

THE NEW TIMES

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

\$7.00 per annum post-free. BOX 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne

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

Vol. 43, No. 1

JANUARY 1978

THE ETERNAL BATTLE

By Eric D. Butler

"History is a very long business", commented a senior Ambassador of the Government of Free China as we discussed the plight of the world, with particular reference to the plight of Formosa at a time when the United States was seeking diplomatic relationships with the Peking Communist Government. The Ambassador felt that in the long haul of history Communism could never permanently suppress the Chinese people and their ancient traditions and culture. Some apologists for the current attitude of the Roman Catholic Church towards Communism, which is not as strongly anti-Communist as it was in the days of Pope Pius, have expressed a similar view; that the Church is taking the long view of history, confident that long after Communism has passed, the Church will continue. This view might be acceptable if there were not evidence that most Christian Communion have progressively compromised on basic truths. Since being allowed to preach behind the Iron Curtain, Dr. Billy Graham has softened his attitude on the Communist issue.

I make these introductory comments in considering the role of the Social Crediter in 1978. Early in the history of the Social Credit movement there were those who, unable to grasp fully the far-reaching implications of the Douglas revelation, and impatient for quick results, felt that orthodox party political activities were essential. The warnings of Douglas were of no avail. It was believed that all that was necessary was to gain power basically in the same way as older parties, and then implement a monetary reform, which would automatically result in a transformation of society. The lessons of the history of parties calling themselves Social Credit are now clear for those willing to heed those lessons. Those lessons are a confirmation of the early warnings of Douglas. They show how, in the attempt to gain votes, and power, the tendency is to compromise with principles. I have been told so often by the party devotees "We must first gain office, which means putting aside the more controversial aspects of Social Credit policy. But then when we are in office we can implement Social Credit policy". It is an attempted justification of the age-old evil that the end justifies the means. It is a denial of fundamental Christian teaching that the end is governed by the means used to reach it.

Even before the Second World War, Douglas had made it clear that a Social Credit society, which must be a Christian society, would develop organically. And that the development could be a long one. The battle in which Social Crediters are engaged is not a new one; it is as old as man. It is the battle between the will-to-power and those who seek freedom for all individuals. It is a battle, which was fought during the time of the Roman Civilisation. That battle was lost and Civilisation was plunged into a long period of a Dark Age lightened only by the dedicated efforts of those who had grasped the Truths

revealed by Christianity. The flowering of Western Christendom was a long process. Its finest fruits of that Civilisation have been destroyed, or are in threat of being destroyed, because the manipulation of finance-credit on an international scale, and the era of instant mass communication, has made it possible for centralised power to be exercised on a scale never thought possible in the past. Evil has never before been more threatening. But still the Truth remains and, as the general darkness deepens, increasing numbers are attracted to the light of that Truth. "I am the light of the world", said the Founder of Christianity.

A TASK "TO LAST A LIFETIME"

The Douglas revelation brought a new understanding to the old battle. Douglas stressed that Social Credit was "practical Christianity" and was absolutely essential if Christianity was to survive. Douglas did not expect to see a complete Social Credit society in his lifetime. In sharing his thinking with a small group of his colleagues after twenty years of experience, Douglas said that it would be a dull man who had not, after devoting that time to a subject, learned something. Douglas said, "When I first started I had the idea that I had got hold of some specific technical information and I had only to get it accepted. I was like a clever little boy and that I only had to run to father and he would be very pleased about it. I got rid of that idea in about 18 months or two years, for very far from anyone wanting to put what I had to say in operation, it took me about two years to grasp thoroughly why it was not likely, at that time, to be put into operation".

Douglas went on to observe that he later grasped that "I was in for a political job that was going to last a lifetime. I developed from that stage into the third stage, namely

that it was not only going to last my lifetime, but a great many people's lifetime, the knowledge that we should do no significant part of it unless we touched a great many aspects of life that were a long way from A + B". Douglas drew attention to the basic problem resulting from increasing centralisation of power. He warned against thinking that anything could be done with large masses of people and that it was a mistake to believe that by presenting a good and sound policy it is possible to get large numbers to do something about it. He advised that the task of the Social Crediter was to notice what a group of people wanted, or did not want, and then to show them how to work more effectively. Douglas said that this organic approach was an acceptance of "that supremely wise saying if any man would be the greatest among you let him be your servant".

