his opponents must not. Is that democratic? Indeed, it is a hypocritical method of getting away with autocracy. Anyway, the racial problem is of its very nature a political as well as a social issue.

The Home Secretary, Mr. Callaghan, has as great contempt for, or ignorance of, the essentials of democracy as has his leader. He averred that he had learned nothing new from the anti-coloured immigration demonstrations, as he had known all along that there was disquiet among the people of Britain about the business, and that that had been one of the reasons for limiting the number of immigrants. Apparently it was a very minor reason, for the Labour Government was so little impressed by the disquiet that it forthwith proceeded to frame laws calculated to intensify the feelings of irritation and alarm to the point of excruciation.

### **Press Censorship**

And what about that mangy Watch Dog of Freedom, the Press? The larger and more influential section of it is at present engaged in gnawing the flesh off the bones of its charge. There seems to be an idea among the Press tycoons that censorship is not censorship unless it be exercised by the Government, and that the choicest written or spoken freedom is for entertaining obscenity.

When individual newspapers and other publications are privately owned it is not to be expected that any proprietor would allow his journal to be used to propagate opinions that he believes to be wrong; but with such widely distributed private ownership of publications the many owners make it fairly certain that all opinions have a chance of being publicly aired. When, however, newspapers, etc, are owned by companies there needs to be more impartiality in presenting different sides of a question. When one man controls a group of important papers, an autocratic power over what is to be published and what is to be silenced is almost certain to be exercised.

Anyone who has taken the trouble to find out what is being generally suppressed knows that the racial antagonisms and hatreds have been worked up to the present pitch through suppressing much that should have been brought into the open and intelligently discussed. Had there been a fair presentation of all pertinent matters a fairer and a wiser policy would necessarily have been worked out. The present policy of so-called racial equality is in practice one of racial favouritism for the very reason

that in it no allowance is made for the difference for which democracy leaves freedom.

### "Majority Rule"

Do not be fooled into believing that because a policy has, or is said to have, the support of the majority of the people that it is therefore democratic. Majority Rule has a democratic character in only a democratic organisation. When freedom of expressed thought is wholly or even partly crushed, majority opinion is nothing more than an echo of autocratic opinion. That stands to reason. Only a minority of the people has the time and driving interest to investigate particular matters, to collect all the relevant facts, to analyse and relate them. More often than not different sections of this minority will come to different conclusions. The majority of the people is dependent upon the minority to present it with authoritative conclusions. If one section of the opinion-giving minority selects facts that seem to point to a desired conclusion, and is in the position to suppress the conclusions of those who have considered other facts, then the majority, hearing only the facts and arguments that support the conclusions of the powerful, must believe that what is said is all that there is to be said, and that therefore the presented opinions must be right. That is why from the point of view of democracy, at present majority opinion on the racial question is not worth tuppence.

If, on the other hand, there is equal freedom to present the different conclusions, then the people will be compelled to make a choice and maybe even think about the choice. An element of democracy is in that. Because there has not been a fair chance to express free opinions on other matters besides the racial problem we have so far retreated from democracy that many politicians and journalists have come to believe either that if something that is inconvenient to themselves be not said, it will soon cease to exist; or that if something that they do not want to exist is not said, it does not matter if it does exist. Both Mr. Wilson and Mr. Heath seem to hope the former and believe the latter.

An example of this too common attitude was naively revealed in an article on Mr. Powell's impact upon complacency by a *Sydney Morning Herald* correspondent, T. S. Monks. Said he, "It was always guessed that there might well be more racial prejudice among the public than had ever come to the surface. The last nine days have shown how well-founded was the worry." Appreciate the implications of suppression of democratic freedom of expression and of the matter-of-course autocratic determination that there are in that.

### Leftist Intellectual Arrogance

I have pointed out before how the clever but short-sighted making an ideological issue of World War II resulted in a leftist monopoly of published opinion. The autocratic leftist power to suppress opposition naturally led to arrogance, till those who have been in the saddle so long have come to feel that they are above being required to

give sound reasons for their opinions or demonstrated facts to support their policies. They merely proclaim, without saying why or how, "This is right; that it wrong. This is good; that is evil. We, the Lords of Opinion have spoken." They evidently expected to be able to pursue that line indefinitely. Now, if not as yet often, they are sometimes obliged to come down off the moral high horse and search for sustaining reasons. How hard up they are for rational arguments are to be gauged by the avidity with which they seized upon hot weather as a sound excuse for the Negro riots in America. Mr. Wilson and Mr. Heath do not do much better. What they apparently think is their best argument in favour of the present racial policy and best excuse for allowing the coloured influx to reach such proportions is that "without the coloured population many of Britain's vital services would come to a halt. The proportion of coloured people working the trains and buses is high. Half the junior doctors in hospitals are coloured and so are at least a fifth of the nurses." My, my, how on earth did the poor English manage to man their trains and buses and staff their hospitals before the coloured people came to their rescue? Incidentally, is not 50, or even 40 percent of junior doctors in hospitals out of all proportion to the numbers of whites and coloureds in Britain? It looks as though there has been racial discrimination in making appointments.

