

THE NEW TIMES

VOL. 54, NO. 6

Registered by Australia Post- Publication No. VBH1001

JUNE 1990

Australia and New Zealand Edition. Published in Melbourne and Auckland.

THE REALITY OF NATIONALISM

by Eric D. Butler

C.H. Douglas predicted that the dream of a World State, a dream as old as man, was always doomed to perish under the impact of hard reality. But he warned of the terrible price to be paid as the inevitable disastrous result of all attempts to centralise power globally. Genuine evolution, said Douglas, was the result of diversification, not an artificial uniformity. Nationalism is a powerful manifestation of the striving of different groups of people to discriminate in favour of themselves, their history and their culture. With every day that passes, the nationalist factor is dominating international politics.

Faced with the hard reality of Hitler's invasion of the Soviet Union, and the early welcome in the Ukraine of the Nazis as liberators, and the desertion of large numbers of Red Army troops, Stalin forgot all about Communist rhetoric concerning internationalism, and resorted to appeals to the nationalism of the Soviet people. Stalin went further and appealed to the Christian influence which Communist brainwashing and terror had not been able to eradicate. The hard-pressed peoples of the Soviet were now implored to fight to preserve "Mother Russia". Hitler played into Stalin's hands by treating the Slavonic peoples as members of an inferior race. Polish General Anders claimed that Hitler lost the war against the Soviet Union when he ignored the nationalist factor.

It is the nationalist factor that now threatens to tear the Soviet Union apart. When nationalisation is closely linked with religion, it is an explosive force, one now manifesting itself right around an increasingly chaotic world. During a famous speech delivered at Copenhagen in 1931, Professor Arnold Toynbee, at that time Secretary of the Royal Institute of International Affairs, frankly said, "we are working discreetly but with all our might to undermine the sovereignty of our respective nations", also stating that he and his fellow internationalists were denying with their lips what they were doing with their hands. But Toynbee did concede that it was extremely difficult to erode the "mysterious" force of nationalism.

Whether Mikhail Gorbachev can survive the nationalist forces he has helped, even if unconsciously, to unleash throughout the whole of the former Soviet Empire, remains to be seen. But clearly the course of history has started to change dramatically, even in Communist China, where there is growing resistance in the Provinces to the government in Beijing, which in some areas is being almost completely ignored. It is only a matter of time before China enters the same period of revolt now being experienced in the Soviet Union. The centralisation of power contains the seeds of its own destruction, with extremely painful results when the centralised structure starts to break down.

THE CANADIAN CRISIS

The Canadian Confederation's crisis provides another striking example of the destructive effect of an attempted policy of uniformity with no constitutional provision for the separate regions being able to check the centralist policies of the Ottawa government through an elected Senate or any similar mechanism. It is

instructive to note that former Fabian Prime Minister Trudeau appears to be having second thoughts about the explosive results of a policy which he played a major role in initiating. Genuine French-Canadian nationalism has no chance of manifesting itself constructively inside a Canadian Confederation unless the separate Canadian Provinces have the power to run their own affairs without, for example, the Federal Government attempting

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.

to impose the French language right across the nation. A major feature of the Canadian crisis is the revolt by the English-speaking Provinces against the excessive influence and power of French-speaking Quebec through an excessively centralised Ottawa government.

As pointed out by those South Africans who are observing the upsurge of nationalism throughout the Communist world, the Nationalist government of De Klerk was turning its back on history with a programme based on the delusion that power should be shared by the distinctly different nationalities living in South Africa. The end result is predictable — growing violence ending in chaos. This is the situation confronting Gorbachev. Even the infusion of the long-awaited economic aid from the West is unlikely to dampen the rising tide of nationalist fervour. The election of Mr. Boris Yeltsin as President of the Russian Federation, who defeated a Gorbachev supporter, has further increased the tensions inside the Soviet Union. Yeltsin's proposal that an independent Russia can co-exist with the Soviet Union is in essence a call for the dismantling of the Soviet Union in its present form. Gorbachev has said, "The Soviet Union is unthinkable without Russia. If other republics try to secede we would survive", then asking, "How would we go on without Russia if it goes in another direction?" He charged that Yeltsin was trying "to cut Russia off from socialism". Russia is the core of the Soviet Union of Socialist Republics, and Yeltsin is now in the position to dismantle the whole Soviet structure by a policy of virtual secession.

Reports from the Soviet Union indicate that as the nationalist factor emerges, the different regions are attempting to decentralise their economies and to make economic arrangements with other regions independent of Moscow. A vast black market has always operated inside the Soviet Union and what is now developing is an extension of this type of economic activity. In the absence of the intervention of the Soviet military forces, it is certain that the forces of nationalism are going to continue to produce convulsions throughout the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. The convulsions will become greater as the programme for centralising power through an extended European Common Market is advanced.

AN HISTORIC STAND

Viewed against the background of what is now emerging in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher's decision not to make the final and major British surrender to the proposed United States of Europe, is one of the greatest historic significance in the battle for the world. Margaret Thatcher's stand is basically a manifestation of nationalism, one that in the long term will have far-reaching international implications in a rapidly changing world. If Australia is to survive as an independent sovereign nation, it must go back to its nationalist roots and reject the multi-cultural cult being fostered by the taxpayers' money. Anyone who doubts that the nation's roots are alive and awaiting re-generation, might ponder on the reaction to the 1990 Gallipoli celebrations and the enthusiastic response of young Australians.

