

THE NEW TIMES

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

\$5.00 per annum post-free. Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne.

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

Vol. 38, No. 3

MARCH 1972

THE FUTURE AUSTRALIAN — ENSLAVED OR FREE?

An address delivered by Mr. Edward Rock, Assistant National Director of the Australian League of Rights, to a gathering of Apexians at Nhill, Victoria, in February, 1972. The text of Mr. Rock's address is as follows: —

Our country is in the process of disintegration and unless basic policies are reversed we will witness increasing dissension and distortion as we move along the paths now being followed. I therefore intend to speak bluntly.

In times past in talking to a service club, with its objective of service to the community, there was a presumption that because you were speaking to a body of charitable and dedicated men that one should withhold remarks which may be upsetting. We can no longer afford that luxury. In matters which vitally concern the future of Australians, which will decide whether they will in fact remain free, or become servile to an oligarchic government masquerading under the nom de plume "democratic", but in fact selling out ours and our children's heritage and national assets, I wish to speak plainly to you because whether rightly or wrongly, and I am open to correction, I fail to see what contribution service clubs make towards the deeper issues of our national life. In fact I put the question to you. Has the concept of social service, which activates service clubs, neutralised and negated the effectiveness of a large body of responsible men in our community, and so surrounded their lives with trivia that they are unable to deal with essentials?

I make no apology if my remarks provoke division. When our country is fighting for survival, dissension and division may well prelude unity if men can honestly face up to the problems, which confront them.

We already have division. I realise service clubs see as one of their roles the healing of division. But the division I speak of will not be healed without a major reversal of basic philosophic positions, and subsequently reversing basic political and economic attitudes and policies.

The ideological enemies of our nation with its heritage in what was once known as Christian civilisation have ensured that class warfare in these matters is accepted as a basis for slugging out differences. Employers and employees are natural enemies in the warfare, which has been promoted, and as in a boxing contest it is the promoters who are taking the rake-off. Both sides, employers and employees, believe the one is trying to gain at the expense of the other. Under current finance-economic rules, governed by the promoters, this is not only too true, but inevitable. It need not be.

The farmer believes the businessman is his adversary, and vice versa. "Tariffs", says the farmer "are the main

cause of our problem". "Subsidies" says the businessman give the farmer unfair protection. "It stops raining for a few weeks, or a market suffers a temporary collapse and the cocky screams for relief and subsidies."

The party system maintains permanent division in the minds of the populace, and out of that division comes the tyranny of irresponsible power. Opposition to policies destructive of national interests and individual freedom is forgotten and overlooked while parties fight over effects and ignore causes. The artificial lines of opposition drawn up by party and class warfare leave the nation and the individual Australian defenceless against the eroding forces of alien philosophies.

The most scarifying indictment of party politics was made recently by Professor Arnold Toynbee. He makes some most potent points. He asks, ". . . and is the party system of parliamentary government democratic? Is this not a conspiracy between highly financed political gangs, to deprive the electorate of its constitutional rights to choose its representative freely"?

"In practice, the electorate's choice is restricted to choosing between candidates presented by parties whose policies may not represent the electorate's wishes. The elected members of parliament are the Party's, not the electors' nominees, and they are also the Party's slaves."

Besides disfranchising individuals and destroying their ability to act and choose responsibly, the party system in dividing the community enacts the first law of the tyrant, "divide and conquer".

In recent weeks Australians have seen the restoration of a phenomenon they thought was a part of history, which would never be revived — the soup kitchen to feed lines of destitute people. Additionally over the last few years large sections of the rural community have either been driven off the land, or driven down the scale of existence towards poverty levels. What are the realities behind these phenomena?

I submit the reality is not the greed and division between different sections of the community as the promoters of class warfare would have us believe. The reality is that both the rank and file of employees and employers alike want equity and justice. Very few will deny this except those puppets that have a vested interest in maintaining class warfare. But this small but highly organised and efficiently directed minority whose objective is revo-

lutionary change would wither on the vine if realistic policies advancing justice and equity to all were pursued. What is the basis for reversing present disastrous policies? I suggest to you there is a basic reality we should never lose sight of. That is that this country, along with every advanced nation in the west, has established the physical basis for equity and justice in realistic economic terms. We have more than solved the problem of production through the free enterprise and private property system. It should never be forgotten that free enterprise and the right to own private property are the products of the Christian philosophy under trenchant attack from all quarters today.

Our capacity to produce in increasing quantities all necessary production for our national needs, along with our advanced technology which enables us to shoot missiles, and place them along with men upon the moon, has not been accompanied by an effective distributory system. And here is the root of our problem. Many people falsely believe the remedy is to destroy the productive system in its present form as it works through free enterprise and privately owned property, and along with it the Christian philosophy which produced it, and replace it with state owned and controlled industry, and give to the state the right to ensure adequate distribution. They in fact believe in throwing the baby out with the bathwater, and substituting something which never has worked and never will work, but results in tyranny, desolation and destruction, not only of the human spirit, and along with it his productive capacity, but also his love of his home and his country, and trust in his fellow man.

We can produce, but we cannot distribute with equity and justice. Why is this so? The distributory system is the financial system, and in understanding the functioning of the financial system we should get certain facts clear in our minds, and these are that neither our national parliament, the people of Australia, the captains of industry, nor the trade unions have any effective control over financial policy.

The party system has destroyed the sovereignty of parliament, which nominally has the authority to decide financial policy, but with the growth of the party system effectively enslaving the representatives of the people as Professor Toynbee has so clearly pointed out, the power of the people to obtain equity and justice from the distributory system has been destroyed.

Here is the key to our problem, to obtain effective representation from our parliamentary representatives; but first we have got to make up our minds whether we want to retain the free enterprise, private property system or change it for complete state control. For behind the ineffective politicians whom we now keep in parliament are the real rulers, the bureaucracy.

Party representatives irrespective of their demand for increased salaries are no more than highly paid slaves of the bureaucracy. They are highly paid to keep them

docile, content to serve and fawn, dependent upon the power of the bureaucracy to provide all the answers to our growing problems. They have abdicated their responsibility, and in abdicating their responsibility they have committed the cardinal sin. As Edith Hamilton put it when talking of the demise of the Greek Empire, "When the freedom they wished for most, was the freedom from responsibility, then Athens ceased to be free, and was never free again."

