

THE NEW TIMES

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

Vol. 36, No. 7

JULY 1970

EDITORIAL

THE ADVANCE OF LIBERAL-SOCIALISM

As demonstrated by Mr. Eric Butler in his "Fabian Socialist Contribution To the Communist Advance", * the generally accepted Keynesian financial and economic teachings of the non-Communist world are rooted in Marxism. The revolutionary activities of the Marxists have camouflaged the advance of the Marxists through the tactics of Fabian Socialism. The fact that the Gorton Government's Minister for Trade, the Rt. Hon. John McEwen, has been attempting to promote Australian exports to the Soviet Union, while Australian troops are in Vietnam facing troops equipped by the Soviet Union, graphically demonstrates once again the progressive surrender of Western nations to Marxist strategy and tactics.

We are in possession of reliable information proving that the McEwen visit to the Soviet Union was preceded by missionary activities in the Soviet Union by the Australian trade representative in Vienna, Austria, and that a number of Australian firms have been circularised by the Australian Ministry for Trade and Commerce inviting them to list the type of equipment they might be interested in exporting to the Soviet Union. In more robust times, this type of activity would be listed as a treachery. But under the financial rules dictated by Keynesian economics, bigger and bigger "export drives" must be mounted. The Marxists in the Soviet Union are delighted to receive these exports. They receive valuable physical wealth and technical know-how, while the exporting nations like Australia are left with more financial credits—figures in bank ledgers—**which can only be used on Australian production left in Australia.**

A MARXIST PROGRAMME

The essence of the Marxist programme, as first outlined by Marx in *The Communist Manifesto*, is to progressively take power from the many and centralise it in the hands of the few calling themselves the State. In his ten steps for communising a state, Marx called for heavy, progressive income tax, the abolition of private property and a State monopoly of credit. All these steps are being taken by the Gorton-McEwen Government. This Government is advancing a Marxist programme, and the sooner this truth is grasped by sufficient Australian electors, the sooner the Liberal-Country Party Members at Canberra will be forced to reverse present policies or face the electoral consequences. The double-talk and double standards of Prime Minister Gorton, and his supporters, who drive ahead with centralist policies while

verbally denying these policies, have got to be challenged by all those who claim to be opposed to Marxism.

Any innocent who still believes that John Gorton is not a centralist might study with profit an article by Socialist Dennis Altman in the Sydney journal, *Nation*, of June 27. (Older readers will recall that *Nation* was used back in 1959 to launch the nation-wide smear campaign against Mr. Eric Butler.) In his "Defence Of Mr. Gorton", Mr. Altman confesses that he did not vote for Mr. Gorton's Government at the last Federal Elections, and would not vote for Mr. Gorton's Government in the future, but that his "sneaking sympathy" for Mr. Gorton is based on "a partial agreement with Messrs. Fairbairn, Kevin Cairns, Jess, and the boys that he has strayed from Liberal Party principles. And thank God for that." After this frank statement it is not surprising that Mr. Altman tells his readers that Mr. Gorton's "own choice for External Affairs, Mr. Freeth, did a better job than was generally anticipated, and his statement on the Soviet Union was, I believe, eminently sensible . . ."

PAVING THE WAY FOR LABOR-SOCIALISTS

Mr. Altman finds the Gorton foreign policy an improvement on those of his Liberal predecessors, but "It is in domestic matters, however, that Mr. Gorton has really horrified his party . . . The health scheme, the industrial development corporation, the alternatives to jail for national service non-compliers are all "left" proposals for a Liberal government, a government whose front bench seems noticeably more liberal than its back." Mr. Altman then passes to Mr. Gorton's "alleged 'centralism'" which he finds "highly sensible" and "preferable to the same thing being done by a Labor Government which would face far greater opposition." Mr. Gorton "has broken with much of his party's heritage, and made it easier for a subsequent Labor Government to implement very

*Available from Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne, 3001, price 45 cents, post-free.

ELIMINATE INEFFICIENT ECONOMISTS!

ENLIGHTENING CRITICISM BY PROFESSOR

The following is from the transcript of the opening address to the first Annual State Conference of the Queensland Farmers and Graziers Association held in Brisbane, May 7, 1970. The speaker was Professor John Francis, D.Sc. (Lond.), M.Sc. (Vet.), F.R.C.V.S., Head of the Department of Preventive Medicine, Veterinary School, University of Queensland, Brisbane. The address provides a refreshing change from the stereotyped thinking which is only too common, from economic advisers in general, as they propound policies of monopoly and inflation leading to the destruction of the ownership of property and business. Cross headings are supplied.