A LIFE OF SERVICE

Douglas's Second World War, and post-war writings, was an examination in depth of those fundamental issues

which must be understood by those concerned with ensuring that the eternal battle is fought effectively. In spite of the enormous damage done to our Christian Civilisation, the battle is never lost to those who understand its nature. As one of our younger Social Credit supporters said at the 1977 Annual *New Times* Dinner, the road ahead will be long and difficult. But today there are, in my view, more people with a real understanding of Social Credit and the nature of the situation to be dealt with than ever before. That is why the Social Crediter should, if confident in the ultimate triumph of Truth, feel that a life of service to that Truth gives it a meaning that it would otherwise lack.

As yet another year starts, let us take that long view of history and by applying Social Credit action wherever possible, go forward in faith that ultimately Truth will triumph. In the process we will find much to be thankful for, not the least being the warm and helpful fellowship of a group of very special individuals. Increasing numbers are already enjoying some of the fruits of Social Credit. And they are shaping history.

TOWARDS THE NEW WORLD ORDER

The following condensed article from "American Opinion", the monthly conservative magazine published at Belmont, Mass., U.S.A, provides an excellent current summary of the interlocking power groups attempting to create World Government:

"When in the course of history the threat of extinction confronts mankind, it is necessary for the people of the United States to declare their interdependence with the peoples of all nations and to embrace those principles and build those institutions which will enable mankind to survive and civilisation to flourish. Two centuries ago our forefathers brought forth a new nation; now we must join together with others to bring forth a new world order." That abominable parody of the U.S. Declaration of Independence was prepared by historian Henry Steele Commager as part of the so-called Declaration of Interdependence, a project of the World Affairs Council of Philadelphia.

Shamefully, this altered Declaration was signed by more than one hundred Members of Congress on the two hundredth anniversary of the proclamation of American independence.

The Declaration of Interdependence is a part of the continuing drive to dilute, and then dissolve, the sovereignty of the United States of America. The goal, we are repeatedly told, is a New World Order, a new international economic order, or any one of a half-dozen similar euphemisms.

In any case, it would mean the end of the U.S., as we know it, and her submission first to regional and then world government. The proponents claim that achievement of their goal is inevitable. Americans can acquiesce and take their medicine, or have it shoved down their throats.

Those are totally false alternatives, of course, but they are being aggressively promoted. For instance, by the

World Order Models Project (known at W.O.M.A.).

Dr. Saul Mendlovitz, director of that important enterprise, contends that there "is no longer a question of whether or not there will be world government by the year 2000. The questions are how it will come into being (cataclysm, drift, more or less rational design) and whether it will be totalitarian, benign, or participatory (the possibilities being in that order)".

Mendlovitz is no nut. He is a professor of law at Rutgers University, a member of the Rockefeller-controlled Council on Foreign Relations, and definitely Big League. Indeed, he takes great pains "to thank the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and the Rockefeller Foundation for the support which they gave to specific research within the World Order Models Project".

Men like Mendlovitz might well be termed Established Revolutionaries, being funded by the great foundations for the purpose of attacking our way of life. It is of course Mendlovitz's task as a hired revolutionary to persuade (or scare) us into surrendering the freedom, liberty, and independence of our country.

"I believe", declares Mendlovitz, "that the most likely governance by the end of the century — compelled by the arms races and outbreaks of violence, the food, population and environmental imbalances as well as large-scale serious injustices — will be oligarchic and highly repressive". To forestall that he contends, we will need "disarmament", a world police force (which, of course, should control all arms), and other internationalist machinery to assure World Government.

Fortunately, the American people are not that simple-minded, and the Establishment propagandists are having trouble selling their goods.

UNDERCUTTING PATRIOTIC VALUES

Consider the aforementioned Declaration of Interdependence. Its promoters, commented an angry Congressman John Ashbrook last year, have accepted "to undercut patriotic American values . . . in favour of cultural relativism, international citizenship, and supremacy over all nations by a world government.

"The declaration of interdependence is an attack on loyalty to American freedoms and institutions, which the document calls 'chauvinistic nationalism', 'national prejudice', and 'narrow notions of national sovereignty,'" said Ashbrook.

This was all part of a deliberate attack on the will of the American people to survive as a nation. Another such assailant is the influential Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies (chaired by Robert O. Anderson, the Exxon mogul), which in December 1974 created the national Commission on Coping with Interdependence. This body said its announcements, would "consider the implications for Americans of what Secretary of State Henry Kissinger has called 'the accelerating momentum of our interdependence'."