Every public opinion poll provides overwhelming evidence that the great majority of Australians reject an immigration policy which threatens to fragment what has been a basically homogeneous people, and a Japanese financial invasion which unless halted can only end with economic domination of Australia. Australians should be encouraged to heed the lessons of what is happening in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union and to make use of a major part of their heritage, a political and constitutional system that was evolved to ensure that the people had an effective say about their own destiny.

IN ENGLAND NOW

From "*The Rock*", a journal for Anglican Traditionalists, edited by Bishop R.C. Crawley, 10989 Hillsea Crescent, Ladysmith, B.C., Canada, VOR 2E0.

The Revd. Dr. E.W. Trueman Dicken

I'm not a scavenger by nature, but it's a long-standing habit of mine to pick up and thumb through magazines and tabloids left lying about by other people in railway trains, dentists' waiting rooms, barbers' shops and the like. One learns a good deal that way about matters not usually thought newsworthy.

The quality press, of course, is obligatory reading, though even the best of papers frequently gets the story wrong. My own staple diet consists of the newspapers with the widest news coverage, so that although I know I'm often being misinformed, at least I know what it is that I'm being misinformed about. Thus alerted as to what may be important, I can turn to other sources of information.

The trash magazines and the gutter press, on the other hand, know of nothing, which hasn't a strong 'human interest' angle and preferably a tear-jerking picture. The editors print only the stories and opinions, which they know will appeal to their readers, and they command over ten times the total circulation of the more dignified press. Hence they commonly reflect the less obvious concerns and attitudes of an inarticulate majority of the public.

A NEW TREND

Over the past three or four years there has been a most interesting trend in the female-oriented columns of this section of the British press, one which is perceptibly but only gradually gaining momentum. It is a new style of feminism, playing variations on the theme 'Let women be women!'

One of its more striking manifestations is the growing number of freelance articles and letters to editors written by women who have had abortions, who have borne illegitimate children, who have been divorced, whose 'live-in boyfriend' has left them, and who now bitterly regret their earlier assertion of what they had thought of as the rights of liberated womanhood. They now realize that, at heart, what they most wanted was not a career or a tribe of male admirers but a home, a stable marriage, a family and domestic security. The underlying message to their sisters is a warning to learn from their experience.

I cite just one instance among a great many. A few weeks ago a women's pulp magazine, *First*, whose core readership appears to be the twenty to twenty-five year olds, published the results of a survey on the attitudes of female divorcees, nowadays a not insignificant element of the population. Fifty percent of those interviewed expressed regret that they had divorced at all; and, although this was not stated, it is known that the vast majority of divorces today are in practice initiated by the wife. About the same percentage of those who had remarried wished that they could return to their first partner, and some sixty percent of all those interviewed opined, with hindsight, that they could have made their original marriage work.

I can't vouch for the accuracy of the survey; I simply note that this kind of story is widely printed, and that what is printed is what the editor believes her readers wish to be told. And that is a matter on which no editor can afford to be mistaken.

SEXUAL DIFFERENTIATION IN THE BRAIN

At the end of last year this new anti-'Women's Lib' trend won the accolade of publication in a book, *Brain Sex*, which no commercial publisher would have touched even a year ago. Written jointly in semi-popular style by male and female colleagues, it

gathers together, with copious and highly reputable documentation, some of the mounting volume of current evidence that men and women are by nature radically different even in the structure and function of their respective brains. The feminists' tastelessly expressed claim that 'women are just the same as men, apart from the plumbing' is irrefutably disproved.

Starting from the fact, well publicized for the last three or four decades, that every microscopic cell in any human body is unambiguously differentiated by its chromosomes according to sex, the authors set out the conclusive medical evidence that the entire cerebral cortex of normal men and women is specifically oriented to the nature and function of the whole body according to sex. In other words, that part of the brain which most sharply distinguishes human beings from all other animals begins to perceive and think in ways appropriate to its sex within days and even hours of birth, and is well on course before any kind of training or social conditioning could possibly take effect.

Biological and psychological evidence establishes the fact, for example, that the areas of the brain associated with particular mental functions are differently distributed and developed in the two sexes, and that even the interaction of the two hemispheres of the brain is differently organized in men and women. Hence, for example, the natural competitiveness of the normal male, his preference for rigidly logical thought and his capacity for fixing mechanical devices are all notably more developed than those of the average female, and as deeply inbred as his female counterpart's greater predilection for gentle companionship, her sensitivity to the moods of other human beings and her preference for the nurturing activities which equip her for motherhood and for the care of a family.

A GUILTY SECRET OF THE SCIENTISTS

As the authors rightly say this whole complex of scientifically established understanding of sex has been guiltily hushed up in a society battered into acceptance of the militant feminist propaganda, which it totally undermines. One cannot but admire the courage of the writers of so unfashionable a book, and still more that of those feminist woman scientists compelled by academic honesty to publish results of their studies, which in the outcome confute the case they had hoped to support.

