

THE NEW TIMES

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

\$6.00 per annum post-free. Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne.

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

Vol. 40, No. 6

JUNE. 1975

DOING THE TREASURY SHUFFLE

We often, these days, think about the drunkard who would do anything to cure his illness, and thereby alleviate the hosts of domestic, social, and economic ill effects, which flow from it, except—give up drinking! Similarly, do contemporary economists, more and more at loggerheads with each other, advance all manner of theories for the alleviation of inflation, except—ones, which would really take effect?

The standard, or orthodox "remedial" methods applied by Western economists to impede the rate of inflation have failed, decade after decade. A "tolerable" rate of inflation of 2-3 per cent in the fifties and sixties—the "price we had to pay for full employment" (remember?) has multiplied tenfold, and is now the greatest threat to the stability of Western societies. (Lenin termed inflation the Communists' "secret weapon"!)

Australia's inflation rate will be in the twenties at the close of this year. The rate in Britain is somewhere around 30 percent. America's rate is lower, but her unemployment rate is higher—around nine percent. Even now the economy of the U.S.A. is a little healthier (more realistically, not quite as sick) as those of Britain and Australia. Perhaps a significant reason is that wage demands, although not the basic cause of inflation, are of a higher order in Britain and Australia than in the U.S.A. Wage demands maintain the momentum of inflation, as they are pushed forward into costs, and then further into prices; just like a child belting along a hoop with a stick. The inflation automatically "spun-off" by the workings of the Western finance-economic system negates technological advances as a factor in the reduction of inflation, and this process is given further emphasis as a result of wage demands: thus is the "momentum" maintained. So much for the "productivity" myth. Productivity has increased by thousands, if not tens of thousands percent since the dawn of the Industrial Revolution, yet, inflation and debt are escalating as never before in Man's history.

But wage demands in Britain and Australia are "negotiated" from a position of strength—the strength of unionism: which is not so much the case in the U.S.A. This is a matter of historical causes: Fabian Socialism attacked Britain, and the British world, before it took firm root in

the United States. But the U.S.A. is fast catching up; the C.F.R. (Council on Foreign Relations) is ensuring that this occurs.

So Gough Whitlam, the Prime Minister of Australia, can shuffle his Treasurers like a pack of cards: the effect on the Australian economy will be zero. Why? Because the passing parade of Treasurers can do no more than tinker with **effects**. The same is the case in every country, which has adopted the same finance-economic system. There has been a similar passing parade of Chancellors of the Exchequer in Britain, and such has been the case in the U.S.A., with a passing parade of Secretaries of the Treasury. For all the use any of them have been, they might as well have stayed at home, or gone fishing! Their respective countries may well have been better off without them at all.

One Australian economist has said that he would consider any finance-economic techniques to halt inflation, except those advanced by Social Credit. No doubt C. H. Douglas, with his intuitive, near-mystical insight into the human mind, on meeting with this type of invincible mental inertia, was caused to observe that Man would seize on Social Credit for his survival, from sheer desperation, as a drowning man clutches at a straw. Thus will Social Credit eventually be ushered in.

HAVE YOU FULFILLED YOUR PLEDGE?

The end of the League's financial year approaches. It would be appreciated if all those who have not fulfilled pledges to the 1974-75 \$40,000 Basic Fund, do so as quickly as possible, before the end of June.

AT THE BAYONET'S POINT

By D. WATTS

The following article, examining the diabolical methods of the multi-racialists to create race frictions where none exist, was written before the Senate passed the Racial Discrimination Bill with major amendments accepted by the Government. The Government claimed, however, that the basic "intentions" of the Bill had been left unchanged.

I forget the name of the king of whom it was said that, during the religious persecutions in Europe, he tried to drive his subjects to Heaven at the bayonet's point, but one thinks of him when some who now govern are just as determined to drive their subjects into Utopia at the point of a bayonet. The bayonet that one has in mind is the Race Relations Bill.

