

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. 11

NOVEMBER 1972

DOWN THE INFLATION ROAD TO THE SLAVE STATE

The Heath Government's decision in the United Kingdom to resort to the desperate measure of freezing wages, dividends, rents and most prices for at least 90 days, in an endeavour to halt inflation, provides further chilling evidence of the increasing tempo of the drive to create the Slave State. The British Government has followed the lead of the Nixon Administration, and we have not the slightest doubt that unless the electors force a change of financial policy, Australians will be subjected to the same controls next year, irrespective of the label of the politicians at Canberra.

We can predict with certainty now that any apparent short-term benefits from this programme of controls will mask the build up for much greater explosions in the near future.

Mr. Heath, like President Nixon, was elected on a policy of opposing Socialist financial policies. But as the British have bitterly discovered, Mr. Heath is working to turn them into a mere State of a United Europe in spite of his pre-election promises. Politicians' promises are today generally meaningless and dangerous. In a sensational attack on Mr. Heath in the House of Commons, Mr. Enoch Powell said: "It is fatal for any Government party, or person to seek to govern in direct opposition to the principles upon which they were entrusted with the right to govern. In introducing a compulsory control on wages and prices in contravention of the deepest commitments of the party, has he (Mr. Heath) taken leave of his senses"? Press reports state that Mr. Heath was badly shaken by this attack, and that the House was shocked. We would like to see more of the Enoch Powell shock treatment everywhere!

Mr. Milton Friedman, a former Nixon economic adviser, has observed that "We have two thousands years of history on this, aside from the economic analysis, that there is not a documented case in which wage and price controls ever had any significant effect on inflation." Those who will not learn from the mistakes of history are doomed to continue making those mistakes. As no wage, price and profit controls can remove the basic cause of inflation the rules under which the present finance-economic system operates can only lead to greater convulsions, which will in turn be used to justify still harsher controls. President Nixon said that his controls were only going to be temporary, for ninety days. But they have been extended indefinitely. The same will happen in the United Kingdom. And Australia. And Canada. And inside the Common Market. Inflation everywhere,

deliberately produced by those imposing present financial policies, is being used as the major domestic threat to rob the individual of his little remaining freedom.

A MARXIST PROGRAMME

Anyone who doubts that inflation is being used to create the Socialist State, irrespective of what the politicians in office call themselves, should note that George McGovern's chief economic adviser, the Fabian Socialist economist John Kenneth Galbraith, wrote in *New York Magazine* for September, 1971, that under "the Nixon Game Plan . . . Socialism is the name of the game." Michael Harrington, National Chairman of the American Socialist Party, in a communication dated February 11, 1972, and sent to all members of the Socialist Party, coined the phrase "Conservative Collectivism". He noted with pleasure that Nixon was now well to the Left of even John Maynard Keynes. He observed that price and wage controls together with massive deficit budgets are "collectivist techniques to enhance corporate wealth", and that "there is no longer any question whether the future is going to be collective; the present is becoming more so every day at the urging of sophisticated conservatives." Mr. Harrington welcomes "this belated Republican recognition of one of the most fundamental of Marxist truths."

After defeating Mr. Hubert Humphrey in 1968, Mr. Nixon and Dr. Henry Kissinger and their financial masters adopted a breathtaking strategy by completely implementing both the Humphrey domestic and foreign policies. And while the far-out McGovern was talking about what he would do if he became President, President Nixon was

Continued on Page 8

NATIONAL CIVIC COUNCIL'S SLOPPY CRITICISM OF LEAGUE OF RIGHTS

A document being issued by the National Civic Council, of which Mr. B. A. Santamaria is the Director, commenting on The Australian League of Rights, has been brought to the attention of the League. The National Director of The Australian League of Rights, Mr. Eric Butler, has issued the following reply:

It is unfortunate that the NCC commentary on the League of Rights, being issued I understand to any who write asking about the League, reflects the superficial approach to basic issues which unfortunately is characteristic of a number of anti-Communist organisations around the world. Some of the NCC criticism of the League is extremely sloppy.

After agreeing that the League of Rights "does propose many sound objectives", the NCC document then comments that "The two reservations we have in relation to the League's policies relate (a) to its economic policy, and (b) to its alleged attitude to the Jewish people."

