

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. 4

APRIL 1969

STUDENT VIOLENCE - AMAZING CANADIAN STORY

The rioting at Sir George Williams University in Montreal in Canada in February which resulted in destruction of University property valued at over \$2,000,000 revealed serious undertones of hardcore communist direction, when according to "The Toronto Telegram", March 7, the riots were linked with the embassies of Communist powers and African embassies. This was established at the trial of rioting students when a document was seized in court from one of the accused as it was passed to him by a spectator. The document contained directions that "progress reports as often as possible . . . be delivered to African Embassies, Cuban, Soviet Embassy." The document made the significant comment showing that most of the students involved were dupes. "Many key brothers and sisters as yet seem unaware of the party."

The following two articles make the picture clear and portray the tragedy of modern permissive education.

AN AUSTRALIAN COMMENT

In the Melbourne daily, "The Herald", March 13, 1969, Charmian Clift who writes a regular column for a leading Australian newspaper syndicate unburdened herself on her own confusion about students. She expressed bewilderment at the rioting and dissent in the world's universities. A contributor to our columns, Mr. A. McPherson made the following comments on Charmian Clift's article.

Although posing some telling points on the sterility of the ends to which the "student revolution" is leading, her confusion seems real. She seems lost in the featureless waste of what has come to be known as "intellectual liberalism". She knows not where the line can be drawn between freedom and anarchy so no line is drawn. Agreement cannot be found on how many hairs divide the bearded and the shaven hence these states are both nebulous. Standards vanish and reasoning, which depends on axioms and differences become blurred. One could search fruitlessly among the thinkers of the past to find one who advocates opening the mouth before the ears and eyes.

Even our Lord did not criticise and instruct the world as a teenager, but as a mature adult. Yet we find some "intellectual" leaders asserting the "right" of youth to make decisions and judgments on adult affairs. Somewhat reluctantly, Charmian Clift goes along with this craziness.

While, like Oliver Twist, the student may protest against the paucity of the food, or other unnecessary discomforts and impediments, any attempts to deliver half informed and inexperienced judgments should be rigidly discouraged. Professors who urge to foster these revolts should be replaced. Their job is to equip the student so that he may pursue his selected aims in life. Their value lies not in being like the Master of Balliol—a repository of all knowledge, but in their ability to hand to youth a maximum of tried and tested yardsticks and principles, and a survey of experimental developments **in their particular fields**. The preaching of immorality and lawless-

ness should result in automatic disqualification in an institution through which much of the unformed talented must pass.

"What are they after?" these students who revolt asks Charmian Clift, "I wish one of them would tell me." May I make a suggestion, which may help? Note—as you have—the fact that this phenomenon is world wide; the remarkable similarity of method and direction; the use of violence and the attempts to break down law and order; the unexpectedly poor quality of the arguments raised to justify these actions; seek, and find, among the easily led and the malcontents, the hard core of far left agitators who know what they do; the left wing leanings of the urging instructors and professors, many with tactical contributions in the current issues of the Communist mouth-piece, *Tribune*. Finally read some of the works of the revolutionary communist strategists from Lenin to the present day.

You will find a detailed blueprint of what is today happening in our universities. Emotional and inexperienced youth being used to destroy its own cultural roots.

Then, Miss Charmian Clift, think!

(By Douglas Fisher and Professor Harry Crowe—the first of two articles reproduced from the Toronto Telegram, February 26.)

Errors in the press are hardy weeds, which keep cropping up in stories despite the application of editorial weed killer. Sometimes it is necessary to plant the whole lawn over again.

With only a small number of errors in news stories to help them, apologists for the fanatics at Sir George Williams, like Stephen Langdon at the University of Toronto, are busily at work trying to rewrite that lamentable and anguished chapter in Canadian university history.

So let us start at the beginning and state the facts as they happened, and not as the Langdons would have you believe they happened.

Sir George Williams had a reputation as a most tolerant and open institution, harboring on its faculty and in its student body large numbers of politically "left" individuals. It was in the process of becoming a great university, if only by virtue of the fullness of freedom it proclaimed and practised. There were no student demands for drastic changes in structure as have become commonplace in most universities.

Next to freedom, it was distinguished by tranquility.

