

THE NEW TIMES

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

VOL. 57, No. 10

Registered by Australia Post-Publication PP 381667 100259

OCTOBER 1993.

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

A FALSE INTERNATIONALISM

by Eric D. Butler

The time has come for a more precise definition of the term "internationalism", which has been perverted from its true meaning. Derived from the Latin, "inter", means "between". True internationalism is an association of sovereign nations. That which today masquerades as internationalism is in reality an attempt to establish "supranationalism", a world in which there is a power above nations. The question is of far more than mere academic interest; it concerns the future of the world, particularly those nations whose roots are in the United Kingdom.

The idea of a New World Order, a type of World State reflecting some Utopian ideal, is as old as man. C.H. Douglas went to the core of the human drama when he wrote in 1943 *"There is really only one major issue at stake in the world today. All others are derivatives. That issue is whether, or not, it is possible to impose a Utopia from above, a proposition which involves a standardised human being which it would be incorrect to call an individual . . . the opposite conception is that each human being is to some extent unique and that the common interest is best served by assisting him to work out his own Utopia, and to discourage him from imposing it on his neighbour."*

THE MENACE OF IDEALISM

The fact that most of those directing the Communist movement were criminal gangsters obscures the fact that they were Utopians; they had a concept of a World State built in accordance with their view of an ideal world. Idealism is another term which requires a more accurate definition than that generally accepted. It was the brilliant Jewish writer and philosopher, Dr. Oscar Levy, a man who incurred the bitter wrath of the Zionists, who observed that: *"The ideal is the enemy of the real"*. Most liberals, generally basically decent and well-meaning people, are idealists.

While the Greek and Roman civilisations prepared the ground for the development of what became Western civilisation, they both ultimately collapsed because they failed to come to grips with the reality concerning power, that, in the famous words of Lord Acton, *"tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely"*. The great driving force behind the growth of Western Civilisation was Christianity, whose central teaching gave the individual a status never previously known. Every individual was unique and counted. This was a reflection of realism, not idealism, and in practice completely changed the course of human history. The most significant development was in England where over time there evolved a constitution rooted in the Christian concept of reality. The subject is of the greatest importance when Prime Minister Keating of Australia has played a major role in setting in motion a campaign to turn Australia into a Republic and to eliminate the Crown.

QUEEN IS A VITAL SYMBOL

The pro-Republican committee, established by Prime Minister Keating under the Chairmanship of lawyer and

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) Law, against policies of rape and waste.

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

merchant banker Mr. Malcolm Turnbull, to report on the Republican issue, claims that the Queen could be replaced as head of State with "minimal" impact. Apart from other considerations, the Queen is a symbol of a stream of history, which was taking Mankind towards a genuine internationalism, in which a group of sovereign nations shared a common heritage, which they manifest in diversity. The British Empire was the first Empire in history, which grew out of the concept of decentralising power instead of centralising it. The result was a demonstration that true unity in human affairs stems from diversity, not uniformity and centralisation. In their drive to create their version of a world Utopia, the Communist strategists made no mistake when they stressed that the British Empire was the major obstacle to their programme, and devoted an enormous amount of attention to undermining what was a unique association of peoples sharing the same constitutional and cultural roots.

Every student of history well understands the importance of those symbols, which reflect the life and growth of a people. Destroy the symbols and there is an erosion of belief in the reality those symbols reflect. The Australian flag grew out of Australian history, and reflected the reality that Australia's cultural and constitutional roots are in the United Kingdom. While the Crown is a central feature of a constitution, which offers a major check to the centralisation of power, the Queen is much more than a mere figurehead who happens to have been born in England; she symbolises the heritage which is shared by the peoples of the Crown Commonwealth. Dispense with that symbol, as proposed by the Republicans, and Australians cut themselves off from their roots. The Crown is the custodian of the soul of the nation. The crosses on the Union Jack in the Australian flag symbolise the Christian roots of the United Kingdom. It would be an act of cultural and spiritual vandalism to throw those symbols away, an act for which Australia would pay a fearful price.

DRIVEN BY ANTI-BRITISH SENTIMENT

For some strange reason, Prime Minister Paul Keating says that his Roman Catholicism makes it necessary for him to support Republicanism, a statement that has outraged a number of prominent Australian Roman Catholics. Distinguished columnist, B.A. Santamaria, and author of a biography of the Irish-born Melbourne Archbishop Daniel Mannix, pointed out that even though Mannix had been arrested by the British during the First World War, he was a strong admirer of the British system of constitutional government. Every mature Christian understands the central role of the Pope in the Roman Catholic communion. Presumably Roman Catholic Paul Keating does not reject the authority of the Pope because he happens to be a Pole? Much as he now seeks to deny it, Paul Keating is driven in part by a strong anti-British motive, as witnessed by his attempt to re-write history of the Pacific War to the detriment of the British.

