

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. 8

AUGUST 1984

Registered By Australia Post—Publication No. VBH 1001

ZIONIST CHICKENS COMING HOME TO ROOST

Mr. Isi Liebler's dramatic "carpeting" of Australian politicians who dared to appear on platforms with League of Rights speakers should not be taken as an indication that Australian Jewry is united on the social issues of the day. Mr. Liebler has, in fact, run into some flak. The June issues of *The Jewish Commentary* took Mr. Liebler to task in no uncertain fashion:

"...The views of Australian Jews range across the board of Australian political life, and any suggestion that there is some kind of consensus about a major issue like immigration is patently false.

It is, therefore, thoroughly misleading and potentially dangerous for Mr. Isi Liebler, in his capacity as President of the Executive Council of Australian Jewry, to make this kind of statement in a letter to a national newspaper: —

"As the representative body of Australian Jewry we have consistently supported the policy of the previous and present governments on the acceptance of Indo-Chinese refugees and have urged Canberra to extend that policy wherever possible." (*The Australian*, 4 April 1984)

...In order to put this extraordinary letter of Mr. Liebler's into perspective it is necessary to go back to first principles. The first principle is that the Jews of Australia are a religious minority. They are not expatriate Israelis, nor do they constitute an "ethnic" group, however defined. Indeed, the very term "ethnic" as applied to Jews is incongruous, if not insulting. Etymologically, ethnic was applied to pagans and heathens, in contrast to Jews and Christians. As applied to Jews it is nonsense ... The fact that the Jews are not simply a religious group in the Gentile sense is irrelevant. What is relevant is that it is only as a religious minority that Jews can logically — or should — approach Government ... In this respect, the immigration policy of the Government in respect of Jews is certainly a matter which should concern the Executive Council of Australian Jewry; the immigration policy towards others should not.

If there was ever a case, in recent years, for the community as such, taking a stand on an issue of national importance, it was in 1980 when the Fraser Government decided to boycott the Moscow Games. At the time, Mr. Liebler was in the embarrassing position of having a substantial vested interest in the success of the Games because, through his travel company, he had the franchise for the group tours. This conflict of interest no doubt played its part, along with the dismal role of Israel's Olympic team, which equivocated over the issue, in presenting us as a community whose moral principles were tailored to business and political interests.

There was, of course, one earlier memorable occasion when Mr. Liebler issued a brave message on behalf of the community over an international issue. That was when he called on us to go out and assassinate President Amin of Uganda. Some of us could not get away at the time..."

We only hope that *Jewish Commentary* is not the recipient of the same treatment meted out to Australian historian

Professor Geoffrey Blainey for daring to disagree with Mr. Liebler on this issue.

In fact, it appears that Mr. Liebler's views are decreasingly representative of overall Jewish opinion on a number of issues. Two thought-provoking and intelligently written articles — a two-part series originally from *Commentary Magazine* — by Mr. Irving Kristol on the Jewish dilemma in the United States were carried in *The Weekend Australians* of July 21-22, and July 28-29, 1984.

The first, which dealt with the domestic situation in the United States, lamented the fact that the civil rights movement, so heavily supported financially by Jewish money in the past, had, since the political advent of Jesse Jackson, become both nationalistic and somewhat anti-semitic:

"...This was not supposed to happen (wrote Mr. Kristol). American Jews had anticipated a very different scenario to emerge from the civil rights movement in which they were so deeply involved. That involvement was natural because Jews, as a religious and ethnic minority, have for centuries experienced a deprivation of civil rights and are therefore, keenly aware of how important it is that equality in civil rights be enjoyed by all minorities — religious, ethnic or racial. This explains why, for most of the history of the NAACP and the

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 United, 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.

Urban League, Jewish money played such a large role in keeping those institutions afloat. It also explains why so many individual Jews participated so energetically, over these past 20 years, in the civil rights movement..."(emphasis added)

It seems a pity that the Jewish financier and participants cited by Mr. Kristol did not take more notice of the warnings of Jewish author Alan Stang who, in his excellent book "It's Very Simple" (Western Islands, Boston, 1965) warned of the heavy communist involvement in the NAACP.