What is at last beginning to show through, in the words of *Brain Sex*, is that for a woman to try to be more like a man seems almost by definition to make her a less happy woman.' The typically male vices of aggressiveness and liability to casual sexual encounters, morally reprehensible as they are, have their origin in genetic biological factors, and by her very nature a woman aiming to compete with men on man's terms will most likely end up in tears, and lonely. By contrast, her capacity for unselfish love of husband and children, also biologically based, offers good hope of marital and maternal contentment, and indeed leaves male aggression disarmed in the face of feminine techniques for getting her own way in what, for her, is a matter of prime importance. The alternative, a home broken by aggression on both sides, is not only a personal tragedy but, multiplied a million times throughout the country, constitutes a social problem of massive dimensions.

PERSONAL TRAGEDY AND SOCIAL PROBLEMS

One such problem much in the news at the present time is the homelessness of thousands of youngsters of both sexes, especially in London. Having no shelter even at night but a cardboard carton under the arches of Westminster Bridge or some other bleak but comparatively dry spot, they live by begging, stealing, mugging, drug-pushing, with prostitution a further option for the girls and the more attractive boys.

Reliable statistics are impossible to come by, but of those who are questioned the overwhelming majority are the children

of broken homes, most of whom have run away because the mother, being single or divorced, has taken a new and, to them, unacceptable partner. Not for nothing is the wicked stepfather a legend in every nation's folklore: a man is not biologically disposed to take readily to children who are merely incidental to his self-interest.

Since the beginning of the century it has been the accepted wisdom of the trendy Left that, where there is a social problem, it is not the individual but society itself which is to blame, and it is the business of the Government to put it right. In the light of less biased scientific evidence it must surely soon be seen that, in fact, it is the ill-directed efforts of successive governments over many years which have brought things to the present pass. Legislation to promote the Permissive Society doesn't help people to see where their own best interests lie, nor promote the values of family life and good order in the social environment. Over much of the area, misguided attempts to make women 'equal' to men, rather than complementary to them, lies at the root of the trouble.

Sadly, the Church has for the last thirty years preferred to exalt a purely humanist conception of 'compassion' over the divine love taught in the pages of the New Testament and continues to urge the Government to encourage an ever more permissive lack of order. Today at last there is ground for hope that, in the field of sexual relationships, sanity may be regaining ground. The re-establishment of sound, stable family life is the key to much of our social malaise, and it is here that the Church should be leading the way.

* Anne Moir and David Jessel, *Brain Sex*, London (Michael Joseph) 1989,

CEDRIC JACOBS FOR CALGARY WEEKEND

Our North American readers will be interested to know that the Rev. Cedric Jacobs, O.B.E., Australian Aboriginal leader whose parents were tribal Aborigines, will be participating in the annual Calgary Weekend of the Canadian League of Rights, to be held in Calgary over the weekend of Friday, October 19th, to Sunday, October 21st, at the Port O'Call Hotel-Motel. Author of *"Healing a Divided Nation"*, Cedric Jacobs speaks out fearlessly against multiculturalism and other forms of collectivism.

Also participating will be Mr. Eric D. Butler, National Director, The Australian League of Rights, and Mr. Doug Collins, the well-known Vancouver-based journalist.

"DEMOCRATISING MONEY"

by Chas. Pinwill.

The world rings with the term "democracy". It is generally believed that the only type of democracy is political democracy. But political democracy without economic democracy is a fraud. But as Chas Pinwill shows in this original thesis, economic democracy depends upon the extension of democracy to what in effect is an order system for controlling the money - the "money vote".

This new, fresh approach should prove most valuable at the present time.

Order from all League addresses. \$5 posted.

THE JEWISH INFLUENCE IN THE SOVIET DRAMA

The distinguished American Jewish authority on the Middle East, Dr. Alfred Lilienthal, writing in *The Zionist Connection*, says that Soviet Jewry has been used by Zionist leaders both for blackmailing and for bartering purposes. Lilienthal's charges have been confirmed by the recent Summit negotiations between Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev and President Bush, where the question of Jewish migration from the Soviet Union was a major issue. Washington has been pressuring the Soviet to further liberalise its policy of permitting Jews to leave the Soviet, but also has expressed concern about Soviet Jews being used to develop further Jewish settlements in the Arab territories occupied during the 1967 War.

More than 33,000 Soviet Jews have arrived in Israel in the first four months of this year and the Israeli government estimates that a total of 150,000 will have settled in Israel by the end of the year. Egypt has warned that a new war threatens in the Middle East if the Shamir government continues with its policy of settling Soviet Jews in the occupied territories.

As unrest among the Palestinians continues, Palestinian leaders have urged that a UN Peacekeeping force be established to protect the Palestinians from further attacks by the Israeli military, with casualties continuing to grow. But this has been strongly rejected by former terrorist Shamir, who says that such a UN move would be a violation of Israel's sovereignty, indicating that Shamir and his colleagues have no intention of ever relinquishing their control of the occupied Palestinian territories.

