

THE NEW TIMES

\$8 per annum post free.

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

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

Vol. 47, No. 1

JANUARY 1983

Registered By Australia Post—Publication No. VBH 1001

THE DESIGN BEHIND THE DESTRUCTION

By Eric D. Butler

The international depression has already left a trail of physical, moral and social destruction right around the world. Material destruction can be made good, but millions of lives are being permanently warped. Suicides, violence and drug consumption by the young have escalated. When, if ever, will it end? The depressed state of the economy will only be eased when those who control financial policy decide that sufficient conditioning has been achieved to drive mankind further down the road towards the ultimate objective, the World State.

Former West German Chancellor Willy Brandt, leading proponent of the first major step towards the World State, the New International Economic Order, has recently indicated that the present crisis is the opportune time to increase the call for more global centralisation. Following a recent three-day meeting in Ottawa, Canada, of the Independent Commission on International Development Issues, a 17-member international body that advises the United Nations on the NIEO, painted a grim picture of the threat to mankind. "It is a question of human survival", said Brandt. He did not mention that in every developed country, including drought ravaged Australia, survival was not threatened by a shortage of food, clothing, shelter and the other basic necessities for civilised living. But there was a threat of "a global economic collapse that will trigger mass starvation and social unrest".

BANKING "REFORM"

What is to be done about this threatened "global economic collapse"? The West must "reform the world banking system," with the strengthening of the International Monetary Fund. Loans to the poorer nations should be written off, and Western contributions to the International Monetary Fund doubled to make more loans available to the underdeveloped nations. There is a renewed call for Free Trade.

In the meantime the numerous economic "experts" continue to speculate on when the depression might end. Some say that there are signals suggesting that the worst is over, while others see several years of depression ahead. American correspondent for *The Australian*, Mr. Maxwell Newton, claims, however, that 1983 will see an American recovery getting under way. Newton correctly sees an expansion of the money supply by the Federal Reserve Board as the key to what will happen. But Dr. Beryl Sprinkel, Under-Secretary of State for Monetary Affairs, expresses alarm that the Federal Reserve is allowing the money supply to grow too fast. Even the Reagan Administration is applauding what it previously condemned. But the big problem is what happens to inflation if the money supply is increased? The answer is simple: it moves up again, with all its disastrous consequences.

Assuming that it is possible to get the economies of the non-Communist world operating at near full capacity, apart from high inflation there is the problem of what to do with the torrent of production so easily possible. Striving for greater exports can only intensify the international trade friction now getting fiercer. The planners behind the New International Economic Order believe that if trade barriers are lowered, there will be a "restructuring" of the nations' economies, which means that many will be permanently destroyed. The

threat by Australia's only steel producer, Broken Hill Pty Ltd., to cease steel production within a few years, is an indication of the shape of things to come. Australia, without its own steel production, loses much of its economic sovereignty, being dependent then upon steel from Japan or South Korea.

CHANGE OF COURSE ESSENTIAL

If sufficient people can grasp that there is a conscious design behind the destruction-taking place in all countries, then it is possible for one nation to adopt a different type of policy. It is now certain that irrespective of what type of monetary policy is followed under present rules, there must be escalating disaster. There is no way out of the deepening disaster except through a radical change of course. A nation like Australia, with its vast array of natural resources, is as well equipped as any nation to adopt a change, putting its own internal house in order and demonstrating to others what can be done.

Unfortunately, however, as C.H. Douglas said, only events move people, not explanations. Events are going to become increasingly painful and the only question now is just how much pain can people tolerate before they consider alternatives. Only Social Crediters can provide those alternatives, which means that they must face a tremendous responsibility. But they are also presented with an opportunity, which must be seized before there is a collapse into complete chaos and anarchy. Such a situation may be closer than most people are prepared to admit.

VALE L.D. BYRNE, O.B.E.

It is with a sense of deep loss that we record the recent death of Mr. L.D. Byrne, O.B.E., one of the most distinguished pioneers of the Social Credit Movement. A close associate of C.H. Douglas, Mr. Byrne was technical, adviser to the Aberhart Government of Alberta when that government was attempting to implement Social Credit financial policies. In recent years Mr. Byrne had lived in retirement in Victoria, British Columbia. We extend our deepest sympathy to his widow Janet and family.

We plan in our next issue to publish tribute to Mr. Byrne and his distinguished contribution to the Social Credit cause.

N.I.E.O. AND THE TECHNOLOGY REVOLUTION

By Jeremy Lee

The heady world of economists polarised for a while into two camps on the question of technology. One group argued that, while new technology eliminated jobs in the particular area of application, it created a bigger spin-off of job-opportunities in new fields. Out of this concept grew the "retraining" ethos, which reached the height of absurdity when an over-enthusiastic Australian Minister of Labour and Industry described a potential environment where people regularly retrained throughout the course of their lives.

The second group was more realistic in accepting that technologically induced redundancies were more or less permanent. But it seemed incapable of accepting the logical consequence — that a continually diminishing workforce was not only inevitable but also desirable. So it wallowed towards the notion that service industries would replace productive industries, and now, as technology makes its onslaught in the service field, towards "capital works". There is no difference between so-called conservative and socialist viewpoints regarding technology, and both are drifting closer to an economic vista where the workforce is totally employed and directed by government planners.