Time - and it may be much shorter than he realises! - will eventually remove Prime Minister Paul Keating from the political stage. But those forces, which he serves, will continue with their campaign against the Crown, which they seek to destroy in every Crown Commonwealth nation. They clearly believe that if the Crown and the Monarchical system of government can be destroyed in Australia, it can be destroyed in New Zealand, Canada and ultimately in the United Kingdom. The driving force behind this campaign is a Messianic dream of establishing some type of New World

Order. While the Crown remains, it provides a continuing thread of unity for those who continue to support it, and what it represents. The British Empire was the truest example of genuine internationalism the world has yet seen. Rather than passively permit what is left of this unique historical development to be destroyed by the Keatings and similar vandals, a determined and sustained effort must be made to give it new life. Australians are best placed to lead.

DAVID IRVING SCORES HEAVILY

David Irving's appeal to the full bench of the Australian Federal Court in Perth resulted in a major victory for the British historian. The Court unanimously found in his favour and awarded him costs. One of the judges said that David Irving had been denied "natural justice". Former Immigration Minister Gerry Hand, who had been responsible, under intense Zionist pressure, for denying Irving entry into Australia, complained about the decision. Zionist spokesmen were far from happy, Mr. Isi Leibler stating that while accepting the ruling of the court, "we hope he (Irving) will not come and that, if the government is in the position to do so, it will remain firm with its ban." Mark Leibler is quoted by *The Australian Jewish News* of September 29, as saying that judicial proceedings on the government's refusal to issue Irving with a visa, had "*not necessarily reached the end of the line*".

But there are strong indications that the Zionist leaders in Australia intend to proffer a much lower profile on the Irving question. Media reports quote David Irving as saying that he will be visiting Australia in the first part of next year. Irving's Australian representatives decline at this stage to give details.

Copies of David Irving's dramatic video film, "*The Search for Truth in History*", is still available. This is one of the greatest addresses of its kind ever given. It is available from all League bookshops. \$35.00 posted.

PURITANISM

It is very often asked by people who would admit practically the whole of what I have been saying: If this is so, what is the idea of refusing to remedy this system in such a way that it would produce the desired results? The answer that I shall give you will, no doubt, surprise you. It is certainly the answer I would give if someone were to ask me for a reason in one word - and that word is *Puritanism*. I have no doubt that will surprise you; that is probably not the word you were expecting. Now, when I say Puritanism, I don't of course refer to that desire for an honourable, simple and reasonable and decent life, which, if . . . not overstrained, I should say we should all probably agree as sensible and proper . . . What is really historical and on a good many hands admitted to be the thing, which underlies what I refer to as Puritanism, is that conviction that no man can be trusted to run his own affairs. That man was, as you might say, born into the world to be ruled. "Run and see what Johnny is doing and tell him he mustn't"!

- C.H. Douglas.

PRINCE CHARLES SUPPORTS FRENCH RURAL CULTURE

The address by His Royal Highness, the Prince of Wales, on the occasion of his admission to the "Academie Des Sciences Et Politiques", in Paris on December 4, 1992, was regarded with strong disfavour by the British government and the internationalists. Prince Charles asked the question, "Do we really need to compress the traditions and vitality of rural life and culture into the straight-jacket of an industry like any other?" The following is the complete text of what Prince Charles had to say:

Membres de l'Academie, Messieurs, Mesdames,

It is a very great privilege to have been invited to become your foreign associate member, and I am deeply grateful to the Academic for the honour you have bestowed on me. I only hope that by the end of these proceedings you will not have regretted your decision! Deciding what I should say to you this morning has not, as you can perhaps imagine, been an easy task. "Don't mention the GATT negotiations", I was told, "or the Community budget; or Maastricht; or sheep meat". I do not always do as I am told, but I thought that today I might talk a little about other things; about knowledge, about the use we make of it, and about the use we ought to be making of it.

We are meeting, I believe, at a momentous period in human history. As a lately evolving species in the majesty of creation, we now have two unique qualities. We have the power to transform the very life-blood of the Earth, and the wisdom to recognise and reflect on that power. And yet, precisely at the time when the human spirit should be opening out to embrace the dramatic changes which are taking place in the scientific, intellectual and sociological contours of our lives, life is still going on almost exactly as it did before; indeed, our innate, inherited wisdom tells us that there is a sense of dislocation between our knowledge and the manner in which we are responding to that knowledge.

What are the realities of contemporary life, as our knowledge and the technical means now available to refine and communicate that knowledge, reveal them to us?

A decade of authoritative reports, culminating in the *Earth Summit* held in Rio in June of this year, has revealed what some of us have long feared, that the resources of our planet are being so used and misused that mankind is no longer living off the interest of the Earth, but off its capital.

