

# THE NEW TIMES

\$10. per annum post-free.

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

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

Vol. 48, No. 7

JULY, 1984

Registered By Australia Post—Publication No. VBH 1001

## THE ZIONIST-MARXIST NEXUS

*By Eric D Butler*

**On June 6, immediately following a big public rally in the Victorian Provincial City of Warrnambool, at which I was a guest speaker along with outspoken President of the Victorian Returned Servicemen's League, Mr. Bruce Ruxton, O.B.E., there erupted one of the most revealing smear campaigns seen in Australian history. The public signal for the start of the campaign was the highly publicised visit by Zionist spokesman Mr. Isi Leibler to the Victorian State Parliament, leading a delegation of fellow Zionists, to demand of the leader of the Liberal Opposition, Mr. Geoff Kennett, that none of his Members ever appear on a public platform with me or any other representative of The League of Rights.**

What is the meaning of a campaign triggered by a public rally concerned with the Aboriginal land claims campaign, at which a Liberal Member of the Legislative Council, the Hon. Digby Crozier, spoke in defence of one of his electors, Mr. Neil Muldoon, threatened by a land acquisition claim by the Victorian Labor Socialist Government, with several of his colleagues, together with the leader of the Victorian National Party, Mr. Ross Edwards, also sitting on the platform in support of the threatened Muldoon family? Many people have been puzzled by the campaign set in motion by the Leibler demands on the Victorian Opposition parties.

The national significance of what has happened may be judged by Mr. Leibler's own statements that political leaders throughout Australia were being approached as part of a national campaign designed to try to isolate the League of Rights, perhaps the most significant response to this campaign being a grovelling letter from the Chairman of the Queensland National Party, Sir Robert Sparkes to Mr. Leibler expressing his opposition to the League of Rights. As Sir Robert Sparkes on one occasion actually chaired a meeting for me, and later was chairman of the Management Committee of the Queensland National (at that time Country) party, which examined the type of "pro-Nazi" and similar allegations now being resurrected by Mr. Leibler, and then completely dissociated his party from these allegations, it would be instructive to know what type of pressure Mr. Leibler was able to apply to Sir Robert to obtain his denunciation of the League.

Many have asked the same question concerning the knee-jerk reaction of Victorian Liberal leader Kennett after Mr. Leibler and his fellow Zionists had called upon him. Mr. Kennett is not noted as one of Australia's most profound and informed political leaders. But he had no hesitation in saying that he "hated" the League of Rights and what it stood for. He not only refused a request from me for an appointment but as yet has not had the courtesy even to acknowledge a letter asking which of the enclosed League of Rights objectives Mr. Kennett disagreed with.

One report has it that unless the Liberal Party strongly dissociated itself from the League of Rights, there was a danger of the Jewish vote being lost. As the distinguished American anti-Zionist Jew, Dr. Alfred Lilienthal has demonstrated in his classic, *The Zionist Connection*, even in the U.S.A., where the Jewish population is a much larger percentage of the American population than is the case in Australia, the Jewish vote is relatively unimportant. What is important, as Lilienthal points out, is the Zionist dominance of most of the American media and the film-making industry.

I well recall being in the U.S.A. on the occasion when an exasperated President Lyndon Johnson drew attention to the fact that opposition to America's attempted anti-Communist stand in Vietnam was being promoted by Jews. Anyone who asked, as I frequently did, why Zionists, claiming to be anti-Communist, were heading the anti-Vietnam campaign, was immediately called and "anti-semitic."

If the anti-socialist political leaders in Australia really believe that they are in danger of losing the small Jewish vote if they or any of their Members of Parliament are publicly associated in any way with the League of Rights, they stand self-condemned as political ignoramuses. One of the most fervent Zionists in Australia is Prime Minister Robert Hawke, a man often eulogised in the Zionist media and a friend of Mr. Leibler's. The case of Prime Minister Hawke highlights a fact often overlooked: Not all Jews are Zionists, and not all Zionists are Jews. The long-term Fabian-Socialist strategy of

### **OUR POLICY**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Prime Minister Hawke holds no terrors for Mr. Leibler and his fellow Zionists. Much of the Jewish vote in Australia has always gone to the Socialists.

As in the United States and elsewhere, Zionist influence is exerted primarily through all sections of the media and a flood of books and films used to promote psycho-political warfare. The immediate collapse of Mr. Kennett and many of his colleagues is a classic example of the deadly effectiveness of this type of warfare. Mr. Kennett is a typical case of the modern party politician who is concerned primarily with "image". With the media deeply influenced by the enemies of genuine conservatism, and with the non-socialist parties making no effort to develop any type of in-depth educational programme of their own, they have felt it necessary to engage in the futile effort of trying to placate a media dominated by their enemies. In view of the highly orchestrated media campaign following the Leibler call to the Victorian Opposition politicians, it is not surprising that so many party politicians are terrified of the media.

The first report on the Warrnambool rally in Melbourne's evening paper, *The Herald*, a half-page feature story on page 3, was a true reflection of what was a major new story of great human interest. There was a small farmer with whom all people, country or city, could relate — an example of the genuine "Aussie battler", the ex-shearer who had saved enough money to buy a rough piece of country which he could call his own, supported by his wife and two children on the platform as a deeply moved audience of hundreds watched him struggle for words to tell his story. *The Herald* story was straight journalism, reporting what I and other speakers had said. But what a change after the Leibler offensive started! Editorially and in featured articles *The Herald* joined the anti-League of Rights pack, one article claiming the League of Rights was planting seeds of fear in country areas.