The succession of Cyrus Vance to head the State Department has provided no respite. He is identified in the January 1977 issue of *Transition* (published by the Institute for World Order) as yet another "world order type". Pollster Daniel Yankelovich, who serves on the Institute's board of directors, happily reports that the new Secretary "is concerned with those (world order) issues. He is in a very important position".

How does one go about "Coping with Interdependence"? The Aspen Institute spells it out in a brochure, noting "the most important changes will be modifications in attitudes which, in the nature of our pluralism, must first take place in the reasoning consciences of millions of individuals. The most important adjustment of all will be to blur, then erase, the psychic frontier between 'domestic affairs' and 'international affairs'." Stripped of self-justifying verbiage, that simply means we are to be conditioned to forget that we are Americans and become men and women without a country.

School indoctrination is of course important, especially among those expected to become "leaders" in the New World Order. We are assured of this by no less an authority than C. Douglas Dillon — the former Under-secretary of State, former Secretary of the Treasury, C.F.R. Director, Brookings Institution Director, and Honorary Chairman of the Board of the Institute for World Order.

Dillon has emphasised that it is essential "that we educate the intellectual elites so that thinking of this nature can come from a broad group of people". But even he agrees "it will take a while before people in this country as a whole will be ready for any substantial giving-up of

sovereignty to handle global problems". Nonetheless, Douglas Dillon says, "global authorities will develop, possibly through the United Nations or parallel organisations".

SCHOOL PROGRAMMES

To speed up this development, the Institute for World Order has established both School and University Programmes to teach "world order". At the university level, according to programme director Michael Washburn:

"I think our success was somewhat spectacular. In 1960 there were virtually no courses being taught in this area. By 1963-1964, there were 500 colleges or universities with these courses. We were fortunate in getting support then from the Rockefeller Foundation, the James P. Warburg family and from a number of smaller foundations in southern California, Minnesota and elsewhere. We have raised nearly \$500,000 for our centres programme in two years".

The barrage is falling upon our children from all sides. For instance, the director of the World Order School Programme, Mrs. Betty Reardon, has happily reported that the National Education Association chose "education for a Global Community", as its Bicentennial theme. In an interview with *Transition*, Mrs. Reardon indicated what New World Order means. She offered Martin Luther King as a hero for schoolchildren, claiming that he "was a moral leader and a great teacher with being a 'moralist'."

Never mind that the "Reverend" King was in fact a notorious libertine who was trained, backed, and advised by top Communists to provoke violence and build racial hatred.

You see, says Mrs. Reardon of the World Order School Programme, "I consider him (King) to be part of the world order movement. He had a vision of a transformed society based on the principles of peace and justice and he had a transition strategy, non-violent action, to get from the present to that preferred future".

It is not surprising that a pro-Communist like King would be a World Order favourite. Among the listed Sponsoring Institutions for the World Order Models Project, after all, is the Novosti "Press Agency" of Moscow, a Soviet propaganda organ largely staffed by the Russian Secret Police.

Indeed in *Commentary* magazine for February 1975, John Hopkins professor of international relations Robert W. Tucker comments on the anticipated Communist role in the proposed New World Order. Professor Tucker observes that "the new equality is also likely to lead to an international system in which the relative power position of the Soviet Union will be considerably enhanced, for the Russians are neither dependent in any significant way on the new ("developing") states nor disposed to view their claims in the manner of Western elites".

TRANSFORMATION OF E.E.C.

But those "Western elites" are working with the Communists to siphon off our wealth. That is already in black

and white in the United Nations Declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order. In the New World Order, Mr. Falk lays out a roadmap. The Seventies, he reveals, are to be the decade of "Consciousness Raising"; the Eighties, of "Mobilisation"; and the Nineties are to be the decade of "Transformation".

The piecemeal approach is to involve, to start, the transformation of the European Economic Community (E.E.C.) into a regional government. The leaders of the E.E.C. agreed in 1972 to a "European Union" by 1980. Plans were made in Paris for a preliminary political government with complete economic and monetary unity including one currency, budget, and central bank. The first direct elections to a European Parliament will be held in May of 1978.

TRILATERAL COMMISSION

While consolidation of Europe proceeds, regionalism is also going forward at other levels. David Rockefeller's Trilateral Commission "has to be built from the bottom up rather than from the top down . . . an end run around national sovereignty, eroding it piece by piece, will accomplish much more than the old-fashioned frontal assault".