In describing "the farmers great march through Melbourne" *The Australian* (24/3/70) told us that the men and women looked rather magnificent—they behaved with cheerfulness and dignity and won the sympathy of city people. But the crux of the matter was in the statement by Dr. R. Bade.

"What is needed is a return to the primary producer of some small measure of the prosperity of this country which primary producers gave to this country over the past 150 years."

FARMERS RESENTED BY ECONOMISTS

Unfortunately, there are many forces opposed to this very proper and reasonable objective. First of all, many economists, academic and otherwise, seem to have adopted a fanatical opposition to farmers and all those concerned with the basic activity of producing food and materials from the land. Perhaps this is due to some primitive jealousy.

It seems to me that men in many sedentary walks of life have an instinctive feeling that life on the land is a more manly occupation than life at the desk. This does not cause them to have any special respect for farmers and graziers, but I think causes an attitude of resentment. In their minds farmers are divided into two categories: those that are inefficient and should therefore be castigated, and those who are efficient and are envied and abused for being too wealthy. This attitude unfortunately seems to extend to many people who live in our cities. Recently the Liberal Party has been giving thought to rural matters, and many of their proposals are doubtless sound, but some of the discussions at the Rural Seminar held at Dalby illustrated the above attitudes.

There was a paper by the brilliant economist, Dr. Davidson, who has been described as the man with a plan for the abandonment of northern Australia. I believe he also thinks that the driest continent in the world should not waste money on building dams, but should allow the water to flow harmlessly into the sea. At the Seminar he stated, or at least implied, that there was no need to worry about the small farmer if he received the basic wage or a little more. Apart from supplying capital the farmer, be he large or small, has to make innumerable judgments, and be familiar with a wide range of techniques, whereas many people who receive far more than the basic wage on the production line, due to militant trade union activity, have to make hardly

any decisions at all. I therefore regard this suggestion of Dr. Davidson's that about the basic wage is good enough for the small farmer, to be a very considerable impertinence.

Dr. Davidson maintained that the farmers' costs were not increased by tariffs protecting Australia's secondary industry. A few lines later, however, he admits that tractors, and presumably other equipment, in Australia do cost more—because of "protection": actually nearly twice as much as in Britain or America. The fact that these increased costs may be compensated for by bounties or a subsidy, which he opposes, does not affect the fact of increased costs!

As he holds such quaint views, I would suggest that Dr. Davidson rather than the dairy farmer should be put on the basic wage. People are entitled to hold and express whatever views they like, but primary producers should see that their own research funds do not go to support people with attitudes entirely antagonistic to the primary producer. Two or three years direct responsibility for the work and management of a dairy farm would give Dr. Davidson a much better understanding of very many things.

ECONOMICS NOT SOLE MEASUREMENT OF NEED

Economists do many useful things and some give important advice to governments, but I think they appreciate that Government and private individuals have the right to make their own decisions on many grounds other than economic. Perhaps the most important things are not subject to economic analysis at all. Thus after a public lecture on electricity by Faraday one lady asked him: "What is the use of electricity?" His reply was: "What is the use of a new-born baby?" Again, Captain Cook's voyage, Australia's works in the Antarctic, or the U.S. flights to the moon are clearly not subject to economic analysis. They are part of the same instinct, which causes man to want to grow two blades of grass where one blade grew before, or produce more efficient breeds of cattle.

Recently, one economist said there were too many people on the land and, of course, many of them were inefficient. One wonders how the latter conclusion was reached when, as I understand, productivity per man (and woman) has increased two to three times more in farming than in the manufacturing industries over the last 20 to 30 years. Also, in my experience, people on the

land work harder and certainly for much longer hours than the ones in secondary and tertiary industries.

Farmers are unfortunate because they comprise many productive units and there are well known differences in human efficiency and productivity: as the psychologist discovered after extensive research, 49% of children have below average intelligence—in the same way 49% of economists or members of any other profession, are inefficient compared with the 49% who have greater ability or are prepared to work harder. Yet, we do not have the same call for the elimination of these inefficient people as we do in relation to farmers. Why should primary producers be mown down or destroyed, as indicated in a cartoon in *The Australian*, by a more insistent demand for efficiency than is applied to the rest of the community? Many people so easily take it for granted that a factory or large organisation is efficient, but I showed (*Courier-Mail* 6/6/69) that what the housewife had to pay to the wholesale milk distributor had increased 56% more than what she paid to the farmer over the last eight years. Who then has been the more efficient—the small farmer or the large wholesaler?