We continue to base our economic practices on the pursuit of growth, in a manner which is not only unsustainable in ecological terms, but also incurs a host of other costs; growing wealth differentials, an unhealed divide between North and South, a horrendous debt burden, the creation of an under class in many industrialised countries, and the prospect of chronic unemployment, especially among the young, continuing indefinitely into the future.

At the social level, we are wrestling with universal problems of urban growth and rootlessness, depressingly illustrated by the indices of social despair, drug addiction, alcoholism, mental illness and violence.

Ecologically, economically, and socially, the empirical evidence of unprecedented difficulties ahead seems irrefutable. If we are to change our ways, to follow the agrarian and industrial revolutions with what one might call a sustainability revolution, we have less than a generation to establish its essential credentials. To suppose anything else is to ignore

reality and to neglect our responsibilities towards those who come after us.

And yet I do not think I am alone in believing that the evidence is being ignored, that people are reluctant to rock the boat for fear of spilling themselves out into a hostile sea, along with all the illusory baggage of life with which we now encumber ourselves. There is a disturbing readiness to rule out precautionary action in favour of waiting until disaster occurs - and then inadequately and belatedly trying to pick up the pieces.

I thought I might illustrate what I am trying to say by looking at one or two areas in which this sense of dislocation strikes me as both obvious and disturbing. The first - and perhaps the most dangerous to address before this distinguished gathering - is that of contemporary thought.

The classical philosophers, it always seemed to me, displayed a great deal of wisdom, even if their technical knowledge was later shown to be seriously flawed. Aristotle's view of the Earth as the hub of a series of concentric shells, which fitted inside each other and rotated at different speeds provided a framework for a comfortable - and in many ways beneficial - belief that the Planet Earth, and the human race, were at the heart of all existence.

This basic concept remained dominant until the middle of the 16th Century. Then came Columbus, demonstrating that the World was not flat after all; Copernicus, who confirmed that the earth rotated round a stationary sun, rather than vice versa, and of course Galileo. The Age of Reason was with us. Rene Descartes' view that everything in the world apart from the human mind was lifeless clockwork gained general currency.

Today the scientific revolution of the 16th and 17th Centuries is recognised as having been incomplete, in that it was mechanistic, atomistic, and took no account of the historical context. And yet, even though the gradual development of the quantum theory over the last 70 years has done so much to show that the Cartesian approach was scientifically as well as spiritually incomplete, virtually every Western institution continues to function on the tried and tested "enlightenment model".

In fact, contemporary science is revealing a world based on interconnectedness rather than separation, on relatedness rather than the distinct atomistic entities favoured by the rationalists. Those reassuring atoms of old-style materialism - hard, permanent particles of matter moving around in a void - simply don't exist. Instead, we have to come to terms with wave packets, quarks and cosmic super string! Translated, this means that Science has definitively demonstrated the dangerous limitations of Descartes' dualistic vision of mind and body. Science commentators tell us about these findings with all the awe and wonder they deserve, making clear that they should be revolutionising the way in which we think. But, in practice, little seems to change!

Does it really matter, one might ask, if the implications of this post-Cartesian consensus are being extensively ignored? It might not, but for the fact that the workings of human society

are so profoundly influenced by prevailing scientific orthodoxy.

The birth of modern science was, after all, accompanied by the birth of the spirit of capitalism. Adam Smith's model of progress based upon each individual maximising his or her self-interest to ensure the prosperity of all has fared better in the test of time than Karl Marx's alternative - a system which has never come close to creating a free or classless society in which the oppressive organs of the state would wither away.

There is much empirical evidence, nonetheless, that we need to move on from Smith's concept of society seen simply as an arbitrary aggregate of individuals held together by no more than a Lockean sense of "social contract". But has anyone given serious thought to the political implications of leaving behind the atomistic view of human relations, which has prevailed throughout the industrial era? If individuals must now be seen as unique but integral parts of the whole, are not many of the economic and social premises on which our models of progress today are based severely flawed?

Then, of course, there is the question of our traditions, our familiar values. Before our very eyes, much that we know to be of importance is destroyed, undermined, and replaced in the name of scientific progress. And yet one cannot help wondering whether, for example, it really has been necessary - in my own country at least - for us to deny our children the same opportunity to read, write and appreciate their literary heritage that was available to their predecessors, simply because the human intellect has decided that it knows more about education than it thought it did 30 years ago.

In the architectural sector, we now have at our disposal materials, which make possible the engineering of buildings of the most remarkable shapes and sizes. But does this, when combined with the existence of a generation of architects often as interested in making statements about themselves as in creating fine buildings, mean that the wisdom, balance, humility and reverence of previous builders have to be cast onto the scrap heap of history?

Because of the imperatives of trade, and the unyielding rigours of "comparative advantage" do we really need to compress the traditions and vitality of rural life and culture into the straightjacket of an industry like any other?