The more certain a man is that he knows the exact way to Heaven or the true direction of Utopia, the more likely is he to mistake a mirage for the Shining City. Usually the impulse to dictate what all people shall believe or to insist upon conformity of opinion about controversial matters comes from personal egotism. It requires more broadness of mind than have the majority of powerful men to refrain from ordaining that whatever they, themselves, believe shall be accepted as being true by all those whom they govern. A thought is that religious toleration was never achieved by compulsion, nor will racial tolerance ever be achieved by that means. For example, from all accounts, the British laws against racial discrimination have only converted openly expressed outrage into private mutterings. The mutterings of the populace are, or should be, the dread of kings and governors.

Multi-racialists began by positively asserting that if people of different races lived together in a racial mixture, they would come to appreciate one another's good qualities and so forget their differences. This is often true of certain individuals. It is not true of the majority and it is never true of racial groups. That is something that has been demonstrated throughout history. For instance, the original inhabitants of Spain never accepted the Moors, nor did the Greeks ever come to tolerate the Turks. However, it is excruciatingly painful to be sure that one is absolutely right and then to be proved to be wrong. Rather than admit it, many try, by force, to alter natural law and human nature in order to prove themselves to be right though the rest of the universe be wrong. Already this fortified persistence in error has ruined the happiness of thousands, spoiled the quality of nations and ravaged a once promising civilisation.

THE WITCH-HUNTERS

Coming back to the particular bayonet under consideration, the Race Relations Bill: already the eager agents

of ideological conformity are looking for those whom they think need to feel the point. Before the Senate Standing Committee inquiring into discrimination by real estate agents against Aboriginals, a certain social worker, evidently a quite sincere witch-hunter, presented documented evidence of 19 cases of racial discrimination, most involving local estate agents. One highly indignant estate agent, Mr. Tony Stavrianos, protested strongly that he did not discriminate against any prospective tenant because of colour or creed. He declared, quite rightly, that his duty to the landlord was to ensure that the person seeking tenancy is able to pay rent and to fulfill the conditions of his lease. If, he said, an Aboriginal did not meet those conditions, then it was his duty to refuse to let the premises to him, and that applied to all persons irrespective of colour.

The accusation by a witch-smelling social worker is a small taste of the unpalatable draught that Australians will be forced to swallow if the present Federal authorities have their way. In such as the particular case instanced, the circumstances and conditions surrounding it need to be taken into account. They will not be by most complainants. They may or may not be by the examiner, but even if they were, a man unfairly accused would suffer unnecessarily great vexation and anxiety. One thing, for instance, likely to be ignored by those accusing an estate agent of discrimination is that among the conditions attached to letting a house would be included an undertaking not to cause any willful damage to the premises. Aboriginals have a name for being destructive. Another consideration should be the happiness and peace of the neighbours. No doubt there are among the Aboriginals many good, careful tenants; but people letting houses would need to discriminate—not on racial, but behavioural grounds.

Those who have indulged inordinately in a romantic passion for coloured people, in Australia especially for Aboriginals, are ready to sacrifice all that the white people have achieved in the matter of cultural standards and ethical appreciation and the white people, themselves, to their darlings. It is not the fault of coloured people, including Aboriginals, that so many of them should now have the idea that they should be accepted and endowed, not because they justly merit advantages and privileges,

but simply because they are coloured. This partly obscured racial prejudice in favour of coloured people is very thinly veiled, indeed, in the case of Aborigines. The Race Relations Bill, if passed, would further exaggerate their conviction of having special racial virtue and justify to themselves their way of demanding and taking from whites while denigrating the givers.

THE RANTINGS OF MR. CHARLES PERKINS

Just what a disservice to the real advancement of Aborigines has been the type of propaganda which has led up to the introduction of the R.R.B. was exemplified in a statement by Mr. Charles Perkins on the eve of his departure for the U.S.A. to spread the glad tidings of Australia's bad racial behaviour. His rant was unfair, not altogether accurate and an innocent betrayal of the common, biased outlook of Aborigines. The R.R.B. could crush all criticism of such statements, thus hindering rather than helping Aborigines to live in that healthy climate of thought so necessary to social development. The criticism offered herein is not intended to express antagonism by whites towards Aborigines, but to tone down the inculcated antagonism by Aborigines towards whites.

