

THE NEW TIMES

\$8 per annum post-free.

Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne.

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

Vol.46a No. 2

FEBRUARY 1982

Registered By Australia Post—Publication No. VBH 1001

A Moment of Truth

By Eric D. Butler

A report from a normally reliable source states that following the imposition of martial law in Poland, and the call for international economic sanctions against the Soviet Union by President Ronald Reagan, Soviet strategists met in Moscow and concluded, in essence, that because of the depressed state of the Western economies, it would be impossible for the Reagan policy to be adopted. So far from fearing a cessation of economic blood transfusions from the non-Communist world, the Soviet leaders have indicated that they anticipate even more transfusions. Anyway, why shouldn't they, as they recall that two years ago at the time of the Afghanistan crisis. Prime Minister Fraser of Australia strutted the international stage calling for the toughest possible measures against the Soviet, and then presided over the quadrupling of Australian exports to the Soviet! These exports have helped the Soviet to feed its restless masses and to ensure that there was no effective anti-Communist revolt in Poland.

Even before C.H. Douglas had clearly demonstrated the major flaw in the finance-economic systems of the industrialised nations, a deficiency of purchasing power which, amongst other effects, forced nations to try to solve domestic problems by "fighting" for foreign markets, Lenin the Communist leader had grasped how the "imperialist" powers were increasingly resorting to foreign investment and exports in an attempt to sustain themselves. He was thus able to make his famous prediction that the "decadent capitalists" would be forced to compete one with the other to send their surplus production to the Soviet, even providing the credits to enable the Soviet to obtain the production. If the Polish crisis has done nothing else, it has brought into the open what was previously kept relatively secret: that the Soviet bloc has been financed with massive credits provided by the international bankers.

But the Polish crisis has also brought the West to that moment of truth where it can no longer be denied that the plight of the Western world is hopeless under present finance-economic policies. When President Reagan called for a halt to the provision of the rope which the West has been providing for its own hanging, the most violent reaction came, not from the Soviet, but from Western governments. The Japanese also made it clear they had no intention of heeding the Reagan call for economic sanctions. Much of the Japanese economy is geared to exporting to the Soviet.

"INTERDEPENDENCE"

The most violent reaction to the Reagan anti-Soviet proposal came from the French, the French Prime Minister Mr. Mauroy stating that "The Americans have no right to demand sanctions from the Europeans, which would place heavy economic and social burdens on us, as long as they themselves are not ready to make comparable sacrifices." That type of statement must reinforce the confidence of the Soviet leaders that the flow of economic rope from the West will continue. Lenin said that a World (Communist) State was impossible until an international economy had been established. That economy is coming into existence, "interdependence" now becoming one of the "in" terms used by those

internationalists promoting the New International Economic Order. The main promoters are the international bankers, whose demands concerning the huge Polish internal debt helped to trigger the big Polish rises in food prices. The figures concerning big Polish food exports, these primarily to try to service debt, demonstrate that both Communists and non-Communists are working for the same international bankers.

Lenin strongly advocated the establishment of a centralised electricity grid system as a major instrument for creating the all-powerful Socialist State. He would have been delighted with the programme to pump natural gas from Siberia into

OUR POLICY

To promote loyalty to the Christian concept of God, and to a society in which every individual enjoys inalienable rights, derived from God, not from the State.

To defend the Free Society and its institutions - private property, consumer control of production through genuine competitive enterprise, and limited, decentralised government.

To promote financial policies, which will reduce taxation, eliminate debt, and make possible material security for all with greater leisure time for cultural activities.

To oppose all forms of monopoly, whether described as public or private.

To encourage electors always to record a responsible vote in all elections.

To support all policies genuinely concerned with conserving and protecting natural resources, including the soil, and an environment reflecting Natural (God's) laws, against policies of rape and waste.

To oppose all policies eroding national sovereignty, and to promote a closer relationship between the peoples of the Crown Commonwealth and those of the United States of America, who share a common heritage.

Western Europe. Even Spain seeks to import Soviet gas. The blindness, or worse, of Western political leaders may be judged by the claim by the French Socialist Government of Francois Mitterand that the giant Franco-Soviet gas deal gives France the opportunity of applying pressure to the Soviet. The hypocrisy of the policy makers in the U.S.A. has been demonstrated by the American Commerce Department quietly issuing an export licence to Caterpillar Tractor for pipe-laying equipment for the Soviet gas line at the same time that President Reagan was urging the Western Europeans not to participate in the project. The widespread neutralism of Western Europe no doubt partly, at least, reflects the view that it is possible to do business with the Soviet bloc. The former Communist, Vladimor Borin, described this attitude as "suicide by the balance sheet."

SOVIET ACHILLES HEEL

The major Achilles heel of the Soviet system is the constant failure to provide adequate food supplies. Reports from the Soviet indicate once again there has been a major failure in grain production, this failure coming at a time when the Soviet is providing vital food supplies to Poland. If ever there was a moment when the U.S.A. could give a practical lead to the non-Communist world in applying real pressure to the Soviet, this is it. The Soviet must increase its imports of grain, the U.S.A. being the biggest single supplier. But the American reaction to the opportunity is to announce that no grain embargo against the Soviet will be applied. American grain producers would be some of America's strongest supporters of

President Reagan. They would describe themselves as conservatives. But irrespective of what they call themselves, under present finance-economic policies, they are working to help sustain the Soviet bloc and to pave the way for the creation of a World State, which, if it ever came to fruition, would be a type of frozen global hell.