This strategy also appears in the work of the other big names in the World Order business among them Princeton Professor Richard A. Falk, another member of the C.F.R. In the 1975 volume *On The Creation Of A Just World Order* (edited by Saul H. Mendlovitz. New York Free Press), we are informed, the system must be changed because the poorer nations "which constitute 70 percent of the world population, account for only 30 percent of the world's income".

Professor Tucker foresees that "the world community will become a welfare community in roughly the manner that Western states have become welfare states". As U.N. Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim told the World Food and Energy Conference, "the time has come to think in terms of a redistribution of the wealth of the planet".

All of this is to be handled in stages. Professor Richard N. Gardner, a top Carter advisor who is now Ambassador to Italy, explained the strategy in the C.F.R. journal *Foreign Affairs* for April of 1974. The hope, announced Gardner, lies "not in building up a few ambitious central institutions of universal membership and general jurisdiction as was envisaged at the end of the last war (World War II), but rather in the much more decentralised, disorderly and pragmatic process of inventing or adapting institutions of limited jurisdiction and selected membership to deal with specific problems on a case-by-case basis, as the necessity for co-operation is perceived by the relevant nations".

In short, said the Columbia professor, the "house of world order" will have been set up to develop the next step, which is to make "partners" of Western Europe, North America, and Japan. Rockefeller selected his old college roommate and longtime director of the Council on Foreign Relations, George S. Franklin, as the Commission's

first North American Secretary; meantime. Zbigniew Brzezinski another C.F.R. member and protégé of David Rockefeller, became the first Director of T.C.

As is now well known to political observers, at least thirteen Trilateralists - about a quarter of the total American members - are holding top positions in the Carter Administration.

Is this some kind of a conspiracy or plot? "If you like conspiracy theories about secret plots to take over the world", chortles the *Washington Post*, "you are going to love the administration of Jimmy Carter".

And the *New York Times* for January 6, 1977, echoes: "The founding fathers of Trilateralism were members in good standing of the so-called Eastern Establishment. James E. Carter Jr. the former Governor of Georgia, joined the Trilateral Commission when he decided to make his run for the Presidency. Believers in the conspiracy theory of history will surely regard the Trilateral Commission as an Eastern Establishment front organisation whose main purpose is to co-opt Jimmy Carter".

To co-opt Jimmy Carter? Hardly. Mr. Carter knew all about the objectives of the Trilateral Commission well before he became President.

World Order is the order of the day. President Carter declared in his inaugural "Statement to the World" of January 20 1977, announcing: "The United States will meet its obligation to help create a stable, just and peaceful world order". Mr. Carter has not yet, however, publicly endorsed the plans of the World Order Models Project, as described by Professor Richard Falk. "The World Order Models Project accepts as self-evident the need to reorient American public and elite opinion; hopefully, this country can be encouraged to play a less domineering role", writes Falk "and to share its wealth and income with the world community on a far greater scale". (*A Study of Future World*, New York. Free Press. 1975).

Among other things, said Professor Falk, "To achieve this (better world order), central institutions would have to be equipped with police capabilities while national institutions would be substantially deprived of military capabilities".

Well now. Mr. Carter aims, he says, to eliminate all nuclear weapons from the earth, has proposed Trilateralist Paul Warnke to bargain away our arms, and has made his only major Budget reduction in defence.

Compare these developments with the comments of New World Order professor Richard Falk: "The first and central priority of the movement for a preferred world is to make progress toward *diminishing the role of the war system in international life*", writes Falk, "and toward *dismantling the national security apparatus in the major states of the world*". (Emphasis in original).

Certainly the Trilateralist impact is already being felt. Novak wrote in *America* for February 5, 1977:

"According to sources in the State Department, the

trilateral papers have directly influenced the summoning of the Rambouillet and Puerto Rican conferences, the sale of IMF gold, the Law of the Sea conferences, the formation of the International Energy Agency, and steps to establish a new international currency, which replaces the U.S. dollar and gold. The commission's record and its powerful influence after the 1976 elections deserve a great deal of respect".

The Trilateral Commission has called for creation of a number of new institutions "to deal with planetary interest groups". New structures, reports Jeremiah Novak, "are recommended to meet the needs of oil users and producers and to 'bridge the economic systems' of Communist and non-Communist states. These interest-group institutions are seen as subordinate to a super-structure of planetary institutions".