Mr. Charles Perkins, chief spokesman for the Aborigines, plans to protest to the United Nations that Australia is the most racist country in the world. Fiddle-dee-dee. He is merely repeating what a recent visitor was brought to Australia to say. He could find more racism in some parts of Asia and among black Africans. So exaggerated in their own minds have become real and imaginary wrongs to the Aborigines that Mr. Perkins contemplates even going to The Hague to propose that the International Court prosecute Australia for racism. Note the Statute of the International Court of Justice re the competence of the Court, article 34, clause 1: **Only States may be parties in cases before the Court.** Mr. Perkins is not a State nor is the aboriginal section of the Australian population.

In telling the sad tale of discrimination against Aborigines, Mr. Perkins is reported as saying, "The kids (in Alice Springs) get a diet of rice and jam and tea. That's better than in my time when it was bread and dripping." Not being a dietician, I cannot say whether or not rice and jam are more nourishing than bread and dripping or less nourishing than witchetty grubs and lizards; but one often does hear of scandalous drunkenness among Aborigines at Alice Springs and elsewhere. Also one remembers that when, in Western Australia, complaints were made that Aborigines spent welfare money on drink and car rides instead of raising their standard of living, Mr. Perkins indignantly protested that

Aborigines had the right to spend their money as they pleased and that no one inquired how white recipients of social welfare money spent theirs. People would very quickly inquire if the same percentage of whites as of Aborigines spent the money on getting drunk instead of on feeding their children. If the stand that no matter how badly any Aborigines behave, no criticism of them must be made, be the already demanded and accepted one, it can be imagined what a hindrance to their cultural advancement would be the Race Relations Bill.

The above is another example of the monotonously repeated pattern of anti-white racism. Seemingly, not the self-indulgent Aboriginal fathers, but the white providers are to be blamed if the Aboriginal children subsist on a diet of rice and jam. That idea that the Aborigines have no responsibility and that all responsibility for everything is that of whites will spell much harassment for whites in government and in less exalted places should a Race Relations Bill make it legally impossible to present the whites side in the matter of racial relations.

MAKING FOOLS OF THE ABORIGINES

The idea that the whites should humbly wait upon the Aborigines, sparing them the trouble of doing things for themselves, is revealed in another complaint by Mr. Perkins. Said he, "At Alice Springs where I live there are 700 Aborigines living in a creek bed, with 500 kids not going to school." Millions have lived satisfying lives without ever learning to read and write. Still, living among a sophisticated people, it will become increasingly urgent for Aboriginal children to have a grounding in the three R's, if only to be able to fill in forms. But, there are a good many Aborigines who have been to school and there had an elementary education. Surely it is up to some of them to go to the benighted Alice Springs community and to pass their knowledge on to their own people. They need not have teacher training. The primary schools organised by the whites evolved from the same schools. If, from the millions set aside by the racist white Australian Government to be used to promote the advancement of Aborigines, there cannot be spared a few thousands for mobile class-rooms and simple equipment, surely were some Aborigines to begin educating their own, the white Government would be so overcome with admiration for such initiative that it would pay for blackboards, books etc. out of the taxes gathered from their white subjects.

Whites made fools of the Aborigines, so that inevitably the Aborigines are now making fools of themselves. What hope for help for the Aborigines can there be while criticism of the faulty social education that Aborigines have received from the whites is howled down, thus making correction impossible? How are the white people to

receive justice when they are expected to do all the giving and forbearing while suffering nothing but opprobrium in return? There is such a foundation of injustice in that situation that though a Race Relations Bill may cover it over, it will never do other than provide a base for racial failure by Aboriginals.