AUSTRALIA'S FIRST ROBOTS

Just before Christmas, 1982, the General-Electric Corporation installed a Thor K welding robot in its Brisbane plant. It might almost have been a new immigrant from 'Robotia', which has over 80,000 of its workers operating in Japan, and a fast-growing number in Europe and the Americas. Australia's latest Thor K is nothing unusual — it has a memory bank, which will store over 2,000 programmes, and a precision capability, which far exceeds human potential in its own field. It can perform more than one programme at once, draws no wages, and requires neither sick pay nor superannuation. At the moment there is no 'Trade Union for Robots', so this particular worker is entirely amenable to any whims of its owner.

With the possible exception of the A.L.P.'s Barry Jones, not one politician has really thought out what this new 'immigrant' means to the Australian of the future. Most politicians, in all parties, are pinpricked in the direction of "job-creating programmes", which translates into government-controlled capital works.

INTERNATIONAL THINKING

Robert L. Heilbroner, writing in the *New Zealand Times* (17/10/82) gave some insight into prevailing international thinking on the technology question. He wrote: "... The logical extension of the mixed economy lies in the deliberate encouragement and guidance of investment, the key to economic planning. The natural growth of the welfare state lies in the provision of permanent public employment for those unable to find private employment, in particular for the victims of the robotisation that is cutting into factory and office work..."

Heilbroner gave two possible variations on this evolution. One consisted of "a born-again capitalism stripped down to its natural, lean, aggressive fighting weight, once more undertaking its accumulative mission with assurance and pride. Whether this is a realistic vision or a fantasy we should discover fairly soon. I only hope ... we do not move on a dangerous course, preaching the gospel of freedom and enterprise, but practising the economics of military capitalism..."

"A second vision (Heilbroner went on) entertained much more strongly in Europe than the United States, sees this period as the forging ground for a new attempt to create socialism; a socialism of intensified democratic participation, of widespread workers' management of enterprises and of the gradual elimination of capitalist privileges and waste..."

REGIONALISM

As an economist whose "Economics Explained" was

printed by the *New York Times*, it can be taken that Robert L. Heilbroner's scenario is in vogue at the moment. His picture extended thus: "... I would imagine that the first order of business would be to deal with the chronic ailment of the present structure — inflation. I do not see how this can be done without the introduction of various kinds of ceilings and restraints — price and wage and dividend controls of one kind or another ... I believe there will be a marked lessening in the distinction we now make between the private and public sectors. To put it boldly, I believe the strategic vehicle of accumulation for tomorrow's world will be the state corporation ... I have left to the end a wrenching change I see as a precondition for erecting a new structure of accumulation. This is the abandonment of the idea of a unified world market as the global basis for accumulation, and its replacement with a system of regional blocs, each securing a reasonably protected market for its favoured producers, and regulating its intercourse with other large blocs. The reason for this change again lies in the power of modern technology to outflank and by-pass established areas of production ... The jobs of German, French, British and American workers are being performed by Taiwanese, South Koreans, Thais — perhaps soon by the Chinese. This is all very well for the consumer, but it is not so well for the producer. A successful structure of accumulation must ultimately support its producers over its consumers, and that includes its working force as well as its capitalists. I believe that the flag of free trade will be hauled down in the coming restructuring of things..."

One wonders whether Heilbroner's support for "producers over consumers" includes Thor K, the non-consuming robot?

STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS

The scenario he has painted may fit nicely enough round the ambitions of a few multinational corporations and bankers, but it is totally incompatible with human diversity of personal freedom. Take the General-Electric Corporation, for example. Dan Morgan, author of the hard-hitting *Merchants of Grain*, writing in *The Guardian Weekly* (UK) Sept. 26, 1982, said: "In the late '60s and early '70s the General-Electric Co. negotiated agreements with eight big European and Japanese companies to provide the equipment and technical know-how for building sophisticated gas turbines and compressors for pipelines. For G.E. the agreements were a shrewd piece of corporate diplomacy. They enabled the giant US electrical company to head off possible competition in the turbine business from the foreign firms, to take advantage of cheaper labour overseas and, indirectly, to obtain access to government subsidies and financing abroad ... According to a study on "Technology and Soviet Energy Availability" published last year by the congressional Office of Technology Assessment (OTA), General-Electric has provided licenses for building compressors, gas pipeline turbines, automation equipment and compressor stations to Nuovo Pignone of Italy, Mitsubishi Heavy Industries and Hitachi of Japan, Mannesmann and AEG Telefunken of West Germany, John Brown Engineering of Great Britain, and Thomassen Holland of the Netherlands ... OTA also found that 55 US companies have exported or contracted to export, energy-related equipment to the Soviets since 1975. The roster includes such firms as IBM, Control Data, Ingersoll-Rand, and Cooper Industries..."

As a result, the Reagan Administration was totally unable to fulfill its declared intention of halting the Siberian-gas

NEW TIMES—JANUARY 1983

pipeline.

"The internationalisation of the economy — which the US spearheaded — has rendered obsolete old ideas of economic warfare," said Richard J. Barnet, co-author of *Global Reach*, a study of multinational corporations. "You can't find targets any more, and if you aim at a target you often find its yourself . . ."

"Basically we're in an impossible situation," said one senior White House aide. "You don't want to get rid of the advantages of this international economic system, but if you try to exercise control for foreign policy reasons, you cut across sovereign frontiers..."

PLANETARY NEW DEAL

Acknowledging this dilemma caused by the associated problems of technology, internationalisation of industry and frustration of national sovereignty, last June the French magnate and former politician Jean-Jacques Servan-Schreiber spoke to the United States Congress. Servan-Schreiber authored the book *The Global Challenge*, published in 1980, in which he called for the establishment of an international micro-electronic development centre. This so impressed the French socialist government of Francois Mitterand, that it has now embodied Servan-Schreiber's ideas in the World Centre for Computer Science and Human Resources — a think-tank set up to promote the development of new technology to solve the "on-going crisis" in national economies.