We have erected a party political system through which we are selling our freedom for a mess of pottage. The responsibility is basically ours, yours and mine. We cannot really blame the politician, soft on his perks and privileges, his salary, and best ever pension-superannuation. He is the product of our irresponsibility, and in many cases I am sure would like to change policies, but needs the support of the people before he will do so.

Under present policies it can be confidently predicted that we face increasing disaster. Individual initiative, freedom and free enterprise have almost been stifled by the growth of various forms of monopoly, gradually moving us towards the ultimate tyranny, the monopolistic State. The central feature I have indicated previously is the control exercised through finance-economic policies centralised in the hands of a few important bureaucrats in Canberra who in turn work with various international groups in banking, finance, and trade to ensure that domestic policy is increasingly subject to international agreements. This policy of finance-economic centralism is the basic feature of what Karl Marx in 1848 called Communism. As his arch apostle, Lenin remarked, it was impossible to have international communism without an international economic system, a point we have almost arrived at.

With the advent of Mr. Nixon's visit to Red China a gigantic step along the road will have been taken. In more specific form what are the basic steps necessary to achieve the position where a man supposedly dedicated to the defeat of Communism is forced to eat humble pie, desert

FRESH ATTACK ON LEAGUE SWELLS BASIC FUND

With the series of highly critical articles on the League now being run in the *Melbourne Age* and the *Sydney Morning Herald* we are, at this early stage, beginning to reap the benefits. All attacks on the League harden and fortify our supporters, something our Enemy will never understand, and produce that "resilience" which the writer in the *Age* correctly attributes to us. We can assure our critics that the more we are attacked the more of this "resilience" they will see. As expected, the hardening of our supporters is reflected in a jump in the donations to our Basic Fund—supporters have donated no less than \$2,464.00, taking the total to \$20,059.54. With less than \$5,000.00 to go, we are confident that the remainder of our supporters, who have not yet donated, will sweep us well past the target of \$25,000.00.

his responsibilities to the hapless peoples of Taiwan, Vietnam and the rest of South-East Asia, and go cap in hand to Red China.

The facts are that Mr. Nixon, like Mr. McMahon is just as much the captive of his bureaucracy, and like us he is being pushed in exactly the same direction. The underlying factor in this diabolical policy is financial debt. Debt, financial debt which runs right through the whole nation, individual and personal debt, governmental debt at all levels of government, and corporate indebtedness of groups in society. Whether we talk of Australia, America, Britain or any western nation the story is the same.

Marx laid the pattern in 1848 when he published his manifesto; it has been faithfully followed out in every western country as well as those already behind the iron curtain. The principles enunciated by Marx for control of finance-economic policies are contained in his 10 fundamental principles for communising a state. The ten are important but I give you the two, which I am mainly concerned about now.

2. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.
5. Centralisation of credit in the hands of the State, by means of a national bank with State capital and an exclusive monopoly.

Who can deny that both these prerequisites are not fully implemented in our country, as they are in America also?

Through the present form of State control the central banks insist that:

1. All money brought into existence carries with it an interest bearing debt, the basic cause of inflation, plus the inability to ever achieve freedom from debt;
2. In the illusory pursuit to maintain equity and a balance of payments individuals and nations must produce and sell irrespective of demand, markets must be found.

We begin to see the importance of Red China, with its population of 900 million peasants, to the American economy. Traditional markets are drying up as other nations become self-sufficient. Europe is closing its doors to the American producer. And while Europe with the same problems as America is seeking markets in the Soviet, America sees her lifeline in China. In addition, with the Vietnam War running down, the American economy must have new markets under the spurious rules dictated by Marxian economics. With the West enslaved to Marxian economics the prediction of Lenin that the West will contract for the rope by which to hang themselves, is almost reaching finality.

Do we have to continue the policies we now pursue? Obviously not. Any realistic distributory system would

first of all ensure the economic freedom and independence of the indigenous peoples. Trade surpluses would be used in exchange for those things we cannot produce ourselves. Alternative sources of financial credit without indebtedness would be instituted. Along with the reduction in the debt burden inflation would be halted. Individuals would gain greater security and freedom. Not only could we treat our own destitute and old people with honour and dignity, but could extend genuine aid to those countries in need.

Behind the highly centralised bureaucracy controlling financial policy on Marxist lines stretches a tremendous power structure with its philosophy of state monopoly and eventually world monopoly, its religion Marxism and the worship of man.

Opposed to it is the concept of responsible parliamentary representation challenging policies of monopoly and safeguarding our precious heritage with its Christian ethic of freedom, but a freedom, which is only possible when safeguarded by a highly responsible people. What are Apexians doing to safeguard the rights and liberties of their fellow men, the highest form of service?

ANNUAL DINNER WILL BE ANOTHER HISTORICAL HIGHLIGHT

"The New Times" Annual Dinner, to be held this year on Friday, September 22, will be another inspiring highlight in the history of the cause for which "The New Times" was founded in 1935. This Dinner is a family one, and we have no doubt that the 1972 Dinner will reflect the tremendous growth of the activities supported by "The New Times".

The organisers reserve the right to reject applicants. Because of the heavy demand upon the number of seats available, those readers intending to attend should make their bookings as early as possible. Their \$6 donation must be sent with the booking. Every effort will be made to seat guests with friends.

The principal guest of honour for the 1972 Dinner will be the well-known South African journalist, commentator, and author, Mr. Ivor Benson, who will give a Paper at the National League of Rights Seminar, to be held the following day, Saturday, September 23. Every effort will be made to provide private hospitality for country and interstate visitors, but early requests would vitally assist with the large amount of organisation required. These interstate visitors intending to be at the Dinner and League Seminar, and requiring hospitality, should not leave their booking until the last few weeks.

WHO WAS PIERRE TEILHARD DE CHARDIN?