One of the most vicious editorials of all appeared in Australia's only national paper, *The Australian*. But the same theme was developed right throughout Victoria, with most of the Provincial dailies and sections of the country press joining in. A reading of the editorial creates the impression that they were all written by the same person, which was, of course, hardly possible. But there was a striking common note: The League of Rights was so bad that politicians associated with it is at their peril. Television and radio reports and programmes hammered the same theme. Practically every media interview I did was either distorted or basic information edited out.

A striking example of media suppression was provided by the Melbourne TV station which, in spite of my reluctance to be interviewed, flew their helicopter 140 miles to the Victorian country centre where I was based. Right up until the showing of this TV station's evening news service the interview was listed as one of the main headline stories. But viewers watched in vain for that story. Clearly someone did not like the way the interview went. It may have been that my reference to the practice of anti-Jewish discrimination by the members of Melbourne's most prestigious club, the Melbourne Club, was not appreciated. I was attempting to make the point that discrimination was a natural law which should offend no one. But I find it hypocritical that there have been members of the Melbourne Club who align themselves with the "anti-semitic" smear against the League of Rights. If it was my reference to the exclusion of Jews from the Melbourne Club which was not liked, this could hardly be edited out at the last moment, as I had taken the trouble to do my own taping of the interview.

Immediately following the Leibler demands upon the Victorian Opposition parties came the Victorian State Labor party conference. Mr. Leibler did not need to make any demands upon Premier Cain and his colleagues, who joined with vigour in the anti-League of Rights campaign. Premier Cain had been slightly embarrassed when, siding with Mr. Leibler, he had charged that because Liberal and National Party Members were on the platform with me at the Warrnambool rally, their parties had "embraced" the League of Rights. The embarrassment came when it was pointed out

that Mr. Cain's own personal representative on Aboriginal Affairs, and Secretary to the Victorian Cabinet, Dr. Coghill, had appeared twice on a public platform with me. Backed by the ALP conference, Mr. Cain then said that no Labor Member could appear on the same platform as a League of Rights speaker, riot even to discuss or debate any question. In fact it was ruled that when a member of the Labor party inadvertently found himself at any public function at which there was a League speaker, the Labor member must withdraw. How childish.

What is the real meaning of the current anti-League campaign? What was so significant about the Warrnambool rally? This rally was a reflection of a national grass-roots movement on the Aboriginal land claims issue initiated by the League of Rights. As a number of Liberal and National party politicians have, over the years, appeared as guest speakers on League platforms, why should Zionists be so concerned when a number appeared at Warrnambool, primarily to indicate their support for the embattled Muldoon family. At no time have the Zionists expressed any sympathy for the Muldoons or other Australians threatened by some of the most draconian legislation ever introduced. A number of statements by Mr. Isi Leibler and other Zionists reveal support for both the immigration and the Aboriginal land claims legislation being advanced by their favourite politician, Mr. Robert Hawke. While Zionism opposes the creation of a multi-racial society in Israel, it supports it in countries like Australia.

In the welter of controversy concerning the League of Rights, a few of the more rational commentators observed that it was rather strange for the Victorian Labor Party to be adopting the Leibler line, that no politicians should associate with the League of Rights, when many of its more radical Socialists were violently anti-Israel, which, according to the Zionists, is a manifestation of "anti-semitism." Creating further confusion for the superficial observer is the Zionist quoting, with strong approval, attacks on the League of Rights by one of the most radical Socialists in the Federal Labor party, Mr. P. Steedman. The truth is that the controversy between the Zionists and the more radical Socialists is of a dialectical nature. The anti-Israel stance of the radical Socialists and their support for the Palestinians is but a reflection of the dialectical play promoted by the Soviet Union. Zionists willingly participate in this dialectical play, carefully suppressing the true history of how Israel was established with the support of the Soviet Union. The Soviet strategists and their various dupes around the world have no genuine interest in the Palestinians, except as a means of destabilising the whole of the Moslem world.

Australian politics are on the eve of far-reaching changes. The Zionists are well aware of this. While many Zionists easily become hysterical, I find it hard to believe that they really believe that the League of Rights is a "neo-Nazi" movement seeking to improve its "tarnished image" by inducing politicians to appear on common platforms. The League is a service movement, and does not seek power. But it has developed to the stage where it is a major influence, both direct and indirect, of a conservative movement which is at present extremely fluid. Following the next Victorian State and the Federal Elections that movement will almost certainly start to become more cohesive as the Liberal Party disintegrates.

The big danger is that the emerging conservative movement will be diverted. Those who are uninformed on the long-term nexus between Zionism and the various manifestations of Marxism, are currently starting to see Prime Minister Hawke as a more conservative Labor leader battling to maintain his independence against the pressures of the openly declared radical Socialists. It is not inconceivable that in a national crisis, Hawke could move to lead a new political grouping. But while the Zionists' hero is being depicted as the man holding the radical Socialists at bay, the perfect smokescreen has been created under which Mr. Hawke moves his Fabian Socialist strategy forward to turn Australia into a multi-racial Socialist

Republic.

In the developing Australian situation the League of Rights is the only movement with the knowledge and the experience to provide what is required for a genuine conservative revival. If the League is, as the Zionists claim, only a "fringe" movement, of no real significance, then why a massive campaign of smearing? Why is it subjected to a type of campaign not directed against any other movement in this country? C.H. Douglas said that there is an unholy alliance between some of the richest and most powerful men in the world, and the political underworld, the revolutionaries being used to destroy the security of those sections of society from which salvation for a tormented world might come. Having served their purposes, the revolutionaries can then be dispensed with. This strategy has been used successfully in country after country. It is now being used in Australia.