DEMONSTRATION

The Polish crisis has not only demonstrated that the West is unable to make even a token stand against each new brutal manifestation of Marxist totalitarianism, but has brought to the attention of those with eyes to see, that the basic source of power in the world is that of the international credit monopolists. They have played a decisive role in creating and sustaining the Marxist threat. And their all-pervading influence was demonstrated with the announcement by President Reagan that the U.S. administration was taking over responsibility for the Polish debt to the international bankers. Once again the American people are the losers, victims of those who exercise power without responsibility.

Douglas said that only a cold dose of demesmerisation would bring the great majority of people to see reality, even though many would not survive the process. The Polish crisis has brought a moment of truth, which will determine how many are to survive the coming ordeal confronting mankind, now moving into a period, which will decide the fate of many generations to come.

Social Credit Would Make Every Man A Capitalist

by Mr. Louis Even

The following article appeared in our issue of April 9, 1954. The late Mr. Even of Quebec, Canada, was one of the most brilliant exponents of Social Credit produced by the Social Credit movement. He was a born teacher and this article is an example of the clarity and vigour with which Mr. Even presented the case for Social Credit.

We have heard often enough of a national debt, and of taxation to meet the yearly requirements of the debt. But it took Social Credit to turn the whole notion over, and not only to rise against debt and taxation, but to demand dividends for all. What exactly do you mean by a dividend?

A common labourer may ask the question. A capitalist would not. The capitalist knows perfectly well what a dividend is. The worker knows better what wages are.

But dividends do not exclude wages or salaries. And wages or salaries do not exclude dividends. Industry distributes both; and the same person may receive both.

Mr. Jones has money. He invests \$50,000 in a Company to produce, say chemicals. But he is also employed in the Company's plant, as an executive, a manager, assistant-manager, accountant, or even as a simple mechanic. His employment earns him, perhaps, \$4,000 a year. The \$4,000 is a reward for his work in the plant.

The fiscal year of the company comes to a close with a profit. After allowing for depreciation, miscellaneous charges and a prudent reserve, the company declares a dividend of 6 per cent on all paid investments.

This 6 per cent will bring \$3,000 to Mr. Jones. The \$3,000 is not a reward for his work, but a return on his \$50,000 investment.

Mr. Jones gets both: his salary and his dividend, because he is both a worker and a capitalist.

Salaries or wages are tied up with employment. Dividends are not tied up with employment, but with productive capital.

Mr. Jones might choose to be only on the plant. He might in fact be resting in investor. He might never put his foot in Florida, or cruising around the world, while others do all the

work in the company's service. These others will be paid wages, not Mr. Jones. But if the operation of the company net the same profits, Mr. Jones will receive the same dividend, \$3,000.

That is pretty well known. And in many quarters, this distribution of dividends to the idle rich is severely blamed, when the poor can hardly get a decent living on their hard-earned wages. And now, you, Social Creditors, come with the idea of dividends to all, whether they work or not. Are you serious?

We surely are. And we stand on good ground, too.

Socialists, communists, class agitators, howl against dividends, against capitalists, against the rich, the parasites, who fatten on the sweat of the poor.

Social Creditors view things in another light. They do admit the right of the labourer to an equitable reward for his time and efforts, but they maintain also the right of the capitalist to

Only \$10,000 Required to Fill Basic Fund

With steady support from a dedicated minority, the League of Rights Basic Fund of \$45,000 for 1981-82 has moved past \$35,000. We stress that only a minority has supported the Fund, which means that the great majority now have to contribute only \$10,000 to fill the Fund and ensure that the League's on-going programme is sustained. As the crisis deepens, so does the work of the League become more important.

If YOU are one of the many who have not yet contributed, please rush your contribution away TODAY.

his dividend.

This stand taken, they go much further, because they have a far wider view of true capital. And they add: Every man is a capitalist; every citizen is owner of a productive capital; and therefore, every citizen, whether employed or not, should receive dividends proportionately to the part of production dependent upon this capital.

While Communism tears down capitalists and makes everybody a proletarian, Social Credit raises everybody to the status of a capitalist entitled to dividends.

Do I understand you well; do you mean that I myself, who never invested one cent in any producing enterprise, am just the same a capitalist entitled to a dividend?

Exactly so. You are a capitalist and should receive dividends. And your wife also. And every child of yours also. Myself, too, and my wife, my children. And every member of every family. Not excepting the ragged beggar, reduced to live on a crust of bread and a bowl of soup. And if that dejected man received the periodic dividend to which he is entitled, he could wear better clothes, eat better food, and be quite a different type of individual all round.

Wonderful as an Aladdin's lamp! But sounds too much like another tale of the Arabian Nights, indeed.