One of the joys for me of being in France is that you have a particularly strong sense of those traditions - and of the ultimate cost to the human spirit of unrelenting migration from the countryside to the big cities. France, it seems to me, sets the rest of us an inspiring example of civilised values perpetuated and nurtured within an overall cultural approach to life and underpinned, I believe, by giving due importance to the kind of rural traditions without which it would be impossible to enjoy a way of life that recognises (both in the countryside and the town) the importance of elements in our lives which enrich and ennoble us, but which are not "cost-effective" in strictly economic terms. Guy de Maupassant described the essence of this culture far more eloquently than I even could, when he wrote in *Le Norla* a hundred years ago of "*Ces profondes et délicates ses aieux, qui l'attachent a ce que Von pense et a ce que Von mange, aux usages comme aux nourritures, aux locutions locales, aux intonations des paysans, aux odeurs du sol, des villages et de lair lui-meme*".

In each of the areas I have touched upon - contemporary

thought, traditional values and culture - there is evidence, in my view, of society being fully aware of a new set of realities but failing, so far, to match that awareness with an appropriate response. It is as if we have succeeded in inventing new hardware, but have not so far found the right software to make it function. Our arrogance inflated by the enlightenment, and by the belief that we have all the answers and can pull any levers we wish, we have discarded our old cosmology, alienating ourselves, to a large extent, from God, from nature, and from our roots. But we have yet to define a new cosmology, a proper sense of purpose.

This is, it seems to me, a fining challenge for all that talent within the intellectual elite of Western society which has spent the last few decades engaged in intensive but now, surely, fruitless debate about the intricacies of Marxist theory.

Is there not now a need to confront the realities of the post-Marxist world in a constructive and purposeful way; and to convince those communities which have only recently signed up for western liberal democracy that they have indeed made the right choice, despite the shortages, the cruel pressures of consumerism, and the painful process of adjustment to a new way of life?

The scientists will be glad to point the way, with their theories of interconnectedness, purposeful evolution, and quantum physics. But it is not always necessary to complicate the vision. Time after time astronauts have drawn on their unique experiences to provide valuable insights for political leaders, encouraging them to see that the planet we share unites us in a far more basic and important way than any differences of colour, creed or geography divide us.

As an example, I should like to quote you a few words from Gene Cernan, who had the privilege to be the last man to walk on the Moon in 1972. "*I stood in the blue darkness and looked in awe at the Earth from the lunar surface,*" he wrote, "*What I saw was almost too beautiful to grasp. There was too much logic, too much purpose - it was too beautiful to have happened by accident.*"

We are looking, it seems to me, for a new philosophy based not only on seeking a proper balance between the information that is now at our disposal and how we should respond to it, but also on a proper sense of responsibility, or reverence, for the planet we have inherited and are charged with handing on in good repair to our successors. We are talking not of philanthropy or charity, but of hard-nosed, self-interested action by the human race, designed to do no less than ensure the future survival of the species.

In the process, I hope we shall not forget that the stock of what I will call human wisdom is much the same today as it was in Aristotle's day, and that we neglect at our peril the human and spiritual dimensions of the values and traditions which have been handed down to us over the generations. Antoine de Saint-Exupery had none of the scientific evidence of interconnectedness at his disposal when he wrote "*Terre des Hommes*", but I should like to leave to him the responsibility of summarising the essence of what I have been trying to say today: "*On meurt pour une cathedrale, nor pource des pierres. On meurt pour un peuple, non pour une foule. On meurt par amour de l'Homme, a'il est clef de voute d'une Communaute. On meurt pour cela seul dont on peut vivre.*"

ATTACKING THE LIBERAL CENSORSHIP

by N. A. Hunt

"The struggle of our time is to concentrate, not to dissipate; to renew our association with traditional wisdom; to re-establish a vital connection between the individual and the race. It is, in a word, a struggle against Liberalism".

T.S. Eliot: Article in *The Criterion*.

League of Rights members know well that their views are those of a minority, disapproved of particularly by politicians, the media and academics. Every one of our beliefs clashes with their multi-racial, integrationist and egalitarian blueprint for the Australia of tomorrow.

Thus, what League members are doing is to stage a rebellion against the liberal mindset, which has done so much to destroy the West. History teaches us that a rebellion, which stands on the defensive, is doomed. To succeed, we must attack, grasp the initiative, force the establishment to react to our actions. Too often, we react to theirs. We must reverse this, attack vigorously to expose the many chinks in the armour of the liberal minority.

If we do not take the initiative, if we remain permanently on the defensive, then we are in the hopeless position of a tiny voice preaching to the converted; our message unheard by the people whom it is designed to save from multiculturalism and from eventual world slavery.