It certainly behoves white Australians to give special attention to the state of the Aboriginals, but not so much on account of what we took from them as because their need is great. After all, they had not a great deal for us to take. The chant about land rights is not altogether called for. The Aboriginals used to own the land in the way in which a bird that builds its nest in a tree owns the tree. Not that, in twenty or thirty thousand years, they did much nest building. Their Australia was a wilderness. The Australia of high living standards, of good homes and schools and hospitals, of theatres and art galleries, of libraries and gardens is not their Australia. It is the white man's Australia. They want a share of it. That is fair. It is payment for their wilderness; but they could never have had those things if the white people had not taken possession of the land. Aboriginals have not a right to all their ancestors had and also to all the kinds of things that white people created. They must choose their old way, supplemented by gifts from the whites or adopt the white ways of social responsibility and industry. As to taking their land from them: that was not considered wrong then, though dispossession is, by a few peoples, thought to be morally wrong nowadays. We cannot apply living standards of right and wrong to dead history.

Aboriginals are people; just people. They are not sub-human, but neither are they rarely gifted beings out of some mystical legend. They pose problems that are many in number and difficult to solve. A Race Relations Bill that is an attempt to banish the difficulties by a kind of legal sleight-of-hand is ignorance and folly.

THE LESSONS OF MULTI-RACIALISM

All that multi-racial experiments dealing with relations between different races living under the same government have taught us is what not to do. Their method of planning what the final result of racial mixing is to be, and then setting about reaching the desired end in one stride disqualifies the experimenters, on scientific grounds and on account of their ignorance of human psychology, from handling the business of race relations. Something of positive use can be learnt from an unanticipated result of desegregation in U.S. schools. The following appeared in *U.S. News & World Report*: "Racial barriers, in many places almost non-existent in the early (school) grades, become clear and firm as youngsters reach adolescence—and tend to stay that way through college . . . This self-segregation is usually civil and comfortable. But for most schools it means a tendency towards separate tables in the

lunchrooms, separate cheering sections at athletic events, and practically no contact inter-racially after school hours."

Very evidently such self-segregations are instinctive. Those able to set aside the old, threadbare explanations of such behaviour—racial arrogance, prejudice and intolerance—will recognise that the essential cause is not racial antagonism but racial attraction—that of like to like. A very important sentence in the above quotation is that the self-segregation is usually civil and comfortable. That peaceful relations between different races would have had a better chance of being realised if, instead of setting race against race by ranting about wrongs and unalienable rights and race equality, there had been, with acknowledgement of the short-comings of the politically superior races, a crediting them with their virtues and the good that they did and, with that, an encouraging of those younger in civilisation to emulate the virtues and avoid the sins of the more advanced. Of course that would not have been as satisfyingly exciting as dramatic demonstrations and race riots.

Some devoted multi-racialists and racial equalitarians would rather qualify for entry into a lunatic asylum than learn from the practical results of compulsory racial integration that there is considerable good sense in South Africa's policy of separate development. Of course, as conditions are in that country, absolute segregation would be impossible, as it would be in any other country where there are different racial groups; but each group, if orderly and humane, should be free to enjoy the kind of life it prefers without suffering interference by despotic ideologists decreeing what they must prefer. There is realism and intelligence and fairness, so sadly missing from the policy of majority rule if the minority be white, in

Continued on page 8

"CENSORED HISTORY" — THE BOOK OF THE MOMENT

By ERIC D. BUTLER

As the world drama unfolds at an accelerating rate, here is a book to place in the hands of as many responsible people as possible. It explains why the world is as it is, and what is planned by the international power groups. The great hoaxes of this century all exploded, including the one concerning "the six million". And the true role of Dr. Henry Kissinger. Take advantage of the League's discount programme, at the same time also saving on postage: One copy, 50 cents, plus 24 cents postage. Four copies, \$1.93 post-free. Eight copies, \$3.28 post-free. Fifty copies, \$15.55 post-free. Order from all State League of Rights addresses.

SOMETHING WORTH BEEFING ABOUT

By CHARLES PINWILL

(Assistant League of Rights Director for Queensland)

The Beef Industry is on the edge of complete collapse. Cattlemen in Western Queensland are now shooting aged stock. Hundreds of men are leaving the industry or taking outside employment to support it. All repairs on plant and improvements are suspended. One of the most significant Australian industries is going to the wall.

This is not due to physical drought—1975 has been a good average season in the most important cattle centres. Nor is it plague or pestilence—foot and mouth disease hasn't yet entered Australia. The only place on a cattle station, which will give a hint to the basic problem, is in the office—the station books.