And remember that we are no longer talking about the theories of impotent Utopians. These planners are actually moving ahead. Take the strengthening of the World Bank and International Monetary Fund (I.M.F.). The Commission's, "most immediate concern", observes Novak, "is the creation of a new world monetary system to replace gold and the dollar as the international exchange units with a new currency called special drawing rights (SDR's). In fact, as a move in this direction, the commission was instrumental in the IMF's sale of its gold and in the creation of a system of denoting all currencies in terms of SDR's as a first step in the push for a new world system".

Trilateralism, remember, is only a way station on the road to the New World Order.

BEING MERGED WITH SOVIET UNION

One by one the bonds of internationalism are being wrapped around us in preparation for what Ford Foundation president Rowan Gaither admitted years ago is the ultimate goal — "so to alter our life in the United States that we can be comfortably merged with the Soviet Union".

This is recognised by the Reds. As the Marxist *Guardian* noted not long ago: "In discussing the Trilateral group, the author of one commission report noted that 'it does not envisage a new anti-Communist alliance; indeed, at some point in the future the more advanced Communist states might choose to become partners'."

That is the Establishment's offensive game plan. And patriots must attempt to intercept this lateral pitchout - this "end run around national sovereignty" - and again move the ball in the right direction. The lines and goals are clearly marked. As syndicated columnist Nicholas von Hoffman observed in late January of 1977:

"Here at home it has been the John Birch Society and similar right-wing groups who first recognised a collusion between capitalists of the Rockefeller stripe and socialists like Willy Brandt and Helmut Schmidt. As a glance at the membership of the Trilateral Commission, the world ruling class's floating seminar, shows, Social Democrats and global capitalists have no trouble co-operating".

Nor, he might have added, do Communist dictators who

want Western technology to expand their hegemony by increasing the power of their military forces.

The Communists and World Order elitists are playing this game together. Thierry de Montbrial, an influential French economist, writes in the C.F.R. journal *Foreign Affairs* that "in an interdependent world sovereignty is always limited; hence we have already advocated the concept of management of the earth's natural resources for the general good and not for the benefit of a limited few".

At this point, the author introduced what he calls a "relevant quotation" from Karl Marx's *Das Kapital*:

"When our society reaches a higher level of economic organisation, the right of ownership by a few individuals of land forming part of the planet will seem as absurd as the idea of man's ownership of man appears nonsensical to our society today. No nation, nor all the nations covering the globe, are owners of the land, but merely possessors, tenants, with the responsibility like diligent heads of families, of transmitting it improved, to future generations".

ADMIRATION FOR COMMUNIST CHINA

Proponents of the New World Order go so far as openly to express admiration for the vast tyranny of Communist China. This is a recurrent theme, for instance, in *On The Creation Of A Just World Order*, where University of Michigan professor Ali Muzrui calls Occupied China "a major model of political and cultural engineering, with all its potentialities as a whole new civilisation in the world".

It is a "civilisation" built, the admiring Michigan professor neglects to add, on the bodies of some sixty-four million dead Chinese. Peking's tyranny, euphemises Professor Muzrui of the World Order Models Project, really reflects Red "China's determined energy to transcend many of its problems through the energies of its own people and to mobilise a fifth of mankind in the quest for new social directions".

Elsewhere in *On The Creation Of A Just World Order*, McGill University professor Paul T. K. Lin, of the Centre for East Asian Studies, actually declares: "Red China's dynamic society today is indeed an enormously instructive paradigm of fundamental change along lines radically different from those of many other developing countries". So were the practices of Vlad the Impaler.

And Professor Lin praises the following as "The 'end' value of (Red) Chinese development":

(/) *Social justice based on freedom from exploitation, with human relations of egalitarianism, co-operation, and respect for work.*

This Red China, we are apparently to believe, is the very acme of the World Order ideal — or will be when the rest of the "class enemies" are executed or enslaved. These minions of the anthill mentality are to be our ultimate partners in the New World Order - - a scheme already being planned, for instance, by the Rockefellers' Council

on Foreign Relations.

The Institute for World Order's honorary chairman, C. Douglas Dillon, tells us the C.F.R. "is embarked on a major new programme, looking ahead to the 80s. They call it the 80s Project. It's one of the largest projects they've ever undertaken and it posits in their thinking the need for system improvement. They haven't as yet (as of January 1975) reached any answers, and they don't go as far (publicly) as they are now thinking and looking towards this".