I give below the cost per 1 ounce of some well-known drinks:

Milk	0.45c
Soda Water	0.92c
Soft. Drinks	1.20c
Beer	1.58c

I have heard it stated that it will cost four cents **extra** to put a pint of milk in a carton instead of a milk bottle, whereas the farmer goes through the whole long and complex process of producing one pint of milk for about the price that it is apparently going to cost to put it into a carton. Again it would seem that the basic efficiency of those who produce and sell milk cartons or soda water should be inquired into and compared with that of the apparently much more efficient and hard working dairy farmer.

There is much grave talk of efficiency, but really this controversy is as simple as the old fight over the Corn Laws and free trade. The manufacturing city and professional interests want cheap food and if they can get a few cents off the small proportion of consumer costs that go to the producer they will insist on this with the help of their economist allies. Unfortunately, nearly everyone concerned with the higher levels of Government or education inevitably lives where his personal attitudes and interests are dominated by the urban environment. This inevitably causes in the farmer's case to be less sympathetically considered than that of the city dweller and there is a tendency to equate "primary" with "primitive" or uneducated.

SUBSIDIES AND EFFICIENCY

It is abundantly evident that it is easier for people in cities to organise into pressure groups than it is for farmers scattered over the countryside, and in nearly all countries in the world farm subsidies are used as social devices to:

- (a) redress this balance to some extent, and
- (b) to assist the poorer members of the urban community by keeping food, which is a proportionately large part of their budget, at a reasonably low price.

Yet we are told by some economists that subsidies are undesirable because they only make the efficient producer wealthier whilst making no real difference to the small farmer. This is palpably untrue: subsidies naturally help all farmers and as there are an infinite variety of farmers between the two extremes even the most prejudiced calculator will have to admit that there must be a large range of farmers in the middle group that are enabled by subsidies to lead a life that may be worthy of the contribution they make to the community.

The small farmer has been an important member of the community ever since the days of the yeomen of England and he will doubtless persist and continue to be tolerated. But what really upsets our city and professional experts is that subsidies might assist the outstandingly efficient man on the land to become very wealthy. It was recently stated with approbation that

ENGLISH LEGACY SAVES DEFICIENCY FUND

In our last issue we reported that the deficiency fund for the Australian League of Rights' 1969-70 programme was \$6,170. Since then there has been a magnificent response. But this still left a deficiency of approximately \$4,000 as June 30 approached. However, a minor miracle occurred when Mr. Eric Butler was informed that an English legacy would be shortly available. Mr. Butler is making arrangements to apply the major part of this legacy to financing the 1969-70 deficiency of The Australian League of Rights. The legacy was left to Mr. Butler by an old English supporter of "The New Times". This supporter had also been most generous in the past; believing that "The New Times" and the causes it supported were making the major contribution to the advancement of Social Credit throughout the English-speaking world. Commenting on the magnificent English legacy, Mr. Eric Butler observes "This is a most inspiring example of one generation passing a practical heritage to the next generation. I can only pray that we prove worthy of the trust placed in us by our departed English colleague."

Those who have intended to contribute to the 1969-70 programme of The Australian League of Rights, but who have not yet sent their donations, are requested to do so immediately. Every extra dollar contributed makes the work of the League so much more effective. Donations to Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne, 3001.

great wealth will be created by the extractive industries in Australia. This is regarded as good, and some well established mining companies pay a dividend of 30 to 40%. Motorcar and oil companies make huge profits, and their executives are very highly paid, and all this is regarded as efficient and laudable although much of the money goes overseas, whereas farmers' incomes go back to our country towns and capital cities. Despite this, there is much resentment against the outstanding man who has invested his money in the hazardous business of Australian farming, triumphed over pests and adverse seasons and eventually became wealthy. It seems that what is consciously or subconsciously desired by many urban technologists is a sort of factory farming carried out by a few serf-like operatives and yielding returns of 3-6% on capital. This would provide the maximum opportunities for the bright people in the cities to be paid high wages and salaries receive high interest rates and occasionally drive into the countryside to look at a suitably docile and respectful population.