The Warrnambool rally rang the alarm bells to warn that an effective revolt against the planned betrayal of traditional Australia could be under way. And so the message went out: Destroy the League as quickly as possible. The future of traditional Australia is now inseparably linked with the future of the League of Rights.

### POWER AND PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY

As the current Zionist-Marxist assault against The League of Rights in Australia seeks to link the League with various power groups around the world, with specific reference to the British journal *Spearhead*, edited by Mr. John Tyndall, best known for his association with the British National Front, we are pleased to record that in the February issue of his journal Mr. Tyndall makes clear his basic philosophical difference with the League of Rights.

Mr. Tyndall devotes a lengthy article to an examination of the Calgary statement last year by The Crown Commonwealth League of Rights and several American patriotic groups. Mr. Tyndall makes some "friendly suggestions" as he discusses what he describes as the limitations of the League.

We have no desire to enter into an examination of Mr. Tyndall's article, confining ourselves to his assertion that "We do not agree with the CCLR in its assertion that centralised power is an evil in itself; we believe that the evil deriving from centralised power today rests entirely on the nature of those who happen to wield that power . . . . A centralised power manned by patriots of our own race would indeed be a thoroughly beneficent institution. . . ."

There is a law concerning power which was best put in the famous words of the great Lord Acton: "All power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely." Mr. Tyndall is critical of liberalism, but in fact accepts the undergirding philosophy of liberalism. If only the "right" people, like Mr. Tyndall for example, exercised centralised power, the problems of man would be solved.

With the greatest respect to Mr. Tyndall and others who think likewise, irrespective of their race, we would no more trust them with centralised power than those who exercise it now. Reality cannot be altered by well-meaning intentions.

### "TRIAL OF THE LAST TWO CENTURIES"

The case of Mr. Jim Keegstra, Albertan school teacher, and former Mayor of his local town of Eckville, who lost his position as schoolteacher because of bringing before his students the fact that much of generally accepted written history wasn't true, and at least drew attention to the vital influence of some Jews on history, has created international interest, particularly throughout the English-speaking world.

Following the loss of his teaching position, Mr. Keegstra was subsequently charged with promoting hatred against an identifiable group, Jews. During the preliminary hearing to decide whether Keegstra should stand trial, the interrogation

### "THE NAKED CAPITALIST" IN HUNGARIAN

The Canadian League of Rights advises that Cleon Skousen's famous well-known work, "The Naked Capitalist" is now available in Hungarian. If any of our Hungarian readers are interested in this special issue of Skousen's book, we can make arrangements to obtain copies provided we have firm orders. The price will be \$10.00.

of some of Mr. Keegstra's former pupils by his defence council, B.C. lawyer Mr. Doug Christie, it became obvious that those questioned were hazy about what Mr. Keegstra had in fact taught. Some had obviously misunderstood.

But the overwhelming majority of Keegstra's former pupils agreed that they had not acquired any hatred of Jews as a result of what Keegstra had taught. However, Judge Douglas Crowe said that "There is, in my mind, no doubt" that some of Keegstra's statements "were capable of promoting hatred of the Jewish people." He committed Keegstra for trial on a charge of wilfully promoting hatred against Jews.

Keegstra says he was not surprised, but proclaimed "I'll defend freedom and truth right to the bitter end."

It is anticipated that the Keegstra trial will be held in December. Defending lawyer Christie says it will be the "trial of the last two centuries". The fundamental issue goes far beyond whether Keegstra went outside the guidelines laid down for him as a teacher, but whether the Jewish influence in human affairs can be freely discussed. Zionist Jews insist that no one should have the right to be critical of what they regard as true history. In particular, anyone who even doubts that six million Jews were gassed on Hitler's orders during the Second World War is guilty of allegedly "promoting hatred".

If Keegstra is found guilty it can be said that the Pharisaim which Christ so strongly denounced, is in the ascendancy.

### ANOTHER HISTORIC ANNUAL DINNER

This year's Annual New Times Dinner, to be held on Friday, September 29 will have as one of its major features, an Exhibition commemorating the 50th Anniversary of C.H. Douglas's 1934 visit to Australia. Any Australian readers who have material which they feel could be used in the Exhibition, are requested to contact The League of Rights, G.P.O. Box 1052J, Melbourne, 3001.

Mr. Eric Butler's Annual "New Times" address will be devoted to what has happened in the half century since Douglas visited Australia, New Zealand and Canada.

Appropriate messages for the Dinner will be welcomed from all readers, irrespective of what part of the world in which they live. Messages should be sent as early as possible.

Early bookings for the Dinner will be appreciated. The tariff is \$17 per head, which includes pre-Dinner refreshments.

Those intending to be present are requested to note that there has been a change of venue for this year, to Royal Park Hotel, Royal Parade. We believe the change of venue will meet the problem of adequate parking space.

The Annual National League of Rights Seminar will, however, be held at the Victoria Banquet Hall, Little Collins Street, on Saturday, September 30.

As usual, the organisers of the Annual "New Times" Dinner reserve the right to decline bookings for what is basically a family function.

## SUBSIDISING THE SOVIETS

The following informative article appeared in "Wall Street Journal", U.S.A., of May 14. It is of little use the peoples of the West realising they are subsidising the transfer of resources to the Communist world, and in the process are helping to create the World State, unless they challenge the financial policies which appear to make an act of suicide appear "inevitable".