Anyone who has been puzzled by the humanist, leftist or frankly Marxist outlook which has become prevalent among so many of the younger Catholic clergy in the past decade will be interested in the following information taken from the January, 1970 issue of the Canadian Social Credit periodical, *Vers Demain*, which gives as its source a Madrid review, *Que Pasa?* of 13th April, 1968. The article concerns the French Jesuit scientific philosopher and writer, Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, whose works met with strong Vatican disapproval as far back as 1927. In 1962 the Holy See issued a monitum or warning, urging bishops and heads of seminaries not to permit his writings to be used in seminaries or sold in Catholic bookshops because of the harm their numerous ambiguities and errors could do to immature and unsuspecting minds. Though Teilhard was prevented from publishing his works, they circulated freely in seminaries and monasteries in roneoed form. After his death, his secretary, Jeanne Mortier, to whom he had left them in his will, soon found world publication for them. How this was done and why becomes clear from the following extract which the Spanish review gives from a speech made at the General Assembly of the Grand Orient of France by one of Teilhard's friends and admirers, Jacques Mitterand (3rd-7th September, 1962):

"Unlike us Masons, Catholics in the name of ecumenism are not remaining faithful to their past so as to profit by its lessons. They are up-dating their religion . . . Listen carefully: one day an authentic scholar rose among them, Teilhard de Chardin. Without being aware of it, perhaps, he committed the sin of Satan of which Rome so often accuses us . . . In his theory of the Noosphere — the mass of consciousness surrounding the earth — he gives man the primacy. Teilhard says that when consciousness reaches its highest point, or Omega, then man will be as we want him to be, free in body and mind. Thus, Teilhard has deified man and, adoring man, he could not adore God.

Realising this, Rome used all its retrograde powers to condemn him . . . He was not allowed to publish his writings during his lifetime. It was only after his death that they appeared from the publishing houses of Seuil and Grasset.

The Church goes on trying to safeguard by violence all the forces of the past to crush the future . . . Our mission is to serve the future. Not content to be the Hidden Republic in the privacy of our temples, we are at the same time the Counter-Church, because we are the men of life, hope, light, progress, intelligence and reason."

The Spanish writer states that, after the fall of France, the Minister for Justice in the Petain regime came across a copy of *The Golden Book of the Synarchy* in which, at a time when he was little known except to a small

circle of intellectuals, Teilhard de Chardin was listed as "our representative in the Catholic Church".

This was confirmed for the writer by Spanish friends whose eminent positions and lodges he names. They supplied him with copies of Teilhard's works and, a few days after the election of Pope John, they boasted to him:

"With the works of one of our brethren, we are going to organise the great revolution and get into the Catholic seminaries." At first the writer did not realise the full purport of their words. Then he understood they meant Teilhard de Chardin and one of them admitted to him that it was so. This was in 1966 and after that the lodges openly spread the Jesuit's works. They appeared in many languages all over the world.

"The former suspicion that Teilhard was a Mason has since been amply proved, and there is no longer any doubt that he belonged to the Martinist order. He was another Abbe Roca who would not or was not allowed to leave the Catholic Church."

The aim of Martinism is to destroy the papacy. Its roots go back to the French Encyclopaedist, with developments from a variety of pantheistic and evolutionary thinkers. By pseudo-science, the Martinists seek to destroy faith in the Old Testament, particularly Genesis, and in the Gospels. On a basis of a jumble of Chaldean and Babylonian ideas of the cosmos, Teilhard sought to establish a theory that, by means of evolution, Omega point (culmination of consciousness) and the mathematical concept of infinity would eventually coincide. These cloudy ideas, clothed in even cloudier language — shot through with flashes of poetic imagination which made Australian poet James McAuley describe Teilhard as "a sublime rat bag" - - have attracted many who have no very clear idea what it is really all about. Catholic bookshops and libraries continue to feature his works, ignoring the papal warning as "old hat". The result of his elevation of man at the expense of the divine can be seen in the increasingly humanist attitudes of young clergy and religious, and the falling away of so many from their vocations.

L. M. Quinlan

"NEW TIMES" VETERAN PASSES

With the recent passing of Mr. Tom Eley of The Gums, Queensland, we lose another veteran supporter of "The New Times". Mr. Eley was 88. English by birth, Mr. Eley was a dedicated Christian and a man of high principles. He lived long enough to see signs of the encouraging fruits of activities associated with "The New Times", throughout his part of Queensland.

Not only his son, but also his grandson, is active in League work. We extend our deepest sympathy to the Eley family.

THE FOE WITHIN

Economists and Fabian Socialists
Have found a way, by giving devious twists
To arguments and rules they fabricate,
To rob the citizen, and rob the State.
Their objects plain. By centralising power
To cut down Liberty, and destroy the flower
Of Freedom; for which our fathers fought
And thereby bring Democracy to naught.
By "white ant" tactics, underneath a screen
Of pseudo-truth, they gradually demean
The status quo of ordinary men—
Bringing him to hopelessness; and then
When weakling Governments endorse their schemes
Of "More Efficiency's" Utopian dreams—
The leaderless legion soon acclaims, and likes
The wage-increases, and perpetual strikes.
Wake Up, Australians! How much longer, we,
Misled by what is called "prosperity",
When each small business has been forced to sell
To make the chain stores annual profits swell;
Australia's land men, driven into debt,
(Who made Australia, and sustain it yet)
Are told that they must leave their property
To benefit some foreign company!
Is THIS Democracy? What ails us all?
Standing as we are now—backs to the wall;
And never yet a firm, effective stand
Against the pirates, who on every hand
"Divide and Conquer", every day and hour,
To make us slaves to Communistic power;
Who infiltrate our democratic mess,
And steadily bring closer their success!
Where are our statesmen? Shall this lovely land
In which our population should expand—
Witness the folly that we still pursue
Of city-crowding; while the dogged few
Of inland farmers, driven from their farms
To some congested city's siren charms;
Nowhere to go, but some suburban plot,
Where one Atomic Bomb could kill the lot!
The people perish, when no VISION shows—
Where graft, and noise, and all pollution grows.
Poor National Spirit! Live from day to day
Striking for shorter hours and bigger pay;
A dreary rat race that's forever lost
With rising incomes swamped by rising costs;
And food-producers brought to beggary
By auctions farce, and buyers roguery.
Is there no remedy? Shall we go on
Spiritless, blind; until our chance is gone?
Closer the shadow looms. The National Debt
Is monumental, and is growing yet!
Borrowing from nations that were wrecked by war,
While we were spared one alien on our shore.
Who will infuse new spirit in Australia,
Before we wake one day, to tragic failure?

J. W. Horsfield

FURTHER NOTES ON DE-VALUATION ISSUE

You will be aware that the recent claim that Country Party leaders in Canberra were instrumental in forcing through a de-valuation of the Australian dollar was completely false, as explained in our information bulletin, 72/1.

The February issue of the Countryman — official journal of the Country Party in N.S.W.—which has just been published, carries three articles referring to this issue. The first, by the General Secretary W. Ford, criticised the *Sydney Morning Herald* for favouring revaluation. He said, in part ". . . The almost petulant leading article on December 29th, after the efforts of Country Party Ministers had held the increase to 6.6%, was certainly not worthy of a paper with the reputation it enjoys . . . Our readers will I am sure appreciate the superlative efforts of Messrs. Anthony, Sinclair and Nixon during the Cabinet discussions to ensure that the interests of country people (amongst, of course many others) were not ignored. I feel confident that country folk particularly will once again say 'thank God for the Country Party'."