One would have thought that before an organisation like the NCC issued what purports to be responsible comment on the League of Rights' attitude towards "the Jewish people", it would first make itself familiar with what the League's attitude, if it has one, really is concerning what it terms "the Jewish people". To write about the League's "alleged attitude" is a most sloppy comment. The League's attitude towards all peoples is governed by the League's objectives, the first of which is to promote loyalty to the Christian concept of God, which means maximum freedom with personal responsibility inside a stable society in which all power is effectively decentralised. Needless to say, inside such a society the natural rights of all individuals would be protected. If the NCC believes that any of the policies advocated by the League of Rights threaten the legitimate rights of "the Jewish people"—this term is not defined—then it should say so instead of writing about the League's "alleged attitude".

After commenting that "It is sometimes alleged that the League is anti-Semitic (whatever that means) reference is made to my book, *The International Jew*, and a comment by Dr. Rumble of Sydney, who described it as "a childish exhibition of anti-Semitism at its worst. If the author did the right thing, he would publish another book repudiating it, apologising for it . . ." As has been stated ad nauseum. *The International Jew* was written before The League of Rights existed, and was an historical work for which I accepted personal responsibility—including some errors of fact. It has been out of print for years. The introduction of this book into a discussion on the League of Rights is most dishonest.

The NCC document then attempts to equate my "alleged" views on anti-Zionism with the current anti-Zionist line being adopted by the Soviet Union. The document concludes by stating "It is, in our view, a political

error in 1971 to be anti-Israel". To be pro-Israel certainly ensures that those adopting that attitude are not smeared as "anti-Semites"! The League's attitude towards Israel and its policies is basically that of those anti-Zionist Jews like Alfred Lilienthal, the American expert on the Middle East, who have warned, with events confirming their warnings, that the creation and sustaining of an aggressive Israel was essential for Soviet strategy. No sane person is suggesting that the clock be put back and Israel destroyed. But unless there is genuine justice for the displaced Arabs and firm boundaries agreed to by Israel, the Soviet must go on scoring heavily in the Middle East. Personally, as a close student of this problem, I completely disagree with Mr. Santamaria's analysis. Much of his comment on international affairs is a brilliant description of what is happening, or appears to be happening, without any references to basic causes.

IGNORANCE ON FINANCE-ECONOMICS

The NCC document on the League of Rights pinpoints what perhaps may only be sheer ignorance. The comment is in fact merely a rehash of criticism by Dr. Colin Clark, using in places Dr. Clark's very words. We are told that the League's economic policies relate "to the conditions of the 20s and the 30s rather than to that of the 60s and 70s. It certainly was true that when Major Douglas first enunciated the theories of Social Credit that the banks could create credit indefinitely." That is a typically misleading and sloppy statement, as is the statement that "The Social Credit movement started in a period of severe unemployment, when people might have seen some cause for it." The truth is, of course, that Douglas started writing before the end of the First World War, that his first article was aptly described as "The Delusion of Super-Production", in which he correctly predicted the disastrous events ahead if current finance-economic policies were pursued. He specifically warned of mounting inflation. NCC references to consumer subsidies are so absurd that it is hard to take them seriously.

The following statement is one, which has already been made by Dr. Colin Clark: "Some of the economic booklets issued by the League of Rights regrettably contain errors of fact. For instance, Keynes was certainly not a member of the Fabian Society, for whom he had a considerable contempt." Dr. Clark has been asked to point out these errors of fact, but has been unable to do so. I am not aware of any League claim that Keynes was a member of the Fabian Socialist Society. But he certainly was a Fabian Socialist, associated closely with the Fabian Socialists, and was warmly supported by the Fabian Socialists. Dr. Clark was himself a member of the Fabian Socialist Society for many years. His smearing attacks on Social Credit and Major Douglas are a serious reflection upon his academic integrity, as I will show in a work I am engaged on.

I have no objections to the NCC criticising the League of Rights either privately or publicly. But I wish they would be a little more responsible.

THE TRAGEDY OF THE HON. RALPH HUNT, M.P.

Considerable publicity has been given to the clash between the Hon. Ralph Hunt, Country Party Minister for the Interior, and The Australian League of Rights. With typical political dialectical skill Mr. Hunt has tried to create the impression that the League has run some type of vendetta against him, even unfairly revealing that Mr. Hunt was at one time a subscriber to this journal. Mr. Hunt depicts himself now as merely a young innocent when he subscribed, and made at least one small financial contribution, but that was a long time ago and that he had eventually seen through the League.