A group of West European banks last week brushed aside all memories of sick Polish loans and cheerfully had another go at the roulette wheel with a new \$250 million loan to the Soviet Union. The Eurobanks would have happily forked over \$300 million had not the Russians said, "Oh no, please, that's too much." We're happy to report that American banks chose not to play, proving that they have learned a few things.

The latest European plunge eastward coincided with some other news. In a joint report, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) in Paris and the Bank for International Settlements (BIS) in Basel revealed that the Soviets already owed the West more than \$28.7 billion, as of last June. That is twice as much as previous estimates, which did not combine private and government loans. And it almost certainly understates the total current Soviet hard-currency debt, which by all accounts is up from last June. Banking circles also believe that Moscow Narodny Bank's West European branches have a large net borrower position in the short-term "interbank" market.

But even without further growth, the \$28.7 billion made the Soviet Union the third-largest hard-currency debtor in the world, behind Brazil and Mexico. More startlingly (see table), it ranked first in the world on loans subsidized by Western governments, a total of \$17.67 billion.

	Total Debt Owed to the West*	Part of the Total Subsidised by Western Taxpayers*	Proportion of the Total Subsidised by Western Tax payers
1. Brazil	\$66,998	\$12,494	19%
2. Mexico	65,090	6,667	10%
3. USSR	28,772	17,671	61%
5. Spain	25,295	3,198	13%
6. Venezuela	24,221	1,805	7%
7. S. Korea	24,000	7,039	29%
8. S. Africa	16,828	4,286	26%
9. Poland	15,897	6,080	38%
10. E. Germany	?	?	?

The figures in the table are not all-inclusive. IMF Loans are excluded. And East German debt figures are incomplete because the West Germans describe some of it as "intra-German" lending, conveniently ignoring the well-known no man's land that separates the two Germanys. In short, the total West-to-East subsidy is underestimated.

The Soviet subsidy loan level, never before acknowledged by the lending countries, raises an interesting question for Europe's political and business leaders. When did taxpayers in the lending countries ever decide to subsidise communism?

Of the \$17.67 billion, \$5.8 billion is bank loans guaranteed or insured by governments and \$11.8 billion is direct credits backed by governments to Western exporters of goods "sold" to the Soviets. Those quotation marks symbolise the hocus-pocus of East West trade. When loans to Brazil, Argentina and the like go sour, private bankers are at least forced to lose a little sleep until the IMF or central banks bail them out. But in lending to the communists, their bailout is up front in the form of guarantees. No wonder they can be so cheerful.

Two reasons can be offered for the Western generosity to the Soviets. As someone once noted, the Russians are like the Pentagon. They don't trade, they procure, and in huge amounts. Western businessmen and politicians simply can't resist those big deals.

Since taxpayers aren't readily aware that they are providing the subsidies, who worries? The second reason is that Western

politicians mistakenly believe that credit generosity is a way of appeasing Soviet warlords.

President Reagan, pressing his disfavour over the Siberian pipeline deal, has tried to lift OECD standards for loans to the Soviets. But European banks, businesses and politicians still are answering the siren call. They choose not to trouble themselves with the important fact that the Soviet Union, as an economic cripple, has little to trade in return, except the privilege of becoming dependent on Soviet energy. That fact has economic importance. One-sided trading is a sure route for the Soviets to the debt-restructuring line, and when they request the favour, the Europeans are not likely to refuse. At that point, the transfer of resources from West Europe to the Soviet people will grow even larger.

American bankers last week decided that it was time to draw a line. We wonder how much more the Europeans will want to contribute to the Soviet empire before they reach the same conclusion.

## THE ORTHODOXY OF MARXISM

Those Marxists who are followers of Leon Trotsky, shunning what they describe as the "revisionism" and "reformism" of other Marxists, describe themselves as true revolutionaries. But they share the same basic economic orthodoxy views with the "capitalists" they claim to be overthrowing.

*The Battler*, a Trotskyite paper published in Melbourne, provides an example of this orthodoxy in its issue of June 23. Tom O'Lincoln introduces an article, "The Case Against Immigration Controls", by stating: "Along with nature, human labour is the source of all wealth. Human beings with their hands and brains have created the modern industrial society we live in. Organised in a rational manner, they can build a world free from hunger, insecurity and oppression. That is the very core of the socialist perspective."

Apart from the fact that no socialist economic system has been a success at any time in man's recorded history, and that the free enterprise system has been a success as a means of producing an abundance, the claim that human labour is the source of all wealth is a fallacy which is responsible for the convulsions shaking every industrialised society. The logic of this view is that if a person is not engaged in labour, he is not entitled to eat, or at best, to eat sparingly.

The tragic end result of this concept has been demonstrated with the bloody clashes between the British police and striking miners, themselves in conflict with their fellow workers. Something approaching civil war has erupted in Britain. Desperate men, good men, but men with a blinkered view of economic realities, are striking, seeking to prevent their fellow miners from working, in an attempt to keep themselves in work producing coal. But why? Less miners can produce all the coal that is required. What these miners fear is *the lack of a financial income*. The Thatcher government could resolve the problem overnight by the distribution of adequate incomes. But this would upset the "monetarism" of the Thatcher government, whose policies are fueling the flames of revolution.

Back at the dawn of man's long history there was a degree of truth in the view that human energy applied to natural resources — these being a complete gift — produced wealth. But as the industrial arts developed, it became less true. The major factor in modern production is no longer human energy, but the use of solar and other forms of energy in a

progressively automated production system in which human energy is but a catalyst. Inheritance, in all its forms, is the basic factor in the modern production system. That inheritance belongs to all individuals as a right. All that is required is a financial policy which will in an orderly manner ensure that all individuals gain access to that inheritance as a right.