While denying that the USA is prepared to take more Soviet Jews in an attempt to placate the Arab nations, USA Secretary of State Baker has attempted to defuse Arab anger by pointing out that the United States already planned to take 70,000 Soviet immigrants this year compared to 50,000 in 1989 and 14,000 in 1988. In spite of the Zionists' Messianic claim that Israel is the promised national home for the world's Jews, they have the greatest difficulty in persuading more than a small fraction of the Jews of the world to go there, or to stay, Soviet Jews also being extremely reluctant to emigrate to Israel. Many who have gone to Israel have returned to the Soviet Union, claiming they are much better off there.

Although Israel is almost completely dependent upon the USA for financial aid, Shamir bluntly refuses to accept the advice by President Bush concerning peace talks with the Palestinians. If it had the will, the Bush administration could use financial sanctions to bring the Israelis to the negotiating table. But to date no Western government has dared to resist the international Zionist terror machine. There have been suggestions that Israel has blackmailed the USA by threatening to use its nuclear weapons rather than halt a Messianic programme, which could erupt into a major Middle East conflict with dire consequences for the whole world.

THE REALITY OF RACE

"Racism -- by which I mean the expressed desire of people to associate with those of their own race in preference to others — is an enduring phenomenon which cannot be legislated or litigated out of existence. Indeed, the very persistence of racially distinct subgroups of a population such as ours depends upon the continued expression of racial preference in the selection of mates, a preference which none can deny exists and few would regard as illegitimate."

- Professor Glenn C. Loury at 1982 Seminar: *"Ethnic America: Melting Pot Or Mosaic?"*

ISI LEIBLER'S REVELATIONS

Mr. Isi Leibler, Melbourne-based businessman associated with Jet-Set Travel and Agency, Vice-President of the World Jewish Congress, is representative of a type of Zionist messianic fanaticism impervious to rational discussion. His philosophy is that of the one-way street, and he has over many years been a driving influence behind the anti-League of Rights smear campaign. Leibler cannot tolerate even the mildest criticism of Israel or Jewish policies, as witnessed by his recent response to an article by well-known columnist Mr. B.A. Santamaria.

Santamaria is a man who has gone to great trouble over the years to protect himself against the charge of "anti-Semitism". He has been a supporter of Zionist Israel. But in an article in *The Australian* of May 12, Santamaria listed a number of issues on which Jewish organisations were eroding the support of previously friendly groups. He listed support for the War Crime Trials as one such issue. Santamaria concluded his article with the standard protective statement that he was one of those who believed that "anti-Semitism is an unspeakable abomination". If Mr. Santamaria felt that this ritualistic cringe would protect him from Zionist criticism, he was soon proved wrong.

Leibler took the strongest exception to Santamaria quoting a statement he had made concerning the Jews in Lithuania. Leibler was quoted as saying that "In Lithuania and other Baltic Republics, I warned Jews at the forefront of the secessionist movements that they should stop trying to solve the national and social problems of Lithuania and Latvia and concentrate on the enor-

LEAGUE TO HONOUR BRUCE RUXTON

Mr. Bruce Ruxton has in recent years emerged as a type of Australian folk-hero, a man who talks the language of the rank and file of the Australian people, and has played a major role in the growing nation-wide campaign against the current immigration policy, multiculturalism and the "Second Japanese Invasion".

Mr. Bruce Ruxton will be the guest of honour at the first event of the League of Rights' National Weekend, *"The New Times"* Dinner on Friday, October 5, where he will deliver a major address following a suitable presentation to him on behalf of the Australian League of Rights. Every reader should endeavour to be present to pay their respects to a great Australian. There will be a number of other inspiring highlights at this year's *"New Times"* Dinner. Early bookings will be accepted. \$25 per person, this being inclusive.

Bruce Ruxton's Dinner address will set the tone for the National Seminar on Saturday, October 6, which will be devoted to the immigration issue, now increasingly becoming a major national issue. There will be a team of outstanding speakers to deal with different aspects of this question.

Sunday, October 7 will start with one of the most inspiring events in the history of the League, the official opening of the "Douglas Memorial Hall". Every actionist should be present to participate in this historic event, which will be followed by a high-powered action Seminar that will reflect the tremendous upsurge in League activities.

The National Weekend is the high-water mark of the League's national annual programme and a spiritual feast. Private accommodation, or other accommodation can be arranged for interstate and country supporters. But early bookings are essential.

mous problems facing Jews."

In a letter published in *The Australian* and *News Weekly* of June 9, Leibler said he rejected Santamaria's suggestion that his advice "implies dual loyalty and that Jews are being asked to be bad citizens and ignore the national interests of the countries in which they live." Leibler then went on to make the revealing statement that "Jews have a long tradition of supporting humanitarian and national causes — more so than Mr. Santamaria and his associates. We were at the forefront of the civil rights movement in the United States; we were represented in large numbers in the battle against apartheid in South Africa; and we have frequently been involved in Utopian and other left wing movements."

The essence of the remainder of Leibler's letter is that many Soviet citizens, having achieved their freedom from Communism "are now venting their frustrations over their former oppressors by turning on the Jews as scapegoats. . . ." Leibler says that after four visits to the Soviet Union in the past six months, he has concluded "the intensity of anti-Semitism among the people going back over centuries means that the only realistic solution for most Jews is to emigrate. In this context it is counter-productive for Jews to be at the forefront of internal Soviet national movements. They should first concern themselves with their own survival."