Not a tale, sir. But a fact. And you will hold the same view if you admit two statements:

1. That there are other forms of capital besides money capital;

2. That the heir is entitled to the benefit of his inheritance, even if he has not contributed to build up the inheritance.

Take the case of a farmer. He may possess strength, skill, knowledge and good will. But what can he make out of these assets if he has no farm? Place him on a square of asphalt in a city: his skill, knowledge and efforts won't grow a carrot.

But give the farmer a piece of land. This is for him a first capital, and he can begin to produce. Add tools, a plough, a pair of horses. With this much new capital, his production will increase. Bring in electric power, motors, a tractor: our man will produce still more, even with less labour. The capital does the trick.

His capital! Not his money. Money does not plough, does not sow, does not weed, does not reap. Money is just a token, which, in the hands of the farmer, would enable him to obtain the capital, the real capital, the means of production.

So much for the notion of capital.

And now, what about inheritance?

You know Charlie Kelly, the farmer beyond the bridge that spans the Willow River. His farm was just a stretch of forest a hundred years ago, when the first Kelly came over, felled the first tree, cleared the first acre, put up the first cabin.

The pioneer's son, Charlie's grandfather, enlarged the homestead, raised a herd of cattle, erected barns, built a real house for his family.

The third Kelly improved the fields, the stock and the buildings, leaving the whole to the Kelly you know. Charlie gets from his farm, with even less labour, far more than did his ancestor; he reaps the fruit, not only of his own work, but of a capital built up by three generations of Kellys.

Who will go and tell Charlie: "You are not the one who built up this farm; it is not the fruit of your own labour; it does not belong to you."

No, of course. The heir's rights are still recognised in our civilisation, even if today's governments are prompt to filch a portion of the earthly wealth left by the industrious man who is laid in the grave.

All that it O.K. but I do not see how everybody owns capital, even what you rightly call real capital, a factor in production. And how then can anybody claim dividends?

Come with me to this processing plant and witness the men at work. But you see also quite an array of machinery.

All those machines, which turn out production unceasingly and untiringly, are not run by hand. Not even by horses. You see the motor by each one: rather small, but how powerful!

Motors are capital, here, just like horses on the farm. And the machines also are capital. A productive capital. Some of those machines do the work of ten, fifteen, even twenty men, without resting for meals or for sleep.

Machines are capital. Very well. But they are the property of the company. They are private capital. They do not belong to you, or to me, or to the whole community.

We all agree on what I would call the material element of the machinery.

But in this machine, in this motor, there is the application of acquired knowledge. Without that knowledge, you might assemble pieces of metal; get a heap of steel, but no useful device.

The company has bought and paid for the machine. But it never paid for the scientific development without which none of these machines would have been possible.

This knowledge is an enrichment, ever growing, transmitted from one generation to the next. It is a common inheritance, from which all living persons of the present generation should draw some benefit.

This motor is kept running by an electric current generated from a waterfall. Who made the waterfall? Who feeds the water from the sea back to the mountain, to keep the waterfall in action? This waterfall is capital, permanent capital; and it is surely a common capital. In Canada, waterfalls are natural resources of the Provinces. So, each citizen of the province should have a share in the production derived from this common capital; without denying the reward to labour and other factors contributing to render this capital productive.

Speaking of the waterfall, why is a waterfall capital today, whereas it was just an obstacle to the canoe traffic of our ancestors?

The waterfall is capital today, because, some 125 years ago, men learned to transform the power of a falling mass of water into electric current.

This was not discovered without previous scientific

The Development of World Dominion

By C.H. Douglas

This work consists of a remarkable series of comments made by the author of Social Credit, in "The Social Creditor." As the drive to create the World State emerges more openly with every day that passes, this work sheds an increasingly brilliant light on how Civilisation has been brought to its present desperate plight. The penetrating scope of the wide range of comments demonstrates the great genius of the author. This is a handbook of permanent value for those who wish to oppose the submergence of the individual person into the collective. It is indexed in such a manner that the reader can quickly turn to any subject with which he is concerned. He will find that every comment will assist him to preserve his sanity in the prevailing madness, and indicate what is necessary by the individual to prevent himself from being used to serve the purposes of others, instead of his own.

From all League bookshops: Price \$2.55 posted.

acquisitions. Nobody was starting from zero.

Of course, the work of engineers and labour is required to install the hydroelectric plant and generators. And this work is compensated for in salaries and wages. But what of the part played by the accumulated scientific knowledge involved? Who can say that this factor belongs to himself exclusively?

Modern possibilities of production are enormous, compared to the possibilities of only a few decades ago. This is by far, more the result of progress than the result of increased skill or efforts on the part of labour. Oh! surely, the contribution of labour is still here, but the contribution of progress is a bigger factor. Now, progress is not private capital; progress is a common inheritance, common capital.

This common capital, an increasing factor in production, must earn some dividends for all, since it is a common good.

We cannot conceive of a child being materially neglected in a rich family. Why should any citizen be totally neglected in an age and a country where goods are abundant?

But is it not the task of everyone, through his own efforts, to draw for himself a share of the fruits of progress?

Say that to the increasing number of those whom the modern methods of industry leave without any means of production of their own. You might as well advise a man without a square inch of land to avail himself of the fertility of the soil.