In a second article, Mr. Solomons was reported as issuing a statement expressing the same sentiments . . . "And today there are very good 'national' reasons why we should seek to retain some parity with the American dollar by devaluing against sterling," he said. "Critics of the Government will no doubt talk of the vested interests of the Country Party tail again wagging the coalition dog but, in my book, the national interest is a combination of the interests of all Australians."

I fear that the only wag in this mess is Mr. Solomons! As for the tail, the Coalition should have its tail well between its legs after this duplicity!

As a result of this article, I sent a telegram to the Federal Member for the Riverina, Mr. A. J. Grassby, which read: "Latest Countryman claims Country Party victory in forcing devaluation of Australian dollar stop many economists adamant no devaluation stop can you clarify?"

The answer within hours read: "Claim on currency completely false we have effectively revalued in relation to most of our trading partners and competitors now 10% disadvantage with South Africa for example stop the currency minuet between McMahon and Anthony was a public relations exercise regards A. J. Grassby."

"Those whom the Gods wish to destroy they first make mad." There was a time when this sort of trickery got by. Too few people understood or cared enough to expose it. But the government must realise that those who once slumbered are waking up throughout Australia. There will be a lot of explaining to do.

*Jeremy Lee,
Kingstown,
19/2/72*

THE AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

By D. Watts

"Americans Cheer Up" is the heading of a short article by Don Riseborough appearing on September 1st in "The Sydney Morning Herald". That was good reading. The morbid enjoyment found in fatalistically accepting the evils that plagued the sixties has been one of the major obstacles in the way of combating them.

Connecting Riseborough's piece with other articles printed at much the same time in that same journal unhappily somewhat dims one's rising optimism. Don Riseborough begins by describing the sixties as having been overshadowed by assassination, the Vietnam War, racial violence, radical revolutionaries, the "generation gap" and a menacing drug problem. He says that all this had Americans virtually waiting for the apocalypse. He finishes the paragraph with, "It did not come". A safer statement might have been, "It hasn't come yet", unless is produced something more positive than a sigh of relief over a pause in the retribution for the follies and malice that created the problems. A realistic instead of a sentimental approach to the still existing difficulties would help.

A GLEAM OF SUNSHINE?

Don Riseborough names some of the events and trends that show a gleam of sunshine through the gloomy clouds of persistent unemployment, continuing inflation and pollution. One good thing, he says, is the coming end to America's involvement in Vietnam. The comment called for by that is that any war, however inescapable, is horrible and a war fought with the aim of losing it is better ended sooner than later, since the final military result will be the same anyway. There could be other results, international or domestic, and it should not be overlooked that the anti-Vietnam demonstrations were inspired as much by pro-communist as by genuine pacifist feeling. If it is not to be another case of, in the words of England's one-time Prime Minister, Pitt, "they are ringing the bells now; soon they will be wringing their hands", there will need to be much less juvenile thinking about the situation than hitherto there has been. Post-defeat can be very peaceful if only we can dodge the woes which are the usual lot of the conquered.

Riseborough instances another generally approved proposal — President Nixon's anticipated visit to China. Again, although it is not impossible that some good may follow that venture, Americans would be wiser to await the outcome before characteristically behaving as though what they desire is what they will get. The Chinese are displaying a trifle of amiability, not because they are ready to give as well as demand, but because they are becoming alarmed by the expanding military strength of Russia and realise that friendship with America might turn out to be a good investment.

President Nixon's new economic policy is also said to be making things look as though they could become a little brighter. Riseborough says that the view of most

is, "At least somebody is doing something". The feeling that it is better to do something experimental than to stay passively in a sucking quagmire is a healthy one. Though Nixon's measures fail to achieve the intended purposes, at least they represent a slight breaking away from a deadening pattern and could be the preliminary to real reform.

Riseborough observes that people are grateful for their generally quieter youth and for less racial violence. There are a good many who will not like that and who will do their best to keep the witches' brew bubbling. A couple of days before *The Sydney Morning Herald* published Don Riseborough's contribution that same journal printed a sobbing article about that unappetising character, George Jackson, whose story came to a happy ending when he was killed in a bloody attempt to escape from San Quentin prison. This piece of sickening slanting was supplied by the New York Times News Agency. In mercy I forbear to give the writer's name, though it appears without shame at the head of the offering.

The first part of the article is mainly devoted to a denigrating authority in America. Admittedly, from what we read, there is, in that country, a great deal of corruption among the police, lawyers, politicians, businessmen, newspapers and journalists. There is also a great deal of corruption, mostly of a different kind, among the people in general and especially Negroes and Puerto Ricans. If the writer of the article being discussed and his employers believe that the cure for that is to encourage defiance of the laws and to wail when the defiant meet the fate that they have invited, they themselves have been corrupted. The right corrective procedure is to do something towards setting up higher moral standards for the community and insisting upon observance of these by those who are in positions of authority and those over whom a necessary authority is exercised.

The terrible thing, according to certain journalists, is that this lovely murderer, George Jackson, was sentenced at the age of nineteen for one year to life for a \$70 robbery. A sly slant is given to that by his apologist by saying that he was sent to prison for "confessing" that he committed the robbery. There is never a mention of the circumstances surrounding the crime or of his previous conduct. Judging from himself and the conduct of others in his family, prior to his conviction he must have led anything but a blameless life. No doubt his social environment was deplorable; **but bad families create bad environments perhaps even more than bad environments are the cause of the moral inferiority of persons and families.**

Another thing that some Australians as well as some Americans need to realise that in the case of a robbery the serious thing is not the amount taken, but the crime itself. The young George Jackson almost certainly stole only seventy dollars because that was all he could find to steal. If he could have laid his hands on seventy thousand dollars, it is impossible to believe that he would have confined his depredation to a modest seventy.

Much is made by the perpetrator of the article of the fact that George Jackson could write a good letter. He ends his pious tribute with, "A talented writer, a sensitive man, a potential leader and a political thinker of great persuasiveness, George Jackson was destroyed long before he was killed at San Quentin." I have to take the journalist's word for it that Jackson was a talented writer; but a sensitive man he was not. A sensitive man of good mentality could not have deliberately and apparently in cold blood murdered several men. Anyone interested enough can observe that very often people who are acutely sensitive about themselves and their own feelings are woodenly insensitive about the feelings of others. That seems to have been George Jackson's brand of sensitiveness. We need a different term to describe this exclusive tenderness for one's own self and ego—a tenderness common among the most hardened criminals.