So far from Mr. Hunt ceasing to subscribe because he found any faults with the policies we have consistently advocated, Mr. Hunt left no doubt when meeting League supporters that he was sympathetic. He entered the Federal Parliament at the last Federal Elections with reasonable background knowledge of the problems of the world. It is fair to say that the majority of League supporters at that time voted for Mr. Hunt, who won the electorate of Gwydir with a very small majority. If Mr. Hunt loses his seat he will only have himself to blame.

Before moving from the backbench Mr. Hunt asked that Mr. Jeremy Lee, Northern N.S.W. and Queensland Director of the League, call upon him at his home in Moree to outline the League's financial policies. Mr. Lee did this, one result being that Mr. Hunt suggested that Mr. Butler or Mr. Lee might come down to Canberra to lecture to the backbench Members of the Country Party. No more was heard about this. Mr. Hunt, as a private member, then made a call for the establishment of a new Rural Bank to provide the desperate rural community with long-term, low-interest finance. This call was widely publicised and the League of Rights supporters strongly backed Mr. Hunt. We are revealing this background **only because of what happened next.** This is not a gossip journal.

After being appointed to the Cabinet Mr. Ralph Hunt's attitude towards the League and its financial policies dramatically changed. Addressing a Country Party-sponsored meeting in Wellington, N.S.W., last year, Mr. Hunt took the opportunity of attacking Mr. Butler and Mr. Lee, charging that they were going around the country advocating unlimited "printing press" money. Other similar dishonest comments were made, and are on tape. Now this type of comment is understandable coming from the genuinely ignorant politician, but it was outrageous coming from Mr. Hunt, because he knew much better. Mr. Butler challenged Mr. Hunt to substantiate his false charges, first at a public debate, and then by correspondence. Mr. Hunt ignored Mr. Butler.

Then recently Mr. Hunt turned up in Western Australia addressing meetings in Mr. Don Maisey's electorate of Moore. There are many League supporters here and Mr. Hunt obviously realised this because after one meeting he told a group of League supporters that he thought The Australian League of Rights and Mr. Eric Butler were doing "a good job". It was Mr. Hunt who then told these supporters, presumably to convince them that he was their friend that he once subscribed to this journal for three years. When asked why his Deputy Leader, the Hon. Ian Sinclair, could then say that the League was linked with the Nazis, Mr. Hunt said that Mr. Sinclair had been "brainwashed". When the League's weekly news-commentary *On Target* recorded Mr. Hunt's amazing capacity for double-talk, depending upon where he was and to whom he was talking, this was picked up by the Labor Party, and Mr. Hunt had an embarrassing time trying to explain himself in Parliament. He then charged that he had been misquoted, criticised "extremism" and charged that this was the second time he had been misrepresented by the League. The League now found itself in the position where it had to put the whole record straight. This has resulted in Mr. Hunt making wild accusations against the League in a desperate attempt to direct attention away from just how unreliable he has proved to be.

Mr. Hunt trots out the old trick question of why does not the League run candidates and submit these candidates to the electors. The League has observed time and time again that Australia does not suffer from a shortage of political parties or candidates. This is not the problem. The problem is how can electors associate in a realistic manner to bring their paid political servants under their control so that he will fight against the policies destroying the free society. If Mr. Hunt is prepared to tackle the task, as he once indicated he might, then why have him removed? But Mr. Hunt has provided one more tragic example of a politician starting with knowledge, much more than most, and then submitting to the pressures and enticements in the party system. Mr. Hunt has tripped himself up with his own double-talk. He has destroyed his own credibility rating with his electors. Which is a great pity, as he could have been an excellent representative and made a name for himself as a real statesman. If remembered at all now, it will only be as one more political party hack.

The case of Mr. Hunt provides further striking confirmation of the nature of the basic political problem facing the electors in a disintegrating society. It is for this reason that we strongly urge that no candidate should even be considered for Parliament unless he is first prepared to enter into a written contract. As one supporter writes, "Their word is no longer their bond, so let us insist upon their signatures on the dotted line."