The Australian (June 11, 1982) reported: "Together with a team of experts from the Centre, Mr. Servan-Schreiber travelled to Washington to brief US Administration officials on his plans for promoting new technologies and new employment opportunities. The Congressional hearings, held on the eve of the Versailles economic summit last week, highlighted serious problems in the regulation of international trade and development in the high-technology field — an area in which European nations rarely display the idealistic attitudes promoted by the new Centre. He warned the Committee on Science and Technology of the House of Representatives that by the end of the decade 50 million people would have been rendered jobless through new technology.

SERVAN-SCHREIBER'S VISION

In Mr. Servan-Schreiber's vision, advanced nations such as Japan and the US should turn their sophisticated information technologies and computing power to solving the world's economic and social dilemmas. The Centre's blueprint, *The Global Challenge*, does not consider that any major strategic obstacles to the formation of such an international financial and technological partnership exist. Mr. Servan-Schreiber told the Congress the US should establish a parallel World Centre, helping to form a network of such institutions round the globe . . . "It is becoming increasingly evident that in order to stem the forces of dislocation which undermine and depress our economies and societies and those elsewhere in the world, a global approach must be developed," Mr. Servan-Schreiber stressed. "Such a 'Planetary New Deal' would harness the most modern technologies to the training and development of individuals as well as to innovative production techniques . . ."

WHERE TO . . . ?

Only one question mars the limitless vistas and horizons opened up by Mr. Servan-Schreiber's "Planetary New Deal". Assuming we could establish a global network of 'think-tanks', seeking to harness modern technologies to the training and development of individuals — what then? Perhaps if we have enough think tanks, with enough people in each, this will solve the redundancy problem for us. But if we bring Thor K, the robot into the picture, sitting alongside us in each think-tank, even Mr. Servan-Schreiber's grand vision hardly seems likely to solve the dilemma. Some may sit and think, it is true — but more and more will 'just sit'.

There's nothing drastically wrong with sitting — so long as you may sit "under your own vine and your fig tree", as Micah advocated. However, private ownership of vines and fig trees is the one thing not contemplated by Mr. Servan-Schreiber, Mr. Robert L. Heilbroner or any other advocate of a Planetary New Deal. They will be the exclusive preserve of 'state corporations', lumped in 'regional blocs'. Quite where poor old Thor K fits in no one can be certain. But for redundant individuals with their own hopes, dreams and passions, there seems no place at all — unless they start insisting that their lives are their own business, not that of the World Centre for Computer Science and Human Resources.

DISCRIMINATION

"... Egalitarianism is literally a doctrine of death, and so long as life stirs, it is denied. That is why rivers of blood and hatred have been poured out in the name of **e-quality**, which is the denial of the **quality** of others. But salvation lies in **discrimination**, that is, in perceiving and conceding to all men their special qualities, and refusing to sit in ultimate judgment, which involves realising that our understanding is limited."

—Dr. Geoffrey Dobbs

"Do not lose the habit of praying to the unseen Divinity. Prayer for worldly goods is worse than fruitless, but prayer for strength of soul is that passion of the soul which catches the gift it seeks."

- George Meredith

BASIC FUND LAGGING

Shakespeare wrote of the "tide in the affairs of men which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune", but if missed ends in disasters. The rising tide of economic and social disintegration now sweeping the world provides a tremendous challenge, and an opportunity, for recruiting a huge volume of support for a programme of reconstruction.

The record of the League of Rights speaks for itself. The League alone offers not only an accurate analysis of the basic cause of the deepening crisis, but a programme of reconstruction based upon irrefutable truths.

The League has offered effective leadership in every crisis since it was first established twenty-six years ago.

A major programme has been prepared to place before the Australian people in 1983. But it is going to require adequate finance to carry it through. \$10,000 of the League's 1982-83 Basic Fund of only \$45,000 has been allocated to launching this programme. Because of the lag in support for the Basic Fund the League could miss the tide "at the flood".

If you are one of the great majority of readers who have not yet contributed, may we appeal to you to rush in your contribution, the most generous you can make as the hour is very late.

At present the Basic Fund stands at just over \$26,000, leaving a balance of \$19,000. The next few weeks could be decisive.

All Northern N.S.W. and Queensland contributions should be sent to Mr. Jeremy Lee, Ravensbourne, Queensland, 4352. Western Australian contributions to P.O. Box 16, Inglewood, W.A., 6052. All others to G.P.O. Box 1052J, Melbourne, Vic., 3001.

FORMER BEGIN ASSOCIATE ON ISRAELI INVASION OF LEBANON

Haviv Schieber is a Polish Jew and a former close associate of Prime Minister Begin of Israel. Schieber fought alongside his fellow Zionist terrorists in Palestine during the British mandate, but later broke with Begin and turned against Zionism.

The following revealing and historic interview, which we have slightly edited, took place between a representative of Liberty Lobby, Trisha Katson, in Washington, after the Israeli invasion of Lebanon started last year, and was published in the weekly tabloid, "Spotlight". (300 Independence Avenue, Washington, DC 20001). Schieber's comments provide essential background reading for an understanding of the Middle East situation.

Why, in your opinion, did Israel invade Lebanon?

There were three aims of this invasion.

One was to destroy the Palestinian refugees. The PLO (Palestine Liberation Organisation) is the Palestinians; the Palestinians are the PLO. Seventy percent of the budget of the PLO goes to help the refugees in education, health, diplomatic and political activities. Therefore, the refugees are loyal to the PLO.