As for George Jackson's being a potential leader and political thinker — no doubt, from his sympathy with the reaction of the most rabid Negro racists to his death, the writer meant a potential demagogue with all the hackneyed political catch-cries at his tongue's tip. Had he not been so under-privileged perhaps he would have been another ruthless Hitler or Stalin (on the stump, at least); though whether or not he had their organising ability, the poor fellow never had the chance of showing.

The article on George Jackson gives a fair sample of the false values and misdirected hero-worship which has played a large part in bringing down on Western society the ills from which it is now suffering. If, as Don Riseborough proclaims, the morale of Americans is improving and their optimism rising, they will need to wash a good deal of the sweet poison of the sixties out of their propaganda. On the same day as his heart-warming article was published. *The Sydney Morning Herald* printed another article with the heading, "U.S. Powerless to Stem Murder Toll". In it we read that 15,810 people were murdered in the United States in 1970, and that the Director of the F.B.I., Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, said that the police were unable to bring to a halt the rising rate. According to him, 5,568,200 serious crimes were reported. The population increased 13 percent while crime rose by 176 percent — a rate of nearly 14 to 1 when relating crime growth to population growth.

A statement, the full significance of which might be overlooked by the casual reader, was that more than a quarter of the killings stemmed from feuds between relatives or friends. That is to say, the crime of murder is not

mainly confined to the criminal class, but is seeping into the whole of society. As Mr. Hoover says, "It follows, therefore that criminal homicide is to a major extent a national, social problem beyond police prevention."

There is, of course, not just one cause of the horrifying orgies of crime. The crowding together in bloated cities of great masses of people plays no small part in diminishing the importance of individuals, with the result that killing them comes to be regarded less seriously than it is when smaller communities are able to provide more particular safeguards for the citizens.

The national, social problem of which Mr. Hoover speaks would probably not have assumed the proportions that it has done had the need to counter the increasing crime rate caused by the population condensations been recognised by entertainers and writers. Instead, most of those able to influence public and individual behaviour "went with the trends", "kept in step with the times", "expressed the values of the age", "adjusted themselves to a changing world" — often doing their best to assist it to change for the worse. A fine lot of little helpers they have been! You cannot stop a bolting horse by spurring it on.

The near beatification of ogreish criminals and petty offenders together with the undermining of authority by belittling it and apologising for those who flouted it, as is done in *The New York Times* article quoted, has itself been criminal. It has comforted and justified the enemies of society in their wrongdoing. To work to make the police force incorruptible is one of the duties of the media serving the public, but the condoning of defiance and resentment of proper authority is a luxury not to be enjoyed even for the sake of sensationalism or popularity. To deplore the rising crime rate while holding up the arrant criminal to the admiration and love of the populace smells highly of hypocrisy.

That latter, very common practice has run neck-a-neck with the increase in the crime rate and the lowering of moral standards that has had a bad effect on personal,

RED PATTERN FOR WORLD CONQUEST

By ERIC D. BUTLER

This book is the most valuable introductory work to the Communist conspiracy available. It deserves the widest possible circulation. With a brilliant introduction by Sir Raphael Cilento dealing with current Communist strategy, it is a compact presentation of the fundamental crisis of our times. Indexed with a striking cover design in the new edition, with up-dated material, it should be on the bookshelf of all those owning the old edition.

Price: \$1.05, post-free. Quantities: 6 for \$5.25; 12 for \$9.53.

domestic relations. There is a logical as well as a temporal relation between the two things. Something the same state, though less grave because robbery, not murder, is the crime under consideration, has arisen in New South Wales and perhaps elsewhere in Australia. The N.S.W. Commissioner of Police acknowledged that the comparatively petty breakings and entering and thieving cannot be controlled by the police force. One cannot know for certain if he thinks that because such crimes are committed against ordinary, private persons instead of against big corporations that they are of minor importance, but that is the impression given in a newspaper report of his statement. If that is, indeed, how he feels about it, it is something else that indicates that there is a dwindling sense of the importance in the community of the individual. The theft of 100 hard-earned, hard-saved dollars from a small man can cause more anguish than the theft of 100,000 dollars in a bank hold-up.

Leaving those who do not care a gum-nut for the quality of Australian society to put the stock pleas of poverty, unequal opportunity or poor education used to enable wrong-doers to escape from personal responsibility for their misdeeds, I pass on to accuse a condition in the U.S.A. which is crime-breeding — multi-racial mixtures. There have, in the recent past, poured into that country hordes of people from foreign lands where backwardness is not merely technological or economic, but cultural, especially moral. The fond hope was that these immigrants would joyfully adapt themselves to the superior standards and the way of life to be found in the sweet land of liberty. Instead, the original citizenry of that land is well on the way to adopting the inferior standards of the imported aliens. Uncivilised standards and practices of Puerto Ricans and inferior Mediterranean classes have been adopted by all ranks, while the primitive Negro influence on culture has been flaunted.

What is done in the U.S.A. matters to the rest of the Western World. For one thing, she is powerful and therefore admired and imitated. For another, she set out to make the world a better place by persuading all people to adopt the American Way of Life; and the modern media of communication have tacitly purported to show what that Way is. Undoubtedly the U.S.A. must shoulder a great part of the responsibility for causing the mischievous doctrine of racial equality to distort policies the world over and for the misplaced faith in multi-racialism to engender racial harmony.

Australia's intellectuals are notorious for their mental obedience. As a whole they shape their beliefs and opinions as they are told and not upon empirical observation. It is therefore anything but surprising to read in the *Sydney Morning Herald* of 30th August of this year that the Rev. Alan Walker, a public figure in N.S.W., said, "We are likely to face some torrid years ahead because we have given the world the impression that we are a racist nation."

It is too much to hope that by the second "we" he

meant himself and his faction. Naturally other peoples will believe what Australians say about themselves, especially if it be derogatory, and not a few travelling sons of Australia seem to be intent upon giving this country a bad name abroad. They go about the world telling it that Australia is sinfully racist and it is they who give their own country the reputation of being out of tune with present-day racial obsessions. The Rev. Alan Walker is a good-hearted man. It would be a grudging soul who failed to yield him admiration and respect for his strenuous efforts to help those who need help. He would be a greathearted man if he could but add a sense of perspective and proportion to his love and so could see that his racial favouritism is just another form of racism.