The fact that modern means of production are more and more concentrated in ever-larger units, entrusted to a decreasing percentage of the population, gives more weight to the demand of a dividend for all.

Mass production is a fruit of technical progress. If this mass production does not favour the distribution to all of the means of production, a redeeming element is proposed under the form of a dividend to all, granting to all a claim on a share of the products.

Such a novel idea! But it looks logical enough, the way you put it before me.

And I might well bring other arguments to support the demand of a dividend to all?

You will admit that the Earth and its riches have been created for all men. Not for some only. Not for a class only. For all men.

But God, the Creator of all goods, leaves to men themselves the care of devising the means to allow everyone his share of the goods.

In our present economic order, not all have means to get their share of goods created for all men.

Without upsetting anything, Social Credit introduces this effective device: a dividend to all.

Who has ever offered anything better, covering the demands of all without exception.

There are perhaps people who will deny the right of everyone to a share of earthly goods, to at least the necessities of life. They will admit this right for the prisoner, not for the man at liberty.

Well, even outside of this consideration, the dividend to all comes as the only solution to a modern problem: How to distribute mass production, which wages, salaries and industrial dividends cannot buy?

It is a fact that the sum of wages and salaries cannot buy the sum of prices. And if you increase wages and salaries, you increase the prices, leaving the problem unsolved.

Some other source of income has to be distributed without adding to the prices. This means additional money not attached to employment.

Such money not being the reward of employment cannot go to some in particular. It must of necessity go to all.

The Social Credit dividend to all solves the problem.

A Practical Christian Confronts Caesar

There are large numbers of people, including those who call themselves Christians, who are verbally strong in endorsing what they claim to be principles. But faith without works is death. The strength and depth of an individual's professed faith can only be measured effectively by action taken to uphold that principle.

Mr. Robert Nixon of Western Australia, a farmer with a young family, firmly holds the view that man's laws must be subordinated to God's laws. He rejects abortion as murder of the unborn child. Large numbers of Australians feel the same way. But Robert Nixon is the first individual to our knowledge who insists that it is immoral for him to help finance by taxation government endorsed abortion programmes, and has withheld portion of his taxation in protest.

Last year Mr. Nixon made his position clear to both the Taxation Department and the Federal Attorney-General, Senator Durack. Eventually a summons was issued relating to the tax Mr. Nixon declined to pay. Mr. Nixon responded to this with a further letter to Senator Durack, stating, "...I have given notice to defend the summons 'T3183' that would more accurately be described as God's Law vs. taxation to fund murder of unborn babies. God's Higher Law of Love that protects life must not be subordinated to the lower money law that funds the destruction of life and forces taxpayers, against their will, to fund the crime of murder.

"I will not submit to a statutory tyranny that denies my obligation to obey God and I am prepared to accept the consequences of my action, but I appeal to you to seek protection for the unborn child whose life is threatened."

In a letter to the Governor-General, Sir Zelman Cowan, Mr. Nixon pointed out that he was prepared to pay his taxation assessment, but objected to part of it being used to fund abortion. Mr. Nixon requested the Governor-General to take

"appropriate action in accordance with our constitutional powers and duty to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II," concluding "I pray God's will be done."

OMNIPOTENT GOVERNMENT

Mr. Nixon has found that even lawyers who are professing Christians have not been helpful, in essence stating that modern Governments operate in a moral vacuum. This is the fundamental question confronting a disintegrating Civilisation today. There was a time when it was agreed that Caesar must, like the individual, obey a higher, Divine Law. That was what the Magna Carta was all about. It was the violation of traditional English Common Law, which played a major part in producing the American War of Independence. The American colonists rejected taxation without representation.

If there is no limit to the power of modern Governments to plunder the individual via taxation, the end result must be a barbaric tyranny. Rightness and justice in politics and economics will not be achieved until the scope of human law, imposed by Governments, is resolved. This is what Mr. Robert Nixon is concerned about. The future of the world depends upon how this question is resolved. If modern Governments can, once obtaining office, irrespective of what devious devices they use to achieve this end, do as they like without any restraint for a number of years, they could "legally" destroy people in the same way that the Soviet totalitarians have destroyed their victims. Critically commenting on the break

with the Christian tradition by the House of Lords in 1917, when it was declared that Christianity was no longer a part of the law of England, Sir William Holdsworth, Professor of Law at Oxford University, said after the Second World War:

"The Judges are obliged to admit that (Government statutes) however morally unjust must be obeyed... One might have thought that the excesses of the Nazi regime would have made our jurists realise the iniquity of such a theory of law. England's Attorney General at Nuremberg demanded the death sentence for Germans, who obeyed the Nazis, but back in England the same Attorney General said, "Parliament is sovereign, it can make any laws. It could order that all blue-eyed babies be destroyed at birth." Herod could not teach our modern jurists anything. They are grimly earnest — 'Laws may be iniquitous, but they cannot be unjust'."

Mr. Robert Nixon believes that the regeneration of a sick society must start with individuals accepting greater personal responsibility in all spheres. He is not asking others to do what he is not prepared to do himself. He states, "I therefore propose to fight the local Court summons to the best of my ability, even though legal opinion is that I'm wasting my time. If I lose, the bailiff will have to risk the publicity of collecting his blood money."