Needless to say, Isi Leibler does not explain that the strong

anti-Jewish feeling among the Eastern European and other peoples freeing themselves from some of the harshest features of Communism, is that Jews have been prominent in the Communist governments which oppressed them. And that Jewish influence is still strong. However, contrary to some Zionist propaganda, there is no evidence of any threatened pogroms against Jews. Zionist strategy is designed to shift large numbers of Jews out of the Soviet into Israel if possible. "Anti-Semitism" would be helpful!

With a breathtaking display of denial of facts, Leibler concludes by saying that in spite of any criticism of Israel, "the fact is that were Israel not there, Jews escaping from the Soviet Union would be begging unsuccessfully for visas from Western countries" The truth is that the majority of Jews leaving the Soviet Union do not want to go to Israel, and, if they do, then move out to other countries.

Zionist leaders have always seen the rank and file of the Jews as instruments to be used to advance their own power strategies. Clearly coming developments in the Middle East, Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union are going to push the Jewish Question to the centre of the world stage. As the famous anti-Zionist Jew Dr. Oscar Levy said a long time ago, the Jewish Question is of the greatest importance and must be discussed by every "honest thinker". Such thinking requires courage at the present time.

THE SURVIVAL OF THE UNFITTEST BY UNNATURAL SELECTION

by James Guthrie B. Sc.

James Guthrie of Tasmania was one of the pioneers of Social Credit in Australia. A man with a brilliantly analytical mind, James Guthrie contributed articles of permanent value to Social Credit journals. Under the above heading, he contributed a series of articles to "The Social Crediter" during April, May and June of 1959. We reprint a selection from them primarily for the benefit of new readers of "The New Times".

When men speak of evolution. "the march of events", "the trends in world affairs", or say "You can't stop progress", they are referring to the relentless onward march of some impersonal force, some gigantic machine, which they have been taught to believe cannot be stopped, altered or criticised.

There is magic in such words as Evolution and Progress which endows them with a mystical power which can be evoked as a kind of balm, or tranquilliser, to quieten the fears and suspicions of men as they stand helplessly by watching the rapid destruction of familiar land marks.

If people are induced to believe that progress is inevitable, and that evolution is always towards higher levels, then any change, however disastrous it may appear at the present time, can, under the name of this magic formula, be made acceptable (like a surgical operation) as being probably good in the long run; and any person who doubts this official view is looked upon as a "reactionary", "unscientific", and as possessing a "vested interest". It is very obvious that the words Progress and Evolution can be and are being used by those in control of governments to justify and cover up the ruthless elimination of any minority, institution or nation.

The reason why I am writing about progress at all is because I strongly believe that the Industrial Revolution placed into the hands of large sections of the population the possibility of very real and epoch-making progress, as opposed to the pseudo "progress" which is being foisted on a regimented population.

I believe that real progress, in terms of human satisfaction, human freedom and human dignity, is being deliberately held up, and a spurious "progress" of gadgetry, novelty and sensation is being foisted on a public specially educated to swallow it whole.

Progress in the industrial arts appears to be automatic that is if you ignore the flash of genius, which illuminates a new world

and gives birth to each new development. This progress is easily noticed and approved, especially if it is accompanied by an increase in the standard of living.

People believe that the spectacular results achieved in the industrial arts will be duplicated in other spheres of activity. This belief is justified if it is based on the assumption that the vast amount of time, energy and ingenuity invested in labour-saving machinery should pay a dividend in the form of some release from unnecessary and regimented drudgery, and should give men time to look after their own affairs and develop their own personalities.

The reason why so little has been achieved in human satisfaction from what men call Progress is because the industrial giant, from which most of the benefits were to be received, is heavily chained to something called Policy.

In modern society no large-scale operation can take place without the use of money. "Money is the starting point of every action which requires either the co-operation of the community or the use of its assets."

The money power, which controls the issues of credit, has a policy, which is made known to the public as "Full Employment"

Full Employment means that our civilisation is being deliberately turned into an ant-heap, where every man and his family is compelled to leave home each day and punch a clock in some place of employment. The fact is that a great deal of the alleged work is unnecessary, especially in the larger organisations; a great deal of it is merely making useless labour for other people, and to speak of the "dignity of labour" about much of this work would be facetious.

Full Employment is only being tolerated because it is the only means known to the public for obtaining the necessary money to buy the goods already in existence. When employment

stops, the money flowing into the community in the form of wages stops, so that in an age where an increasing amount of work is done by machines men can only be kept in employment by sabotage on a large scale. "The simplest form of this process is that of 'making work'; the elaboration of every action in life so as to involve the maximum quantity and the minimum efficiency in human effort". (*)

The best known method of forcing people to leave their homes each day and take part in uncongenial and unprofitable labour is to keep them poor, keep them continuously in debt, that is continuously behind in their payments. The banking system, by creating debts faster than it issues the means of liquidating the debts, can keep the people and their governments permanently in debt. This means the people are robbed of their legitimate reserves. Without reserves a man is robbed of initiative and the power to make decisions; he is not a free man, no matter how well he is housed and fed.

Manufacturers come under the same limitations, and are compelled to limit their activities so as to fit into a financial system, which has not been altered in essential details since the days of handcraft industries, when overhead charges for machinery were negligible.