On April 29, 1968, six black students complained to the dean of students that an assistant professor of biology, Perry Anderson, has discriminated against black students in that he had not given a black student a grade above C, and addressed white students by their first names and called black students "Mr."

The dean of students reported this to the dean of science who arranged a hearing, which took place on May 5—just six days later.

The records of Professor Anderson were examined in front of the students. He had given black students marks above C, and their grade distribution was much the same as that of white students.

The first charge, therefore, was demonstrated to be false in the presence of the complainants.

It was stated by Professor Anderson, and supported by witnesses, and uncontroverted, that he addressed *all* students as "Mr." except three students who were members of the executive of the biology committee, and with whom he came in frequent contact. Charge number two was demonstrated to be baseless in the presence of the complainants.

We move now to well into the new academic year, to a few weeks before Christmas. The principal of Sir George Williams, Robert Ray, was sitting in his office when a group of black students entered and forcibly frog-marched him out of his office, out of the building, into the other university building, into a classroom where Professor Anderson was lecturing, and demanded he fire the professor on the spot.

That was the first that the principal had heard of any allegations of the previous spring against Professor Anderson. Moreover, in the seven months in between, no new charges had been made against Professor Anderson, nor had any complaint been received by the university authorities that the black students wanted him re-investigated for the alleged discrimination of the previous spring, which had been shown to be baseless.

What had happened in the meantime?

There had been a great increase in the Black Power movement in Montreal and at Sir George, in particular. The Black Authors convention had just been held in Montreal, some black leaders had attended the Black Power convention in Philadelphia in November, and a number of Black Power advocates had visited the campus.

A group of faculty, assuming vaguely that justice must be on the side of the black students, and that the dean of

science must not have gotten to the bottom of the charges, now decided Professor Anderson should be tried again.

Professor Anderson agreed to submit to this double jeopardy, voluntarily suspended his teaching duties (an unfortunate move), and the acting principal (Dr. Ray had resigned) put an official stamp upon this committee.

Two black members of the committee resigned when they got into a hassle with the black students who objected to the fact that Professor Anderson was to be allowed legal counsel. The black students then demanded their places should be taken by two black students to be chosen by the students.

The acting principal did not agree, filled the vacancies with faculty members, and the inquiry was launched in the presence of some 500 students. The complainants then said they would boycott the proceedings.

The university authorities insisted the hearings should proceed, but at the same time entered into negotiations with the black students about the composition of yet a third committee of inquiry before which Professor Anderson would be subjected to triple jeopardy.

In the middle of the hearings about 60 black students invaded the room, turned the proceedings into utter chaos and tried to capture the accused who was rescued by his lawyer. These students then proceeded up to the computer centre and the occupation began. They were joined by some white students, and later some white students occupied the faculty lounge.

The number of students involved was never more than 200-250.

The mass of the student body was now convinced there was no case against Professor Anderson, who at this point returned to his classes.

The authorities thought this unwise and the vice-principal (O'Brien) sent him a letter, in effect suspending him.

Because of a phrase in this letter a dozen black students invaded O'Brien's office, held him prisoner for four hours, and forced him to sign a fantastic document.

(The second of two articles by Douglas Fisher and Professor Harry Crowe reproduced from the Toronto Telegram, February 27.)

Vice-principal O'Brien of Sir George Williams University had signed a letter, the contents of which became public, in which appeared the expression, "risk of violence". Black students expressed outrage at what they claimed was a slur against them.

It will be recalled that black students had already engaged in violence. They demanded an apology from the vice-principal who, when first approached, could not recollect if that expression had been used in the letter. He returned to his office, examined the carbon, and found that he had, in fact, used it.

Late in the afternoon, 12 black students entered his office. They held him prisoner for nearly four hours. When he attempted to leave he was pushed back into his chair. When he reached for his coat it was yanked from him and

ripped. When he tried to phone, the telephone was knocked from his hand.

He was held prisoner until his signature was extorted on a document of confession. He confessed he had smeared the black students, he had lied to them about the contents of the letter, and he swore he was not signing the document of confession under duress.

When the students left, the vice-principal phoned the police and laid charges against three of the 12 whom he was able to identify.

That phone call was about the first act of sanity, which had taken place since the start of the crisis.