TO THE POINT

"Unity" is one of the most overworked of words at the present tune. All the power-men and the planners never cease of talking about the necessity for unity. Genuine unity is something, which can only grow out of policies rooted in reality. The British are on the eve of being forced into the "unity" of the Common Market. But at this very moment internal British disunity has never been greater, with responsible experts predicting a major civil war in Northern Ireland, and industrial convulsions on a scale never previously seen. Friction is rapidly growing inside the "united" Common Market. So far from the United States being united, the internal situation becomes progressively more explosive. Mankind is learning about the truth concerning associations in the hard school of reality. The experience will either end in death for Civilization or regeneration. We are entering the final testing period.

As a correspondent recently wrote to *The Australian Financial Review*, "News can be stranger than fiction when it concerns the antics of international socialism and socialists." He was referring to the news, published in the *Review* of September 19 that British Prime Minister Edward Heath had joined with Labour leader Mr. Harold Wilson and Liberal Party leader Jeremy Thorpe (the man who advocated the British bomb the Rhodesians) to raise funds for the London School of Economics. Mr. Heath joined in the appeal, as it was "a matter of national importance." The role of the London School of Economics, founded by the Fabian Socialists and financed by wealthy financiers, is familiar to regular readers. This subversive institution has played a major role in disintegrating the British Commonwealth.

The *Review* correspondent asked: "Is Heath a Tory? Or is he just another in a long line of politicians that have pimped for the socialism of growth-bureaucracy, centralisation of power into fewer hands, destruction of economic liberty, and dictatorship by elites now illustrated by Heath's undemocratic and insane mania to end one thousand years of British freedom, for colony status in Europe—not through a democratic plebiscite of the people, but by a simple vote of a parliamentary rump!"

* * *

We trust that readers have carefully noted how spokesmen for all the political parties have carefully sidestepped the central aspect of the immigration issue, now also accepted as one of the major election questions. The party spokesmen have tried to avoid the important question of whether or not they stand for the strict maintenance of a European nation. The Government hypocritically talks about maintaining a homogeneous society while permitting an increasing flow of non-Europeans. Candidates should be asked to sign that they oppose all non-European immigration except in very special circumstances.

* * *

From all over Australia come reports that many of the election candidates have discovered that death taxes are a "hot" issue. It was the individual initiative of Senator Syd Negus from Western Australia, supported by the growing educational work of the League of Rights, which suddenly convinced some of the politicians at Canberra that something should be done. A few minor concessions were made in the last Budget, but inflation of valuations will soon wipe these out. The Darling Downs Country

Party candidate, Mr. T. McVeigh, is one of those feeling the "heat" on the issue, but has the audacity to claim "The Country Party has the longest record of consistent effort to eliminate Death Taxes in their several forms and that effort will be maintained."

Never once has the Country Party at Canberra initiated legislation to have Death Taxes abolished. Some Country Party Senators have voted against abolition. Electors should get a signature from all those candidates who say they are opposed to the imposition of Death Taxes.

* * *

The Federal Country Party has quietly dropped one of its major election gimmicks. Immediately following the Budget, Mr. Ian Sinclair, Deputy Leader of the Country Party, stated that the Budget made provision for the establishment of a new Rural Bank to provide the rural community with long-term, low-interest finance. Some saw this statement as a blatant Country Party blackmailing attempt against the Liberal Party, apart from being an obvious election gimmick. The subsequent sordid story does not need to be told in detail. There was statement and counter-statement. Liberal Party Members were angry. The low-interest promise started to disappear. Then eventually Prime Minister McMahon put finish to the gimmick, replacing it with another one: that of long-term finance to the rural community through normal banking channels. There are no low interest rates and the amount proposed, even if it reaches the farmers, is but a drop in the ocean of the vast sea of debt. Even primary producer spokesmen have seen through this gimmick. Mr. Sinclair's Rural Bank project is now mentioned as something for the indefinite future. Another disgusting performance by the Hon. Ian Sinclair.

* * *

Black magic still prevails, even in 1972. The National Bank's October summary refers to Australia's new "monetary wealth". The so-called wealth consists, in the main, in figures in bank ledgers. Many of the figures have come in a "capital inflow". Irrespective of what it is, any form of money is not wealth, but merely a claim to wealth. No doubt the economist who wrote the National Bank's report would be offended if it were suggested that he was a brainwashed product of what passes for an education in economics.