MUTUAL SUPPORT

United States Jews, it seems, received reciprocal support for their input into the civil rights movement. Mr. Kriston went on: "...In Congress, black Congressmen usually voted "correctly" from the Jewish point of view, on Israel, while Jewish Congressmen usually voted "correctly" on domestic legislation that the black leadership endorsed..."

Jesse Jackson has apparently changed all that. Not only has he adopted a pro-P.L.O. line, but he aims to support a black candidate against New York's Jewish Mayor Koch in 1985. Kristol contemplated:

"...The black-Jewish polarisation that would ensue is almost too scary to contemplate..."

PROTESTANT REVIVAL

The other dilemma which Mr. Kristol confessed to was the reaction to the growth of the Moral Majority, which he claimed was baffling Jews:

"...One of the reasons — perhaps the main reason — they do not know what to do about it is the fact that the Moral Majority is strongly pro-Israel.... To be sure, occasionally a fundamentalist preacher will say something to the effect that God cannot be expected to heed the prayers of non-Protestant fundamentalists. At which point many Jewish organisations react in a predictable way, sounding the alarm against growing anti-Semitism. But the alarm rings hollow.... What do such theological abstractions matter as against the fact that this same speaker is vigorously pro-Israel)... It is ironic, and puzzling, that American Jews appear to be not all that interested in, and certainly not enthusiastic about, the fact that the Moral Majority is unequivocally pro-Israel.... the Moral Majority is simultaneously committed to a set of "social issues" — school prayer, anti-abortion, the relation of church and state in general — that tend to evoke a hostile reaction among most (though not all) American Jews..."

It may be true, as Mr. Kristol says, that American Jews generally have mixed feelings about the Moral Majority. But this certainly does not extend to the leadership of some Jewish organisations — the anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith, for example — which contribute heavily to the multi-million-dollar budget of the Moral Majority.

THE UNITED NATIONS

The third perplexing issue described by Irving Kristol is the current attitude towards the United Nations, and its drive to establish international law — now being so forcefully bargaged into position by such bodies as the Socialist International, the Club of Rome, the Soviet Communist movement and Parliamentarians For World Order.

Mr. Kristol was quite candid in describing the Jewish impetus in the advent of this concept.

"...No single ethnic or religious group in the United States has produced such a disproportionate number of scholars in the field of international law as have Jews, **and no other group has been so reluctant to recognise that this messianic vision, when applied to political actualities, has proved to be political utopianism, wishful thinking ...** When the Reagan Administration decided to withdraw from that scandalous entity called UNESCO, the American Jewish community could think of nothing supportive to say, at least openly. **Meanwhile, the U.N. Association, along with other**

organisations that educate people towards a positive view of the U.N. are financed most heavily by Jewish contributors ... (emphasis added)

Thus, it seems that, just as the civil rights movement in the United States, which Jewish finance and participation played so large a part in creating, is now turning against its creators, so too the world government and international law purpose of the United Nations, again as Irving Kristol says so painstakingly fashioned by Jewish involvement, is viewed with increasing misgivings due to the virulent anti-Israel attitude of many of its Third World members.

To what host, then, can Jewish aspirations attach themselves in future? Kristol concludes:

"...It is possible, though far from certain, that Jews in the West will find a new home, however uncomfortable, in the conservative and neo-conservative politics that, in reaction to liberalism's leftward drift, seems to be gaining momentum. But whether this conservatism will be keenly enough interested in Jews to offer tolerable lodging to them is itself an open question..."

Perhaps the ranks of Jewish supporters of the League of Rights -- and there are quite a few, despite Mr. Liebler's disavowals — are set to swell considerably in the near future?

REMEMBER THE OIL SHORTAGE?

A few years back an orchestrated international campaign painted a frightening picture — for the gullible — of the world's oil supplies rapidly running out. Limited supplies had to be conserved, and one way to achieve this was to substantially increase the price of oil. The two big benefactors were the international oil companies, these closely linked to international banks, and, of course, governments.

While it is true that an enormous amount of oil is wasted in fueling economic policies of mass waste, the propaganda about the threatened oil shortage was quite false. Carefully documented facts showing the reality of the situation were drowned out by the propaganda.