The occupation of the computer centre was mainly by black students while the occupation of the faculty lounge was mainly by white students. The core of the white student group was a most bizarre sect, which calls itself the "Internationalists". It professes to be "Marxist-Leninist", and claims to be the only true revolutionary movement.

It recognizes Mao as an authentic apostle, but not Castro (who "isn't doing anything"), or Ho Chi Minh (who is "selling out the true revolution at Paris"). The main contribution of these white students to the Sir George revolution was to consume the liquor in the faculty lounge.

No attempt was made to dislodge either group. It was assumed that in time something would be worked out. Students joined the occupiers, went home to sleep if they chose, attended most of their lectures, and made free long-distance phone calls around the continent. Other people—students from other universities, non-students, people from as far away as Harlem, and Toronto, drifted into the occupied computer centre.

Rumours the computers would be destroyed were not taken seriously.

Attempts were being made to negotiate arrangements with black students for a third inquisition into the allegations against Professor Anderson, the suspension of whom had been lifted. Negotiations were difficult as the black students said their demands were all "non-negotiable".

There were two ominous developments, however.

A professor of chemistry, working late in his lab was forced at axe-point to leave his lab and to go to the computer centre. He was briefly held hostage and then released. Although it is not clear it seems the object was to secure the chemicals, which were used later in the fires.

The other development was a visit to the computer centre by the head of the German radical students (SDS), Karl Dietrick Wolff. Wolff was fresh from a meeting with radical students in Toronto at which the disruption of the Clark Kerr meeting in the Royal Ontario Museum had been planned.

Then came the explosion. Stating as their pretext the refusal of the administration to submit to their demands about the next inquiry into Professor Anderson, a group of black students from the computer centre destroyed the furniture of the university cafeteria, axing refrigerators and other furnishings, and then turned the fire hoses full blast

onto the escalators. This destroyed their mechanisms and ended any possibility of large-scale movement in the high-rise building. Sir George Williams had been brought to a halt.

About 40 students at this point deserted the occupation force as greater violence was impending. The remaining group had built a network of barricades from chopped-up furniture.

Only in the wake of this massive provocation and destruction of property, and above all, denial of rights and liberties, did the vice-principal call the precinct police. When they came they were greeted by broken bottles and other missiles. The precinct police called the riot squad.

After the riot squad arrived there was a delay of several hours while the police and the university authorities thrashed out the charges, which would be laid. The students set four fires in the area of the computer centre, destroyed the computers, threw masses of tapes and cards into the streets, and also some equipment.

The evidence is strong that very many of the students would have suffocated from the smoke if it had not been for the police and the firemen. There is also reason to believe that if the fire had not been extinguished a central pillar in the area, which had begun to bend, would have buckled and the engineering library above it would have come hurtling down into the flames. If that had happened Sir George would have been totally gutted. Also, not many people would have escaped.

What of the future?

In the short run, the courts will render impartial verdicts, the academic community will undo the damage done to one of its members, and hopefully, Sir George will begin to rebuild.

The problem of establishing the rule of law at Sir George will remain. That will require the unsentimental separation from the university of those who do not believe it is necessary.

"DEMOCRACY" IN ZAMBIA

President Kenneth Kaunda of Zambia permits his country to be used by Communist-trained terrorists to attack Rhodesia across the Zambesi River. He has constantly cried for the use of force against Rhodesia. Many naive Christians hold Kaunda up as an outstanding African Christian leader who is demonstrating how to run a democratic society in which the rights of all are protected. But developments inside Zambia have, for some time, indicated that Zambia is moving towards the one party dictatorship now so familiar in "liberated" African countries. Mr. Harry Nkumbula, leader of Zambia's Opposition African National Congress, bluntly states that the result of independence is: "Murder, rape, intimidation of the worst kind — contained in one phrase — 'It pays to belong to UNIP'." UNIP is President Kaunda's United National Independent Party.

In an interview published in *The Rhodesian Herald* of

1st January, Mr. Nkumbula commented on how he had been forced by President Kaunda to leave his official residence. He said that he will never return to a Government house while Zambia is governed by Kaunda's party. He referred to "foreign black imperialists". In the press interview, Mr. Nkumbula recalled the advice once given to him by the former Federal Prime Minister, Sir Roy Welensky. "I was told bluntly by Sir Roy that I would regret it if Europeans left the administration of Northern Rhodesia, because he contended that my people are not yet ready to take over the important posts." Mr. Nkumbula went on to say that unfortunately the results of independence had been disastrous. "It had been proved that if you do not belong to UNIP you are not a human being or you are not a Zambian."