Some of our politicians do sometimes show a cautious amount of firmness when coming up against sectional and international pressures to convert Australia into a multi-racial nation tormented, just like others, by racial conflicts. They would be able to put up a stronger resistance were not almost all-democratic freedom of speech in Australia the exclusive privilege of anti-white racists.

One thing that courageous Australian journalists might point out in the hope that the gruesome comedy being played out in the U.S.A. be not produced in this country is that if Negroes, or any others, make adored heroes of bestial criminals, they do not know what civil rights are and should not be trusted with what they would undoubtedly abuse.

Another thing to be said is that equality is sameness, and that the imposition of sameness is regimentation, and that the active equalitarian almost invariably tries to be God and to make all men in his own image. Anyone who has honestly sought truth and tried to accept it, whatever it may be, knows how extremely difficult it is to relinquish or even modify long-held beliefs. That is surely why, in the face of the screaming failure of multi-racialism and of experiments in equalitarianism, most of those who have advocated those policies remain blandly unimpressed.

In dealing with human problems, logic without consideration of emotion is mechanical irrationalism; but emotion devoid of logic is insanity. Theory that ignores the results of practical application is a monster. From the Machine, the Madman and the Monster, may the good Lord deliver us.

"THE ESSENTIAL CHRISTIAN HERITAGE"

One of the highlights of the 1971 League of Rights National Seminar, at which The Australian Heritage Society was launched, Mr. Eric Butler's Paper has now been attractively published in booklet form. "The Essential Christian Heritage" will prove to be a work of permanent value.

Price 32 cents, posted, from any State League of Rights address. From Heritage Bookshop, Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne, 3001.

Enterprise

Organ of the
INSTITUTE OF ECONOMIC DEMOCRACY
Post Office, Kingstown, N.S.W., 2350

No. 9

MARCH 1972

"A BIG ENOUGH LIE . . ."

It is difficult to say, from a national point of view, whether we have made any progress at all in the last few weeks. In one regard, perhaps, we have taken a step forward with the unspoken but implied admission from the government that the Budget "strategy" was wrong. The massive taxation increases, the retention of exorbitantly high interest rates led, as we predicted, to crisis point throughout the economy.

So the 'experts' were shown to be ludicrously inept, and totally wrong, and if there has been any progress it has been in the fact that the public is aware of the ineptitude.

It is also quite clear that, having wilfully created this mess the government is determined to follow the socialist policies, which have produced an explosive situation in both the United Kingdom and the United States. By easing restrictions on lending we can expect an even greater rate of inflation than in the last twelve months. The volume of money, and the consequent volume of debt, will increase drastically. The brighter prospects for primary producers will be nullified by exorbitant cost increases. The collapse of Local Government will continue apace. Industrial friction will produce national strikes, which will cripple industry and paralyse essential services.

We can expect to be treated to more heated and bitter confrontations through the media between union leaders and government-backed employers; and finally, irrespective of which gang gets in at the coming Federal election, we can expect wage and price controls to be introduced. That such measures have proved completely abortive in both the United Kingdom and the United States is hardly likely to deter the Treasury bureaucrats who will take charge of the party, which bribes its way into office.

So widespread is the disillusion throughout the electorate that certain sections of the media have launched a desperate attempt to salvage the government "image". Typical of this was a two-page dialogue between the Federal-Treasurer and economist P. P. McGuinness in the *National Times* (February 28th - March 4th, 1972) under the heading "**Treasurer Billy Snedden still fights inflation with sweet reason**". Whether this article was seriously intended to enhance Mr. Snedden's reputation is questionable. So great is the volume of "gobbledygook" emanating from our economic pundits that one suspects that it was! Consider the following dialogue:

McGUINNESS: "The present budgetary process does in fact imply a certain assumption of clairvoyance in so far as the broad lines of economic policy are set for 12 months and that's it."

SNEDDEN: "Well, you say at budget time 'this is what we think is going to happen, and if what we think is going to happen does happen, this is the appropriate thing for it.' Then you add as I did, we want to keep the economy under review, and if we want to change it, we'll change it. In other words, you've got to have a state of mind, which is flexible. I don't think you can have legislative provision."

And later . . .

McGUINNESS: "Do you think it would be desirable to have some sort of regular official comment on economic developments from outside the Treasury? For example, the kind of committee that was proposed by the Vernon Committee?"

SNEDDEN: "It's very important that whatever planning you do is a rolling plan that you constantly submit to revision and reversion. Also that it doesn't attain any characteristic which encourages things one way or another, and it doesn't from the government or from some mystical quality of a document determine the direction in which the allocation of resources will go. Equally, of course, for it to have any objective value it has got to involve a clairvoyance that is just not available to us."

Well, if you can make head or tail of all that you're a future "Super-Sned"! The Federal Treasurer has a wistful pre-occupation with clairvoyance. We can only add that many of those who were taken onto a high mountain, and tempted with the all-embracing power, which our Lord rejected, subsequently wished that they could have seen into the future. But in Mr. Snedden's case, it is probably better if he does not see too far — "where ignorance is bliss, 'tis folly to be wise!"

The same issue of the *National Times* went even further

in a desperate attempt to bolster the sagging Country Party. The survey recently conducted by the Party amongst its branches confirmed the warnings we have given with the best intent during the last two years. *The Australian* (25-2-72) reported: "Only slightly more than half of all branches believes the party's best interests for the future lies in coalition with the Liberal Party. A majority of branches in N.S.W. and Queensland believes the Country Party's reputation in rural areas is worsening."

It was obvious towards the end of 1971 that the Country Party had to do something about its image. As we pointed out, the Party could have emerged as the dominant force in Australian politics. Had the Deputy Prime Minister, the Hon. J. D. Anthony, led his Party out of the coalition onto the cross benches, allowing the Liberals to continue governing "on condition" we would have seen the start of a great resurgence of confidence. Mr. Anthony could have announced a simple policy on which the Party would fight — an end to rural destruction, a re-establishment of Local Government onto a sound financial footing, a heavy reduction of taxation and interest rates and the provision of long-term low interest finance to reconstruct existing rural debt. The general reaction is quite predictable. "At last! Somebody is going to take a stand!" would have been the view of both town and country alike. The Country Party would have re-captured all the support it received in better days, with a major swing from all other parties.