In these days of machine production, when overhead charges constitute the major part of prices, the collective price of goods and services offered to the public is so great compared with the collective purchasing power in the form of wages and salaries, that few sales over the value of a few pounds can be effected except on "terms" - nothing down and the first instalment in three months time.

Because the artificial restriction of purchasing power is an automatic device for placing everyone, including governments, into debt, ever increasing debt, it places every country under the control of the only institutions which "can create the means of payment out of nothing" — the banks.

Another method of diverting goods and services from the homes of the people is by an unbalanced export trade.

A fourth method is by penal taxation.

That progress in the industrial arts has not been paralleled in other spheres of activity has been one of the greatest tragedies of the century. The great disappointment that no such progress has been achieved in the more important spheres of human activity has broken the spirit of many sensitive and experienced men. The acute disappointment that such a colossal expenditure of energy and ingenuity should produce so little in human satisfaction has filled the world with a strange sickness amidst its ceaseless activity. It is completely wrong therefore to believe that all movements, which call themselves Progressive, will lead to the freedom and independence of the individual. In all the most important spheres of human activity progress is not only *not* automatic, it is just as likely to be in the reverse direction, i.e., we might quite easily slip back many centuries.

As in the inorganic world, so in the organic world, the belief that progress, or "evolution" as it is called, is automatic has been exploited for reasons which we are now to discuss.

The fact that great progress has been made in breeding plants and domestic animals has induced people to accept the belief that if these changes can be made in a hundred years, the changes which have been made in a million years would be so enormous as to easily explain any change whatever.

The fallacy in this argument is that although a large variety of say, domestic dogs, may have been bred over the last thousand years from the wild dog; these dogs are still dogs, they are not cats or rabbits. Nor can they be made to interbreed with animals outside the "Dog Family".

I would say that the essential difference between a dog and a cat is not its size or shape, but its mentality. The more we change the size and shape of dogs "the more they remain the same

thing". This is not evolution; this is variation within the family. Men have come very close to breeding dogs that look like reptiles, but the poor little caricatures still try to wag their mutilated tails. There is no experimental fact for the belief that all animals evolved from one ancestor.

As one evolutionist said, "let us not give in to the temptation of saying: many things can happen in 100 million years. If *nothing* happens in a year there is no reason why, by multiplying *what has not happened* one million or a hundred million times, something will happen at the end of that time. There must be a starting point, no matter how humble". (ψ)

Evolutionists agree that any evidence for their theories must be found in the fossil record.

THE STORY OF EVOLUTION

The story of Evolution, which has been presented to immature minds in the schools and universities, is a story of a grand triumphal progress of life from the amoeba through various animal stages to modern man.

The man of the 20th century, with his motorcars, his television and jet planes is the crowning glory, so the story goes, of a vast process of millions of years of gradual evolution. He represents the survival of the fittest. Man is on the move and the move is always upwards. "Modern" man looks upon all previous generations with the utmost contempt, in spite of the fact that he insists that the evolutionary process, of which he is the end product, is an automatic process, which has no design and no mind behind it.

Evolutionists from Darwin's day to the present have been confronted with the fact that the fossil record shows that all the animals in existence today have not altered in any essential feature from the beginning of their existence on this planet. They have found no place on the face of this earth where the fossil remains show the gradual development of any animal. They have found no 'link' between one kind of animal and another.

On this subject Thomas Henry Huxley, in 1862, in his address to the Geological Society, said:

'What then does an impartial survey of the positively ascertained truths of paleontology testify in relation to the common doctrines of progressive modification, which suppose that modification to have taken place by a necessary progress from more to less embryonic forms, or from more to less generalized types, within the limits of the period represented by the fossiliferous rocks?

"It negatives the doctrines; for it either shows us no evidence of any such modification, or demonstrates it to have been very slight; and as to the nature of that modification, it yields no evidence whatsoever that the earlier members of any long-continued group were more generalized in structure than the later ones'.

In 1930 the evolutionist, A.H. Clark, wrote: (ψψ)

"One of the most striking and important facts which has been established through a study of the fossil animals is that from the very earliest times, from the very first beginnings of the fossil record, the broader aspects of the animal life upon the earth have remained unchanged".

Why then, in face of actual evidence to the contrary, do evolutionists stick to their theory of gradual evolution from the amoeba to man: they do so for one reason only and this has been generally admitted. They say "If we admit, as the fossil record clearly demonstrates, that there have been sudden bursts of activity, when creatures arrived on the face of this earth fully equipped for life for millions of years, without the need for any major variation, then we must scrap the ideas of the origin of species by natural selection' and 'survival of the fittest' and the gradual evolution by automatic impersonal forces. We are com-

pelled to postulate that the mind is not the end product of evolution, as we thought it is more likely to be starting point.

"Clearly we dare not admit this".

Here we come to the crux of the problem. The question of evolution is not a question of facts, or of 'Science'. I don't think that it is even a question of faith, as some writers suggest.

Darwin's theory of the "Survival of the Fittest" came as a 'gift from Heaven', or Hell as a complete 'cover', or justification, for the crimes of ambitious and ruthless men.