"Black Imperialists"

Mr. Nkumbula pointed out that unless a member of the ruling party one cannot trade or obtain property. Recalling the end of the colonial rule of the country he said: "We created a vacuum, and that vacuum has been filled by black imperialists from other parts of Africa who are now hastily engaged in consolidating their positions in Zambia." He added, "These black imperialists, however, can arrest, imprison, shoot or kill, and that is the end of the story. He said he could not understand why the United National Independence Party could be so loud in its condemnation of the Prime Ministers of South Africa, Rhodesia and Portugal, when the party's own leaders were "doing worse things to the people of Zambia".

Mr. Nkumbula said he had never been treated by any leader during colonial rule, in the manner in which he had been treated by Vice-President Simon Kapwepwe. "I have been very good to him, very co-operative, but from the

day I disclosed to the public that he was not a Zambian but a Tanzanian, he became bitter against me personally." Mr. Simon Kapwepwe is reported to be strongly pro-Red China.

MAORI COUNCIL REBUFFS MR. DENNIS BRUTUS

During his recent visit to New Zealand, Mr. Dennis Brutus, the former South African working with the subversive African National Congress and the South African Defence and Aid Fund, tried to persuade Maoris that they should not support the 1970 tour of South Africa by the All Black rugby tour, even if Maoris were selected in the team and could accompany the team. Mr. Brutus claimed that by visiting South Africa the Maoris would be endorsing the "crime of apartheid". Mr. Brutus clearly indicated that he did not feel that Maoris would be able to realistically assess the situation in South Africa.

The New Zealand Maori Council has delivered Mr. Brutus and his Communist supporters a massive blow by formally endorsing the New Zealand Rugby Union's acceptance of South Africa's invitation to tour South Africa next year with a fully representative team. A spokesman for the Maori Council pointed out that the Council had never at any time opposed sending rugby teams to South Africa.

The New Zealand Government has also refused to heed the campaign opposing the sending of the rugby team to South Africa. It is also to the credit of the New Zealand Government, that in spite of severe criticism, it has refused to oppose the All Black rugby team visiting Rhodesia from South Africa. The Communists and their dupes do not win every battle they initiate!

PLANNED TYRANNY

By D. WATTS

Public opinion is a fool for a label. When the business section was showing signs of becoming too powerful there was something louder than a murmur against the middlemen who waxed fat by squeezing both consumer and producer. With the attainment of supreme power by the business section, now enjoying the divinity that doth hedge a king, middleman rapacity became business efficiency and acumen, and Public Opinion acclaimed the virtue and methods of the latest overlord. To be unbusinesslike is to be among the worms, while dishonesty and cruelty can always be excused by saying. "It is business."

Planning and organising have come to be almost synonymous with business efficiency. The relation between communism and planning and organising is obvious; so that the affinity between Big Business and communism is plain enough. The conflict between capitalism, as Big Business sees it, is not between private and State (or organisation) ownership, but between rivals for the power to plan and organise. This is evident enough in the propaganda of those who claim to voice Public Opinion. Communist countries and communist dictators and such brutalities as cannot be ignored are attacked, but not communist methods of organising; never the communist philosophy of dispossessing the ordinary, private individual

and centralising of wealth and power. Whether the centralised possession and power be in the hands of a State Government or monopolistic Companies or Banks is neither here nor there as far as the planned pattern goes; it is the pattern, itself, that is obnoxious.

The pattern of an organisation may be covered over by a mass of details beneath which seemingly few peer to discover the basic design. That last accounts for the popularity of socialism. The chief villains whom the theorists expected socialism to banish were the middleman and the monopolist. It does seem strange that socialists of the past and present have been unable to see that by making the State—which in actuality is the governing

body—the one, supreme, unchallenged middleman and monopolist, the evils with their attendant secondary abuses would be carried to the utmost extreme instead of being abated.