SUBSIDISING SECONDARY INDUSTRY

Most of the talk is about farmers' subsidies, although it has been repeatedly shown that the total support given to secondary industries is two to three times larger than that given to farmers—the Vernon Report showed this and perhaps that is why it was so quickly pigeonholed. As Dr. Rex Patterson said (*The Australian*, 12/12/69) "The Vernon Report pointed out that the value of protection given to the motor car and construction materials industries (alone) in Australia was greater than the total subsidies or their equivalent, directly and indirectly, provided to all primary producing industries in Australia." Mr. Gilbert pointed out that (*The Australian*, 24/2/70):

" . . . By extending tax-free operations to major oil companies, between 1963 and 1968 Australia lost \$700,000,000 to overseas firms. By subsidising gas production on Victorian fields, another \$700,000,000 capital gift was made to these same owners, and by subsidising crude oil search another \$600,000,000 may be lost to Australia. The long-term contract price the Victorian Government paid to Esso for the same product is around 30c per 1,000 cubic feet or 500 percent more than that company receives for the same product in the U.S."

Yet despite these subsidies the Australian consumer is glibly told that he must pay more for the privilege of buying his own oil products and related articles "as profits must be maintained". One can imagine the outcry of similar statements made over primary products.

People who work for oil companies have of course, to be paid very high salaries and wages and we were recently threatened with a serious strike because some Ampol and Amoco workers were not receiving a \$3 per week "isolation allowance" when their place of work was some 10 miles from the G.P.O. in Brisbane.

Mr. McEwen has rightly said that we must adopt an entirely new approach to the place of the primary producer in the affluent Australian society and perhaps the oil workers have provided the solution. If one requires a \$3 isolation allowance for working 10 miles from the centre of a capital city, on a pro rata basis life on sheep and cattle properties around Winton or "back of Bourke" might become very rewarding and even dairy farming at Gympie or Dayboro would become a very sound financial undertaking.

With this happy thought I have much pleasure in declaring your Conference open.

GRAVE WORLD PROBLEMS

CHRISTIAN LEADERSHIP QUESTIONED

The following contribution comes from Mr. John Mitchell* in England. Mr. Mitchell was the founder of the Christian Campaign for Freedom. He founded the organisation to encourage Christian laymen to take a more active interest in their Church as a means of advancing the cause of justice in all spheres of human associations. Mr. Mitchell wrote to the Bishop of Crediton in England. The cross headings are ours.

Dear Bishop,

I feel strongly that when a bishop, from whom the public is entitled to receive sound advice, makes a fatuous statement in public a strong protest should be made, preferably by as many people as possible. I am referring to your appeal in *The Daily Telegraph* for people "to subject the issue of modern war to intense prayer and study". I do protest.

PEACE THROUGH GOD'S KINGDOM ON EARTH

Millions of people pray daily, by repeating the Lord's Prayer, for the coming of the kingdom of God on earth;

A reprint of Mr. Mitchell's authoritative article, "World Government Is Anti-Christian", published in the fifties is still available from New Times Ltd., Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne. Price 10 cents posted.

this has been going on for two thousand years. But are we any nearer the kingdom of God on earth? On the contrary, we are heading away from it at a frightening pace. How else do you think there will be peace on earth except by the establishment of the kingdom of God on earth, or something like it?

The further you get from the negative end of a stick, the nearer you get to the positive end, and perhaps the easiest way to see what conditions are favourable to the promotion of the kingdom of God on earth is to look at what it emphatically is not: this we are enabled to do simply because the world is cursed by practical examples. I refer, of course, to the communist States on the other side of the Iron Curtain and to the many progressions towards it on this side. The cardinal feature

of all these systems is the centralisation of power in the State and the erosion and denial of the individual person's power of choice, personal exercise of judgment and personal responsibility, in a word, the elimination of the sovereignty of the person over his own affairs.

Now, no one with a modicum of intelligence and an open mind can read the Gospels and fail to see that the kingdom of God is concerned with immanent sovereignty and the diminishment of external interferences with it so far as is practically possible. There are therefore simple guide lines by which a Christian can test the political, economic or financial policies which he is invited to support or which are thrust at him. But what do we find?