But, just as we predicted, reality would eventually start to be seen. Our desk is covered with press reports from all over the world concerning the growing oil glut. One report from Basle, Switzerland, headed "OPEC CASH SURPLUS SLASHED BY OIL GLUT," reads, "Oil-exporting countries have become net borrowers of funds from major Western banks for the first time since the end of 1978, the Bank for International Settlements (BIS) said yesterday. The BIS attributed the change largely to a decline in the huge balance of payment surpluses built up by oil explorers as a result of big price increases in 1979 and 1980.

"An oil glut has developed since the middle of last year and prices have begun to crumble. After a decade of unchallenged supremacy over the market and unity of purpose in raising prices ever upwards, the 13 members of OPEC are now in a political battle among themselves over what to do about the precipitous drop in prices."

The oil glut has grown in spite of the disruption of production in Iran, which has announced a cut in its prices in a desperate attempt to boost lagging sales to finance the war with Iraq.

New oil discoveries continue to be made nearly every day, as witnessed by what is happening in Australia. And now come estimates that Red China has oil supplies perhaps as great as those of Saudi Arabia. Needless to say, Communism will not be able to develop the supplies; that will be done by the application of Western technology financed by the international bankers.

However, in spite of oil gluts and lower prices for the countries owning the oil, it is certain that there will be no benefits for the consumers. The international oil cartels and governments will make sure of this.

NEW TIMES—AUGUST 1984

EDUCATION VERSUS LEARNING

The education issue is blowing up in the face of the experts — particularly the state education/planned curriculum advocates. Parents — the major "hitch" in the planners' dream — are voting with their feet. Waiting lists for private schools stretch ahead into an obscure uncertainty. State-employed teachers — faced with a barrage of criticism over the end product emerging after twelve years or so of primary and secondary education — are now advertising in their own defence throughout Australia. Their position is indefensible: — Their critics, who are often employers seeking if not accomplished skills, at least an aptitude for a quick acquisition of technical competence, have no right to determine their own requirements; Rather, they should be adapting their needs to the nonsense with which the heads of today's youth have been filled by the "system". The system, needless to say, is beyond reproach.

Their second line of defence is an attack on private education and, by inference, on private parental choice. They cannot attack choice in so many words. So it is deliberately misrepresented. Private education, it is inferred, is a special state-supported privilege for the elitist rich. Nothing, of course, could be further from the truth. Many a modest income-earner in the western world is struggling with the unwelcome cost of providing a real education for his children, as well as paying taxes for an increasingly hostile state education system from which he seeks to rescue his offspring, and which publicly attacks him — without returning his money — for exercising such a choice.

HORNS OF A DILEMMA

The recent series of television advertisements by the Teacher's Federation in Australia really is a disgrace. "Government support of private schools" is the target. The figures are wrong, the arguments fallacious and the objectivity non-existent.

The Teacher's Federation in Queensland has, probably without realising it, left itself wide open by publicly stating that discipline is almost non-existent in government schools, and that a return to some disciplinary sanctions is necessary. Perhaps they don't realise that the very curriculum they have been pushing for the last 20 years has resulted in the undisciplined chaos they are now bewailing. UNESCO's material — so fashionable in the educational bureaucracy — goes very nearly as far as suggesting that any form of discipline is discrimination against children. The old-fashioned six of the best from parent, teacher or even the local policeman when warranted, which cut short so much latent precocity, has been replaced with an absurd form of indulgence quite capable of destroying human potential. It is so obviously ridiculous that it must be deliberate; and there is ample evidence for that contention if one is really interested in finding it. Jean Wallis's excellent "*Chaos In The Classroom*" is a good starting point for those interested.

DELIBERATE INTENT

The intention behind all this absurdity lies in the deliberate subjection of individuality to the group. Individual excellence and personal responsibility, both natural ingredients of integrity, are anathema. The flock becomes more important than the sheep; which might cause a few Christians to ponder on the 'outmoding' of Christ's teachings on the importance of the "one, which was lost". Peer group pressure is turned from being a normal adolescent pecking order into a contrived science ruthlessly manipulated for long-term political goals. Listen to this description, by Professor Bowers, of the object of the American Education Fellowship as promulgated in 1947:

"Brameld made social consensus (his term was 'group mind') the basis of the ideal social order and the goal of education." Public education becomes", to use his own words, "a process of creating a kind of 'group mind', a means of thinking and feeling the group's way towards achievement of unified ends that are desired by its individual members and that bind the curriculum into a unified whole. In this context social consensus becomes the key to the remodelled school-community in all its dimensions". To deny the individual any

justification for refusing to yield to the demands of the group, Brameld ... made truth synonymous with social consensus.