Few sights are more pleasing than that of the all-powerful liberal establishment forced on to the defensive, obliged to justify untenable beliefs and trying hard to conceal the fact that it censors our knowledge and stifles our right to know. Once shown up as the repressive bigots, which they are, liberals lose much of their power to intimidate.

The liberal stronghold is more vulnerable than many think. It holds the majority captive by the exercise of a very complete, very powerful and never mentioned censorship of all subjects of which it does not approve. Yet those subjects are the very ones, which we wish the public to know more about.

The liberal censorship is so powerful and all pervading that it is easy to forget that liberals do not, as they pretend, represent a majority view. They are in fact a sick minority of a minority, which hates its own race and culture and works untiringly to destroy both. We should make this point whenever it is possible to do so. There is nothing new about this liberal censorship, nor is it confined to Australia. As long ago as 1790 that acute observer Edmund Burke, (in *"Reflections on the French Revolution"*) wrote: **"Because half a dozen grasshoppers under a fern make the field ring with their importunate chink, while thousands of great cattle....chew the cud, and are silent, pray do not imagine that those who make the noise are the only inhabitants of the field; that of course they are many in numbers; or that after all they are other than the little, shrivelled, meagre, hopping, though loud and troublesome insects of the hours"**. The typical liberal has never been better described.

Our constitution guarantees freedom of speech and of information. The liberal censorship severely limits these rights. We must make this widely known. Liberals hate it when you do. So do it at every opportunity. Here follow a few suggestions on harrying liberals and having fun while doing so.

You can make a good start by asking your local public library if it has a copy of, say, Wilmot Robertson's *"The Dispossessed Majority"*, or of Professor Wesley Critz George's masterly *"Biology of the race Problem"* on its shelves. Ask in writing and persist until you get an answer. It will almost

certainly be "No". You can now write politely to the local newspaper publishing the correspondence and pointing out that your constitutional rights are being restricted. At the same time, the body controlling the library can be asked why the books are not stocked. Once again, publication of the correspondence will give you useful publicity. The usual pretext for failure to stock is *"lack of public demand"*. You can make capital by asking how the public can be expected to demand what they do not know exists? You could follow this up by asking your local school board if the school library contains, say, copies of Professor Henry Garrett's classic work *"I.Q. and Racial Differences"*, or of H.B. Isherwood's *"Race and Politics"*? They are almost certainly not available. You can now write to the school board, copied to the local Press, protesting that young Australians are being subjected to a censorship on what they may read and learn. Copies can profitably be sent to parent-teachers associations. If only a few people are moved to start thinking for themselves and asking questions then your time and effort have been well spent. Observe that you are not stating for a moment that the views of the authors of the books you name are correct, or that you agree with them. Your point is that men recognised as authorities in their fields have expressed points of view supported by their scientific reasons for holding those views. Under our constitution we all have a right to access to these views. This is a difficult approach for liberals to counter.

Any recruits joining as a result of your efforts are the most valuable type. They will have approached you out of interest and a desire to know more. Welcome them with open arms, and set them to work attacking the liberal enemy.

Your local M.P. and Local Government Councillor are almost certainly ardent integrationists and egalitarians, or they would not hold the positions they do. So write them asking them to explain why the works we have mentioned and others like, say Carleton Putnam's *"Race and Reason"* and *"Race and Reality"* are not available either in school or public libraries. Persistence will in time bring an answer, full of evasions and weasel words. This is just what you want. You can now publish the correspondence in the local and possibly in the national Press, together with your contention that censorship is being enforced and that your constitutional rights are being infringed. The resultant uproar can only bring you valuable publicity and possible recruits.

Use the communist "salami technique": as fast as you carry your point over any one book, start pressing for another to be made available, if possible using another library or official as target, so as to obtain the maximum spread.

Each of the books mentioned contains a bibliography of relevant works. Each of these will be of interest to League members. Form letters on the lines of those, which you used, can be copied and sent to other possible supporters countrywide. If each adds his mite much can be done to spread information, discredit the liberal censorship and recruit new members. Once people begin to realise that the liberal establishment is not as impregnable as it is made to seem, that it is even silly and indefensible, then the liberal rightly

becomes a figure of fun and a bigot, a suitable subject for mockery and ridicule. They really hate this approach, so use it often.

By using these methods - there are many others, of course - League members can do much to lift the veil of silence imposed on subjects which liberals regard as taboo. No activity can do more to help our cause and make our beliefs known;

nor is it easy to think of a way of having more fun more cheaply at the expense of the liberal establishment than by holding them up to public ridicule as the tunnel-visioned bigots and race traitors which they are.

(British born Noel *Hunt* served for many years as a District Commissioner in Rhodesia, where he studied race relations at first hand. He now lives in retirement in England).