The 19th Century industrialists, who had changed the most sublimely beautiful parts of the English countryside into the most desolate spots on the face of the Earth, grabbed Darwin's theory hungrily. ("If Nature is ruthless man can be likewise"). Here was a complete justification for the most hideous crimes against nature and their fellow men; here was the complete answer to those proud men who objected so strongly to the industrial towns, the polluted rivers and the rootless proletariat.

Here was an answer to those who spoke of the sanctity of the "Moral Law"; the sanctity of the human personality; and the overriding importance of the spirit in man. Such people were impractical fools, let them keep out of politics, and economics; let them mind their own business and teach their religious ideas to old ladies. We are Modern men; Progressive men; Enlightened men; all the hard facts of Science are on our side.

The enormous expansion of industry and the amazing prosperity of Victorian England seemed to justify every claim made in the name of Evolution and Progress. But behind the facade of expansion and ceaseless activity there was clearly visible much to horrify intelligent Englishmen. The caricatures of human beings, which crawled from under the "dark satanic mills", were not the only or the most fatal casualties of that era.

POLICY

In 1920, when England was a hive of industry desperately trying to overtake the heavy losses of her "successful war", Montague Norman, the American trained banker, was placed in charge of the Bank of England. He immediately withdrew from a large part of British industry permission to carry on. He systematically reduced credit to all industries; the shortage of credit meant of course that some firms got none at all. The result was that many old established firms were destroyed; several million unemployed were standing in queues waiting for a dole. Being in England at this time and seeing the tremendous industrial activity suddenly slowed down for no particular reason, I realised then that scientists and engineers, businessmen and politicians had very little control over our destiny. Later I was to find out that what really counted in the modern world was the policy-makers behind Montague Norman.

Policy implies a mature decision to move towards a distant goal as opposed to the day-to-day decisions, which are mostly adventitious.

Just as the position of one point with respect to another may be due north, yet a ship voyaging between these two points may at various times, to reach its destination, move north, south, east and west. Analogously, events happening in various parts, although presented to us as having no connection with each other, and even presented as indicating the results of opposing policies, may all be directed by the same policy and may all lead to the same destination.

This insistence on the isolated nature of events has been consistently used in peace, as in war, to prevent people taking any precautionary action to protect themselves against coming events. This episodic view of things is the opposite to what is called 'military intelligence.'

"Military intelligence" means accurate information from reliable sources, which enables one to make reasonably accurate

forecasts of coming events, so giving one time to take adequate protective action. It is obvious that for many generations the British people and their political leaders either had not had any information akin to "military intelligence", or have not been allowed to use it. Accordingly they have been enticed into one trap after another, and have only escaped from ridiculous situations at suicidal costs. What that cost has been nobody has the courage even to guess.

The ordinary man lives from day to day in an environment he does not like nor understand; he lives in the sphere of the contingent — a life in which few important decisions are possible.

When we come to policy we rise above the sphere of the ordinary man; we rise out of the sphere of the contingent to where a philosophy determines not only the day-to-day decision but a decision aimed to reach a distant goal. Here we see the clash of giants; the clash between two philosophies. Our tragedy is that these two philosophies have been symbolised for us as a clash between Russia and America, between Communism and Capitalism; nothing could be further from the truth. No information could be more carefully designed to prevent people protecting themselves against coming events.

We are asked to believe that Russia and America are at "daggers drawn"; but the facts are that the Russian Revolution was financed by the wealthiest men in America, and the leaders of both countries agreed that the elimination of the British Empire was the first essential step towards 'universal democracy'

When "Americans" state that their policy is anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist they mean, of course, anti-British; and practically every move against the British in the Middle East, India and elsewhere has been heavily backed by "American" propaganda and dollars.

Whether you agree with this policy or not is not my present concern; the point I wish to make is that the British people have been kept in almost complete ignorance of America's consistent policy. Needless to say, the American people are in an almost similar position and, like the British, have no control over their national policy.

In one short life time the British people have seen destroyed the resources of hundreds of years of brilliant and courageous endeavour. They have been reduced, after two "successful" wars, from the greatest power on earth to a satellite of New York, and their continued existence as a nation left in some doubt. To this day the British people have not the slightest idea how all this came about, or who caused it.

They have been taught to believe that all these tragedies were inevitable, just a "modern trend" a fortuitous combination of "unfortunate circumstances", the operation of "blind forces" a demonstration of the principle of the "survival of the fittest"; Evolution in other words.

We, who have had the temerity to point to the long-term policy behind this tale of continuous humiliation of a courageous people, have been treated with contempt and ridicule. Had there been a tale of continuous success and prosperity, some British statesman would have come forward and claimed that he and his party were responsible for the policy, which made such desirable conditions possible. But to suggest a long-term policy behind continuous disaster, that is different. That would point to criminal intent, to some destructive purpose achieved, to some criminal mind behind the policy. This sounds "too diabolic"; this sounds "evil"; and "there is no such thing as evil in the material or animal world." In evolution there is no place for evil. Now you can understand why Darwinism now being absorbed under the mystic title of Progress, meaning of course automatic progress, became so amazingly popular in those quarters which alone had the power to make it universally popular.