But all the Marxists irrespective of label, along with those who control the present financial system are strongly opposed to "something for nothing". They are united in their orthodoxy against any policy which would place the individual in the position where he would be genuinely free to decide what activities in which he would prefer to engage.

The never-ending conflict between employers and employees is basically about money. The producer is constantly striving to reduce his financial costs by greater efficiency, which generally means the use of more labour-saving equipment. Under present financial orthodoxy, this is a threat to the employee who, is displaced by a computer-operated machine, is without a financial income. The orthodoxy of the employers prevents them from considering how their production is going to be bought if progressively less incomes are distributed by the use of more sophisticated technology.

There was a time early in the Social Credit movement when some British Trade Unions, including those in the coalmining industry, were taking serious notice of what C.H. Douglas had to say about finance. But the Trade Union movement was diverted by the Marxists, the most dangerous being the Fabian Socialists. Consider the plight of Britain today. Revolution is the inevitable end result of financial orthodoxy. While this is welcomed by the Marxists, what about those who call themselves anti-Marxists?

True co-operation in society will only be possible with the application of Social Credit. That is why the Marxists detest it. Their attitude is as logical as that of the Credit Monopolists.

---

## REALITIES OF FRENCH NUCLEAR TESTING

**France has been the target of an international propaganda campaign because of its nuclear programme. The following letter by Mr. John Grover, an Australian mining engineer and recognised authority on the nuclear industry, balances a distorted picture with the following informative letter in "Weekend Australian" of June 30-July 1.**

Mr. Hayden is right to warn us that denial of uranium to France would mean cancellation of coal contracts and other reprisals from the EEC.

But he does not go far enough. Why does he not try to stop the childish, unreasoning emotional hatred of the French who are blamed for their determination not to experience again the heel of the invader through being unprepared? They should be commended!

Like me, they remember the guilty politicians of the 1930s who listened to the pacifists and unilaterally disarmed while Hitler was arming like mad. Those pacifists who supported Hitler brought on a war we nearly lost, killing tens of millions of men, women and children, including many of my friends. Have we learned nothing from history?

France has a point in not relying on the American umbrella; unlike us, they think it unfair to put the American people at risk. So France decided on their own nuclear deterrent at the minimum level necessary for credibility, a small but significant 132 nuclear weapons in all.

The USSR has at least 2300 multi-warheaded rockets deployed with another 2500 atomic bombers, 11,000 nuclear

NEW TIMES—JULY 1984

warheads in all capable of hitting French cities, So 132 can only be defensive.

Technological testing and research to make the deterrent credible calls for an area without buildings for 20km all round. There is no place in France.

The deserted Mururoa Atoll is the best site in the world, 1200km from the small population at Tahiti, whose citizens have never asked that the tests be stopped because of the way it is being done; there has been no radioactive leakage whatever (in spite of the nonsense we are being told) since the tests went underground, the only place for them.

Australian's backyard? 6700km from Sydney is farther than from Paris to New York, or from Perth to Calcutta. Would you call Calcutta our backyard? Let's be fair and not deal in untruths.

By contrast, the Nevada test site is only 120km from Las Vegas, 500km from Los Angeles. The Russian site is 560km from Omsk with more than a million people. The Chinese site 500km from the capital of Sinkiang Province. We are criticising the wrong people, for Mururoa is far the safest.

I have before me the world list of N-test explosion for 1980; U.S. 17, USSR 14, Mururoa 7. Why does the left criticise only France which does the least?

Surely France deserves our respect, not childish hatred, for taking full responsibility for her own defence and helping the U.S. and Britain to prevent a war that nobody wants because both sides know what it would mean.

We listen to the wrong people, making ourselves the laughing stock of the Western world. Indonesia has quadrupled her Atomic Energy Authority. Fraser destroyed ours, ordering a fleet of DIESEL submarines for the 21st century!

---

## TO THE POINT

**Once again the problem concerning written history has been highlighted, this time in Japan, where Japan's Education Ministry has ordered many references to wartime atrocities to be deleted from new high school text books or toned down.**

**South Korea, where the long Japanese occupation left behind strong anti-Japanese feelings, is not satisfied with Japanese text books concerning the occupation. China is also dissatisfied with the Japanese version of Japan's occupation, of that country. The winners of wars attempt to write history to justify their own policies. The distinguished and independent British historian, David Irving, is presenting a rather different picture of the Second World War than that of the establishment writers. As Douglas said, most written history is 95 per cent historian and 5 per cent history. True history can be perceived by examining policies.**

Man is truly a slow learner. The papers are full of letters and comments concerning what can be done about unpaid leisure known generally as unemployment. Those fortunate enough to have independent incomes do not regard themselves as unemployed; they have no problems fully occupying their time, even if only attempting to grow better roses than their neighbours. There is no good reason why the benefits of technology, the result of the cultural heritage, should not be passed to the individual as a right in the form of a monetary dividend — except that there are those who do not trust their fellows with genuine freedom. A recent letter writer in *The Australian* says that 2000 years ago Roman Emperor Augustus forbade the introduction of any labour-saving devices in industry or agriculture, asking the rhetorical question, "How am I to keep my people busy?"

The basic question about employment is philosophic, not technical. It is physically possible in all industrialised nations to, for a start, reduce the retiring age to 50, providing all those in retirement with physical security. All the young

unemployed could be then absorbed into industry. But this would mean that a big percentage of the population would be freed from the necessity to be busy. And freed from economic pressures, more people would have time to think. Totalitarians have always distrusted those who, in Shakespeare's words "think too much."