The second goal of Israel was to wait for any kind of excuse — if some Arab country dared to help the Palestinians, Israel would use this as an excuse to immediately attack the military facilities of Saudi Arabia, Jordan or Syria. The Arabs understood this danger. Therefore, they kept very cool and tried to press the US to intervene and stop this savage destruction of Lebanon.

The third goal is that Israel wants to militarily destroy the PLO. Israel believes the West Bank Arabs are so frightened and humiliated that they will agree to any kind of autonomy it gives them.

In your view, has Israel been successful in its goals?

No, I believe Israel failed on all three aims. It didn't fail at destruction — it did a good job of that — but it failed in breaking the will of the Palestinians. Today world opinion supports the PLO more than ever before, and the issue of the Palestinian people is more accepted now than before the attack on Lebanon.

The West Bank Arabs will never fall into the trap of accepting so-called "Israeli autonomy", regardless of whether or not Israel finishes off the PLO in Lebanon. These Arabs will still be under the orders of, and in full agreement with, the PLO, but will remain nearly intact. The PLO has never been, and never dreamed of being, a military force against Israel, but the Israeli invasion made them military heroes.

During the civil war in Lebanon, one faction hit the other factions. The main issue was for the PLO to have weapons to be able to protect the Palestinian refugees against any kind of attack from extremists. At this time, Lebanon was divided into a lot of factions that were fighting each other.

But wouldn't you say that Israel has achieved the feat of expelling the PLO from Lebanon?

What Israel has achieved now is that — with a tremendous amount of weapons, the war has lasted more than two months. And the PLO still was not liquidated — not physically, not even militarily. The PLO left Beirut like France, England and Israel were forced to leave the Suez Canal in 1956 by President Eisenhower.

Besides this political reason, the PLO left because it felt a moral obligation to the half-million Beirut inhabitants that Israeli Defense Minister Ariel Sharon was ready to kill.

Isn't the departure of the PLO from Lebanon similar to when it left Jordan?

With Jordan, there were no cities or villages destroyed, there were not even camps destroyed. It was a political "family affair", and the Arabs are used to such family quarrels.

Doesn't the PLO have a lot of sophisticated equipment, supplied by the Soviets?

The PLO has no sophisticated weapons at all. The only weapons of substance that they had were the anti-tank carbines that can, from a short distance, hit and destroy tanks.

The tanks that Israel captured came from Syria, not from the PLO. You cannot even begin to compare the weapons of the PLO to the might of Israel. It has no helicopters, no airplanes, no tanks, nothing.

What do you think the Arabs will do now?

In the Arab world, there will be a new unity. Israel will become more disunited, I believe, and the Israelis will start to fight each other.

Why haven't the Arab countries, in the past, taken in the Palestinians?

They have. They absorbed every Palestinian who came to their countries. There are Palestinians in every Persian Gulf country, including Saudi Arabia, in the fields of business and education. The Arab countries of the Arab League adopted resolutions to finance and help the Palestinians and the PLO as the first item of each agenda of the league.

During the Lebanon crisis, the Zionist propaganda tried to spread the false image that Arab countries don't want to accept the Palestinians in their states. This lie has been shattered by the acceptance, in nearly every country, of the PLO as heroes.

Then would you say that Israel has actually helped to unite the Arabs?

With this war, Israel has definitely united all the Arabs. They will soon finish all their quarrels and unite. Their aim will be fortification, training, and then a jihad — a holy war — that will be justified in the public's opinion after what Israel did to Lebanon. The greatest sign of unification was shown by the emotional greeting of King Hussein to the PLO heroes, saying the family quarrels should be forgotten — meaning the expulsion of the PLO.

You are a member of the Holy Land State Committee, which proposes that a demilitarised, de-Zionised and secular state be created, where Christians, Moslems and Jews can live together. But for more than 50 years now, the Jews and the Arabs have been fighting each other. Do you think your committee's proposal is a realistic one?

My proposal for a Holy Land state is based on a long history of peace, prior to the last 60 years. People were not only living together within the Moslem/Arab world, but they were even partners in the golden age of Islam.

I am also basing this Holy Land state concept on my own personal experience with the Arabs, working and living with them and learning to understand them.

You said there was peace until about 60 years ago. What happened, at that point, to change that?

Back around 1920, the Marxist-Zionists started the fighting between the Arabs and the Jews. They forced Jewish employers to fire Arab workers — they used the slogan "Only Jewish Labourers". On the other hand, they organised Arab labour against Arab employers, according to the basic hate doctrines of Marxism.

The result was that the Arab labourers and Arab employers joined against the Jews and the British in the 1930s. But I believe that, like disputes and even civil wars among Arabs are forgotten and forgiven to build a better future, so will the fighting and hatred among Jews and Arabs will be forgotten and forgiven under the umbrella of a Holy Land state.

But supporters of Israel cannot think that way, can they? If they did, then they would have to give up Israel, which is "a

Jewish state".

That is true. With its meddling into the affairs of Lebanon, Israel was trying to show that Christians and Moslems cannot live together. Therefore, Israel must be an exclusive Jewish state, and Lebanon must be divided into Moslem and Christian parts — and this is against the nature of the people in this region.

Every nation, every state today has minorities. And if people follow crooked and sick principles, then there would be fighting all the time. In these dark days, we believe in a Holy Land state more than ever, because, after wars, people seek peace.

If the people want peace, then is it the leadership that is subverting this?

People everywhere want peace, but the desire to live together has been destroyed by the Moscow and Tel Aviv conspiracy. Moscow has an interest in undermining the US position in the Middle East, so it is using the Palestinian issue to pit the Middle East against the interests of the US.