Similarly, knowledge was no longer to be considered the pursuit of the individual. "It is," Brameld says flatly, "equivalent to 'group mind'".

That concept was subsequently taken up by UNESCO, and became the guiding principle of an avalanche of curriculum material which has spewed into teacher's colleges and from there into schools — mainly, but by no means exclusively, state schools. From there it has flowed into sections of the Church. Behind all the seemingly nebulous fuzziness there are five carefully fostered doctrines towards which the education system now coerces its victims:

- (1) Atheism, and a pseudo-scientific denigration of all things spiritual.
- (2) The Theory of Evolution as fact. There has been an almost hysterical reaction to the excellent material published by the Creation/Science Foundation.
- (3) Amoralism. A school-based sex education course, divorced from parental scrutiny and moral 'hang-ups' is

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.

a modern 'must' for educators.

- (4) Autonomous self-centred man, having no personal beliefs or values, save conformity to the group.
- (5) A socialist one-world government, with all differences — national, sexual, racial, intellectual, physical and cultural — eliminated by law.

A whole battery of behavioural science techniques have been developed to change our children from individuals into mentally-feudalised serfs, and is applied in the majority of state schools by teachers who only have the haziest idea of what they are doing. 'Education' in the sense of its original meaning, as C.H. Douglas explained, "to lead out" simply doesn't exist. Rather, there now functions a classical brainwash conditioning.

REACTION

This has resulted, predictably, in a big and ever-increasing withdrawal from the educational spider's web. Increasing coercion is all that currently keeps the state system intact. Given a genuine choice for all parents, it would either have to reform drastically, or self-destruct. Hundreds of small private schools have come into existence throughout America, Canada, New Zealand and Australia. Some are excellent. Others have over-reacted, substituting a "fundamentalist" and narrow brand of schooling, which can itself become a kind of conditioning. Lacking the legislative power to impose itself without competition, it will probably have to mature enough to meet the demands that are crystallised by experience — that is, if the totalitarian government system does not succeed in eliminating it before it is itself eliminated.

In searching for ways to re-establish true aims for education, we could with benefit examine the past.

Miss Dorothy L. Sayers, the brilliant British novelist and essayist, in her 1947 article *"The Lost Tools of Learning"*, gives a fascinating insight into educational thinking in the Middle Ages. Remember, this was the period which gave Britain its Gothic Cathedrals, its jury system, its Westminster system of government its Magna Carta, and its Shakespeare's and Francis Bacons. Is it significant that Miss Sayers wrote in the same year that Dr. Theodore Brameld was devising his "social reconstruction" concepts through the American Education Fellowship?

A BASIC PATTERN

Miss Sayers started with what is, surely, the basic question: "Is not the great defect of our education today ... that although we often succeed in teaching our pupils "subjects", we fail lamentably on the whole in teaching them how to think; They learn everything except the art of learning..."

"Let us now look," she went on "at the mediaeval scheme of education — the syllabus of the schools ... The syllabus was divided into two parts; the Trivium and Quadrivium. The second part — the Quadrivium — consisted of 'subjects', and need not for the moment concern us. The interesting thing for us is the composition of the Trivium, which preceded the Quadrivium and was the preliminary discipline for it. It consisted of three parts: grammar, dialectic and rhetoric, in that order.

Now the first thing we notice is that two at any rate of these "subjects" are not what we should call "subjects" at all; they are only methods of dealing with subjects. Grammar, indeed, is a subject in the sense that it does mean definitely learning a language — at that period it meant learning Latin. But language itself is simply the medium in which thought is expressed. The whole of the Trivium was, in fact, intended to teach the pupil the proper use of the tools of learning before he began to apply them to "subjects" at all. First, he learned a language; not just how to order a meal in a foreign language, but the structure of language — a language, and hence of language itself — what it was, how it was put together and how it worked.