\* \* \* \* \*

The Argentine debt situation provides the substance for a new version of Alice in Wonderland. A consortium of American banks has provided Argentina with a short-term loan of \$US125 million so that Argentina can meet the interest payments on its massive debt. According to the devotees of that red magic known as "sound finance", if Argentina had not been able to meet its interest payments, Argentina would have lost its "financial credibility". But a further injection of the debt structure has saved the day — at least for the time being. But it is becoming increasingly difficult to juggle the international debt crisis and prevent a major convulsion, resulting in open revolution in many countries. Those who believe that the American banks could "go broke", might consider just how easy it is to manipulate the money mechanism, as witnessed by the Federal Reserve suggesting that it take over part of the total debt owed to American banks, handing over Federal Certificates. These certificates would be a form of capital against which the banks could create further debts. The American taxpayers will be the losers.

\* \* \* \* \*

A further note on the international debt situation: The total outstanding debt of the 10 largest debtors — Mexico, Brazil, Argentina, Chile, Venezuela, Peru, Indonesia, Philippines, Egypt and Nigeria — rose from \$US346 billion in 1962 to \$US406 billion this year. Interest payments of the ten debtors were 40 per cent of exports in 1982 and are 48 per cent of exports now. The situation has been aggravated by the further increase in the American interest rates. Managing Director of The International Monetary Fund, Jaques de Larodiere, has coined a new piece of financial numbo-jumbo, with a recent speech to the American Bankers' Association in which he called for a "stretch-out" of loans. Irrespective of whether created debt is for a short or a long period, it still remains an instrument of subversion and ultimate open revolution.

\* \* \* \* \*

If Australians are a nation of "racists", what about the Germans? The Turkish guest workers which West Germany invited back in the days of the "economic miracle", which we predicted could not last, are now the source of growing bitterness. There are 1.5 million Turks in West Germany — 560,000 workers and their families making them the largest single national group among the 4.3 million foreigners. The Turks have become the target for increasing abuse by desperate Germans striving to obtain paid employment in a badly depressed economy. Workers from other European countries like Italy and Spain are much more readily accepted in Germany. The West German government has resorted to a number of strategies in an attempt to persuade Turks to go back to Turkey. These strategies, including a direct payment to leave, have only been marginally successful. A recent report says that every city is dotted with the scrawled slogan — "Turks out".

C.H. Douglas observed that, given time, a basically homogeneous nation had some chance of solving its own problems. But the fragmentation of homogeneity made solutions impossible and provided fertile soil for subversives of all kinds.

\* \* \* \* \*

The first attempt to create an International Bank along the lines of the International Monetary Fund, was the Bank of

International Settlements, established as the result of the Great Depression. The Bank of International Settlements continues to operate, providing what is described as "a banking service for central banks and a forum for international monetary co-operation". Displaying either frightening ignorance of finance-economic realities, or of urging more revolutionary ferment everywhere, the BIS says that the huge American deficit is the major stumbling block to world economic recovery. It does believe that economic recovery "is under way", which brought "invaluable eleventh-hour relief for the rest of the world", but that there was a grave danger that the American deficit would result in renewed inflation.

Without the big American deficit, which meant an injection of a greater flow of new credits into the American economy, there would not have been even the relatively small upsurge in the American economy. The urgent necessity for the deficit demonstrated once again the truth of Douglas's discovery, that modern industry cannot over any given period distribute sufficient purchasing power to enable total production to be bought at profitable prices; that increasing debt is inevitable as new credits must be created and distributed in an attempt to prevent a complete economic breakdown.

If the American Administration heeded the advice of the BIS., Ronald Reagan would be swept out of office. He requires the debt drug for survival purposes. But the drug itself has deadly side effects and these will, in the long term, be disastrous.

The BIS says that a "breathing space" has been won" in dealing with the international debt crisis, but that the position is still precarious. With that we can completely agree. The "Breathing space" is not going to be of a very long duration. That is why in Australia Prime Minister Hawke desperately needs his early election.

\* \* \* \* \*

When power is increasingly centralised, enormous damage results when only one part of any structure, political, economic or social, is affected. British car workers have been seriously affected because of a strike of West German metalworkers. The Germans want a 35-hour week, a response to the developing technology which makes it easier for fewer workers to produce more. If an international industrial system could be created, a break down in one part of the world could cause global havoc. Decentralisation of financial power is the first requirement.

\* \* \* \* \*

The latest report by the Paris-based Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) confirms the view of *The Economist*, London that "The best of world economic recovery is just about over."

In Western Europe — where one person in ten is jobless in West Germany and France, one in eight in Britain, Belgium and Italy, and one in six in Holland — unemployment is going to stay high or even keep rising.

The momentum of the technological revolution is now so

---

## The Meaning of Meaning

"The true meaning of a term is to be found by observing what a man does with it, not what he says about it."

—*The Logic of Modern Physics*, Bridgman.

\* \* \* \* \*

"A controversy is normally an exploitation of a set of misunderstandings for warlike purposes."

—*The Meaning of Meaning*, Ogden and Richards.

great that even what has been termed an economic recovery has had no serious effect on unemployment. With a forecast of American economic growth slowing next year, unemployment can be expected to rise again. Australia's Minister for External Affairs, Mr. Hayden, one-time Labour Treasurer and a man who prides himself on his expertise concerning economics, has cast doubt on the "recovery", stating that to maintain unemployment figures even at their present high level will require an annual growth rate of 5 per cent. That is not going to happen.