Israel is trying to divide the Arabs, especially in Lebanon.

Do you think the Arabs would agree to a Holy Land state?

The Arabs have no problem with the Jews living in Israel; this is not what they object to. They object to an exclusive Jewish state, which the Zionists insist upon.

Under the jurisdiction of the British in the 1930s and 1940s, even the British wanted to see a fair situation develop. They didn't want to see the Palestinians disfranchised. But with the advent of World War II, they lost control of the situation and lost the will to deal with the Jews, who are very clever in manipulating US and world opinion.

When Israel was declared an independent state, Josef Stalin and President Harry Truman immediately recognised it — against the advice of some advisers of Truman, who could foresee the terrible consequences for the US.

The Soviet empire supposedly backs the Arabs, and Israel is heralded as a "democracy, like the US". Therefore we are told that Israel is our only ally in the Middle East. But now you are saying — and there have been other, similar reports — there is a linkage between the Soviets and Israel. What is your knowledge of this?

First of all, the worst partners of the communists are the Moslems; they don't make faithful communists. In 1949, Golda Meir was sent to the Soviet Union as the first ambassador. She was the most Marxist-minded member of the Ben Gurion government.

A pact was made with Stalin, which stated that Israel wouldn't try to solve the Palestinian refugee problem as long as this served the interests of the communists in Israel and the Soviet Union in Arab countries. The pact also said that Israel would not permit any foreign bases on her territory, particularly US bases.

Also, the pact said that Israel's external policy should through American Jewry make the US a partner against the Arabs, and that Israel should remain a true socialist establishment and permit the communist party to act freely.

If this is true, why have Americans not been told about this?

Because it is a secret that has been kept from them. As you know, there is much censorship in Israel. Anyway, Stalin agreed to open the gates of his satellite states in Eastern Europe to let the Jews go, only to Israel. Also, if the emigration to Israel dried up, he would permit the Soviet Jews to leave.

Both parties agreed that peace between Israel and her Arab neighbours could be achieved only if the Soviets dominated the Arab countries politically, militarily and economically.

We hope that the latest events in Lebanon will illustrate in black and white to the president and members of Congress that Israel's actions against Lebanon were acts against a state that didn't exist. It didn't have an army — not even a police force.

NEW TIMES—JANUARY 1983

So who was profiting from this? Not the Israelis, not the Lebanese, not the Americans — only the Soviets.

Your views on the Middle East are interesting, especially in light of your once being an associate of Prime Minister Menachem Begin. Could you go into some detail about your political background?

I was raised in the movement of Zew Zobotinsky, who organised the Jewish Legion in the British army during World War I. He was the organiser also of the Jewish National Movement (Betar) and was the leader of the political Zionist revisionist movement. Later, after leaving the general Zionist organisation, he began a new Zionist organisation. After he died, in 1940, Begin became the flag holder for his movement.

I lived in Poland and attended only private Hebrew schools. I was one of the first organisers of so-called "free immigration" to Palestine. I was politically involved from elementary school and became the national secretary of the labour organisation in Haifa. My work was to give jobs, housing and other help to the newcomers of our group to Palestine. These individuals later became members of the Irgun and Stern groups.

They were terrorist groups. The Irgun and Stern groups started their activities to liberate Palestine from the British to establish a Jewish state — first by kidnapping Jews for financial purposes. The majority of Jews were against this. These activities frightened the Jews, and they began supporting the groups against the British.

After 1938, I went to Poland to be part of the organisation of illegal immigration two years before World War II. I escaped two weeks after the war broke out. After returning to Palestine, I was arrested by the British for illegal immigration activities and having a false passport.

You were arrested for your own illegal immigration or for helping others?

For helping others. Then I worked in the British camps during the war with the Arabs.

Begin never worked as a private individual in any job. He never met with Arabs socially or in business. I worked with them and met with them socially and through business and I knew that we could work together, like the Jews did in the Arab countries for hundreds of years.

After the Irgun started to terrorise, I was helping the economic branch of our movement in acquiring jobs. After the partition of Palestine, I helped Begin by giving him contacts with the British. I gave him the opportunity to save the future of Israel as a state by attacking Jaffa one month before the British left in 1948.

Were you a member of the Irgun?

I was not a member but a helper. This was my "family". I immediately discovered that Israel was not for the Jews. It established a military, socialist republic, a socialist state, second, in Marxist structure, only to the Soviet Union.

So up until this time, you were a dedicated Zionist?

Yes, I fully believed in Zionism. But then I became disillusioned. I was elected the first mayor in Beersheba, in 1949. I saw that this state could not exist without 100 percent participation of the Arabs, so I helped to establish the Anti-communist League of Israel of Moslems, Christians and Jews.

We told the Israeli government that there would never be peace until it solved the Palestinian refugee problem, and that that must be done by giving the property, homes and assets back to the Palestinian Arabs. We gave the government our full plan.

At the time, the Arab houses were occupied by Jewish newcomers. A socialist government is not a giver, but a taker. The Israeli government tried to keep everything that they had taken, and this has led to the situation that we are facing today.

Did you form the Anti-communist League to fight all commun-

ism — or just communism in Israel?

We were really just trying to seek the anti-communist solution for Israel. But our alternative to changing the Israeli socialist economy is also the alternative for all people behind the Iron Curtain. Decommunisation of the economy means that the factories, mines, housing and land return to private ownership.

How were your proposals for reform received?

My ideas were accepted, and I was invited to participate at the Fourth Anti-Communist Conference in Latin America in Guatemala in 1958. I asked the Israeli government to give me at least \$100 for expenses. They will give unlimited funds for any communist enterprise. I was given only \$10, so I tore up the money in the face of the bureaucrats and left the country without one penny.