The accounting figures on one side, the expenditure side, are multiplying as fast as a mixed herd of cattle—20 to 30 percent pre annum. The figures on the other side, the income side, have been decimated to one quarter or one third of their former totals. This is no physical drought—this is a financial drought.

Cattlemen have come down in the world since medieval times. As the bankers of Europe they once created its money supply in the form of leather discs bearing their brands. When this leather disc money was returned to them, they destroyed it with as little ceremony. They delivered cattle to the value of the discs and cast the token symbols into the branding fire.

Once society's commanders-in-chief of the money system, they have become its most grievously wounded victims. The two objectives that the cattle industry must achieve to avert disaster are one, a market, and two, dramatic cuts in costs. The problem is that countries buying beef from Australia have financial delirium tremens, and our traditional policy of getting as much beef as possible consumed by someone, indeed anyone, other than Australians, is therefore impossible to implement.

Western nations like Japan can no longer "afford" to have their people consuming our beef. An embargo on beef imports into Japan has only been lifted by a token amount by Joh Bjelke-Petersen's negotiations. Inflation is in the process of reducing the western nations' economies to subsistence level—or below.

The export of grain to the Soviets has left grain in short supply. Resulting high grain prices have made lot-feeding cattle "uneconomic". The vast herds of cattle in the United States intended for next year's market and the years afterwards are going to slaughter . . . now.

Dismantling highly perishable and high maintenance capital (stock) in a period of enormous unsustainable losses is the lot of American and Australian cattlemen.

All importing nations, except some Arab states, have decided that financial difficulties "prevent" their people from consuming beef. In Australia, cattlemen's losses have financed a consumer subsidy on beef. The increase in consumption has been dramatic.

Australians now eat 50 percent more beef than they did 18 months ago. Consumption is up from 90 pounds

per head per annum to 140 pounds. Domestic consumption has increased from 40 percent of production to over 60 percent.

Hard-working shearers eat 20 pounds of mutton a week—that's 1000 pounds a year. The Argentinean population has demonstrated a capacity to eat a pound of beef a day or 360 pounds per year. Australian consumption seems depressed even after a 50 percent jump to 140 pounds per year.

A consumer subsidy on beef of 20 cents per pound would bring another dramatic increase in consumption. If Australians ate two ounces more beef per day, then our exports would be halved, competition would again enter the market and the industry would make a recovery. If Australians wanted to eat four ounces more beef per day the Australian cattle industry couldn't supply the domestic market.

The cost of subsidising every pound of beef consumed in Australia at the moment would be \$370 million. It would cost less to save all rural communities in Australia than to build one at Albury-Wodonga at a cost of \$400 million.

Rising consumption would probably lift the cost of 20 cents per pound subsidy to about \$500 million. This represents one seventh of the Federal deficit. Every dollar spent in this way would lower the cost of living, the level of indexed wages, and therefore lower the level of prices.

The Cattle Industry is disintegrating for the want of a market. The market is right here in Australia. All Primary Industry Organisations and Political Parties continue to oppose the solution—a 20 cents per pound consumer subsidy on beef.

It seems that the mills of God do indeed "turn very slow". Yet we should not despair in that—for they "grind exceedingly fine". All industries that fail to achieve a consumer subsidy for their product will be broken, root and branch, before the wheel. Ground and broken as though talc powder was a sea of boulders.

There is no such thing as an industry without a market. Industries disappear with their markets. They also grow with them. If any industry cannot, or will not see to it, that consumers have sufficient purchasing power to buy its products, then that industry is headed, express delivery, to the bone yard.

Force is tried, and will continue to be tried, to coerce consumers. Monopoly of supply of the essentials of life, through cartels, boards, marketing authorities or whatever stratagem will be tried.

Cunning will be given full vent and manifest itself in

gimmicks, sophisticated advertising, high-pressure selling, low-key confidence tricks, playing to egos and encouraging sex fantasies. All will fail. All will fail completely.