Douglas said that events were going to be the major factor in forcing a change in financial and economic policies. He also said that the process of de-mesmerisation could be fatal for many people. Obviously the convulsions of the 1984 are going to be nothing compared with the convulsions of 1985.

\* \* \* \* \*

The Marxist influence in the ranks of those Christians supporting what is generally termed liberation theology is, to a degree, the result of the failure of the Christian Church to speak out with authority on how power should be used. Many of the critics of liberation theology make the fatal mistake of insisting that the Christian Church can have nothing to do with politics. If politics, which involves the use of power, is not subject to moral absolutes, then governments can operate in a moral vacuum. The Church should not be involved in party politics, neither should it pronounce on technical matters. But it can and should pronounce on the moral implications of financial, economic and other policies. If, for example, the Christian Church were to pronounce on the immorality of present debt policies, the Marxists would have less opportunity for exploiting well-meaning Christians who are supporting revolutionary liberation movements.

---

## A CHRISTIAN VIEW ON IMMIGRATION

By Edward Rock

**Large numbers of Christians are today confused about the subject of immigration and race, now being hotly debated in Australia, primarily as a result of growing concern about the relatively large influx of Asian migrants. Many confuse Christian truths with a type of liberal sentimentalism. Stating the Christian Law of Love does not of itself tell us how to apply that Law in all circumstances. Mr. Edward Rock, State Chairman in Victoria for the Christian Alternative Movement, brings some Christian realism to bear in discussing a Christian view on the subject of immigration. We trust it will assist Christians to clarify their own thinking on a debate which will help to decide the future of Australia.**

There is a growing debate about immigration, the admitting of people from other countries and cultures into Australia, a country founded by Anglo-Saxon immigration, with a populace maintained basically from that racial stream with a culture inherited from that source. Inherent within that culture was the predominant acceptance of the Christian religion fashioning the institutions of government, the standards of morality, the purpose of education and the meaning of life.

In recent years a new immigration policy has changed the structure of Australian society. A large body of peoples with totally differing racial, religious and cultural backgrounds have been admitted. Many people in high places now describe Australia as a multi-cultural community, and do so with approval signifying they believe the change is for the better. Along with that approval has come the view that Christians should not claim any special position for their faith, that Christianity is just another religion which must take its place alongside other religions. Further, the protagonists of the multi-cultural community have argued that the Christians in Australia will be to the forefront in accepting and welcoming the new policy, for out of the policy of Christian love and tolerance for each brother and sister of God's creation, the followers of Christ will be the first to welcome strangers to their midst.

### A LEGITIMATE QUESTION

It is a legitimate question to ask, is this as Jesus Christ would have it? To ask the question is to raise the possibility that there may be another answer. Christians should not be afraid to look at that possibility, reject it if they believe it to be wrong, and equally accept it if they are convicted otherwise.

Christians are right when they argue that in Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek, not gentile or any other race. But here we are talking about one belief, not all beliefs. We are talking about a situation which develops when diverse peoples are reconciled in Christ and united in him with all their racial differences a secondary matter to the important matter of spiritual unification. Spiritual genes have brought unity where racial genes brought division. Is that the case in Australia? Obviously not. How then does God deal with this situation? Does he want Christians to go on accepting a situation where government follow policies which reject Christian standards and institutions on the basis they may be offensive to our newly acquired residents. The present government has

announced plans to legislate to change the oath of loyalty which involves not only a statement of belief that we must be loyal to Queen Elizabeth, but also to the God to whom Queen Elizabeth pledges her loyalty. Mr. West, the Minister for Immigration, made it clear that his government wanted an oath which did not offend other nationals who did not want to be referred to as "British subjects", and because "we are no longer just a colony of the British Crown, therefore it is perfectly logical to introduce an oath that is more Australian in character and flavour", (quoted from *The West Australian* 17/10/83).

### PEOPLE LIVING TOGETHER

The whole subject of immigration is about people living together. Christianity has everything to do with successful principles by which people can live together harmoniously and without friction. Inherent within the acceptance of Christ as our supreme authority on all matters, is the acceptance of him as creator. "Without him was not anything made that was made". John 1:3. When we are told about that creation in detail in the book of Genesis we are told that he created all the natural order "after their own kind". He made it clear that in his design there was not only infinite variety, but there was also mutual exclusiveness. Those things which were of their own kind were separate from those of another kind, but each had its place. Modern anthropologists and biologists like Robert Ardrey refer to "the territorial imperative" which operates right through the whole of creation. That is that each living entity, whether insect, animal or man have had designed for them; an environment in which they feel more at home, which is more their own than any other place, and where they live more in harmony with their fellow creatures than anywhere else. When that territory is invaded by elements from another territory it results in not only fear, insecurity and disharmony, but a destruction of the natural order which enables that species to thrive in a balanced way. All that Robert Ardrey and his fellow anthropologists were discovering was that God created each species "after their own kind".

Can mankind be included in this rule? Creation is not only selective, but also elective. The whole of the biological structure of each individual is both selective and elective. Each component has its function; they are very selective. Some are more important than others, but whether more important or not each has its role. An individual may function quite well

with the loss of an arm or leg, but not without a heart. Each are very selective in their activity but each are elected to perform a function different to the other.