In Guatemala, I delivered three resolutions. One was that the Palestinian-Israeli quarrel, which, I explained, was basically the refugee problem, must be solved. The second resolution concerned the Cyprus crisis. I said the Cyprus problem should not be a ball in the hands of Britain and other big powers, but that this must be solved between the Turks and the Greeks. The third resolution was an appeal to France to give freedom to Algeria. Those were the burning points of the day.

After I delivered this speech, the Anti-Defamation League (ADL) of B'nai B'rith ordered the Jewish community in Guatemala to sabotage us, and they forced the government to expel me. It was about the worst treatment I have ever had . . . I was arrested, but I felt I had been successful because I discovered that some Jews agreed with what the Anti-communist League was doing. In spite of the ADL's attempt to stop me, I eventually reached the US.

Do you feel you are a man without a country?

I have no status. I am not even a legal resident of the US, but I feel more American than some Native Americans, particularly all American Jewish Zionists. All of them are anti-Jewish and anti-American.

And not only am I an "illegal", I don't even have the right to travel from one state to another without a permit from the ADL — or rather the Immigration and Naturalisation Service (INS), which is under the thumb of the ADL. I cannot go out of the country to see my family, which I would like to do. I don't have a so-called green card.

And you attribute your immigration problems to the ADL? How can that be?

The ADL is the headquarters of all unregistered agents of Israel not only in the US but also throughout the world. It is in charge of the Jews in Guatemala, Buenos Aires, Rio de Janeiro and Moscow, and in the US. The ADL is in charge of the president of the US, the Senate and the House, the Justice Department, the INS, and the IRS. It has unbelievable power.

Some people reading this will find it hard to believe. How do you know that the ADL has so much influence?

I have experienced this first-hand from the local courts in New York to the Supreme Court; from the director of the INS in New York to the INS commissioner in Washington and the chairman of the board of appeals of the INS. The ADL controls all Jewish organisations, all synagogues and their Judeo-Christian puppets that are signing full-page advertisements for Israel paid by the ADL, like with the AWACS sale.

The ADL also controls all rabbis and can get all the money that it needs. The ADL has agents in every country who work with Israeli diplomats. In my case, together with the Israeli ambassador in Mexico, they demanded from each Central American country that they expel me.

On a more general level, in Congress, any member who dares to speak for America first and not for Israel becomes a target for the ADL to run out of office. Former Senators William Fullbright, James Abourezk, former Congressman John Rarick, and Paul Findley (R-Ill.), who is still in the

House, are just a few of the better-known examples of this.

Another very useful tool of the ADL is luncheon and dinner invitations to members of Congress. The ADL pays thousands of dollars for 20-minute speeches and covers the expenses, not only for the senators or congressmen but also for family members and staff. Sometimes the ADL even writes the speeches for the congressional member.

How did the ADL get to be so powerful?

For a very simple reason. The most affluent community has the most influence. The next-door neighbour to a general, a future president or a current president is not Joe Schmo or some mineworker or a carpenter, but a celebrity from Hollywood or a famous lawyer.

Just recently, columnist Robert Novak said that President Reagan's position on the Middle East reflected a Beverly Hills outlook — and he is correct.

Now Reagan is learning the hard way, the dangerous way, what Israel's relationship to the US is. I hope he will be a good student.

But don't you think that before Reagan was elected, he was in a position to know how powerful the ADL was?

Every candidate knows only one thing: If he wants to be elected, he needs votes and money. Jews in many states give both money and votes, and even in states where they are not that powerful vote wise, the money buys the votes. This is true in Nebraska, which has a small Jewish population but a powerful Zionist organisation (see *Spotlight*, Aug. 9).

What are your thoughts on Begin now?

He is a sentimental, unrealistic individual — fanatically thinking he knows the Jews and that he is the defender of the Jews. But he is really a gravedigger of Israeli Jews, physically, economically, politically and morally, and of world Jewry, especially in the US.

Begin and the Israeli government have been accused of committing the same crime that Hitler did to the Jews during World War II. Is this a valid comparison, in your opinion?

I lost nearly all my family between Stalin and Hitler, so you can, I am sure, understand my feelings on this. But the truth should be known that to compare Zionism and Nazism is incorrect.

Nazism should be credited with honesty and Zionism with falsehood. Hitler never promised the Jews or the communists a rose garden. But we Zionists promised the Arabs education, culture and civilisation in the Middle East.

Instead, we brought murder and destruction, and we are endangering not only the Middle East, but all world peace.

What do you think will happen next in the Middle East?

The next stage is very important, and it depends on the US and the Arabs, particularly the PLO. They are fighters who survived and showed the world their heroism. Americans don't understand the mentality of my brethren in Israel. The Jews were saying all the time that the Arabs, especially the Palestinians, are cowards.

The future is up to these heroic Palestinians — not to fall in the trap of the Soviets who want them to attack the Arab governments for not militarily helping them out in the war. The Soviets not only want to spread disunity among Arab nations, but they want also to spread disunity among the PLO. Most important, Moscow and Tel Aviv want the extremist activities of some Arabs to destroy the positive public opinion in the US toward the Palestinian issue. The communists want these Arab extremists to conduct terroristic activities against the Jews.

PLO leader Yassir Arafat has suggested that after the war in Lebanon is over, an international conference should be held to discuss the issue of the Palestinian people and their need for a

homeland. What do you think of his proposal?

I think it is a splendid idea.

What do you think of Ariel Sharon?