Secondly, he learned how to use language; how to define his terms and make accurate statements; how to construct an argument and how to detect fallacies in argument (his own

arguments and other people's). Dialectic, that is to say, embraced logic and disputation. Thirdly, he learned to express himself in language; how to say what he had to say elegantly and persuasively.

At the end of his course, he was required to compose a thesis upon some theme set by his masters or chosen by himself, and afterwards to defend his thesis against the criticism of his faculty. By this time he would have learned — or woe betide him — not merely to write an essay on paper, but to speak audibly and intelligibly from a platform, and to use his wits quickly when heckled..."

REMMANTS

Miss Sayers agreed that remnants of this method still existed, but in a disjointed context:

"...It is, of course, quite true that bits and pieces of the mediaeval tradition still linger, or have been revived, in the ordinary school syllabus of today. Some knowledge of grammar is still required ... School debating societies flourish; essays are written; the necessity for "self-expression" is stressed and perhaps even overstressed. But these activities are cultivated more or less in detachment, as belonging to the special subjects in which they are pigeon-holed, rather than as forming one coherent scheme of mental training to which all "subjects" stand in a subordinate relation. "Grammar" belongs especially to the "subject" of foreign languages, and essay-writing to the "subject" called while dialectic has become almost entirely divorced from the rest of the curriculum, and is frequently practiced unsystematically and out of school-hours as a separate exercise, only very loosely related to the main business of learning. Taken by and large, the great difference of emphasis between the two conceptions holds good; modern education concentrates on teaching subjects, leaving the method of thinking, arguing, and expressing one's conclusions to be picked up by the scholar as he goes along; mediaeval education concentrated on first forging and learning to handle the tools of learning, using whatever subject came handy as a piece of material on which to doodle until the use of the tool became second nature..."

REGENERATION

We haven't space to show how Miss Sayers proposed that the breakdown could be remedied, using established principles that worked in the past in a new role. Her essay is a brilliant and timeless piece that should be studied and pondered over in its entirety.

But her almost prophetic picture, — and remember, this was almost 40 years before the disaster of education in the 'eighties - - of the state of young people who have been deprived of the tools of learning is stark and horrifyingly true:

"...We let our young men and women go out unarmed, in a day when armor was never so necessary. By teaching them all to read, we have left them at the mercy of the printed word. By the invention of the film and the radio, we have made certain that no aversion to reading shall secure them from the incessant battery of words, words, words. They do not know what the words mean; they do not know how to ward them off or blunt their edge, or fling them back; they are a prey to words in their emotions instead of being the masters of them in their intellects. We who were scandalised in 1940 when men were sent to fight armored tanks with rifles, are not scandalised when young men and women are sent into the world to fight massed propaganda with a smattering of "subjects"; and when whole classes and whole nations become hypnotised by the arts of the spellbinder, we have the impudence to be astonished..."

CHRISTIAN CONTEXT

It is important to remember that the Trivium and the Quadrivium grew out of a huge surge in educational expansion, as the Public Schools in Britain were founded, which in turn grew from the spirit which built the great cathedrals. Sir Arthur Bryant expressed it thus in a recent I.L.N. article:

"The most formative part of Britain's long history was that in which the national consciousness of its rival and quarrelling peoples grew out of the Christian faith. History suggests that the normal political state of human society, as it evolved from the family and tribe, was either anarchy or despotism; either the kind of existence in which there was continual fear and danger of violent death, or an authority brutally imposed on the weak by the strong. Out of Christ's teachings rose a higher option for mankind; the creation of law and order and personal freedom through the exercise of Christian love. The central tenet of Christ's teaching was that, through such love, believing Christians could create a heaven, not only beyond the grave, but in this world as well. The rock on which the Church on earth rested was that love and trust between Christians were capable of creating islands of mutual endeavour and happiness which could mirror that greater and timeless happiness to be found through faith in the Heaven to come ... On this belief Christian civilisation was built. It was such cumulative works of faith and love which made islands of light in the great ocean of barbaric hatred, cruelty and darkness which had swept across Europe with the disintegration of imperial Rome, itself a cruel and conquering tyranny. Christian civilisation in Britain grew out of barbarism because those who preached Christ's gospel of love to its savage tribesmen established centres of example where that gospel could be put into practice and be seen to operate.