INTELLIGENCE AND RESPONSIBLE VOTING

Incredible as it may seem, we find bishops and clergy and laity who actually support State control. There are others who shirk the issue and their responsibility in the matter. Then, typical of a large number is a stalwart of the local Church, a medical man who holds a senior appointment in the Health Service and has therefore, one presumes, at least a normal quota of intelligence. He came up to me not long ago and said he didn't understand politics—if he was persuaded by one speaker that his ideas were good he would change his mind when he went to a meeting of a rival party. I did not ask him whether he votes at Parliamentary elections; but there are plenty like him who do, knowing little or nothing about the policies of the party they support; they nevertheless exercise their power anonymously and refuse to accept responsibility for the result. These results may be the ruin of whole groups of people; they may be the destruction of the savings of old people causing them to live in miserable conditions; they may be the vicious and unnecessary competition for markets leading to war. Yes, war, bishop! Brought about with the aid of the irresponsible act of a would-be Christian! Of course, in their businesses and professions they would never dream of their subordinates and associates not being made responsible for what they do. They know chaos would result. But, is theft or cheating an old woman out of her savings by a remote irresponsible act less of a crime than direct theft?

The bishops and clergy are willing enough to condemn dishonesty, disloyalty, murder, unchastity and any of the sex things they are so obsessed with. They will even go to press to decry irresponsibility, especially in the young. But when have they ever come out insisting that people should be **made responsible** (I don't mean just urged to be responsible) for their political acts. On the contrary they are silent when whole areas of responsibility are taken away from the individual; he is taxed so that the Government can provide for his education, his welfare, his health care—you name it. He is taxed in such a way, i.e. differential taxation, so that he is penalised in the exercise of his choice in this, that and the other. Even on the simple issue of whether a parent should be responsible for the care of his children's teeth the respon-

sibility is taken away from him through mass medication of the water supplies. And the Church is silent!

THE CHURCH AND POVERTY

Your subject is war, and particularly "in the development of nuclear destructive potential". Let me tell you something. Back in the 1920s and early 1930s, when the totalitarian organisations of tyranny were in their infancy and lacked military strength to do much harm outside

ERIC BUTLER RETURNS

Mr. Eric Butler left Melbourne for his ninth overseas lecturing and fact-finding tour on February 16. He returned to Melbourne on Saturday, July 4, his wedding anniversary, after campaigning in New Zealand, the U.S.A., Canada, the United Kingdom, Rhodesia, South Africa, Western Australia and South Australia. During this tour Mr. Butler worked seven days a week. League campaigning reached new levels of intensity during the final five weeks of Mr. Butler's tour, in Western Australia and South Australia, when in-depth schools kept Mr. Butler on his feet up to six hours in the day. At several schools some students were fighting hard to keep awake in the early hours of the morning as Mr. Butler continued to lecture. Literature sales were massive. The R.S.L. Hall was packed for Mr. Butler's Adelaide meeting. There was a record attendance at the fourth Annual Dinner of the League in Perth. The intensity of the two weeks South Australian tour can be judged by the financial returns: approximately \$1,100 in the two weeks. Over \$500 was taken during the three weeks in Western Australia.

Mr. Butler's final function before returning to Melbourne was the fourth Annual Dinner of the League on Eyre Peninsula, held at Cummins on Friday, July 3. Regional Council Chairman, Jim Cronin, told the Dinner, that on the previous evening one of the largest political meetings ever seen at Streaky Bay had "exploded" after hearing Mr. Butler give an address "which they would remember as long as they lived".

After a short "rest" in Melbourne at League headquarters, Mr. Butler is leaving for an intensive programme next month in New South Wales and Queensland, following up on the magnificent recent country tours of Assistant National Director Edward Rock and Queensland State Director Jeremy Lee. It is not surprising that with the increasing intensity of League campaigning throughout Australia primarily on the finance-economic issues, that both State and Federal Members are feeling the "heat". Upon his return to Melbourne, Mr. Butler said: "If the politicians are feeling the heat now, they are going to find the situation scorching before very much longer."

their boundaries, when the Church had far more power to influence than it has now, the members of the Church were constantly asked to speak out about the situation of poverty amidst plenty (deliberately misnamed "the unemployment problem") which then existed. They refused.