### **A BLURRED VISION OF GOD'S DESIGN**

Alexander Solzhenitsyn, the great modern Russian writer, and one who has suffered greatly because of his Christian belief that God meant people to be different and yet live in unity in their territorial imperative, told a Western audience after he had been released from the Soviet Union that the pattern of nations was part of God's design for happiness and harmony in the world. He said this against the background of knowing the forces of evil trying to destroy the pattern of nations and turn the world into one vast nation where the different-ness of people did not count, and where there are no national boundaries. That this is a movement against God's design is clear in Genesis, chapters 10 and 11. Here is the picture of a city, Babylon, and an edifice, the Tower of Babel built by man in order to exert control by man over his fellow man instead of acknowledging the order and design of God where each race and tribe were created "after their own kind". The drive for unity in Babylon, and in the erection of the Tower of Babel had the same purpose as the spirit of anti-Christ seeking to achieve world government today. Solzhenitsyn lives through the same worldly structure built by man, and is able to see clearly the evil intent behind it. Those seeking to make Australia a modern Tower of Babel where all different nationalities are mixed together denying their own rightful place in creation have the same objective. It is pertinent to observe that recent Australian governments which have initiated the new immigration policies are led by men weak on the authority of God. The present Prime Minister does not believe in God, the former Prime Minister admitted he had no firm convictions about God, and the Prime Minister third back in line was of the same political philosophy as the present P.M., which has a basic belief in the superiority of man over any religious belief. But it is fair to say the weaknesses of these leaders is reflected in the Australian community, including that section which calls itself Christian. God's design for a diversity of nations has become blurred in their eyes, and they mistakenly see through that blur man's design. There are other indications of the evil flowing from these misconceptions. The same forces working for a multi-cultural society in Australia where national differences go into a melting pot, also want to eliminate differences between God's unique creation of man and woman. The recently-passed Sex Discrimination Bill seeks to make equal what God designed as different, man and women, each selectively created and designed, and each elected to different functions. It is important to note this Bill could not have been presented or passed by an Australian Parliament, and been immune from legal challenge until recently, because the Australian constitution which made Australia a different nation to others, and protected her people against interference from external forces had not been broken down by the High Court decisions which accepted that directives passed by the United Nations could now become binding upon the Australian people. In terms of Christian authority the United Nations has no authority as it expressly rejects the authority of Jesus Christ. Like the Tower of Babel it is a man made structure, constructed for the same purpose and intent as the Tower. If Christianity was really alive today in Australia, Christians would unite in working for the restitution of Australia's Christian constitution.

### **GOD, OR MAN'S DESIGN**

Immigration into Australia can either reflect the will of God or work against God. It can either maintain his design, or be in conflict with it. Many of those arguing for the admission of increasing number of Asian migrants do so out of genuine pity and concern for people who have suffered hardship due to war and the inhumanity of man. The Vietnam War was the wedge used by those favouring a multi-cultural community. Through

false propaganda Australia was depicted as a country which brought war to Vietnam, and it was argued Australia should make reparations by accepting refugees of that war. Much could be said about the falseness of that argument, and how that war was lost to Godless communism by nations which lost their faith and their will which is part of real faith. We will continue to lose to Communism until we rediscover real faith. That is all part of the problem, but more essentially here at the moment we must face up to the false arguments which have lead to us accepting an immigration policy in conflict with God's design for harmony and peace between nations and people. Irrespective of what some idealists are saying, the influx of large numbers of Vietnamese and other non-European migrants is bringing a great deal of disharmony into the Australian nation.

### **THE CHRISTIAN'S DUTY**

Let us make no mistake about this issue. We do have a responsibility towards the victims of the Vietnamese war. Besides offering refuge to the genuine victims of that war we need to honestly face the reasons for our loss of faith and will in meeting the threat of the victor in Vietnam, the anti-Christ called Communism. If we genuinely love these victims of the Vietnam war we will make it clear that we will work without ceasing towards the day when the Vietnamese refugees can be repatriated to their own country freed from the tyranny of Communism, and where Christ reigns. In the meantime we will practice those principles Christ so clearly explained when he was asked that vital question "who is my neighbour". That question was the sequel to a more important question, "what shall I do to inherit eternal life" the answer to which was the first and greatest commandment, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbour as thyself". In answer to the question, "and who is my neighbour" Jesus told the parable of the good Samaritan. The victim of the robbers had been left for dead on the side of the road, ignored by those who should have helped him, the priest and the Levite, those of his own kind, people who professed their belief in God. It should be noted that in our modern application of the parable, Australia and USA heard the cries for help from South Vietnam and went to the victims aid: they failed to consummate that help in beating off the aggressors, and left the victim worse off than they found him. But they were still the good Samaritans, and should now proceed to do what the good Samaritan did in fact do, to bind up the wounds and give succor and sustenance to the victim. However let it be noted what else actually did happen. The victim was not taken into the country of the good Samaritan, nor did he take over his house. Sustenance was arranged and paid for. Responsibility for restoring the victim to his former estate was accepted, but not so that the victim exercised any right towards a claim on the estate of the good Samaritan. In so doing God's design was kept intact. The victim returned to his own estate and territory where he was in harmony with his own kind, and the good Samaritan did likewise. Christians, or anyone else, are not entitled to use false sentiment in order to destroy justice and God's design. Charity should never be practiced to despoil the charitable.

### **GOD'S WILL**

When it comes to nations God's will is that there should be love and harmony between nations. Each nation sure of its own territory and position in the world. In that day the sword will become a ploughshare, the Australian will sit down with the Vietnamese, the Chinese, the Russian knowing there is perfect harmony between them, the harmony of doing God's will and adhering to his design. In that day there will be genuine international harmony, for the word "inter" is derived from the Latin 'between'. The forces of evil trying to destroy national sovereignty today do not want harmony 'between' nations, they want power 'over' nations. They can only obtain it by destroying God's design, and God is indestructible.