Where Christian monks and missionaries made their settlements and lived and worked together in amity they were able to achieve advances in agriculture, in the arts and ways of living, and, above all, in social and political organisation — advances impossible in societies torn by perpetual strife, fear

and mutual destruction. Everything that was educative and enduring in mediaeval Britain was the legacy of the Christian church and its creed of creative love. It was Christianity, which taught barbarians to base their social relationships on something wider than tribe or kindred.

In its quiet monasteries the Church began to teach the forgotten classical arts of writing and keeping records. It trained men who could show tribal rulers the means of governing peacefully and justly. It gave them clerics or "clerks" to reduce their chaotic affairs to order, draft laws and reckon accounts and taxes. For the way of life the Church preached called for a law-abiding world — one in which men made and kept promises instead of perpetually resorting to force. The "King's peace" was a better basis for Christian relationships than violence and anarchy ... By far the most important element in our history has been the continuity of our Christian tradition. Through it Britain developed a policy in which the sanctity of the individual has counted for more than central authority and in which power, instead of being concentrated in a few hands, is distributed in those of many. The value set by her people on the freedom and sanctity of the individual, on justice and fair play, on mercy and tenderness towards the weak, their dislike of lawless violence and their capacity to tolerate, forgive and forget, have been, and still are for all her past mistakes and faults, the most important factor in her national tradition and all derive from her long Christian apprenticeship."

In conclusion, that Christian apprenticeship also equipped our pupils with the tools of learning. They have been replaced with what some are pleased to call "education" — but which might more properly be called the road back to barbarism.

EVERY PICTURE TELLS A STORY

The following article by South African journalist Ivor Benson appeared in the June-July issue of "*Behind the News*", P.O. Box 1564, Krugersdorp, 1740, South Africa:

Many Londoners were deeply puzzled, we may be sure, by a large and handsome oil painting recently put on display in the Art Gallery.

In this skilfully executed work of art in the classical style, and in a setting which could have been copied from a mediaeval Venetian parlour, we see a somewhat idealised portrait of Britain's Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher seated gracefully on an ornate chair, turned slightly to the left, her gloved right hand resting demurely on her lap.

It is the rest of picture, however, with its variety of previous contents, which contains all the puzzles.

The heavy drapes suspended behind Mrs. Thatcher has an obvious purpose, giving dramatic emphasis to her fair face and the dignified expression she wears, much reminiscent of Britannia on the old English penny. The luxurious Persian carpet under her feet, a white marble statuette on a low table behind and the noble fluted Corinthian columns within which the whole scene is framed, can also be recognised as no more than parts of the decor.

But how are we to explain the fact that peeping out from behind Mrs. Thatcher, as part of the tapestry with which the back of the chair is upholstered, is the image of a royal female figure in full regalia, complete with crown? Does that have some meaning, or is it also only part of the decor?

Examining with closer attention a printed reproduction of the picture, we notice on a shelf high above the bookcase in the background two pieces of precious china, great dinner plates, one of them partly obscured by the edge of the aforementioned drapes. Those plates might have passed unnoticed, but the percipient art lover would ask: Whose are the portraits on those two plates? And by what strange chance, we wonder, does each plate have a visible crack a little to the right of top-centre?

We now take a closer look at the leather-bound volumes in the bookcase, hoping to learn something about Margaret Thatcher's taste in literature. Not all the titles are legible, but

those we can read leave us more puzzled than ever: *IBM*, *Nestle*, *BES-Gervase-Danone*, *British Airways*, *Dunlop*, etc, etc — the names of great transnational mercantile concerns, 47 of them.

An element of mystery remains even after we have been able to identify the portraits on the plates and the titles of the books. The two faces shown on the plates are those of Maurice and Charles Saatchi, copied from a rare photograph taken more than 10 years ago, partners in one of the world's biggest and most prestigious advertising and public relations agencies, Saatchi and Saatchi, and the names on the spines of the books are those of the group's biggest and most profitable clients.

So far so good, but how is that excellent oil painting by German artist Hans Hacccke to be interpreted? And how did it come to be hung in the Tate Gallery, repository of some of the world's finest and most costly works of art?