* * *

THE HON. IAN SINCLAIR'S APPALLING IGNORANCE

When Country Party leader Mr. Doug Anthony is not walking along the beach, pondering on the "quality of life" which the advertisements say are his major concern, he launches lyrically into how his kind of Australia can be produced through decentralisation. Over the past five years 83,000 people have left their occupations in rural areas; 1300 properties have been abandoned; 50,000 people have left country towns; and the number of rural holdings has been reduced from 245,000 to 190,000. Can Australia stand another three years of Coalition decentralisation?

* * *

Mr. H. W. Herbert of Brisbane is one of the few professional Australian economists talking any sense. He has observed that inflation will quickly wipe out most of the tax concessions in the last Federal Budget. Mr. Herbert has advocated an attack on inflation by cutting the Sales Tax in half and the application of a five percent consumer subsidy, providing it was passed to the consumer. Mr. Herbert has stated "These two measures would help lower prices, and reduce the crazy spiral of prices, forcing up wages, and then forcing up prices . . ."

Mr. Herbert has also exposed the capital inflow racket. Political candidates might have Mr. Herbert's recommendations brought to their attention with the suggestion that there are alternative experts to those being employed by the Federal Government at present.

* * *

Prior to coming to office in 1949, the present Coalition Parties promised, "to put the shillings back into the pound". The value of the 1949-dollar, taking it to have been 100 cents, is now 42 cents. Federal Treasurer Snedden claims that his anti-inflation programme is working! Australia now has the third highest inflation rate in the world.

* * *

The media have not featured the fact that the Soviet and the U.S.A. are negotiating the biggest trade agreement in history. Having exhausted its own natural resources through unrealistic finance-economic policies, the U.S.A. is now turning to the Soviet Union. It is planned to bring Soviet natural gas from Murmansk in the Soviet Union to the American West Coast. Another step towards the World State that Lenin advocated.

A PREDICTION

If the ALP wins the Federal Elections, next year they will move to implement price and profits controls, with perhaps some mild control of wages. Liberal and Country Party Opposition Members will cry "Socialism". If the Coalition wins the elections they will implement basically the same programme with the Labor Opposition supporting but claiming, "it does not go far enough."

On August 20 the Hon. Ian Sinclair, Deputy Leader of the Federal Country Party, and Minister for Primary Industries, spoke at the Wesley Church Forum, Melbourne, and charged that the Nazi Party and the Australian League of Rights were "closely linked". This vile smear has resulted in a number of nation-wide developments, including some discussion in both the Senate and the House of Representatives at Canberra. Mr. Sinclair has found himself under considerable pressure to attempt to justify his allegations. It is no secret that he has embarrassed many of his Federal Country Party colleagues.

Mr. Sinclair received so many protests that he was forced to produce a standardised, roneoed letter with, of course, the assistance of the official of the Department of Primary Industry who prepared his speech. The same official helped Mr. D. Anthony, which explains why the same terms were used by Mr. Anthony in attempting to justify his "pro-Nazi" speech in South Australia last year. At that time Mr. Anthony was the Minister for Primary Industry.

Having said that he believes that the "assertions I have made in this speech (at Wesley Church) are correct", Mr. Sinclair comments, "However, I certainly do not believe that all supporters of the League of Rights are pro-Nazi or anti-Semitic". This means that Mr. Sinclair believes that some supporters of the League of Rights are pro-Nazi or anti-Semitic. It would be instructive to have Mr. Sinclair attempt to prove this gutter smear. The truth is that the philosophy of the League of Rights is diametrically opposed to that of National Socialism, or any other form of Socialism, including the Liberal-Country Party Socialism, which Mr. Sinclair supports.

Mr. Sinclair claims "My views contained in the speech come from extensive reading of statements and pamphlets issued over the years by the League of Rights." Mr. Sinclair has done no such extensive reading. This statement was provided for him by the same official, or officials, who provided exactly the same statement for Mr. Anthony last year. Even the same articles are listed, such as *The Dangerous Myth of Racial Equality*; an excellent publication that we suggest Mr. Sinclair might actually read some time!