The British do not realise that they are trying to operate under unnatural political and financial laws nor that these laws are governed by a fixed policy. Governments change, but the policy has not changed. Whatever the long-term plan may be, we can easily recognise the direction in which it is going — downwards; we can recognise the people who are being singled out for destruction — the British; and it is very obviously the work of people who have an inveterate hatred for what the British people stand for.

I have used the word unnatural with respect to laws, meaning by that a law, which does not fit reality, which is not part of the "nature of things". Such artificial laws introduce strange perversions, and in the attempt to meet hostile criticism, more laws of like nature are imposed on the helpless public. Thus instead of a few new laws to fit the revolutionary change caused by replacing man power by solar power, we have a multiplicity of laws based on conditions prevailing before the Industrial Revolution. The result is the disruption of society from top to bottom and a universal contempt for laws.

The managers of the factory which churns out these laws year by year, know very well that they lead to chaos and to contempt by the public, but any person who has the temerity to point this out, not only gets into serious trouble with his own political party, he gets into trouble with all official parties political or otherwise.

The persistence, over many years, of a course of action which leads consistently to disaster is neither fortuitous nor inevitable; it points conclusively to a consistent policy ruthlessly carried out against a people robbed of all defensive weapons; it points to the destruction of that vital integrating force which we call our cultural inheritance.

Our cultural inheritance consists of a body of experience accumulated over thousands of years, and handed down in practical form from generation to generation. It is designed for one purpose — the survival of the tribe or nation.

A well-integrated tribe, or nation, can seldom be destroyed by war, but they have been destroyed by "other means". Separated from their base, i.e., from their cultural inheritance, civilised man becomes more helpless than an animal robbed of all natural protection, hunted by machine guns. The inability of a virile, active and inventive people like the British, to protect their vital interests in any way whatever shows clearly how far advanced is their destruction by "other means".

The British are not the only people being destroyed; I have mentioned them because their history is more familiar to us. What is being viciously attacked and deliberately destroyed is the whole basis of Christian civilisation.

The halting of the allied armies at the end of the last war to allow the Russian hordes to enter and rape the capital cities of central Europe was probably one of the most despicable acts in recorded history, and is an essential part of the *same* picture, an essential part of the *same* policy, directed by the *same* men.

OUR CULTURAL INHERITANCE

"Civilised man is no better than primitive man — he is only more civilised." What is meant by this is that, although civilised man may not be much more intelligent than primitive man and is probably much more helpless, he has the advantages of a cultural inheritance, i.e., the advantages of thousands of years of gathered experience, "laid on" as it were, like plumbing in his house. This should ensure for him a vastly higher standard of living; but in return for this he becomes more dependent on "society" for the means of existence.

NEW ANTI-LEAGUE CAMPAIGN

The Zionist influence behind the carefully co-ordinated attempt to halt a League of Rights meeting in Canberra on June 2, addressed by National Director Eric Butler, and a front page report in *The West Australian* suggesting that the League was linked with the threat of violent "racism" in Australia, are part of a psychological campaign designed to prepare the way for the introduction into Australia of the type of legislation crippling free speech in Canada. The N.S.W. Greiner government's anti-discrimination legislation has paved the way for other States.

Our cultural inheritance manifested itself in what was called the "British way of life", or the "Australian way of life"; it represented the slow organic growth of a culture, which has been adapted to the country, the climate and the people. Our cultural inheritance hands on to each generation a vast treasure house of knowledge, especially that particular kind of knowledge, which gives men power over their government.

Since our cultural inheritance represents the practical results of thousands of years of human activity, any discussion of it can only hope to cover small fragments of the whole. Further, a discussion limited to one institution alone, however scientific it may be, must give a false impression unless it is interrelated with those institutions, which decide its policy.

If, for example, we select what appears to be one of the simpler aspects of our cultural inheritance — the use and development of tools — the discussion does not get us beyond the aspect of a new set of toys for the amusement of technicians, unless we examine very carefully why we make tools, and for what purpose we use them. According to all the political and financial leaders on both sides of the Iron Curtain, the purpose of tools (our industrial equipment) is to ensure (1) Full Employment, i.e., that labour-saving tools shall provide no leisure; and (2) that any increase of production shall be exported, i.e., that labour-saving tools shall produce no profit for the ordinary man, his family or his country.

It should be noticed how violent is the contrast between the official policy and the policy of private individuals. In fact this official policy is so contrary to all human aspirations, so contrary to everything, which our cultured inheritance was designed to give us, that it can only be enforced by brute force and fraud.

Throughout history, ambitious men have caught a glimpse of the tremendous power, which lay in that vast treasure house of knowledge, which we call our cultural inheritance, and they have seen in the institutions of the group the perfect instrument for exercising absolute power over their fellow men. History is the story of how society has tried to protect itself against such men.

There are two main reasons why no nation has been able to build a constitution capable of protecting itself against the usurpation of power by a small group; one is the general lack of correct information concerning the nature of "democracy", and the other is ignorance of the over-riding power of financial control. I propose, therefore, to examine these two vital problems.

(to be continued)

UTOPIA

"The comprehensive Utopia is the result of the organised centralisation of the will-to-power. Its defeat and our escape from it cannot be by way of alternative Utopias of the 'planned' variety, but by the organic growth resulting from its progressive decentralisation"

— C.H. Douglas.