All the guile and cunning of an ancient race couldn't get blood out of a stone. Nobody ever received a cent off a man who never had one.

The Beef Industry will have to learn that the housewife will dictate its future. If the housewife can afford beef she will give the beef industry a future. If not, she shall pronounce death.

Cattlemen should not despair at the prospect of getting housewives to accept a consumer subsidy that will make beef 20 cents per pound cheaper. That is a result she can understand. We can be confident that she is favourably disposed to this idea.

Cattlemen and housewives must unite to gain a common objective that will save them both, or agree to suffer separately. This is beginning to happen in Queensland. Its success or failure will decide much more than immediate issues.

The second major objective that will have to be achieved to save the cattle industry is a large cut in its costs. No headway has been achieved in this regard, even on limited fronts.

Recently it was enquired of over 500 cattlemen, whether they could supply the name of one Federal politician (of whatever Party) who had given a firm commitment to abolish the special Beef Export Tax of 1.6 cents per pound. No cattleman knew of one who had given this commitment. Even the National Country Party which affects a sympathy towards primary producers have not a single example of a Federal Member firmly committed to the abolition of the Export Tax.

In physical droughts, cattlemen know that the calf must be weaned, or disaster will befall the cow. In financial droughts governments will have to be made to learn that unless they're weaned off their taxes then the death of the Cattle Industry is assured.

Excise tax on fuels, and motor registration on vehicles used in the Cattle Industry, must go. Systematically, all taxes imposed on a Cattle Industry at the point of death must be campaigned against and lifted.

The average Queensland shire rates are 45 percent interest and redemption on their own tax moneys. In some cattle producing shires 70 percent of rates go to repay former taxes lent to the shire. If Queenslanders could only learn to forgive themselves for their debts on their "own" taxes then rates would fall by 45 percent. If the Federal "grants" to local government were really grants to be used as local Shires wished, then rate alleviation would not be forbidden. These two measures would reduce rates to less than half this present level.

The largest cost in the Cattle Industry is interest and redemption on debts. In former times of crisis, money has been provided debt free (for the construction of the Transcontinental Railway) and practically interest free (World War I funding). The imminent collapse of every

rural town in Australia to the extent that it depends on the cattle industry, is also, one would think, something of a crisis.

If our Government takes the destruction of the cattle industry seriously, i.e. if it starts to affect members personally, in spite of their large salaries, then interest of two percent, long terms, and even suspension of the payment of either for a time are possible. We can only assume that the present disaster is not sufficiently destructive to warrant its correction.

If Cattlemen can wring a moratorium on taxes from the Government—if cattlemen and housewives can really achieve a consumer subsidy of 20 cents per pound, then the latest sales jingle "Beef Eaters are World Beaters" may well have some validity.

PLANNING AHEAD FOR NATIONAL WEEKEND

This year's National Weekend, starting on Friday, September 19 with the League of Rights all-day Annual National Secretariat Conference, followed by "The New Times" Annual Dinner in the evening at The Victoria, Little Collins Street, Melbourne, will take place as Australia moves at an increasing tempo into the most deadly crisis in its history.

The all-day Action Seminar on Sunday, September 21, will be the most comprehensive yet held. Hard-line action programmes will be outlined and discussed. As the nation faces the threat of a long night of collapse, at a time when all spiritual and moral resources are required, it is appropriate that the theme of the League's Annual National Seminar should be "Christianity and The Social Order". The Rev. Fr. A. G. Fellows of Queensland will be one of the speakers at the "New Times" Dinner and will also present a Paper at the Seminar. He will also conduct a short Divine Service before the Action Conference on the Sunday.

The New Zealand League of Rights will be represented and we may have an exciting announcement to make shortly concerning a distinguished figure from the United Kingdom.

Booking for "The New Times" Dinner must be made in advance, together with subscription of \$6.50. Interstate and Victorian country visitors requiring private accommodation are requested to let League headquarters in Melbourne know as soon as possible. Do not leave this until the last minute.

We have no doubt that because of the crisis atmosphere there will be record attendances at all functions. It is the duty of every supporter who can attend to be present to participate in a weekend of fellowship, inspiration and practical planning for intensified action.