But having attempted to justify his "pro-Nazi" smear, Mr. Sinclair then moved on to say, "Additionally I am concerned with the activities of the economic proposals of the League of Rights". We would suggest that Mr. Sinclair, or his official ghostwriter, might take a course in grammar as well as one in realistic economics! We are told that the League is promoting economic policies which

Continued on Page 8

PEOPLE AND THEIR CULTURE MORE IMPORTANT THAN GOVERNMENTS

Sir Alexander Downer, retiring Australian High Commissioner in London, has constantly made it clear what he thought of the policy of British entry into the European Economic Community. In a recent interview in London he said that even though the British Government is now preoccupied with what he contemptuously refers to "Europephoria", he still clings to the hope that the future will see a revival of the "old" Commonwealth spirit and its ideals.

C. H. Douglas once observed that much more important than the threat to the British Empire, was the threat to British culture. That culture can be sustained and regenerated irrespective of what Governments and their masters may attempt. Following reports in the British press that Australians were disgusted with the threat of being made aliens in the United Kingdom, a spate of letters from the people of the United Kingdom to the Australian press provided striking evidence that the British sense of family is as strong as ever. It will be one of the major factors in the resistance to the programme to force mankind into the One World State. The following letters appeared in "The Sydney Morning Herald" of November 4:

SIR—May I say this to the people of Australia: In Tobruk, Greece, Crete and throughout the Middle East, I and thousands like me served as ordinary private soldiers and have memories of those ordinary private Aussies who stood at our side.

Australians becoming Australiens—my stomach heaves at the thought so please, I beg you, believe this; Governments may change, policies, too, but not people. We shall remember with gratitude; We shall always welcome you and may God bless Australia and our friends, its people.
—V. H. Andrews. New Maiden. Surrey, England.

SIR—I read a report of your article and cartoon on "Australiens" in the *Daily Express* in Lowestoft on October 26, and felt so damn sick and ashamed that I had to write in the hope that you will publish my letter to tell your readers that it is none of our doing.

Your people must not get the idea that most of us—the ordinary people—want to have our country turned into one of the Federal States of Europe (for that is what it will come to) which, among other things, apparently turns our Commonwealth friends and relations into aliens.

Don't think too badly of us—the ordinary Poms—we haven't changed, and never will, although you will probably think we are weak for allowing it to happen.

—G. R. Gay, Lowestoft, Suffolk, England.

SIR—I am enclosing a cutting from the Scottish *Daily Express* of October 26, and would like to make a few comments.

The reported "Aussie" fury, believe me, is only matched by "Pommie" fury over the whole beastly aliens business.

Our entry into the Common Market with the consequent betrayal of our own flesh and blood and those who have gallantly supported us in two world wars is strongly deprecated by the huge majority of Britishers.

Please tell your "man in the street" NOT to break with US, THE PEOPLE, who still have a warm spot in our hearts for all of you, and, the struggle over here is not yet finished.

—G. F. RYDE, Kilmarnock, Ayrshire, Scotland.

SIR—When I read about the reaction in Australia to the "alien" status being given to you next year, I felt that I must write and try to put the record straight.

Believe me, Aussies; we Poms don't like the situation any more than you do! Most of us ordinary, unimportant people don't want to join the Common Market or to turn our backs on the Commonwealth! We have not been asked. We have never given our consent. But we are being sold down the river and frog-marched into the EEC by a bunch of arrogant and utterly unrepresentative politicians.

Most of us in Britain have friends and relatives in Australia. New Zealand and Canada, and, even in our present demoralised state, I cannot see us tamely allowing their being made "aliens" in their mother country, while Europeans and thousands of Asians are given unrestricted right of entry.

—B. E. Thomas, Narberth, South Wales, U.K.

SIR—I thought you ought to know that there are millions of people in Britain who are absolutely disgusted at the treatment meted out to Australians by our Government. "Aliens", indeed!

Does Edward Heath, a World War II soldier himself, forget what sacrifices Australia made for us in two world wars? It seems that he does otherwise how could he countenance the insult to our Australian brothers and sisters?

I visited Australia, New Zealand and Tasmania in 1958-59 but if I come again I'll feel utterly ashamed to acknowledge the disgraceful way you have been dealt with.

—Harry Gee, Kingskerswell, Devon, England.

SIR—"If that's the way they want it let's break with them completely and see if they can play cricket with the French!"