Sharon is an arrogant student of the leftist Establishment. He was a leader and a member of the Hagana of the leftist underground. My view is that Begin is used by the leftist Establishment in Israel as a puppet to heat up anti-American feelings until the leftists take over the leadership again. Then they will go after tax *Sovietica* — Soviet peace. Then all the weapons that the US gave Israel will become a part of the southern flank of the Soviet Red army.

Do you think Israeli policy would be any different if Begin were not prime minister?

Begin developed an anti-American and pro-Soviet atmosphere. After this war, many Jews will accuse the US of preventing the Israeli army from having a chance to finish the job and kill all the Lebanese and Palestinians. So there will still be an anti-US sentiment, and I believe a leftist government will take over and the Soviets will renew diplomatic relations. Israel will be the greatest danger to the US in the Middle East.

What are your feelings about Yitzhak Shamir?

This says it all: Shamir belonged to the Stern group. The Stern group tried to make contact in 1940 with the Germans and Italians in Syria, and they were caught red-handed. When they came out from the underground in 1948, the leadership was pro-Soviet — and Shamir was one of them. Recently Shamir had a 90-minute conference with Andrei Gromyko, the foreign minister of the Soviet Union, who has no diplomatic relations with Israel. Maybe they were planning the scenario for the war in Lebanon.

The US gives Israel approximately \$7 million a day in economic and military aid. Do you think the US should continue to support Israel?

I think it is more like \$15 million a day. Regardless, any aid— even economic aid — should be stopped. Otherwise the Jews will not come to their senses. And Israel spends this money, which comes from US taxpayers, without accounting for it. Uncle Sam is giving away something for nothing.

When I criticised the US Embassy in Tel Aviv for their foreign aid, I demanded, "Show me in the Bible where Jesus or Moses ever gave something for nothing".

Foreign aid should be given people to people, not from government to government. An American shoemaker, for instance, with a trade, should teach a shoemaker in Israel, or wherever, his skills. This should also be done with all communist countries — not provide giveaways. In the area of agriculture, we should send farmers to deal with foreign farmers.

With the way the US now gives foreign aid, instead of achieving pro-American sentiments, it has resulted in anti-American feelings — and accusations that, behind this foreign aid, there are invisible strings attached.

Over the years, Israel has engaged in hostile military acts toward the US, which has made Israel into the third most powerful military entity in the world. Examples of this are the attack on the "USS Liberty" and most recently, the harassing of US helicopters by Israeli planes — or rather US-made planes flown by Israelis. Why does the US condone this?

For the US, Israel is an internal affair and an external headache. For the Soviets, Israel is a ball to use and play with. Israel is, was, and will be, with the Soviets. The Soviets have 2.5 million Jews to deliver. America not only has no Jews to deliver but is taking Jews from Israel.

There was a well-known saying during the establishment of Israel that "Israel needs Jews without money and money without Jews": Jews without money, to take from the Soviets, and money without Jews, to take from the US.

So if you want to stop this, stop the money. Then the Soviets will not have another satellite in the Middle East. As a matter of fact, the only Soviet satellite in the Middle East is Israel.

Do you think you will ever go back to Israel?

No.

What do you think of the belief in the US that Israel is a "Western" country and a "bastion of democracy"?

It is a lie and part of the Zionist propaganda. Is it a "democracy" where they close newspapers and censor all facets of communications at will, a "democracy" where there is no capital punishment, but they kill people between the place of arrest and the police station.

There are 120 members of the Knesset, the Israeli parliament, and nearly all of them are functionaries. They never earned a cent as private, independent citizens. They are dividing the pie, that comes from the US and from the world Jewry, among themselves.

You can predict elections in Israel in advance, and about 40 or more members of the Knesset are always leftists. The rest vote according to how the wind blows. Today they vote for Begin, tomorrow they vote against him. Begin has no foundation at all.

We hear so much about Jews being persecuted in the Soviet Union. How bad is this situation?

The most privileged part of Soviet society is the Jews — not because they are Jews, but because they constitute white-collar professionals who live in the big cities, and they are all members of the Communist Party. On occasion, you read in the newspapers about someone asking to go to Israel, and they fire him from his job, and he doesn't get a job for two years.

Can you imagine being without a job in a police state for two years? When a labourer is dismissed, the next day he has nothing to eat.

The Jews are the masters of false propaganda . . .

FALKLANDS AND THE SOVIET

The admission by former President of Argentina, General Galtieri, that he was ready to receive active military aid from the Soviet Union and Cuba, but that events moved too fast for this to happen, confirms the view of those who believe that the Soviet strategists hoped to see the development of a long, drawn out conflict in which they could have intervened on the side of Argentina, thus establishing a Soviet influence in the South Atlantic.

The Galtieri admission also confirms the warning issued before the Falklands affair produced a major military conflict, by the respected Roman Catholic traditional anti-Communist movement, Society for the Defence of Tradition, Family and Property, which sent messages warning that military action by Argentina could result in the Soviet gaining a major foothold in South America. Striking evidence was provided of Communist influence in Argentina.

TFP warned that Brazil, Argentina and Great Britain were facing the same enemy. The relatively quick British military victory was a major defeat for the Soviet strategists. But the British once again have still not convincingly won the peace. Mrs. Thatcher expresses surprise that Washington should now appear to turn against the British at the United Nations, endorsing the suggestion that sovereignty over the Falkland Islands can be negotiated. While the strategic significance of the Islands is important, even more important is the question of whether British subjects are going to be permitted to remain British and be independent.

Foreign aid is Western taxpayers' money. Its advocates do not give away their money, but demand taxes on others. The donors are the taxpayers, who are forced to pay whether they like it or not, and often do not even know that they pay for aid let alone how much.