The supposition of the socialists was that democratic political power would, with State ownership result in democratic economic power. We had better have a second look at that. Democratic government is from a distribution of political power among all sections, and to some extent among all individuals. A democratic economy would result from a distribution of economic power among all the people. The cure for middleman bloat and monopoly is not in the gathering of all economic power into the hands of the governing few, but in the breaking up of over-large accumulations.

The wealthiest section, be it of land-owners, merchants, manufacturers, financiers or others, have the most political power. The land-owning nobility and gentry formerly comprised the wealthiest section and therefore were the real governors. It is to be noted in reference to socialism, that when, in France the King sapped the power of the nobility, an absolute monarchy was established. Something similar happened in England, though in that country the monarch had a somewhat looser hold over things and affairs, so that there the dissolution of the king's power was accomplished with rather less violence. All the same, there would never have been an orderly distribution of political power in England or elsewhere had there not emerged a new wealthy section to wrest political power from the monarch and so make his less than absolute.

New Political Rulers

As the merchants and manufacturers, now become financiers and industrialists, are gathering all wealth into their hands, they are becoming the real political rulers. The Government is virtually their possession, whatever may be its party name; and votes without ownership of something by nearly all individuals is fast becoming a farce. Voting is that under communism. It is not just the power of the official Government, but also that of the unofficial government that must be checked. Otherwise, any power the Government has belongs to the wealthiest sections.

Bad Planning

Whether the governing planners of today be in the capitalist or communist camp, they are bad planners. One reason for this is that it is beyond them to realise that while up to a point organising does, as is claimed, make for efficiency and economy, past that point it becomes inefficient and uneconomical. This is especially true of business organisation. With the growth of big cities, the market at which the producer sold directly to the consumer is no longer adequate, and a distributor has become necessary. Distribution is a service that must be paid for; but with regard to the rural industries, the business organisers have come to take it that the distributor's part

is not to serve the producer and consumer, but that both of those exist to serve the distributor. That is to be seen, not only where private monopolists reign, but also where governments and monopolists combine to set up Boards. Recently, in *The Sydney Morning Herald*, Keith Campbell, Professor of Agricultural Economics at the Sydney University, in an interesting article, criticised the proposal to establish a super milk board of 10 members to take the place of a Sydney Zone monopoly of marketing dairy products, and the extension of control beyond the Zone to the whole State. He remarks that the report in which the setting up of a super milk board is recommended "has all the trappings of a paternalist and monopolist enterprise. It is recommended that an absolute prohibition be placed on some products which are beneficial to the consumer, nutritionally and budget-wise."

Egg Board Inflates Prices

Apparently the Professor sees no relation between a marketing monopoly and a recent plan for structural reform of farms, i.e. the buying up of small farms to make larger ones. A comparison with what happened when a monopolist N.S.W. Egg Board was organised suggests that he may have missed something. Before the Egg Marketing Board came into existence a man could make a living out of 500 laying hens. Now he needs 2,000. Before the days of the E.M.B. the agent used to charge for his services, if my memory serves me, a penny a dozen eggs. The price of eggs used to fluctuate a great deal, but it was reckoned to average 1/6 a dozen. That is, the agent's charge was roughly 1/18th of the price. Figures recently given me were \$68.46 for 150 dozen, from which sum the E.M.B. deducted \$9.46—a little more than 1/7th of the price. On a fraction basis the marketing costs are now more than double what they were when the private agent handled the eggs. In addition the agent used to supply the egg boxes and fillers, but now the farmer must buy them; and the increase in the price of feed is out of proportion to the increase in the price of eggs. Further, with 500 layers the small man could breed and incubate his new stock, but to do that with 2,000 birds would be more than one man's work, so chicks are bought, less economically, from hatcheries.

What with the E.M.B. charges, feed-cost increases and the greater capital outlay needed in setting up and maintaining the larger farms, most of the small farmers have been forced out of business or else have been obliged to take other jobs and run their farms as a side-line. It was not the farmer's inefficiency that made the small farm uneconomical, it was the Egg Marketing Board. Was it the Milk Board that made the small dairy farm uneconomical?

When the establishment of a marketing organisation was first proposed, the farmers were assured that it was to be a democratic body, the managers of which were to be elected by them. Soon the bigger farmers were persuaded to vote for the disenfranchisement of the small farmers, but still, with the organisation's becoming a Government

Board, it was undemocratically compulsory for the voteless to belong to it.