A PARTING THOUGHT

By JOHN A. MALAN

It was in 1917 that Douglas started to formulate his ideas concerning the truth about how the monetary system operated. Since then a few minor modifications have been made, but no radical changes have taken place. His criticism and suggested corrections, which are needed, are still valid as they were set out in his first book "Economic Democracy", published in 1919.

Apart from a brief spate of publicity due to the 'great depression' in the early 1930's, his analysis has been ignored as far as the media is concerned. Nevertheless his exposure of the truth as it relates to our society has been retained by those who have come to realise the accuracy of his predictions—accuracy well illustrated by the present chaotic state of the world's monetary systems.

The major reason for the lack of any spectacular progress towards the acceptance of the Douglas solution has undoubtedly been the diversity of ideas as to what action individuals, or even groups, should take. Douglas himself launched several suggestions for action, but the silence imposed upon and by the media effectively stifled any progress.

This difficulty of obtaining concerted action also accounts for the continual attempts to solicit support for a variety of proposals concerning monetary reform. Whilst many such proposals have some merit either for general or local application, it would seem that the time has arrived when a single line of action could be adopted by all those who are thoroughly aware of the basic flaw in our present finance-economic system.

It is simply the equivalent of beating the air to talk and write about the causes of or cures for the many symptoms that emerge as the result of its fundamental error—an error from which springs such absurdities as inflation, unemployment, poverty and the like. However, before even the basic flaw can be properly presented, it is quite essential to clarify the use of that very much-abused word 'law'. Its present application to what is essentially only a 'code' of personal conduct is the major, if not the only cause of the confusion which arises when the same word 'law' is used in the same sense when referring to Nature.

The many legislative acts passed by parliaments are referred to as 'laws' but whether they be so called or referred to as 'regulations', 'orders in council', 'by-laws' or by any other name, they are subject not only to amendments but also to wide variations of interpretation in our so-called 'courts of law'. Such laws are really no laws at all unless they carry some penal clauses, and even then the degree of penalty imposed varies from the ludicrous to extreme severity. There is nothing consistent about them, which gives credence to the saying that the law is an ass.

In reality all such legislation amounts to nothing more than a code, or set of rules, for the orderly and peaceful conduct of the affairs of a community. The fact that what

is 'lawful' in one locality may be forbidden in another must never be forgotten.

The situation would be greatly simplified and confusion abolished if the use of the word 'law' were restricted to either man's creations or to Nature's operations, and a new word invented for the other of those concepts. The need for such an arrangement becomes very obvious when even a superficial study is made of natural laws. The first point to be noted, and one of the most important, is that the word 'inevitable' can only be correctly applied to Nature, whereas the misleaders of our society are continually applying it to man-created circumstances.

This point can hardly be overstressed as the major fallacy being imposed on the community. The next point is that any breach of a natural law will inevitably result in the appropriate penalty being applied without the slightest possibility of it being avoided. It is of no con-

JOHN A. MALAN

The author of "A Parting Thought", Mr. John A. Malan, left his fellow Social Crediters in this life on the 20th May last.

John Malan spent the major portion of his life in endeavouring to spread the enlightenment, which Social Credit brings with it, for the benefit of Australians.

The mantle of the father has been taken up by the son. Mr. David Malan, now living in north Queensland, is continuing the work of propagation of Social Credit.

"A Parting Thought" was unfinished. John A. Malan's labours on behalf of Social Credit are not only being carried on by his son, but also by the many who came into contact with him, and who came under his influence.

sequence what the social status may be of those who initiate the breach, or their professed intentions no matter how noble they may be. If this 'inevitability' were not so, our complete social structure, built as it is on science and technology, could not exist. The fact that our present civilisation has reached its present development in those two branches of knowledge is at least prima facie evidence that there has been a correct understanding of how Nature operates.