THE DANIELS'

The history of two thousand years of Christian history is studded with examples of a courageous few that dared to be a Daniel, thus inspiring their fellows also to take a stand on a basic principle. Already Mr. Robert Nixon's expression of determination to give a lead has shifted a few Christians to offer support. His stance could have widespread repercussions, raising the wider question of whether the individual should be compelled to finance policies, which he feels are immoral. A system of just taxation would ensure that taxpayers contributed only to that which had their support. Parents who do not wish their children to be brainwashed by "progressive" education in the State system should not be financially penalised if they elect to send their children to a non-State school.

Why should taxpayers be forced by Government to contribute millions of dollars in "foreign aid" to Communist and pro-Communist regimes, or to black tyrants in Africa? The totalitarian philosophy underlying modern Government must be challenged if the growing disintegration of Civilisation is to be reversed. It will not be challenged by modern parties, which increasingly bribe members with the spoils of office and retirement benefits, which are revolting. The challenge must come from individuals of integrity, courage and faith. Mr. Robert Nixon is one such individual. His case will make history.

Communism and "Capitalism" in Africa

by Ivor Benson

The following survey of developments on the African continent, by that most perceptive writer, Mr. Ivor Benson of South Africa, provides a most valuable contribution towards an understanding of the general global situation. It was written after Mr. Benson's visit to Australia last year and appeared in a double October-November issue of "Behind The News," issued from P.O. Box 1564, Krugersdorp, 1740, South Africa:

The task of conveying to audiences abroad the truth about developments on the continent of Africa since 1960 is reminiscent somewhat of the legendary Labours of Hercules.

Supplying information which people just happen to lack is generally quite easy. Far more difficult is the task of conveying the truth to minds already over-supplied with falsehood, minds that have been rigorously conditioned by 20 years and more of propaganda and pressure, minds mostly closed to further instruction.

Our own task in Australia, however, was made a little easier by the circumstance that our arrival coincided almost exactly with the commencement of the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting — CHOGM for short — which Prime Minister Malcolm Fraser hailed as being the "most important" conference ever held in Australia; for the antics and utterances of some of the African delegates (loaded pistols brought into conference rooms, car loads of call girls shunted from place to place, Mr. Mugabe's defence of the one-party state, etc., etc.) subtracted somewhat from their credibility and from that of the media which strove so valiantly to represent them all as genuine representatives of free and independent nations.

Their doubts, suspicions and curiosity thus aroused, Australians were more inclined to listen carefully and ask questions.

WINDS OF CHANGE

The revolutionary changes which have transformed Africa were given something like an official launching in January 1960 when Mr. Harold Macmillan, then Prime Minister of Britain, after a lightning tour of many African countries, delivered his memorable "Wind of Change" speech at Cape Town.

In this he warned that the Black peoples of Africa were about to shake themselves free from the shackles of colonial-

ism and emerge as free and fully independent nations.

Events that followed rapidly that year seemed to confirm the accuracy of Mr. Macmillan's prediction, as one former colony after another was transformed into what was supposed to be a free and independent nation, each armed with all the trappings of parliamentary government, each with a set of rulers elected on the basis of the principle of one-man-one-vote.

Nevertheless, as history records, the birth of several of these new nations was attended by much strife and bloodshed, as in Zaire (former Belgian Congo) and Nigeria.

As we pointed out to Australian audiences, a clear distinction must be drawn between what *appeared* to have happened and what *actually* happened.

There never was in Africa power of the kind that could have transformed the continent in a few years. There never was in Africa any indigenous power capable of sweeping away the colonial system.

On the contrary, all the power that has transformed Africa since 1960 has come from outside.

Thus, what has been presented to the whole world as the emergence of many free and independent Black nations was, in actual fact, something quite different: it was *an invading imperialism of money*, economic colonialism in a new and more sophisticated form.

For when in the long history of mankind was there ever "nations" which could not even feed themselves? And is it not significant that so much praise and encouragement should have been given to "emerging nations" in Africa at a period in history when in the developed areas of the world the great establishment media were unanimous in denigrating nationalism and discouraging and downgrading every form of political patriotism?

THE DARK CONTINENT

Propaganda on a scale never experienced before in history has succeeded, *almost entirely*, in concealing the truth that the regimes that were represented recently at Melbourne are all puppet or proxy regimes, each one wholly dependent on support from outside Africa.

Incalculable quantities of money and food and assistance in other forms have had to be poured into Africa since 1960. In spite of this assistance, the continent of Africa has become one of the world's disaster areas, with millions in constant danger of death by starvation, violence and disease, plagued with the world's biggest refugee problem.

The boundaries of the new African "nation states" should have warned us of the spurious and highly artificial character of the so-called "liberation" of the peoples of Africa. The Blacks themselves were never consulted about these boundaries which, in most cases, enclose several different Black nations, each with its own language, tribal political institutions and cultural inheritance — not to mention the many Black nations, each with its own language and cultural heritage, which have been split into two or more parts by the present boundaries.