At one time there were about three million unemployed living on the dole—with their wives and children making close on ten million people in dire misery and distress. The men, the materials, the machines, the skill, the factories, the farms—all that was available to keep these people in comfortable circumstances. All that was necessary to enable these unfortunate people to enjoy a good life was to put money in their pockets so that they could buy what could so easily be produced. Not only was this possible, but there was superfluity of men and materials to create an effective defence system to deter the aggressors who started the last world war. The financial know-how, the method, which would have enabled this to be done, was available (extraordinary measures have been taken since 1922 to suppress knowledge of it). A dignitary of the Church of England even asked a leading member of the inner political circle in Moscow at the time what he thought about it, and was told: "We know about it. It is the one theory in the world of which we are afraid." And a member of an international banking family commenting on the same subject, said: "It is the only proposal which would save civilisation, but civilisation is not worth saving. I cannot assist it."

What was the attitude of members of the Church? I will tell you. When this situation was at about its worst I went down to South Wales to investigate conditions in the town, which had the highest unemployment figures in the country. From the unemployed themselves, from the local editors, from the commercial community, from the Rotary Club, from all of them I got the same story: the unemployed were self-respecting, proud men, bitterly humiliated by having to take charity, i.e. the dole (the latter day attitude of work people is something which has come about since then, a legacy of the bitterness then sown). When I got back to London I discussed this situation with a respectable citizen, a pillar of his local Church. Nothing I could say would convince him that the unemployed were not unemployed because they didn't want work. This attitude, or something close to it, was widespread in the Church—an attitude of bigoted, narrow-mindedness of indifference.

POLICY OF MATERIALISM CONDONED

What has been the fruit of all this. Well, we have had Keynes. He was put up to "solve" the lack of purchasing power the wrong way, prime the pump, get everyone on the payroll where they can be kept quiet and controlled. The result is for all to see, always accompanied by a lying propaganda to deceive people as to the true nature of what is being done: we have never-ending expansion of industry so that money is distributed in

wages, never-ending battles for markets, foreign markets, wars covertly encouraged, space programmes, shoddy production of goods which frequently needs replacing; vicious competition and advertising campaigns to make people want what is produced. With it all, the inflation (which the correct method would have prevented), the pollution, the conurbations of people, the mass production methods. In a word MATERIALISM—the materialism that the Church condemns, but has done nothing to prevent, has even condoned the policies, which create it. And, Bishop, the growth of the giant undertakings, the concentrations of financial and economic power, the massive bureaucracies, without which the concentrated destructive forces, which you deplore, could never have come about. There is a direct connection—cause—between centralised concentrated industrial organisation and concentrated destructive power.

In the Athanasian Creed, which the Church of today has inherited, there is a clear statement of the Trinitarian nature of the Creator, with an over-riding emphasis on the importance of balance. But the bishops fail to point out, or perhaps even to see, the over-riding importance of respecting the same Trinitarian character of the Creator in the created universe in which we live (vide Dorothy Sayers—*The Mind of the Maker*).

THE CHURCH AND RESPONSIBLE ACTION

The bishops have remained silent while the Trinitarian constitution, evolved painfully over the centuries in this country, has been subverted virtually to destruction in all but name. They have failed to point out the vital importance to society of the Trinitarian nature of any association of people: policy, administration, sanctions

"A SMALL FARMER REPLIES"

There is nothing so dangerous as individual initiative, particularly when backed by knowledge, is the view of the anonymous author, or authors, of the controversial revolutionary documents known as "The Protocols". At present it would appear that all the Big Battalions are carrying all before them in the drive to create the completely centralised State. But they are striking increasing resistance from what could prove to be the last effective line of resistance to the World State, the rural communities of the non-Communist world. Mrs. Doris Phelps, wife of a small farmer in South Australia, has produced a most valuable contribution to the growing resistance movement in the rural community. "A Small Farmer Replies" shows in simple, effective English how financial policy is the key to the question of whether the small farmers can effectively protect themselves against the monopolists. The Australian League of Rights is making a major effort to effect a nationwide distribution of this most valuable book. Order from Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne, 3001. Price 50 cents, post-free.