Instead of which the Party chose to pursue what must be one of the most dishonest tactics ever foisted on rural people. Following the devaluation of the U.S. dollar, electors were saturated with reports of the heroic fight put up by Anthony, Sinclair and Nixon to force through a devaluation of the Australian dollar in order to safeguard export industries. We were told that Mr. Anthony would leave the coalition if his demands were not met.

For a while the bluff worked. But it is now quite clear that there was no devaluation at all (see our information bulletin 72/1). It is also quite clear that Party leaders hoped that no one would check the facts. Sections of the Press are carrying on with the bluff. The same issue of the *National Times*, in an article eulogising Mr. Anthony under the heading "**Anthony emerges as Super McEwen**" wrote, inter alia: ". . . The McMahon Cabinet got its first taste of real Anthony dominance during last year's Budget discussions. In the face of fierce Treasury and Liberal opposition Mr. Anthony, at a private meeting with Mr. McMahon, forced capitulation on the costly wool deficiency payments scheme, which was to help resuscitate the wool industry. A few months later Mr. Anthony brought the whole Cabinet to its knees in a far more public display on the issue of revaluation. He humbled both the Prime Minister and the Treasury with his determined threat to wreck the coalition unless he got his way. Needless to say he did."

But did he? Those who have any memory at all will recall that while industry leaders and Country Party men insisted that 40c was the minimum required, Mr. Anthony compromised for 36c — hardly "bringing the cabinet to its knees!" **And on the issue of devaluation no stand was made at all.**

Needless to say, Mr. Anthony's one chance is that rural voters have short memories and child-like faith. His one hope is that the Party's dishonesty is not exposed. Thus every effort must be made to silence and isolate the Australian League of Rights, by smear and misrepresentation, even if this means bringing government departments into the attack. The use of the Treasury Department in the latest attack was so improper that even *The Australian* — hardly sympathetic to the League of Rights — was moved to comment editorially on the abuse of privilege involved.

But Mr. Anthony has reckoned without one thing — the countless sound and honest members of his own Party who, sickened by the betrayal and compromise, are turning to the League's educational material and advice in an effort to rectify the situation. Such people Mr. Anthony now calls 'infiltrators' despite the fact that a great many have served the Party longer and more faithfully than Mr. Anthony himself.

After a particularly nauseating bit of hypocrisy in the February *Countryman* (official organ of the Country Party in N.S.W.) where the State President, Mr. Solomons, reiterated the claim that there had been a devaluation, and the State Secretary, Col. Ford, concluded his message by saying "I feel confident that country folk particularly will once again say "Thank God for the Country Party", the editor of *Enterprise* sent a telegram to the Federal Member for the Riverina, Mr. A. J. Grassby, asking him to clarify the matter. Within hours came the reply, which read "Claim on currency completely false we have effectively re-valued in relation to most of our trading partners and competitors now 10% disadvantage with South Africa for example stop the currency minuet between McMahon and Anthony was a public relations exercise regards . . ."

Lest we be accused of adopting an anti-Country Party attitude, we reiterate what we have always said in the past. The Country Party has a vital role to play. It has a sound national policy and a proud record. The real betrayers are those who have abandoned basic principles. The Federal Country Party men are, by their inaction and compromise, and now deceit, clearly guilty. Sir Arthur Fadden, in his memoirs summed it up thus: —

"To abandon the sound, tried and proved principles on which the Party was founded, and on which it has successfully survived, would not only be disloyalty to its pioneering founders, and stalwarts, but also to hundreds and thousands of men and women who gave and are still giving deviating support. A hybrid policy would be abhorrent to them, and would make the Party neither one thing nor the other . . . In the long run, disloyalty to ideals never pays or long survives the tests of time."

An interesting and illuminating letter, written by the former Premier of Queensland, Sir Frank Nicklin, to an old supporter of ours, Mr. L. Reid, has come to our notice:

Parliament House
Brisbane,
15th September, 1948

Dear Mr. Reid,

I appreciate your letter and read with interest your comments in regard to present day problems. The Country Party's policy is to use to the full our national credit and to make full use of the Commonwealth Bank. If this were done within the limits of our Constitution there would be no need for the establishment of a State Bank. However, should the Commonwealth Government insist in their policy of nationalising the banking system of Australia, and if we had a Commonwealth Government in power that adopted the same policy as the present Government does towards the States, it may be necessary for us, for our own protection, to exercise the right we have under the Constitution to establish our own State Bank. However, this would not be needed if we had a Commonwealth Government in power prepared to do the right thing in regard to State developments.

With kind regards,

Yours sincerely,
Frank Nicklin

We can but ask what Sir Frank would be called today for uttering such sentiments. A Social Creditor? A Fascist beast? Or one who once had some sound ideas?

SOME ILLUMINATING DEBT FIGURES

	\$ million	\$ million	% increase
Commonwealth Government	1960	1970	
State Governments Local	\$5300m	\$3885m	— 36%
Government (1958-1968) Semi-	3334m	9320m	+ 160%
Government (1958-1968)	432m	1389m	+ 221%
Primary Producers (Gross)	2494m	5218m	+ 109%
Primary Producers (Net)	980m	2095m	+ 114%
Taxation per head GNP	77m	1224m	+ 1490%
(Average Prices as	\$298	\$618	+ 107%
distinct from Current Prices)	16,501m	27,118m	+ 64%
Average minimum weekly wage	36	54	+ 50%
Volume of money	7,192m	14,837m	+ 106%

Source: Dept. Census & Statistics, Brisbane

THE VOLUME OF MONEY (June 1968 - December 1971)

	(\$ million)			
	Public's Cash	Bank Deposits	Savings Banks	Total
June 1968	\$964m	\$5641m	\$6200m	\$12,806m
June 1969	1065	6089	6682	13,974
June 1970	1187	6415	7090	14,837
December 1970	1330	6856	7418	15,698
March 1971	1301	7037	7468	15,908
June 1971	1336	6840	7618	15,851
September 1971	1384	7041	7906	16,350
December 1971	1477	7513	8044	17,066

Percentage increase in volume of money in 42 months—33%

Source: *Sunday Telegraph*, 20/2/72

NOT AFRAID TO SPEAK OUT

The following article was carried in the "Sydney Morning Herald", 15/2/72:

"The Minister for Local Government, Mr. Morton, is to receive a strongly-worded protest from the 'G' Shires Conference complaining about the composition of the special committee he has set up to investigate Local Government. Thirty delegates from 14 shires, representative of the zone seemed to be under no illusions about the purpose of the committee — it would be hell bent on amalgamations, possibly with the ultimate establishment of regional councils. "I think it is much more serious than we realise," said Councillor Ross, of Jindallee Shire Council. "We will wake up some morning and find that our Shire headquarters are at Wagga with others at Goulburn, Orange and so on."