It should be clearly understood that the people of Africa had no say whatever in the drawing of the boundaries of the former colonies, and that there was little or no disturbance of those boundaries when the colonies were transformed into "free and independent states."

Heroic efforts by the Blacks themselves to alter some of these boundaries were vigorously resisted by the external powers. Thus, armed force was used by the United Nations to prevent the Katanga province from separating itself from the rest of the Congo (Zaire), although this was undeniably what the people of Katanga wanted. And military force on an even bigger scale was supplied from outside Africa, mostly by Britain and the Soviet Union, to crush the people of Biafra when they chose to declare themselves independent of the federal republic of Nigeria.

There can be no doubt that it was external interests rather than African interests which were served by the preservation of most of the old colonial boundaries, for this enabled Africa's new masters, operating from behind the scenes, to make full use of all the administrative machinery set up by the colonial powers.

THE NEW SCRAMBLE

So, what is this "invading imperialism of money" which has revolutionised Africa, how did it come into existence, and what are its purposes?

For an answer to such questions, it is necessary to turn back the pages of history, back to the days when the different nations of Europe participated in what came to be known as "the scramble for Africa."

The same drama, it should be remembered, was being enacted in other parts of the world, especially in South-East Asia where vast areas, together with their peoples and natural resources, were parceled out among the colonialist nations.

In Africa, as in most other parts of the world, Britain got the lion's share, the most precious of the prizes being the Boer Republic of the Transvaal where gold in great quantity had recently been found, now part of the Republic of South Africa. The Germans got areas now known as South West Africa and Tanzania (formerly Tanganyika); the Portuguese got Angola and Mozambique; the French and Spanish got slices of North Africa; and the Italians took possession of Somaliland.

It is taken for granted today, quite rightly, that last century's scramble for possession in the so-called undeveloped parts of the world was economically motivated, all the areas concerned being seen as real or potential treasure houses of natural resources. As was only to be expected, the colonial powers set about exploiting the natural resources of their

colonies. In South Africa it was principally diamonds and gold; in the Congo diamonds and a wide range of raw materials, including oil from the palm forests, etc., etc.

It is also a matter of common knowledge that there was keen rivalry among the colonial powers as they grabbed their separate portions of the politically and militarily defenceless "undeveloped" world.

So far from being rivals clinging to their separate colonial possessions, the colonial powers participated quite eagerly after 1960 in the dismantling of the colonial system, which they had themselves so laboriously set up.

So, what had happened to make this possible?

A world change of enormous importance had taken place, unnoticed except by a few of the people at the top who "make things happen" and unreported by the media and the historians.

Last century, and well into this, finance capitalism existed in the world in the form of separate national concentrations of it. Most powerful for a long time was British national capitalism, at times in nervous rivalry with German national capitalism. There was a French finance capitalism, a Dutch finance capitalism, a Belgian finance capitalism; and so on, and so on.

It was these separate concentrations of financial power, which supplied the driving force, the money and the motivation, for the colonising enthusiasm of yesteryear.

What we have seen in our time is the internationalisation of finance capitalism, with the separate national concentrations of it running together like pellets of quicksilver to form a single global finance capitalism which today lords it over whatever remains of national capitalism in the industrialised countries, seeking to gobble it up as it has gobbled up the rest.

It is common knowledge that this global finance capitalism has given rise to innumerable international, or transnational, trading and industrial concerns, their products and services being likewise internationalised — giant mining and construction companies, hotels, business machines, etc., etc., all the way down to such seeming trifles as fried chicken and carbonated waters.

Consider, then, the difficulties, which present themselves to this global financial power and all its transnational companies as they view all the frontiers and boundaries, which were set up when the different national capitalisms were competing with each other!

For, what do all those boundaries mean? The natural resources of Africa were the possessions of the colonial governments and came under the jurisdiction of a number of different European governments, which, in their turn, were in varying degrees answerable to electorates.

'WORLD OF LIES'

The financial internationalists soon found an answer to the problem: separate Africa's natural resources from the jurisdiction of the governments and peoples of the colonial powers.

But how? This, again, was a problem easily solved: dismantle the whole colonial system; transfer ownership of Africa's natural resources to the Blacks; set up Black regimes of a kind so artificial and precarious that they can be easily controlled and manipulated.

Political parties and the news media in the metropolitan countries having already come heavily under the influence of international finance, with local financiers as its well-rewarded agents, it was relatively easy to set in motion that "wind of change" which Mr. Harold Macmillan had predicted.

Money and other assistance in every imaginable form were poured into Africa to help launch "Black nationalist liberation" movements, further supported by a whole

generation of rootless intellectuals, all hungering for some great cause that would give some semblance of meaning to their lives.

It is not enough to say that millions of quite intelligent people all over the world have been defeated in their minds by an ingenious form of psychological warfare — for a full understanding we need to know that it was done by means of a confidence trick as old as history and against which mankind seems to have no built-in defence.

It is a trick in which motives of avarice and lust for power are made to masquerade as motives of altruism and benevolence.

In Africa, who could resist a revolutionary campaign masquerading as "liberation", as the raising to proud and happy nationhood the former victims of "colonial oppression"? Liberation has certainly come to Africa, but it is not the liberation dreamed of by all the dewy-eyed idealists who helped to achieve it.