C.F.R. GLOBAL STUDY

As C.F.R. director Dillon knows, the Council on Foreign Relations is a secret organisation. It is not about to blare from the housetops that a world tyranny is in the making. Its 1980s Global Study is now underway, having been announced without fanfare on the day after Christmas 1976.

Some \$1.3 million in funding has been provided, reported the *New York Times*, "by the Ford Foundation, the German Marshall Fund of the United States, the Lilly Endowment, the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation".

The unifying theme, according to Professor Richard H.

Ullman of the Woodrow Wilson School at Princeton will be to suggest "desirable achievable conditions of international relations and specifying policy avenues leading toward such conditions'. That is, dropping the euphemisms of the C.F.R., the objective is to plan how best to dupe us into the New World Order.

Meanwhile, Professor Ullman's fellow Ivy Leaguer and C.F.R. colleague, Marshall Shulman of Columbia, put out the latest word to the Establishment Insiders in *Foreign Affairs* for January 1977, concluding:

"It is therefore a central requirement that our actions serve to strengthen the international system, and that we seek as a long-term objective to draw the Soviet Union, (Red) China and other authoritarian regimes into constructive participation in that system, as they come to appreciate their self-interest in doing so".

Frankly, Professor Shulman, we are not enthused about fulfilling the Communists' self-interest, nor even that of the European Socialists — especially when it means surrender of our sovereignty through merger in a New World Order.

And we frankly believe that all it will take to stop you is to provide sufficient exposure of your game plan. Consider the battle joined.

THE PHONY AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL ELECTIONS

Modern elections throughout the "free" world have degenerated into contests for power with the media, including television, being used for propaganda, which bears little relationship to truth. The financial cost is so enormous that there is growing pressure in support of the proposal that the parties be financed out of the public purse. Such a proposal is designed to maintain a monopoly of power by the major parties and to make it more difficult for smaller groups and independents to contest elections.

Much to their own surprise the Liberal-National Country Party Coalition was re-elected on December 10 with a Parliamentary majority little less than that obtained in the massive backlash against the Whitlam Government in 1975. Prime Minister Fraser proved that he has nothing to learn from the other political tricksters who have graced the political stage in Australia and other "democracies" during this convulsed century. The real primary reason for his early election was Mr. Fraser's view that a continuing strong anti-Whitlam feeling in the Australian electorate was his greatest asset. A nation-wide fear campaign convinced large numbers of electors that, painful though it was to be slowly fried by the Fraser Government, jumping from the frying pan into a dreaded Whitlam fire would perhaps mean instant death. The anti-Whitlam feeling was so strong that even the former Prime Minister's son, Mr. Tony Whitlam, was the victim of it.

FRASER SUPPORTS PAYROLL TAX

One of the ironies of the campaign was that the Labor-Socialists, seeking desperately for some dramatic issue, proposed to have the Payroll Tax abolished. It was argued that the elimination of Payroll Tax would result in employers engaging more staff, thus relieving unemployment, while at the same time lowering costs. No sane person can argue that Payroll Tax is other than one of the most

iniquitous taxes ever devised, employers must pay the Tax irrespective of whether they are making profits or not. The Tax contributes to inflation. The Payroll Tax schedules are such that the tax bears heaviest upon the medium-sized organisation. Businessmen have been campaigning for years to have the tax either reduced or abolished. But when Labor leader Whitlam announced his party's policy for abolishing it, there was the spectacle of the leader of the party, which claims it represents free enterprise, opposing the abolition of the tax and charging that a Labor Government was pledged to putting extra money into the "coffers" of the multi-nationals!

Taxpayers should, of course, be thankful for small mercies and appreciate how the Labor Party's proposed abolition of Payroll Tax together with early public opinion polls which suggested a big electoral swing against the Government, forced Mr. Fraser to counter with his promise to abolish Federal Death Duties. But Mr. Fraser's general strategy was to generate electoral fear by recalling the Whitlam era while consistently claiming that his finance-economic policies were being successful. A study of his policy statement reveals little. He would be instructive to learn how many really believed that a Government, which, in two budgets, increased *total* taxation by \$6000 million, "would bring taxes down further". Mr. Fraser asserted that "interest rates will keep on falling", even though there was

only a fractional reduction just prior to the elections.