*Peter Bauer,
Equality, the Third World and Economic Delusion.*

THE FREEZE

As not even the silliest politician can believe that curbing wages is going to solve the basic problem causing the deepening economic recession — lack of adequate purchasing power in the hands of consumers — it is obvious that the wage "freeze" policy of the Federal Government is a political gimmick. It probably helped the Liberal Party in the Flinders by-election, with the government perceived to be "doing something" with the Labor Party offering nothing. The reason for offering nothing is that the Labor Party, whether led by Mr. Hayden or by Mr. Hawke, has nothing to offer that is basically different from what the government is offering.

Not only wage controls, but also price controls, have been tried a number of times over the past twenty years in different countries. The overall results have always been the same — disastrous. Mr. Muldoon is attempting a "freeze" across the Tasman in New Zealand. The overwhelming majority of New Zealanders are agreed that it is making the New Zealand situation worse, not better.

One does not need to be particularly bright to understand that if \$300 million is "saved" by the Federal wage freeze, those who have not obtained the higher wages will have less purchasing power than if they obtained the wage increases. The government will, of course, obtain less tax revenue. If the \$300 million is spent on "making work schemes", then all that will happen is that some Australians will have \$300 million which others would have had. The whole concept, including that of governments "making work", is pure socialism. Instead of young Australians chipping weeds off footpaths and similar activities, they should be given the opportunity to learn worthwhile skills under the supervision of private employers. These employers will engage extra staff if they receive orders. The building industry, for example, could usefully employ tens of thousands if adequate finance were made for builders to build homes for people who need them. But it appears that widespread home-ownership in Australia is being deliberately phased out.

Any suggestion of increasing the money supply is met with the cry, "But this will only make inflation worse". Of course it will — under present financial rules. Those rules have to be changed. The Federal Government is increasing the money supply as it attempts to finance an ever-increasing deficit, now estimated to be at least \$4,000 million, making nonsense of Mr. John Howard's last budget projections. But if new money were used to REDUCE financial costs and prices, a completely different result would emerge. The first two major steps required to shift Australia off the present disaster course, is the complete abolition of Sales Tax, which would reduce prices — and increase purchasing power — by \$3,000 million. The second step necessary is the re-introduction of the consumer subsidy scheme used so successfully during and after the Second World War, when basic items in the economy, those used to adjust wages, were reduced by subsidies. For a start, \$3,000 million a year could be allocated to such a scheme, the Sales Tax in reverse.

A total reduction in prices of \$6,000 million would automatically make wage increases unnecessary. In financial terms, \$6,000 million is not a large amount compared to a Federal budget of nearly \$50,000 million. But it would be a first step, one that could be followed by other steps later. Unless this type of policy is adopted, we can predict with complete certainty that the much-publicised wage "freeze" will be yet one more disaster, irrespective of whether it helps to save the Fraser government or not.

Unlike the party politicians, the League's track record has been one of consistent accuracy. Principles and absolutes cannot be changed by political gimmicks. People who insist on

jumping over cliffs will always be subject to the law of gravity and hit the bottom of the cliff. Those who survive might eventually come to the conclusion that there are absolutes, which must be obeyed in order to avoid disaster. Regrettably, many politicians are very slow learners! But they could be brightened up with the threat by informed electors that their jobs — and those nice fat superannuation schemes — were in danger if they did not brighten up!

EDGE OF THE DARK

By Neil G. McDonald

A personal experience by the author in County Armagh, Northern Ireland, on March 18, 1982, which provides a glimpse of sanity in a mad world.

"I be come round at edge of the dark," was the way an Irish farmer referred to sunset. He judged the time to come, not by clock or radio, but the need to put a match to a hurricane lamp.

Not far away from his small farm in County Armagh, was a domestic power line. But, the farmer, sturdy and independent declined to connect to the supply. His father too, had never bothered to link up with electric light and its omission had never stopped conversation.

Other farmers preferred to receive electricity and pay their accounts. Their homes with television and other modern appliances were more attractive to live in . . . but not more cheerful.

The farmer was a bit of a muddler. Not far from his back doorstep, small stones protruded above pools of water. He never got round to cement paths. After all, most days, he wore gumboots and a few puddles did not cause wet feet.

The dim kitchen contained all his immediate comforts — an old style settee with a dog nestling at one end.

A combustion stove kept the room warm and provided hot water. It had never been properly cleaned and the ash container was full. But, it too, cost nothing to run, except the effort to cut down boxthorn — and saw the broken branches of fruit trees into short logs.

"An Australian, eh?" he questioned. "Isn't that where the natives eat the white man?"

"No worse than here," I answered. "There's plenty of trouble in Northern Ireland!"

"Never a quieter place," said the farmer. He did not bother with newspapers except to light his fire.

"Ireland is full of friendly folk. Come and meet some tonight."

At the edge of the dark, the farmer arrived at the nearby house where I stayed. He led me to a nice car — owned by a brother. "I be licenced — step inside."

Along the wee'est lanes, lined with hedgerows, we drove. Without signposts, lit faintly by a cloud-caressed moon, he followed a course remembered from boyhood nearly fifty years ago.

A light on a farmhouse door — a gentle knock. "Meet my Australian visitor." I walked into a circle of smiles and handshakes. There was much laughter, singing, supper and Irish coffee (whisky laced).

Near midnight, we drove away then stopped at another farmhouse. "Meet my Australian visitor," the farmer repeated. Two hours of laughter and then farewells . . . "only a few wee hours to milking at morn — why waste it with sleep — before the edge of the dawn?"