(vide *The Tragedy of Human Effort*, C. H. Douglas). They are so utterly blind to this that they have never spoken one word of warning about the inevitability of bad government and bad policies proceeding from the election of administrations by an ill-informed, anonymous, irresponsible electorate. Chaos results because making people responsible (not just urging them to be responsible) for their actions is all part, a vital part, of the efficient operation of sanctions, a vital part of the trinity. The character of an organisation determines the type of person who rises to the top in it. This is all too evident, whether you look at the Mafia or large-scale business. If criminality or ruthlessness is necessary to the operation of the system, the system automatically ensures that only people of that character rise in it. Caesar does not appoint people to limit his power. So far as the Church of England is concerned over a long period the system has ensured that only men with a certain cast of mind are selected for bishops. The cast of mind ensures that they are not dangerous to the men whom the public sees in power, and particularly to the much more dangerous men behind the scenes, the men who exercise ultimate power. The system has been working so long that the longstop in 10 Downing Street rarely has to exercise his veto to ensure that a good man who would be dangerous to the system does not get on to the bench, I realise therefore that you are probably incapable of understanding this letter, but at least you cannot say you haven't been told.

Yours sincerely,
JOHN MITCHELL

THE ADVENT OF AGRICULTURE

From chapter 2 of "The Church and Farming" by Rev. Denis Fahey, C.S.Sp., D.D., Ph.D., B.A., we reprint the section, "The Advent of Agri-Industry". This shows that modern technology, through perversion brought about by money manipulation, is destroying the proper organic relationship between man and the land.

On a society thus disordered came the Industrial Revolution with the factory-system, which "destroyed the organic connection between the worker and his work. He became a "hand" . . . a cog in a mechanism which had usurped his position . . . Thus was evolved the proletariat of modern times, the mass of humanity which lacks **property** . . . What the countryside gained in technological aids to agriculture was more than counter-balanced by its loss in human membership and in the subordination of husbandry to commercial ends. The old, intimate association of land, labour and living was broken apart by the intrusion of inorganic factors—money and machinery . . . Nearly all economic activities have come to be regarded as "industries"—mechanized

organizations for conversion, the efficiency of which is calculated in terms of money or machine power. We even have an "agricultural industry", a "distributive industry", an "entertainments industry", and a "sports industry". Doubtless, we shall soon have a "medical industry" and a "social service industry" . . . Now the function of the factory is to add utility (and, therefore, exchange-value) to materials by converting them into useful articles—"goods". These materials may be inorganic, in which case they are changed in form. Or they may be organic, in which case the function of industrial organization is to de-organize them—render them inert in order that their final form may be stable . . .

"Hence the essence of the **industrial idea is output**—the conversion of materials into wanted "goods" by means of techniques. It is an expression of power, the power of the human mind, in control of the inorganic energy which it has harnessed for application through machinery, to adapt inanimate things to human needs . . . This manipulative conversion has become the supreme objective, as it is the supreme achievement, of the Mechanical Age—the expression of Power-Man. Its motif and method may be observed in all the "organized" (actually mechanized) economic activities of the modern world. In **finance**, the objective is **transaction** . . . In **trade**, the objective is **turnover** . . . In **transport** likewise the objective is **traffic** . . . These mechanisms do not in themselves originate production, and ought not to be regarded as ends in themselves. Their function is to render intermediary services. But because they are an expression of power . . . their increasing size and complexity have come to be regarded as the measure of human achievement. Economic well being is in fact largely assessed in terms of conversion - - volume of output, transactions, turnover and traffic. This emphasis on conversion . . . has led to a purely mechanistic concept of efficiency . . . Its use in "economics" presupposes that the sole criterion of any economic enterprise is the quantity of consumable goods obtained per unit of human energy applied."

Industry, trade, finance and transport, in true Cartesian style, lay emphasis on quantity and local movement, as if nothing else mattered. Yet no matter what may be the quantities of "goods" turned out, their social value depends on two, things, namely, the conservation and development of the sources of real wealth, and the use to which the wealth is put, that is, the manner in which the wealth produced favours living as members of Christ in the country.

"Very typical of the influence of mechanical progress on the modern outlook is the general impression that because agriculture has not yet adopted, or has only in part adopted, the technical methods and large-scale organization of manufacturing, it is correspondingly 'backward' . . . This view originates in a misconception. Human relationships with the **organic realm** are of a fundamentally different character from those with the **inorganic realm**. Agriculture is not 'backward' for the good reason that it cannot 'progress' beyond the limits

**The Church and Farming* by Rev. D. Fahey, C.S.Sp. Price \$2.20 post free, from Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne, Vic., 3001.

imposed by organic Nature, and within those limits improvement must be . . . by the intensification of natural processes rather than by the imposition of mechanical processes. Nevertheless, Western agriculture has been subjected to the same forces that have been shaping other economic activities, and while such a term as 'the agricultural industry' is a misnomer based on the above misconception, there is no doubt that in some countries there has developed a sort of hybrid which may be conveniently described as 'agri-industry'."