Mr. Fraser said nothing specific about government spending, while he forgot completely the Government's long obsession with the deficit. What does the Government propose to do about this? Under present financial rules, any further reduction in the deficit will make greater taxation inevitable. Not unless a drastic reduction in government spending is proposed, the result of which would be the collapse of Mr. Fraser's promise that unemployment will be steadily reduced from February onwards.

CONDITIONING ON INFLATION

The destructive economic, social and human effects of the Fraser Government's anti-inflation policies will have long-term, perhaps permanent, consequences. The nature of the party struggle for power was clearly demonstrated by the manner in which both the Government and the Opposition attempted to manipulate figures to serve their propaganda campaigns. One of the most thought-provoking aspects of the propaganda concerning inflation, is that a Government calling itself responsible can claim that the "back of inflation has been broken" with an inflation rate of just over 9 percent per year, as measured by the last three quarterly Cost of Living Index figures.

As demonstrated by C. H. Douglas in his early analysis of the finance-economic system, which showed inflation was mathematically certain if attempts were made to overcome a growing deficiency of purchasing power by orthodox methods, there is no hope of avoiding increasing economic dislocation and social disintegration under present financial rules. The Coalition parties make much of the fact that before the Whitlam era Australia "enjoyed" a low rate of

inflation. But in that period it was generally accepted that even a 3-4 percent inflation rate was disastrous. And, of course, it was. Now it is inferred that a 5-6 percent inflation rate would be acceptable. This is a measure of how many people have been conditioned to accept today that which yesterday was violently rejected. Continuing inflation at "acceptable" levels is essential to keep moving what is left of the free societies towards more Socialist planning and centralised controls.

Douglas predicted early in the 'twenties that, irrespective of the labels of Governments, they had no hope of holding back the forces of revolution under financial policies which generated increasing debt, high taxation and progressive inflation. Douglas warned that those calling themselves conservatives could, at best, fight a series of rearguard actions until overwhelmed. Prime Minister Fraser took over the very foreign and domestic policies advanced by the Whitlam Government. He has maintained himself in power by exploiting the electors' deep fear of Whitlam, but must now preside over increasing convulsions.

A RAY OF LIGHT

The one ray of light in the 1977 Australian Federal Elections was a strong minority protest vote, some of which reflected itself in a conscious informal vote. Thanks to the expanding work of The Australian League of Rights, there is a growing minority of electors who are informed and involved in politics in a constructive manner. It is that minority which is going to be the decisive factor in guiding the majority as it reacts to events. Some of those events will be unpleasant, but the lessons of history teach that most people only react to such events.

TO THE POINT

Twelve months ago many observers were predicting that the end was in sight for Rhodesia; that the Smith Government would have to capitulate completely to international pressures. But having eliminated the major terrorist forces in Mozambique with a daring counter-thrust, Mr. Smith has rejected the Anglo-American "agreement", a major feature of which was the inclusion of the terrorist in the Rhodesian armed forces, and turned towards attempting to negotiate a new constitution with Rhodesian black leaders, including the Chiefs. Mr. Smith is now criticised by the Owens of the West for insisting upon a constitution, which provides the white minority with guaranteed rights. With all his faults, Prime Minister Smith creates the impression of a tenacious and wily politician who is constantly playing for time.

A press headline announces that Communist China is "on the move". On December 6, a report from Hong Kong quotes the official Peking newspaper, *The People's Daily* as follows: "China must develop the science and technology of electronics to a high level and ensure widespread application". The paper admits that Chinese Communist electronic techniques are "backward". As Communism is not going to overcome this backwardness, it is the West, particularly the U.S.A., which will help out. As it has done in Communist Russia. The stage is being set for the financing, on credit — with the aid of — the international bankers — of a flood of advanced technology to Communist China. *The People's Daily* insists that when Communist China is strong enough, it must "liberate" Taiwan. As Mr. David Rockefeller and his fellows are also investing in Taiwan as well as in Communist China, what do they think of the

Communist threat to Taiwan? Obviously they feel that this will have no bearing on their long-term planning.