This is reported in the Australian press to have been said by "a man in the street" regarding our entry in the Common Market. Let me assure "man in the street" that the majority has fully understood his anger.

The old saying, if you can't beat them join them, now seems to be beat them then join them, or did we beat them?

The old age pensioner here has £6.70 a week, in Italy £19.95 per week, three times as much as we have here, and in Germany £12.50 per week. Did I hear someone say we won the war?

We are throwing away the friends who came to our aid when we were almost on our knees, to link up with the people who brought us to that position.

Let man in the street bide his time, we will pay dearly for our treachery, for this is what it is.

At present we are wining and dining the top men in Germany. They are our guests. Had it not been for the help given us by the Commonwealth and the U.S., they would still have been here today not as our guests but as our masters. Don't let us make any mistake about that.

Had someone told me we would one day do what we are now doing I would have laughed at them. Although it's now a fact, I still find it hard to convince myself that it's not just a bad dream.

To be part of a nation which could act like this makes me ashamed to be British. Man in the street I'm sorry.

—W. Jackson, Glasgow, Scotland.

CAN THE LEAGUE HOLD THE LINE?

The intensity of the nation-wide campaign to smear The Australian League of Rights out of existence is being increased with the widespread distribution of a booklet by Mr. Edward St. John. Published by the N.S.W. University Press, this booklet is the text of Mr. St. John's opening address in his debate with Mr. Eric Butler in the Mosman Town Hall on July 13. Footnotes and references create an impression of painstaking scholarship and authenticity.

Mr. St. John has personally sent the booklet to a large number of newspaper editors. But in other areas it is being circulated anonymously through the post. A major desperate effort is being made to halt the League's expansion, as Australia, along with every other Western nation, moves into an era of growing convulsions and a changed political situation. A lot of money is being spent in the campaigns against the League.

The complete break-up of Civilisation can only be halted by defeating the Money Power and its destructive policies of mounting inflation, debt, taxation and centralisation. Money Power can only be defeated by Money Power. With a comparatively small sum of money the League has been able to exert enormous influence. To meet the demands of pre-election campaigning and the crisis of 1973, the League of Rights requires at least the annual Basic Fund of \$25,000. The League must not only hold the line against the enemy's attacks; it must increase its constructive offensive. Adequate finance is now the crux of the situation. Will every "New Times" reader please regard this matter as urgent? A major part of the \$25,000 has already been contributed by a small number. Northern N.S.W. and Queensland contributions or pledges to Box 17, Alderley, Queensland 4051. All others to Box 1052J, G.P.O. Melbourne. Vic. 3001.

TERRORISTS FOR THE UNITED NATIONS

The Government of Rhodesia issued the following statement on Monday, October 2, 1972:

"It is reported that the United Nations Committee dealing with trusteeship and non self-governing territories has, by a majority vote, agreed to seat members of terrorist organisations as observers when Rhodesia's affairs are under consideration. These are people who represent no one but their own ambitions.

This move is in conformity with the determination of communist countries and the Third World to flout the charter whenever adherence to its provisions conflicts with their aims.

In abandoning principle for expediency the member countries voting for this resolution have made a mockery of their pledge in the preamble to the charter—"To practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours'.

Surely if the United Nations is to survive the time must come when the world will no longer allow these irresponsible elements to set the pace in international affairs."

"THE NAKED CAPITALIST" IS NOW AVAILABLE

This is the book, which effectively and absorbingly answers the question — IS there a nexus between International Finance and International Communism?

The author, W. Cleon Skousen, was for 16 years an officer of the F.B.I., he was for four years Chief of Police in Salt Lake City, and is now a Professor of Law at Brigham Young University.

W. Cleon Skousen demonstrates that there IS a ruthless power movement in the world, perhaps even greater than that of International Communism. It can perhaps be more accurately said that International Communism is but a part of this power movement, exposed by the author.

This book can best be used in jolting the arrogant, especially the smug academics; it will alert the curious, electrify the doubters. Great numbers of Left-wing students have come to the League because they have read this book.

Supplies are now on hand, and the ordering is already heavy, and mounting. Please send your order in today, with a remittance of \$2.24, to Box 1052-J, G.P.O., Melbourne, Vic., 3001.