Communist Policy Of Egg Boards

What infuriates the smaller farmers is that the E.M.B. has expropriated their eggs. They now belong, not to them, but to the E.M.B. It makes no bones about that, and woe and betide the varlet who steals a few dozen of the eggs he has produced to sell privately. The seizure of farm produce by the State, and the compulsory membership of an organisation are frankly communist practices, but they are also business conveniences. And with it all, if the ordinary consumer ever comes upon a fresh egg these days, he probably wonders what it is.

Of course the small poultry farmer, in voting in the beginning for the setting up of a marketing body, never dreamed that he was putting his head on the chopping block. It might likewise seem far-fetched to the small property owner today to suggest that the N.S.W. State Planning Authority may end by virtually owning most of the settled land. In the district in which I live, when a living could still be made out of a small poultry farm, the land, with that in view, was cut up into three and four acre blocks (approx.). Gradually the farms ceased to pay and most went out of existence. There was then a Cumberland Plan to keep a Green Belt around Sydney, and the owners of the useless blocks were forbidden to subdivide, and were obliged to use their three or four acres as residential lots. The Green Belt restrictions were lifted, but the State Planning Authority, with apparently absolute power to dictate to a man what he must do with his own property, took over and zoned the district, now bordering on housing settlements and factory areas, as non-urban. Its restrictions are even more severe than those formerly imposed. The owners are, I am told, forbidden to do anything at all with the land except plant trees. The pretty sure guess of the owners is that the land is being frozen for future resumption at as little cost as possible; and meantime, they, unlikely under the conditions to find buyers, are privileged to pay rates to an urban-oriented Municipal Council on behalf of the S.P.A. or whatever future beneficiary it has in mind.

Put all that beside the increasing power assumed by Municipal Councils to dictate to the ratepayers, and it can be seen how easy it could be, in the not too distant future, for the S.P.A. to take over from the Councils and become, in all but the title, a monopolist landowner. That is not simply a possible local development, but is a sample of the kind of thing that is happening everywhere.

When any organisation tries to embrace too much it develops lesions and ruptures and falls apart. That is seen in Communist China and even in the U.S.A. in which country government has become more centralised than was originally intended; while Soviet leaders are so scared that Russia may disintegrate that they dare not release their terrorist grip. Yet with that plainly demonstrated to him, Mr. Edward Launcelot Mallalieu, Q.C., and member of

the British Labour Party, could express the opinion that the threat of a nuclear war could be abolished only by setting up a World Government. A World Government would not free men from the fear of use being made of nuclear weapons, but would, itself, use them as a threat in order to keep all nations and people in abject submission. If a nuclear war does come, there is a good chance that it will follow upon the snapping of a too tightly wound international business organisation.

I may have said it before, but it is important enough to be repeated until it is hammered into the heads of the little brothers of Big Brother: human organisations that are satisfactory in all ways are not built like houses, but grow like trees. Certainly there are Organisational Laws but they are more akin to biological than to inorganic Laws. That is where the modern economo-political planners' gigantic error comes in. They have in mind the mechanical inorganic Laws, and treat the human organisation as though it were an automatically working machine needing only a few organisers to pull handles and press buttons to keep it functioning.

In the afore quoted article by Professor Keith Campbell, he is very critical of a proposal to make the chief of the Division of Dairying in the N.S.W. Department of Agriculture the Government representative on the suggested Milk Board. He argues that an authority on the husbandry of dairy cows would not pretend to be an expert on marketing and price policy. Just as bad, or worse for the dairy farmer, would it be to have as Government representative an expert on marketing etc., who was ignorant of the problems of practical farming. Better even than one who knew something of both would be a man who knew, as well, something about human beings, their aspirations, the urgent desire of very many to be free and to be masters of themselves, and the love that most who take up farming have for the land, itself. Recently I came upon a quotation from K. E. Barlow's *Disciple of Peace*: "If man has an organic relationship to the soil and the region, the attempt of propaganda to make his actions fit an industrial system is an assault upon his essential liberties."