THE EVOLUTION OF LIFE

The Russian display in Australia of prehistoric monsters, and a film concerning these creatures, has created widespread interest in why these creatures died out. Presumably there were no "Save the Dinosaurs" Clubs when these monsters were threatened with extinction! And is the world any worse because of their extinction, giving way to the development of other forms of life? Clearly many of the prehistoric monsters did not survive because they could not adapt to changed circumstances.

From Africa comes the news that the famous pygmies are also threatened with extinction, by their contact with civilisation. A report from Uganda quotes a member of the dwindling pygmy people as saying at a Seventh Day "survival camp" on the Uganda-Zaire border, where he is learning to raise chickens, that he will never go back to life in the forests, hunting monkeys with bow and poison-tipped arrows, gathering beans and berries and sleeping in temporary shelters made from banana leaves.

One old pygmy is quoted as saying, "*Monkeys not enough!*" So much for the life of those "noble savages" eulogised by the famous French philosopher Rousseau, whose teachings still linger on like a disease among so many self-styled intellectuals. Rousseau was in the forefront of the movement, which taught that "*all men are created equal*", that civilisation was of the Devil and that private property and family should be abolished. But the man who was so strongly anti-Christian had no scruples in making use of the Christian Sisters to look after the large number of illegitimate children resulting from his "natural" way of life.

What, then, do the equalitarians have to say about the pygmies, who, having experienced what they regard as a better way of life, are determined not to continue living in the forests. It is estimated that while at one time there were 5000 pygmies living in the forests of Uganda, Zaire and Rwanda, that number has dwindled to as few as from 300 to 400. Seventh Day missionaries are teaching up to 100 pygmies survival skills. But their increasing contact with the outside world also threatens their complete extinction, either through disease (AIDS is extremely widespread in Uganda) or inter-marriage with bigger people. Eventually the pygmies as such will become extinct like the prehistoric monsters. They will become historical curiosities, primarily because of their inability to adapt to new situations.

But will Western man, who has evolved a type of civilisation fundamentally different from other civilisations, be able to sustain that civilisation under the impact of threatening forces, which his own creativeness has made possible? The deserts of Northern Africa are one of the legacies of previous civilisations, which denuded large forests in an attempt to provide fuel. The industrial revolution, out of which developed the technological revolution, was an historical event of the greatest significance in the long history of Man. It opened up a vista completely new in recorded history. The age-old spectre of scarcity was ended. Man could be freed from all forms of slavery. A new type of society could develop with greater freedom for all. A new and deeper meaning could be given to the Christianity, which had undergirded the creation of

Western civilisation. "*The life more abundant*" which Christ spoke about, and His advice that there was little need to take thought for the future, started to take on a new meaning.

Unfortunately, however, no Christian-oriented movement emerged to stress that unless there was also a revolution concerning finance and economics, with a changed attitude towards work and leisure, the very industrial revolution which promised so much could result in the collapse of Western civilisation, not because of an external challenge, but because of internal decay. Much of the early discontent with the direction, in which the Industrial Revolution was heading, was marshalled behind the various Socialist movements and a variety of Utopian idealists. It was only when the first great disaster struck Western civilisation, the first world war, that at last there emerged a unique figure, C.H. Douglas, who went right to the core of the problem confronting industrial civilisation. He warned that unless the necessary changes were made, civilisation was doomed.

The state of the world today, with the potential to progressively free man, being increasingly used to destroy the physical, moral and social environment, Western man must either change the direction in which he is heading, or he is doomed to pass from the stage of history. Future historians could then have exhibitions and ponder on what happened, as today archaeologists ponder on what happened to the prehistoric monsters, or the ancient Egyptians.

But there is no need for this to happen. For the first time in recorded history the solution to a threatened death of a civilisation is known. Not only is there an answer to the threatened death but a policy which would in practice lift that civilisation to a new level. That policy is Social Credit.

ARCHBISHOP TUTU IN AUSTRALIA

Archbishop Desmond Tutu of South Africa is one of the favourites of those who control the world's media. Like his friend Nelson Mandela, he has been the chosen instrument of those who seek to fit a restructured South Africa into the New World Order. The good Archbishop is, however, most selective when he condemns what he regards as injustices. For example, he refused to protest against the cruel international campaign, which destroyed the career of the South African born runner, Zola Budd. He even refused to be interviewed by a well-known British television interviewer. Zola Budd's "crime" was that she ran internationally as a British citizen taking advantage of her part British parentage, and refused to denounce South Africa's "apartheid" policies. A simple country girl from Bloomfontein, she had grown up with South African blacks, she simply accepted the traditional separate development policies of her country. But she refused to be drawn into public criticism of South Africa's policies.