Hume Shire Clerk Mr. Brian Clarke went through the personnel of the eight man committee which Mr. Morton has set up, described one as "an avowed apostle of amalgamation".

He said that another had written a book on local government administration, but claimed that if his advice was followed it would take three people to do the work of one.

"It is my personal opinion that they are not out to investigate. I believe their job is to put on a show so that the Government will be able to say that a democratic process has been observed," said Mr. Clarke.

The President of the Hume Shire Council, Councillor J. A. Kiley, said the objectives of the committee would be amalgamation, which would take away democratic representation and the close contact between the people and their councillors.

The President of Illabo Shire Council, Councillor Rex Merrin said that when the Grants Committee visited Junee a couple of years ago, they seemed interested in finding out what shire councillors thought of the municipality. "They were not interested in grants, but in amalgamation. Personally, I think it is all cut and dried, said Councillor Merrin.

Councillor L. Hoad, of Narraburra, suggested that it was the same sort of scheme as had been produced for farmers to "get big or get out". He said that like Junee and the Illabo Shire Council, which opposed amalgamation, so did his council and the Temora Municipal Council. Both wished to retain their separate identity.

The Illabo Shire Clerk, Mr. A. McEwen, said it would be a different kettle of fish if people were clamouring for amalgamation, but instead they were not and had not asked for it.

"It is a case of a Central Government telling you what is good for you," he said.

It was wrong to assume all small shire councils were inefficient or uneconomical. There were many outstanding records. "Are we to assume that if we are small we are the wrong size — or would it be better to trim the bigger

areas back to a smaller size so that they can get back to a more efficient working and more "local" government?" he asked. (Own emphasis.)

I personally feel this committee is the beginning of the end of local government, which may have its imperfections, but so does any form of government."

The meeting appointed Mr. McEwen and Mr. W. Casperon, clerk of the Mitchell Shire Council at Wagga, to draw up the necessary protest . . ."

THE MARCH OF MONOPOLY

Foreign ownership will become a more crucial issue as centralisation of financial policy increases in intensity. The Canadian situation has long been a point of contention and even internationalist Pierre Elliot Trudeau has been forced to recognise that there is political mileage in paying lip service to national sentiment against growing American takeover of Canadian industry. According to Tony Thomas in *The Age* of January 12, Canadians keep requesting reports on foreign investment, but always get the same reply from Trudeau's financial masters—investment would be screened as it arrives and "thrown back" if it won't benefit Canada. As the transfer of financial capital consists of transferring figures from one ledger in a particular bank in the U.S.A. to an appropriate reciprocal bank in Canada, the writer's term "thrown back" is about appropriate as if he was referring to sunbeams. Figures in a book are an intangible and cannot be "thrown" anywhere. If those exporting capital were forced to show tangible assets they wished to bring into another country, "throwing" them back would become a valid concept.

Mr. Thomas says Canadians daydream of finding \$50 billion to "buy back" their country from the U.S.A. That means the Canadians have been the victims of a colossal confidence trick, which has resulted in Canadian assets to that value being filched through the manipulation of figures in bank ledgers.

Canadians complain that in mining and manufacturing, foreigners are in 50-60 percent control. In Australia, 58 percent of mining production and 71 percent of processing was foreign controlled in 1968. Those are figures of three years ago and no later figures are available from the Bureau of Census and Statistics, but everyone knows the years since have seen dramatic rises in capital inflow. In fact capital inflow for 1969-70 was \$1025m and for 1970-71 was \$1493m. A good proportion of that money would go into mining, so the Canadian and Australian scenes are taking on similar aspects.

The use of the word "foreign" to describe such ownership could be just as erroneous as the concept that financial capital moves from one country to another like bananas. The main factor developing is the growth of giant corporations. Mr. Thomas paints a grim picture on the basis of a top-secret report issued by Canada's Minister for National Revenue, Mr. Herbert Gray. The report is said to have shaken Canadians and has been dubbed "Gray's Elegy". Just as Gray's Elegy depicted

the death of the English countryside and the rural community, Mr. Gray's modern Elegy reveals the means of destroying national equity and ownership. Not only rural communities but industry and commerce come under the hammer.

"About 200 corporations create 80 percent of American foreign direct investment. Their subsidiaries' sales abroad are worth more than \$200 billion a year, and with another 100 corporations outside the U.S. they account for 15 percent of the Western world's production.

"In 10 years, world corporations are expected to have sales of \$1000 billion. In 20 years, on crude projections, about 350 corporations will control half of the West's production, and single corporations will have workforces a million strong.

"The corporations will be as economically powerful as governments, whose traditional weapons of tariffs, taxes and monetary policies will be virtually impotent.

"A popular idea is that U.S. corporations further American goals. **But the Gray report suggests they are becoming loyal to no country. Governments at least are responsible to electors: corporations are laws unto themselves.** (Our emphasis.)

"So an open-door policy to foreign investment resembles the smile of the lady who rode on the tiger."

The Australian Government is committed to a policy of encouraging so-called foreign takeover, which under present financial rules must result in Australian assets falling under the control of individuals whose only loyalty is to the corporation, which controls them and their livelihood. Operating on an international basis, such giant corporations are just another step in the process of rationalisation, which eliminates individual ownership and brings about partnership between government and business. With individual ownership eliminated and industry controlled by international groups the net result is—well, communism is as good as any name to describe it.

It was Lenin who said that World Communism was impossible without a world economic system.

ENTERPRISE, official journal of the Institute of Economic Democracy, is part of a comprehensive information service available to associate members. Associate Membership may be obtained on application to the National Secretary, P.O. Kingstown, via Armidale, N.S.W. 2350.

The following booklets are available:

"A Programme To Reverse Inflation", E. Butler (35c posted)

"Centralised or De-centralised Government?" (35c posted)

"Responsible Voting in a Free Society" (60c posted)

"The Creation and Control of Money" (30c posted)

"A Defence of Free Enterprise and the Profit Motive",

E. Butler (20c posted)

"Money — Fact & Fiction", D. Malan (25c posted)

"A Just and Honest Measure", D. Phelps (50c posted)

"A Small Farmer Replies", D. Phelps (60c posted)

"What's Wrong with the Economy?", C. A. Haythorpe (20c posted)