To come to the main issue: those coloureds placed in the services could not, without cruelty and injustice and confusion, at once and altogether be plucked out of them, any more than the million or so coloureds now in Britain could in one swoop be immediately repatriated. Still, what was done gradually could to a large extent be undone gradually. But fancy suggesting that the existence of an exasperating situation is a good argument for doing nothing about it!

### Distorting Racial Truths

I now beg the patience of those who have heard it all before when I mention one argument that I thought had been scotched about twenty years ago, but which, as those who once felt unassailable are now being obliged to defend their position, is very likely to be resurrected to impress the ignorant. Colin Maclnnes brings it up in his *England, Half English*, published as late as 1961. He first apologises for using the odious (sic) word "half-caste" to describe children born in England of Africans or West Indians and of English women. He then says, "These boys and girls—thousands of whom have been born among us—are—as English as any one is. They represent . . . the modern infusion of that new blood which according to our history books, has perpetually re-created England in the past and is the very reason for her mongrel glory."

That is tendentious in implication. To begin with, any breeder of stock knows that just any old cross does not improve the herd. The new blood introduced has to be carefully selected. A still more mischievous misrepresentation is in the implication that the English were, even

before the coming of the coloured migrants, already a mixed race. Actually they all belonged to the Caucasian race and, moreover, were of the Aryan branch of that race. Furthermore, they belonged chiefly to the Teutonic subdivision of that branch. There was a not very great infusion of Celtic (Aryan) blood; though even at that, in the days of England's cultural glory, there was not complete assimilation, the Celts remaining for the most part segregated in Cornwall, Wales and the Highlands of Scotland. The Normans more than probably had a little Celtic and French blood in them, but predominantly they were of the same stock as the Angles, Saxons, and Jutes, or of one closely related to theirs. They were the Northmen who invaded and settled in the north of France.

Colin Maclnnes is a typical product of a rigid ideological censorship. As he has been taught to do, he dislikes and despises the English, and is determined to love all Africans and everything about them, no matter how unlovable he may find some of them and some of their ways. This alienation of natural affection among white inverted racists, of whom Colin Maclnnes is one, may be regarded as a triumph by those who have worked assiduously to maintain an ideological autocracy.

In a letter to *The Sydney Morning Herald*, needless to say not printed, I pointed out that the personal reaction to a few contacted aliens may be very different from the mass reaction to a mass of aliens; and that it might be more intelligent to try to understand why this is so than to be shocked by it. What is involved is an instinctive coalescence and a common loyalty among people of the same kind. Political and Press propagandists have become so swell-headed and arrogant in their consciousness of their power to sway public opinion in matters that have not an immediate impact that they seem to think that they can ride rough-shod over instinctive reactions. Perhaps they remember how quickly and easily, during World War II, they converted a strong anti-war sentiment in England and America into fervent pro-war enthusiasm, and have thought that they could as easily sway racial feelings. Ah, but then they had natural instinct on their side, whereas now they are working against it. To do that they are compelled to pervert justice and crush freedom.

### **Destroying Natural Instinct**

Natural instinct may be sublimated, but it cannot be eradicated, no matter how many principles are sacrificed in the endeavour. In their paranoiac efforts to root out natural racial instincts, certain intellectual, "liberal" thugs are strangling democracy while calling themselves democrats. They are the betrayers, the treacherous political moralists, the kissing Judases. Perhaps they know not what they do; but I think a great many do not care what they do, or what they ruin, in their pursuit of a sentimental policy, which has about as much relation to reality as any other obsessive superstition.

### **THE BOOK OF THE MOMENT**

After a long delay, Mr. Eric Butler's revised and up-dated "Red Pattern of World Conquest" is available. There is no more valuable introductory work on the Communist conspiracy. The new edition contains a long brilliant introduction by Sir Raphael Cilento. It is also indexed and has a striking cover. Supporters should not only have their own copy for reference, but a supply on hand to use when the opportunity presents itself.

Price: \$1.13, post free from Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne, 3001.

### **YOUR CO-OPERATION, PLEASE!**

By acting on the first reminder notice you receive concerning the renewal of your subscription, additional postal expenditure will be avoided, thus assisting us to maintain the present subscription rates. Postal rates increased with the last budget, forcing up our overhead expenses. With your help we can keep these down to the minimum.

Don't forget! Send your cheque, money order or postal order within a week of receiving our account. Thank you!

### **"SECRET COMMUNIST AGENTS WHO HAVE CHANGED THE COURSE OF HISTORY"**

By Patrick Walsh

At the 1968 Annual League of Rights Seminar Mr. Pat Walsh, former under-cover agent for the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and internationally recognised authority on Communist espionage, presented a dramatic Paper showing how so far from being a mass movement, Communism was a movement of an elite, and that a handful of secret agents had changed the course of history in favour of International Communism. Revised and slightly enlarged, Mr. Walsh's Paper is now available in booklet form. It is essential reading for those who wish to know how the present plight of the world developed.

Order from The Australian League of Rights, Box 1052J., G.P.O., Melbourne. Price 36 cents, post-free.