Archbishop Tutu supported the international campaign

which used economic sanctions to force the South African government to surrender to the concept of a unitary multi-racial State. The freeing of Mandela from prison led to an escalation of violence throughout South Africa, with blacks murdering fellow blacks. Archbishop Tutu has shown far more support for Nelson Mandela and his Marxist allies than he has for his fellow-Christian Chief Buthelezi's Zulu leader who has openly expressed concern about the future of his Zulu homeland.

Having helped to undermine the South African economy and to have contributed to the revolutionary ferment, Archbishop Tutu now comes to Australia to appeal for economic and other aid, not only to South Africa but to other parts of Africa. He met with his old friend former Prime Minister Bob Hawke, who boasts that **"We were the initiators, the world leaders, in seeing those sanctions imposed and there is no doubt they accelerated the move**

towards non-racial democracy". The anti-colonial campaign, which forced the premature withdrawal of the British and other European powers from Africa, has resulted in general disaster, with the African people being the main victims. Australia and other countries are being urged to supply massive aid. Archbishop Tutu has joined with Bob Hawke in launching an Australia-wide campaign by the Australian Council for Overseas Aid to increase aid to Africa. Archbishop Tutu has taken it on himself to lecture Australians on the question of Aboriginals, charging that Australia's "international credibility" was at stake over the government's handling of the Mabo and other Aboriginal issues. He also said that he hoped that Australian politicians would be sensible enough "to recognise they would be on a beating to nothing" if they suspended the Racial Discrimination Act. The Archbishop understands where and how real power is exercised in today's world. He is prepared to serve that power.

BRITISH EMPIRE REALITIES

Writing in "The Social Creditor" of January 5, 1945, under the title, "Contemporary Gibberish", C.H. Douglas provided some little known facts concerning the role of the British Empire during the Second World War. While the campaign to break up a unique international association of nations has continued, Douglas's comments support our view that that association still has the capacity for regeneration.

It is part of the charlatany with which "scientific" thinking is now infected, to suggest that history automatically repeats itself. As a consequence of this, the fact that the Egyptian, Greek, Roman, Byzantine and other great civilisations all had their rise and fall (or, at any rate, are presented to us in that aspect) is supposed to be evidence that - e.g., the British Empire must inevitably go the same way.

The implication is, of course, Masonic; Nations and Empires are supposed to be merely repetitions, macrocosms, of the individual man, the microcosm, and to have their infancy, manhood and decline in the same manner, but over a greater duration, as that exhibited by the human being.

If there were no other grounds for objection to this theory, and there are many, anyone whose senses are not blunted by the schoolmen would suspect it as being too "neat".

Similarity of behaviour is far more usually due to incompetence of observation than to actual identity of process. To the average non-travelled Englishman all Chinamen look alike, and are nearly indistinguishable from Japanese. But a Chinaman would not regard that idea as proving anything but the barbarism of the English.

Whether we are prepared to accept this conception of "rise and fall" at its face value or not, so far as our knowledge takes us, no Empire has previously "fallen" by proclamation, which appears to be the case with that of "Britain", unless, of course, the collapse of Jericho is an allegory from which we are intended to take warning.

PERSISTENT PROPAGANDA

To add to the outstanding interest of the event, it appears to be the one contemporary phenomenon on which everyone is agrees. Our leading newspapers (produced strictly in accordance with war-time economy standards both in paper and veracity) vie with our "British" organisation for relaying recorded Negroid disharmony in their agreement with General de Gaulle and Professor Laski that "Britain" is a second-class Power; exit visas and travelling expenses are happily provided for Manchester experts in crematorium oratory, so that the

good news may reach the humblest foreign, and particularly United States, mourner for "Britain's" vanished splendours. 'Tis strange; 'tis passing strange.

Observe, also, how the history of the fall of the British Empire is being written while you wait. The high point of "Britain's" war effort was Dunkirk - in fact in a few years' time it will be the only battle in which British troops were engaged!

There is little or no mention of the Battle of "Britain", which, according to one American account, owed what importance it possessed to the "fact" that the Rolls-Royce engines in the Spitfires and Hurricanes were made in America! British troops were sometimes heard of behind the lines in Egypt and there are rumours of a British fleet in the Mediterranean, but there is not an inhabitant of the Middle West who cannot tell you how Rommel folded up before the generalship and fighting qualities of American strategists and troops whose location in Algeria (which he identifies with Egypt) effectively defeated the Germans two thousand miles away at El Alamein!

And, of course, everyone knows that the scattered and demoralised remnants of the British Army were finally rallied by the victorious Eisenhower, and Burma was recaptured by a couple of platoons of Americans, as conclusively proved by Messrs. Warner Bros, in their historic film *"Objective, Burma"*.

SIZE AND POPULATION

All these things being as they are, some examination of the nature of our "decadence" seems not merely desirable, but obligatory.