This accurate assessment by science has produced the material abundance, or at least potential abundance, that surrounds us today. The only problem left to be solved is that of distributing the products. The mechanism for doing this we call 'money', and the financial chaos that is so evident is entirely due to the fact that our method

of accountancy does not reflect the natural law of cost. So long as any action by man is in breach of a natural law, then by virtue of its inevitability, the resultant penalty will be inflicted. This is precisely what is happening today—and we call it inflation.

There should be no need to elaborate on the fact that every modification to the methods of production employed in our industrial system is aimed at, and achieves, the making of any article either of a better quality, or in greater quantity using less material or less energy. If at least one of these advantages were not obtained, the modification would not be undertaken. What is physically happening is that the correct cost of producing everything, when expressed in physical units, is continually declining. In other words it is becoming physically cheaper. This is the very vital point at which our present economy endeavours to ignore Nature—which, in the long run, is an impossibility.

Surely those who thoroughly know this truth can afford to abandon every side issue, and by concentrating on this one fact produce a much more effective pressure to correct the fundamental error than appears evident under present circumstances.

THE INSTITUTE OF ECONOMIC DEMOCRACY

A Division of the Australian League of Rights—offers a unique service in Australia. The only organisation genuinely explaining and providing specific answers to the financial and economic dilemma gripping the Western World, the Institute is the source of information from which genuine advocates of free enterprise, private property and economic democracy - - consumer control of the productive system—can gain the concise explanations and solutions needed for a return to sanity.

The Institute of Economic Democracy, P.O., Kingstown, via Armidale, N.S.W. 2350.

BACK COPIES OF ENTERPRISE STILL IN STOCK

"Bleed, Bleed Poor Country"—The battle through Australia's history for decentralisation.

"The Drive to Smash the States"—The tragic story of the Commonwealth Grants Bill.

"Dare the States Resist?"—The Fabian Socialist plan for Regionalisation and Unitary Government.

"And AH the World Was Taxed"—The socialist imposition of progressive taxation in Australia.

"The Canberra Opposition—Neither Hot Nor Cold"—The Liberal-Country Party response to the Petersen Plan. (20 cents each, posted.)

Continued from Page 4

Rhodesia's plan of first establishing good relations between the black and the white races and educating the black race to reach the political and social standards of the whites, before handing the country over to be governed by the blacks in co-operation with the whites. Immediate rule by backward people in Rhodesia would be as atrocious as it is in certain approved black African States for, as history shows, it would not be the most civilised blacks who would wield the power. Most likely there would not even be majority rule, the absence of which is made the excuse for the attack upon Rhodesia by pious, white humbugs and power-greedy blacks.

THE IRRITATION OF ANTI-RACIST LAWS

Racial tolerance will not be enforced at the point of a symbolic bayonet. Indeed, the use of the bayonet is, itself, a demonstration of intolerance. Anti-racist laws constantly draw attention to racial differences. People are never allowed to forget them and are therefore the more irritated by them. It is the far better, the far more honest policy, to face up to racial and ethnic differences and to try to adjust them than to pretend that they do not exist.

One is not surprised to find a Race Relations Bill being fathered by Labor Government, ideologically shackled to the false theory of human equality; but what are the Limp Liberals doing? They seem to be desperately looking for a winner to back, and do not realise that the favourites are becoming winded. They have not the courage to oppose the Race Relations Bill very strongly, but are trying to gain some advantage by advocating the entry into Australia of masses of refugees who, racial differences apart, are bound to be a very mixed lot. Immediate relief is, in truth, the refugee's pressing need; but the trouble caused by allowing emergency arrangements to slip into being permanent ones never seems to enter their minds, though the dire results of the bad blunder of doing that in the case of Palestinian refugees should be a warning to anyone pretending to have any political nous. Certainly, in the matter of permanent Vietnam refugees, the results would be different, but they would be dire; and the Race Relations Bill could be used to smother very effectively any protest against allowing such trouble to eventuate.

We may have the compassion of saints, but if we have not good sense with it, our acts could well be those of devils. Indeed, had the Devil set out to create, among men, race hatred, race injustices and race inspired terrorism, he could not have done better than to have followed the methods of multi-racialists and racial integrationists in dealing with race problems; and he would have sealed a lid over the seething mess with a Race Relations Bill.