Although the love of power explains much of the present-day tragedy of over-organisation, there is another factor. Organising is to the dedicated organiser what the painting of pictures is to the artist, the writing of music to the composer, the pursuit of knowledge to the scientist, the making of poetry to the poet and the quest of truth to the philosopher. It is a passion. Passion and self-restraint are found together only in persons of strong character, so that usually those whose passion it is to run other people's lives and affairs must be restrained by the others. When planners and organisers are better educated than most of them are today they will know that we cannot have too much of a good thing because too much of anything makes it a bad thing and that includes organising. They will know, also, that economic and political organisation should be as a skeleton upon which a living, complex body freely develops, and not as a carapace.

The following letter to *The Economist*, March 8, 1969, reveals the pitfalls of foreign investment.

MR. GORTON'S BACKLASH

Sir—After reading your article (February 22), I can only reach the conclusion that your Canberra correspondent must be either oblivious to economic reality or a faithful vocal puppet of Anglo-American monetary interests.

Foreign investment is, in most cases, synonymous with foreign ownership and there is no empirical evidence to suggest that foreign ownership is beneficial to a country and, indeed, the evidence points to the more harmful effects of foreign domination. In the first place foreign ownership tends to concentrate in the fields of finance (nearbanks), mining, oil, chemicals and transportation, where the profits are extremely high. This was pointed out in the recent report by Professor Reddaway. Profits, plus capital appreciation, on British investments overseas are 14.9 percent on chemicals and 21.6 per cent on mining.

Overseas investment does not create new dynamic enterprises that might compete with enterprises in the mother country, or in the export markets. The overseas corporations prefer to integrate the resources into their own structures, thereby extracting wealth from the economic satellite for their own development. The corporations also attempt to smother any nascent, indigenous companies. Almost everybody is aware that the United States has milked Venezuela of its oil and Chile of its copper while passing only negligible benefits to the reluctant donors. Those who have been lulled into believing that this type of exploitation has ceased should be reminded, as Mr. James Petras has pointed out, that between 1960 and 1965 the income on American investment in Latin America totalled \$6.4 billion.

We, in Canada, have seen our country securely moulded

into an economic satellite of the United States by means of the branch plant takeover. We are no longer masters of our own economic development (witness our enormous regional disparities), and in foreign affairs are directed from Washington. The cumulative effect of foreign domination is such that the nation has thoroughly lost its identity and sense of purpose.

Japan has had fantastic economic growth during the past decade without the "benefit" of foreign investment. If Australia does not wish to sell its birthright, lose its identity and become a reservation of natural resources for the more advanced technological nations, it should act now and heed the experience of other, less fortunate countries.

Yours faithfully,

G. McALARY,
Montreal, Canada.

QUEENSLAND AND NORTHERN N.S.W LEAGUE DINNER AND SEMINAR

Supporters in Queensland and Northern N.S.W. are asked to plan now to attend the Dinner and Seminar in May. Details as follows.

The Dinner will be held in the new Pasadena Lounge, South Pine Road, Alderley. The guest speaker will be Mr. Horton Davies, Chairman of the League's Church Committee. Donation for the Dinner is \$4.50 each.

The Seminar will be on the theme "New Guinea and Australia's Future". The main speaker will be Sir Raphael Cilento who will deliver the paper "Which Way New Guinea? — Which Way Australia?"

The charge for the Seminar is \$1.00 for one or more sessions. For further details write Mr. D. A. Martin, P.O. Box 3, Paddington, Queensland, 4064.

FLUORIDATION CITED AS GOVERNMENT-SPONSORED HAZARD

As further evidence of the steadily increasing concern about dangers of water fluoridation among responsible professional circles, the July 1968 issue of "The George Washington Law Review" (2000 H Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006) carries a very pointed, thought-provoking article entitled "Controlling and Potential Hazards of Government-Sponsored Technology" in which the inception and promotion of fluoridation come under heavy fire.

"In the Convention programme the discussion of fluoridation of drinking water was indicated. At this discussion Resolution 39 was submitted again to the Scientific Council. After hearing the toxicological and biochemical aspects of fluorine as enzyme and cell poison in very small trace concentrations, *and after considering the arguments of the promoters of fluoridation of drinking water and their opponents, the Scientific Council has reconfirmed this resolution*" (italics added).