As the emphasis of industry, under pressure from the manipulators of money, is always on quantity, factory farming thus tends to oust family farming. Gradually, "the economic content of agriculture underwent a fundamental change. No longer was it the chief function of the land to provide nourishment for those who lived and worked on it, it became more and more a food factory for the towns. Landlord, labourer and farmer might still feel a real affection for it and take a deep interest in it, but their effective connection with it was now mainly through money. Similarly, the fast-growing urban population obtained their food through the market mechanism and its entourage of dealers, merchants and processors . . . To the intermediate charges (of collection, grading, packing, transportation and delivery) were gradually added, as the food trade grew more complex, the costs of 'processing', that is, the adaptation of perishable produce to the requirements of transport and storage . . . Thus the net effect of urbanization and the widening gap between producer and consumer was to increase the total cost of food." Food gradually became dearer and, as we shall see later, less nourishing and even injurious.

Continued from Page 1

necessary social reforms." In other words, Mr. Gorton's Government is the front-runner for the Fabian-Marxists, opening the way for the follow-up by the openly declared Fabian-Marxists. The revealing statement that the Gorton Government is introducing centralism more easily than the Labor Government would find possible, is already causing many electors to ask whether the only method of bringing the Liberal-Country Party Coalition back to their founding principles, is a spell on the Opposition benches. At least the implementation of Marxism by a Whitlam Government would not be described as anti-Communism! And some genuine electoral resistance would undoubtedly grow.

RURAL COMMUNITIES MAJOR BASTION

The basis of Civilisation is adequate and guaranteed food supplies, clothing and shelter against the elements. All "prosperity" is comparative, as witnessed by the tremendous civilising achievements of the Romans, or the English during that period called "Merrie England", when adequate food, clothing and shelter was provided with sufficient surplus energy left to build the great Guildhalls and Cathedrals. The basis of true freedom is

economic freedom—which means ready access to sufficient food, clothing and shelter. The Marxists have always understood this, and for that reason their first major "reforms" when they have seized complete control of a country, are to collectivize the food producers. The Australian Country Party was founded to support the independence and security of the nation's food suppliers, and to foster decentralisation. Today, Country Party Minister Anthony and his colleagues vigorously support the Marxist policy of stripping the rural community of its population. The excuse is that smaller farmers are "uneconomic". They are allegedly "uneconomic" because of the Keynesian-Marxist policy of "controlled inflation". Unless the Liberal-Socialist advance in Australia can be halted, Australia's future looks bleak. But the most important base for resistance, and an effective counter-attack, the rural communities, is still strong enough if that base can be held and expanded. A new hope is dawning. The Australian League of Rights is to be commended on the leadership provided on the rural front. We strongly urge all our readers to get firmly behind the League's mounting programme. Time is running short. When Stalin broke the back of the Russian peasants' fight to hold on to their properties, the Communist grip on the Soviet nation was almost complete. Resistance became almost impossible. The Liberal-Socialists at Canberra must not be permitted to break the back of Australian rural independence. The rural community must be urged to greater and more effective resistance under that famous slogan of World War 1: "They shall not pass!"

BOOK NOW FOR 1970 ANNUAL DINNER

The Annual "New Times" Dinner is a very special "family" function, and it is essential that it be kept that way. We must therefore restrict guests to "hard-core" supporters and their families. Seats will as usual be allocated in order of bookings, and we trust that with our new policy we can take all supporters wishing to attend the 1970 Dinner. This year's Dinner is on Friday, September 18. Bookings may be made from now on. Donation is \$5 per person. State if receipt is required. With three special overseas guests last year, unfortunately there was not the usual amount of tune for fellowship amongst guests. There will be adequate time allocated this year. Country and interstate guests requiring private hospitality should make their requests as early as possible.

The Annual League of Rights Seminar will be held on Saturday, September 19, the theme being "Centralisation". Readers should plan ahead for these annual highlights of the year's activities. Do not leave booking until the last minute.

Dinner bookings to New Times Ltd., Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne, 3001.