* * * *

One of the sacred dogmas of the financial "experts" is that a prosperous nation must have a "favourable balance of trade". In reality this means a national loss of real wealth because more production has been sent out of the country over a given period than has been brought in through imports. Now the Japanese have been so successful in the drive for the "favourable balance of trade" that other countries are crying, "halt"! The European Economic Community has insisted that the Japanese must send less steel and less motorcars and electronic equipment to Europe. The Japanese exports are depriving people in the Common Market countries of "full employment". Now the

American Government is insisting that something must be done to halt the flood of Japanese production to the USA. The American trade deficit with Japan for the calendar year 1977 has been estimated at a record \$8000 million at the very least.

Leaders of the Joint Federation of Labor Congress of Industrial Organisations has called for new import quotas to save tens of thousands of American jobs. Asian Labor leaders are critical of their fellow Labor leaders in the USA. One has bluntly said the American restrictive policy means an international trade war. Such a war is now inevitable unless one nation gives a lead by changing its internal finance-economic policies so that intensive export drives are unnecessary.

While criticising the European Economic Community for not taking more Australian production, Prime Minister Fraser scored votes off the Whitlam Labor Party in the recent Australian elections, by charging that Labor would permit a flood of cheap imports into Australia, these depriving Australian workers of their jobs. Such is the hypocrisy of politics under present unrealistic financial policies.

* * * *

Such is the madness of the export or perish mania, that instead of pressing for maximum consumption of beef in Australia, Australia's beef producers are told by their "leaders" that they must concentrate upon bigger exports. It is difficult to export meat to Japan because of the strict quotas, but easier to send it to the Japanese Province of Okinawa, which has a bigger beef quota. From Okinawa it is smuggled into the main Japanese Islands, with smugglers making a small fortune. A number of meat wholesalers have been arrested. As one report puts it, "Smuggling Australian steak and hamburger meat into the beef-starved Japanese islands can be almost as profitable as running dope".

* * * *

A report late last year stated that the Australian Wool Corporation has arranged a \$40 million overseas borrowing to support its trading activities, principally through the Rockefeller's Chase Manhattan banking group. The Fraser Government agreed last October to allow the Wool Corporation to borrow against stocks of wool held overseas. At the moment AWC stocks are over one million bales, with 300,000 bales being held overseas in Western Europe, US, Korea and Israel. This wool is real wealth produced by Australians in Australia. Instead of borrowing from overseas, credits could easily be made available at the cost of administration by the Reserve Bank to enable the AWC to operate its reserve price system. This would enable the levy on woolgrowers to be reduced, as much of the levy is required to pay interest bills.

Revelations that not only Communist-dominated nations are making little effort to repay debts, plus interest, extended to them by Western-based banking organisations, but that "Third World" nations like Zaire in Africa are falling behind in their debt repayments, naturally prompts the question of why international banking organisations continue to extend credits to such bad risks. As most of the credits are created out of nothing in the usual manner, the banking organisations are losing nothing. But most of the debts are guaranteed - even if they don't know it - by Western taxpayers. Enormous quantities of Western production is being poured down bottomless pits, one argument being that this is essential to keep Western economies operating and to maintain "full employment".

* * * *

On reading through many of the reviews on the October, 1977 Soviet celebrations of sixty years of Communism, we did not see one reference to the most important fact about the Bolshevik Revolution of October, 1917: that Lenin and Trotsky were financed by Wall Street international financiers. We would not expect the Communists to make any contribution towards exploding the myth about Communism. But we felt that a few of the anti-Communists might be bold enough to mention that the Bolsheviks were financed into power by Wall Street and that Wall Street has continued to finance the essential blood transfusions without which the Soviet would have collapsed years ago.

However, thanks to the Crown Commonwealth League of Rights, which financed the paperback edition of Dr. Sutton's blockbuster, *National Suicide*, and the World Anti-Communist League report on how the Soviet is being financed from the West, one of the biggest of the money hoaxes of this century is being progressively exposed.

GROWTH OF NATURAL HEALTH MOVEMENT IN U.S.A.

The clear-cut case of a Melbourne family adversely affected by fluoride in the public water supplied, as confirmed by the family's medical adviser, highlights once again the erosion of the individual's natural rights by the imposition of a policy of mass medication.

A medical bureaucracy is just as evil as any other bureaucracy. In the United States there has been a growing opposition to compulsory mass medication and the rapid expansion of a number of organisations working for freedom of choice concerning medical treatment and health care. The National Health Federation, the pioneering citizen organisation fighting for freedom of choice has a large and growing active membership. In a battle extending over 14 years, it eventually defeated a proposal by the Food and Drug Administration's proposed restriction on food supplements, minerals and vitamins.