It is Africa's natural resources, which were *liberated*— freed and separated from the jurisdiction of governments and electorates in Europe, which could have prevented the international financiers and their transnational companies from operating with the maximum of freedom in exploiting the continent's natural resources, including its human labour.

What "liberation" means for the peoples of Africa is well described by Australian journalist John Monks, a close witness of the African scene after 1960, as "a trail of death, misery and destruction" which "sickened" him — as, indeed, it did other journalists who stayed to see it all at close quarters.

TECHNOLOGY OF ILLEGITIMATE POWER

However, the internationalisation of natural resources, their severance from the control of advanced nations and their electorates, is only one half of the story of what has happened in Africa since 1960.

The other half of the story has to do with *political power*, since obviously a globally concentrated money power is meaningless unless accompanied by a globally concentrated political power, which it can easily control.

For this purpose it has been necessary to create a vast number of spurious "nations," each with a vote in the United Nations General Assembly equal in value to the vote of the United States, or Canada, or France, or West Germany, or any of the other industrially developed countries.

In fact, Africa has been prolific in producing new "nations" and additional votes at the United Nations, which body must be seen today as a world-government-in-waiting set up by globally concentrated finance capitalism.

What makes these new "nations" so valuable as voting fodder is that, being independent only in name, they can be manipulated with ease, and their representatives quickly eliminated if they fail to perform as required.

It is the purpose of the United Nations or any other world government of the future, we may be sure, with its controllable voting majorities, to pass off as "world decisions" whatever policies the international financiers require for their own purposes.

Hence we have mini states like Rwanda and Burundi, valueless in terms of natural resources, and more mini states around the world like Vanuatu (population 91,000) in the Pacific, helping to outvote those highly developed nations without whose massive aid most of the new, so-called "free and independent states" would quickly vanish from the world political scene.

So, there we have it in brief! Financial and business power has been globally concentrated and needs for its survival a corresponding global concentration of political power - which it is now in the process of achieving. Hence, what has been happening on the continent of Africa is only a segment of

what has been happening all over the world, giving rise to "plans" like the New International Economic Order which has only recently broken surface, and the setting up of innumerable well-financed organisations like the Trilateral Commission, U.S. Council of Foreign Relations, the Royal Institute of International Affairs, etc., etc., all working for some form of world government.

For the thoughtful and concerned individual the battle line has been clearly drawn: it is a struggle between *Power Concentrated* and *Power Distributed*; power that controls absolutely and power that remains sensitive to the responses of those governed; in a word, it is a struggle against totalitarian evil.

BEHIND COMMUNISM IN AFRICA

Another very important part of the African story remains to be told — that part of the story which has to do with the expansion of Soviet influence on the continent.

Where does Soviet strategy fit into the total picture? Where does ideological Marxism fit into the picture?

On this subject of the relationship of super-capitalism and Communism, most people in the Western world are, to quote Shakespeare, "more puzzled than the Egyptians in their fog."

So, let us see what Africa has to teach us on this subject.

Last September, Australia's Prime Minister, Mr. Malcolm Fraser, as a climax to the meeting of Commonwealth heads of government, called on Australians to throw their weight behind the South West African People's Organisation (SWAPO) in its efforts to "liberate" South West Africa (Namibia).

Mr. Fraser must know that SWAPO has been massively supported by the Soviet Union right from the start and that its leader, Sam Nujoma, is a self-proclaimed Marxist. He must

PATRICK WALSH FOR ANZAC TOUR

The distinguished Canadian authority on Communist subversion and terrorism, Mr. Patrick Walsh, will be making a tour of New Zealand and Australia later this year. A former undercover agent for the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Mr. Walsh is internationally recognised as one of the World's top authorities on Communist subversion. Over a lifetime of practical experience, Mr. Walsh, who has a special flair for researching and assessing information, has worked in all parts of the world, and has lectured and written extensively. He was primarily responsible for the initial exposure of Pierre Elliott Trudeau as a top Fabian Marxist.

Mr. Walsh was not surprised by the sensational disclosure that Anthony Blunt, a type of cultural adviser to the Queen, had been a KGB agent, this followed by other disclosures concerning the KGB penetration of British Intelligence. As Mr. Walsh says, "What is new?" Prior to his Anzac Tour, a new book by Mr. Walsh will be published.

It is probable that Mr. Walsh will start his Australian tour following a short visit to New Zealand. He will be the guest of honour at the "New Times" Annual Dinner in Melbourne on Friday, October 2 and participate in The Australian League of Rights' Annual Seminar the following day. It is planned that Mr. Walsh will visit all Australian States, including Tasmania.

Australian supporters of The League of Rights, who would like to have Mr. Walsh visit their area, can assist the organisers of the Patrick Walsh Tour by forwarding their requests as soon as possible. They should write to The Australian League of Rights, G.P.O. Box 1052J, Melbourne.

also know that when the South Africans crossed the border into Angola a few months ago they found a command base manned by Soviet officers and that they brought back more than R200-million worth of Soviet arms and munitions.