"The Naked Capitalist" — by W. Cleon Skousen.

in fact implementing Mr. McGovern's policy. Like Taiwan, South Vietnam is about to learn that no obstructions will be permitted to the programme for creating the World State. The power men are pushing hard towards their objective.

If Australians wish to take a stand against being driven down the same road being taken by the American and British Governments, they must make every endeavour to make inflation a major election issue. Election gimmicks must not be allowed to obscure the growing inflation crisis. In case it is thought that we are being unnecessarily fearful, we draw attention to a recent warning by the Institute of Public Affairs, which said that although a free enterprise research organisation, the threat of greater inflation was so great that they reluctantly supported wage and price controls. *The Australian* of November 7 quoted the Australian Industries Association as warning that "Unless we can quickly and effectively control inflation. Australia faces a bleak and uncertain future." The statement went on to say that in spite of what Government spokesmen said, "a situation in which a Budget is based on a seeming acceptance of a rise in wages and salaries of nine percent in the year ahead cannot be regarded as indicating that the Government is tackling inflation successfully."

PRE-ELECTION ACTION URGENT

The Australian Industries Association urged that inflation be made a major election issue. Readers can help to achieve this objective by participating in the nationwide pre-election campaign being conducted by the Australian League of Rights. As many candidates as possible must be pinned down to a written pledge on the inflation issue. Coming events cast their shadows before them. The shadows are going to deepen rapidly unless some modifications are made to present financial policies. And if effective action is not taken, the deepening shadows will be the prelude to the night of revolutionary convulsions and consequent totalitarian controls.

The writing is now clearly on the wall about the future of freedom. We have been warned.

ORDER YOUR SUPPLIES OF "CONSPIRACY" NOW

One copy \$1.07, six copies for \$4.00, 50 copies for \$30.00. Except in special circumstances, do not give away, but sell. Then use small profit to obtain further supplies. "The Naked Capitalist" is \$2.24.

Order through the following addresses: Box 16, Inglewood, W.A. 6052; Box 17, Alderley, Queensland 4051; Box 1297L, G.P.O., Adelaide, S.A. 5001; Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne, Vic. 3001.

All election comment authorized by Eric D. Butler, 273 Little Collins Street, Melbourne, Vic, 3000.

1973 ANNUAL "NEW TIMES" DINNER

This will be held on Friday, September 21, followed by the League of Rights National Seminar on Saturday, September 22, and the National V.P.A. Conference on Sunday, September 23. The donation for the Dinner will be the same as this year, \$6. The theme of the League's National Seminar will be "The New Education". Outstanding authorities will be presenting Papers.

Why not plan ahead and make a note of the above dates in your diary? Every effort will be made to provide private hospitality for those requiring it. Early bookings for the Dinner will be accepted, but must be accompanied by donation.

Continued from Page 5

are "leading some sincere people in financial trouble into believing that their problems can simply be solved by the Government creating more money." Mr. Sinclair is careful not to say just where the League advocates the policy he talks about. The truth is, of course, that the policies supported by the Government, of which Mr. Sinclair is a Minister, require a never-ending expansion of the money supply, but in such a manner that the inevitable result is continuing inflation and its many disastrous consequences. The League points out that it would be simple to have a necessary expansion of money without increasing costs.

Mr. Sinclair goes on to charge that "The simple truth about the League's economic policies which offer a very painless way of achieving Australia's national objectives is that no responsible Government anywhere in the world has adopted the Social Credit ideals they espouse." Mr. Sinclair is correct. And because all Governments adopt the policies, which Mr. Sinclair and his colleagues support, all Governments have basically the same problems. They are all grappling with mounting debt, crushing taxation and progressive inflation. Mr. Sinclair offers no concrete solutions to these problems, confining himself to smearing those who do.

Representatives of the New England Electors' Association have publicly stated that when they went to see Mr. Sinclair personally, he said that he was against death taxes. But he was not prepared to vote for their abolition because of the loss of Government revenue! The actual revenue from death taxes, the most immoral of taxes, is comparatively small. If Mr. Sinclair does not know that the Government is obtaining hundreds of millions of dollars in increased tax revenue every year, this coming from new credit created to finance never-ending wage increases, then he should cease commenting on matters of finance and economics, and he should not try to hide his ignorance by attempting to smear Government critics as Nazis.