Written by Michael Wollan, a young graduate of the

Yale Law School and research associate at the National Law Centre of The George Washington University, the article appears as a contribution to a symposium on "Technology Assessment and the Law". (Other contributors to the symposium include Senator Edmund Muskie of Maine and Congressman Emilio Daddario of Connecticut.) Emphasizing how absolutely essential it is "for the continuation of assessment *after* government policy with respect to a scientific or technological innovation has been initially developed" (emphasis in original), Wollan con-

siders various shortcomings and improprieties involving three such innovations weather modification, engine noise from supersonic transport, and fluoridation.

Under the latter heading, he reviews "early warnings" of potential medical hazards that were voiced in 1944 by competent scientists at Hearings of the Federal Security Agency. Subsequent pressures from Wisconsin public health officials and others, culminating in the general "endorsement" of fluoridation by the U.S. Public Health Service in 1950, are then related, with new evidence from personal interviews and unpublished documents in the archives of the Wisconsin State Historical Society.

Next the 1952 Delaney Committee Hearings are summarized. Singled out are "points overlooked by the PHS" in its 1950 endorsement, especially its failure to set up adequate measures "to detect possible adverse effects of artificial fluoridation." Touching on the embarrassing record of the 1951 Fourth Annual Conference of State Dental Directors at which nationwide promotion of fluoridation by practically any means whatever was urged, Wollan notes that the PHS has continued to be a major promoter of fluoridation." At the same time, "PHS officials have expressed their willingness to evaluate studies critical of fluoridation carefully and objectively, but the ability of the PHS to offer a balanced assessment is limited by the strong public commitment to fluoridation it has voiced since 1950."

As an example of this biased viewpoint, Wollan cites the manner in which PHS officials have reacted to recent findings of researchers at the National Research Council of Canada showing that an adult individual's intake of fluorine in a fluoridated community now varies from two to more than five milligrams per day, partly because of increased amounts of fluorides in foods and beverages processed or prepared with fluoridated water (J. R. Marier and D. Rose. *Jour. of Food Science*, 31:941-946, 1966, see *National Fluoridation News*, Sept.-Oct. 1967). Previous research by the PHS indicated that 4-5 mgs "may be the limits of fluorine which may be ingested daily without appreciable hazard of the body storage of fluorine" (F. J. McClure et al., *Jour. of Industrial Hygiene and Toxicology*, 27:159-170, 1945; reprinted in *Fluorine Drinking Waters*, PHS Publication No. 825, 1962, pp. 377-384).

"Instead of sponsoring further studies to confirm or deny the Canadian reports," Wollan goes on, "the PHS responded by dismissing them rather disdainfully. Fluoridation, agency officials said, has been *proved* completely safe, *and no additional studies are now necessary*" (emphasis added).

In the face of such an arrogant official attitude, it is no wonder that Wollan concludes, "the federal government's vested interests in the continuation of its technological programmes limit its ability to provide adequate technological assessment. . . . In the case of fluoridation,

the Public Health Service's advocacy has interfered with its responsibility for continuing assessment of its original endorsement."

STATEMENTS BY F. B. EXNER, M.D., F.A.C.R. (U.S.A.)

(*Four times President of State Radiology Society, six times Secretary of the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons.*)

"Opinions differ as to what traces of fluoride can do, but all agree that they do damage to teeth and that damage is serious. It can be worse than the worst neglected decay.

"Quite aside from the moral, legal, philosophical, and religious objections, which should preclude any thought of fluoridation, there are medical reasons against putting any drugs into the water supply. In fact it is medical insanity.

"There is a sharp difference of medical opinion as to both the effectiveness and safety of fluoride as a drug to prevent tooth decay.

"However safe and effective it may be in prescribed and measured doses, when it is wanted, it cannot be both effective and safe when in the water supply.

"Once you have stopped to think, you know this of your own sure knowledge; and you know that if anyone tries to tell you different, however wise he may be in other matters, and however many degrees he may have after his name, either he has a very large axe to grind, or he, too, has let someone else do his thinking for him.

"No decent government has any right to dictate what drugs I must take, or even what foods I must eat, so long as my choices harm no one but me. Government has no right either with or without a referendum.

"The real purpose of fluoridation is not to protect children's teeth but American big industry."

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.