Quite obviously, then, Mr. Fraser is not adverse to an expansion of Soviet power and influence into South West Africa.

Likewise, it so happened that Mr. Edward Heath, a former British Prime Minister, visited South West Africa shortly after the South African raid-in-force into Angola. He, too, was in no way embarrassed by all this proof of massive Soviet complicity in the SWAPO terrorist campaign, declaring that the West would continue to press for a "settlement" in South West Africa.

Increasingly enough, many of the delegates to the CHOGM exercise in Melbourne were actually-listed by the Australian newspapers as Communists, the usual "Mr." being replaced by "Comrade," and no attempt was made to conceal the fact that many of the new African states are being run on Marxist-socialist lines, like Tanzania with its disastrously collectivised agriculture.

THE DIAMOND CONNECTION

It is hardly necessary to expand on this theme. The terrorists who helped overthrow white rule in Rhodesia were Communist-trained, and no secret has been made of the fact that Mr. Mugabe recently imported military instructors and advisers from Communist North Korea.

So, how does this fit in with the fact that it was Lord Soames, a member of the board of governors of N.M. Rothschild and Sons, and Lord Carrington, Britain's Foreign Minister, another nominee of big banking interests and a Trilateralist, who installed Marxist Robert Mugabe as first prime minister of Zimbabwe (Rhodesia)?

South West Africa has more to tell on this most perplexing subject of the relationship of super-capitalism and Communism.

The vast diamond deposits in that country are owned and mined by De Beers, which, along with the Anglo American Corporation, forms part of the Oppenheimer mining, financial and industrial world empire.

It would be reasonable to expect the head of these super-capitalist conglomerates to tremble at the prospect of South West Africa becoming part of the Soviet Union's sphere of influence. On the contrary, Mr. Oppenheimer's newspapers in South Africa press relentlessly for a "settlement" in South West Africa knowing as they must that there can be no settlement acceptable to the Western powers, the United Nations and the so-called "front-line" African states which does not leave Sam Nujoma and his Soviet-backed SWAPO in power.

So, why is Mr. Harry Oppenheimer losing no sleep over the possibility of an expansion of Soviet power into South West Africa?

What most South Africans do not know is that while their sons and husbands risk their lives fighting against SWAPO terrorists and attacking SWAPO bases across the border, Mr. Oppenheimer's companies are actually operating the diamond mines in Angola, evidently undeterred by the presence of scores of thousands of Marxist Cuban troops and an internal security service controlled by the Soviet Union's KGB.

For good measure, Mr. Oppenheimer's companies also share with Tanzania's Marxist government ownership of the former Williamson diamond mine in that country. Not to mention the fact that De Beers through its central sales organisation handles the sales of diamonds produced in the Soviet Union — secretly visited earlier this year by one of the top men in the Anglo American mining-financial conglomerate, Mr.

Gordon Waddell, former son-in-law of Mr. Oppenheimer.

What this means is that international finance capitalism (something quite different from private enterprise capitalism) regards Communism not as a deadly opponent but rather as an ally, both dedicated to the obliteration of all national boundaries with the loyalties and preferences they enclose, as a prelude to their ultimate convergence in a totalitarian new world order.

How could it be otherwise when the Soviet Union, with all its industry and military might, is itself a creation of international finance capitalism - - a statement that has been proved beyond any shadow of doubt and has never been seriously challenged.

PRAYERS AND HERESIES

Do you believe that prayers are answered? The Christian will answer in the affirmative with conviction and sincerity.

Ask and thou shall be given. It seems pretty clear.

In all times and circumstances the Christian answer is a clear resounding "yes."

The point I wish to raise, and that alas urgently needs to be raised, is that this simple affirmation of faith, given a misunderstanding of prayer itself may constitute a heresy. The answer is correct, but only to the correct question.

Whatsoever thou shall ask in my name ... is not an open cheque. Whilst a just society is dependent upon the correct association between men, the answering of prayers is dependent upon the correct relationship between man and God.

"Whatsoever" that may be asked, is not inclusive of that which defiles this relationship.

To ask in one breadth for a win at the pools next week, to be bequeathed a deceased Uncle's Rolls Royce, and find one's shoes miraculously polished in the morning because one so hates that little chore, is nonsense and no prayer.

He in whose service is perfect freedom, ministers unto His servants. Prayers to this end, service, for an opportunity to serve, are answered, as, too, are the means to serve.

All else is a foolishness, a superstition, a "prayer" to a "God" which is not, an invitation to God (unerringly declined) to serve your gods.

Men have many gods, good health, wealth, power, admiration, means without ends. Prayers cannot go beyond asking an opportunity to serve, the means are implicit and well within God's powers to administer without reiteration, even without request.

In this is the difference between living prayers and the dead, between militant Christians and those who cry Lord, Lord, between service and self-service.

All the difference in (and outside of) this world.

Chas Pinwill

THE SWORD OF THE SPIRIT

by L. D. Byrne. O.B.E.

Shows how the course of history can be shifted by those with sufficient faith.
Price 50 cents.

"The divine right of the masses is about to replace the divine right of kings."

—Gustave Le bon, *The Crowd*, 1897