Let us first consider that modern criterion of greatness; size. The British Empire has in round numbers an area of 14,000,000 (fourteen million) square miles; the U.S.S.R. is second with 8,250,000 square miles, France is third with 4,336,000 square miles, and the United States ("unquestionably the greatest Power in the world today" - vide any press, anywhere) has an area, including its Mandatory Jurisdiction, of 3,750,000 square miles, or slightly more than one quarter of

the area of the British Empire.

As to the population, the British Empire has a population of 498,000,000 (four hundred and ninety-eight millions) or just over a quarter of the total estimated population of the earth.

Russia (U.S.S.R.) is estimated to have a population of 166 million, or about one-third of that of the British Empire. And the United States has a population of 137,000,000 or rather more than one quarter that of the British Empire. Thirty millions of these are predominantly non-European in origin.

It is stated by the Proclaimers that the British Empire is breaking up - in fact, it is, according to propaganda which is circulating everywhere in South Eastern Europe, due to disintegrate completely in a mere matter of months. This being so, it is rather odd that the British Empire is at the time of writing, December 1945, the only political area on the world's surface in which no fighting is in progress, if we extend this phrase, as we are entitled to do in this connection to "spheres of influence" such as Azerbaijan, China, and the puppet State of Panama; the preserves of Russia and the United States respectively.

THE BRITISH WAR EFFORT

Let us now take, without asserting, war as a criterion of greatness.

No one will dispute the pre-eminence of air power and its counter-measures as the deciding factor in this (present tense) war. The dominant and decisive aircraft at the decisive period of the war were British, powered by British designed and built engines, and, for the major part, fought by natives of these islands. The decisive counter-measure to aircraft was radar, invented designed and built in Great Britain.

No decisive weapon used in this war originated outside the British Empire.

But perhaps "Britain" did not exert herself? In 1940 "Britain" spent 39 percent; Russia (not at war) spent 27 percent, and the United States spent 3 per cent on war. In 1941 the relative figures were 49 percent, 35 percent, and 11 percent. In 1942, 53 percent, 45 percent, and 35 percent. In 1943, 54 percent, 48 percent, 44 percent, and 46 percent.

In 1943 and 1944, every British Dominion, as well as the British Isles, contributed a greater proportion of its national income towards winning the war than either Russia or the United States.

And over the whole period the output per man was greater than in the United States and incomparably greater than in Russia.

But the amazing feature of the whole situation is that Great Britain, the key-stone of the Imperial arch (not excluding the British Dominions, to whom "Britain" owes large sterling, and in the case of Canada, dollar, debts) is the only major contestant emerging with a loss of overseas investments, a largely increased foreign debt, and a fantastically reduced standard of living.

FALL THROUGH FINANCE?

Can it be that the fall of the British Empire is a book-keeping transaction?

In considering situations of this character, it is important to avoid a common error - that of bolstering up an hypothesis with subsidiary ideas which are not factual. For instance, there are two carefully propagated ideas in connection with the Loan, the acceptance of which has just been authorised by the two Houses of Parliament.

The first of these is that on balance the Loan is either inevitable or advantageous. In regard to this, I regard the case made by Lord Beaverbrook in his article in the *Sunday Express* as reasonably sound, and Lord Keynes's ridicule of it in the House of Lords as of the same reliability as his prophecies of the course of the wheat market in 1920.

The second and skilfully suggested idea is that the United States is annoyed that we have "gone Red". On this, it may be helpful to state my opinion at once. Not only do I believe that every covert assistance has been given by the most powerful Forces in America - including the free services of half a million American soldiers as canvassers? - to ensure the return of a Socialist Government in this country, but I think I know exactly why that assistance has been given, and subsequently to its success, a loan has been forced on us. The primary preoccupation of the United States for years past has been Russia: as a result of the most careful investigation by such people as Joseph Davies and other less publicised insiders, their inner ring of officials satisfied that the Russian industrial system is the most inefficient the world has ever seen; and that a Socialist economy and the Bretton Woods Bank and Gold Standard Dollar will make foreclosure on this loan a mathematical certainty in less than ten years.

* * * *

There is plenty of competent ability in the British Empire; it has the major physical assets of the earth; and such disadvantages, if they were disadvantages, as were involved by geography, have been minimised by modern transport. If we are to see its disappearance in a cruder and untried organisation, we are witnessing the most amazing triumph of unarmed forces that the world (so far as we know) has ever seen.

INDIVIDUALISM

It is not necessary to invoke the authority of Christian philosophy (though that is unequivocal on the point) to realise that the relationship of the individual to the group is not arguable. The group exists for the benefit of the individual, in the same sense that the field exists for the benefit of the flower, or the tree for the fruit. Groups of any kind, whether called nations, business systems, or any other associative label, inevitably decay and disappear if they fail to foster a sufficient number of excellent individuals. . . . It is also true that excellence involves exercise - a man does not become a good cricketer by reading books on cricket."

C.H. Douglas.