THE HIDDEN PERSUADERS

The history of Saatchi and Saatchi, or as much of it as a team of reporters was able to glean, is told in the June issue of *International Management*, one of the world's most prestigious trade magazines, available only by subscription. *

First of all, who are the Saatchis? They are described by the magazine as "brothers, first-generation Englishmen from a prominent Iraqi Jewish family". Charles (40) was born in England shortly after his parents fled from Iraq during World War II; Maurice was born three years later. The father, Nathan David Saatchi, has retired from the family clothing business and now lives in London.

The magazine's special article, occupying four pages, is heavily laden with superlatives, beginning with the title: "the incredible, invisible Saatchi brothers: advertising may never be the same again".

Starting 10 years ago in London as a pair of "pipsqueak ad men", the Saatchis now have 74 offices worldwide, having swallowed up many rival advertising and public relations

companies in their seemingly miraculous progress:

"Until two years ago, the brothers concentrated their growth largely in Europe. But in 1982 they moved west, making their first move into the cutthroat world of New York's Madison Avenue. The Saatchis acquired the giant Compton Communications for \$56.7-million in July 1982, then a year ago bought the medium-sized McCaffrey and McCall for \$10-million cash. They now hold a \$29-million nest egg on short term deposit in the United States, ready for more take-overs".

The most interesting and possibly most important part of the story of the Saatchis' skyrocket progress is that which has to do with their pioneering efforts in the field of national politics:

"Whatever the motivation, Saatchi ads scooped up top awards in a recent British competition conducted by *Campaign* magazine, a British trade publication. Their 1983 Conservative Party campaign posters, including an ad whose lengthy copy compared the Labour Party's platform with the Communist Manifesto, took top honours. Margaret Thatcher's use of the Saatchis to mastermind her election campaign in 1979 marked the first selling of a British candidate by a professional advertising agency. And after voicing loud complaints of 'un-British' tactics, the Labour Party hired its own firm to handle its campaign for the 1983 election".

(The above two quoted pieces are from *International Management* magazine).

Not mentioned in the *International Management* article is the fact that Saatchi and Saatchi were also hired by South Africa's ruling National Party to sell the new constitution to the electorate in last year's referendum.

BEHIND THE SCENE

Evidently much impressed with services rendered in Britain's 1983 election, Mrs. Thatcher rewarded the Saatchis by transferring to them the \$25-million-a-year British Airways account, breaking a 30-year-old relationship with the long-established British firm of Foote, Cone and Beelding.

That obviously symbolic picture of Margaret Thatcher in the Tate Gallery could be the product of two quite different sets of purposes; in other words, it has one central meaning capable of being interpreted in more ways than one. It could mean that the artist has cunningly created the pictorial equivalent of George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, with an encoded description of modern parliamentary politics - therefore a warning to the British people.

Or, it could mean that a pair of "first-generation Englishmen" are boasting that the power now being exercised by Mrs. Thatcher and the Conservative Party is a power delegated to them by Saatchi and Saatchi. As such it could not fail to evoke gleeful chuckles from innumerable other instant-Englishmen who today exert an influence in British politics out of all proportion to their numbers. This interpretation is not altogether far-fetched, for we learn from *International Management* that Charles Saatchi is a patron of the Tate Gallery.

Either way, the picture tells the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth. It is a truth, however, that may call for some elucidation.

We need to know more about the success of those "incredible, invisible" Saatchi brothers; it was not superior talent, either "creative" or administrative, that launched their enterprise like a rocket into the heavens of advertising and big business; the secret of their success was something invisible — the patronage and support of high finance plus an aggressive application of techniques which, while always carefully within the law, dispense with many of the socio-ethical criteria which have always tended to impose limits on the inventive enterprise of their old-established rivals in the game.

Thus, there is a close parallel between the meteoric success of the Saatchis and the success of Rupert Murdoch in spreading his media empire all over the English-speaking

world; Murdoch, too, does not need to be a cleverer journalist or media manager; the secret of his success, too, is mainly a release from the hindrance of ethical standards that have to do with the promotion and preservation of the best interests of the community.**

The British people, therefore, have cause to blush as they look at that picture of Margaret Thatcher in the Tate Gallery reflecting, as it does so frankly, the degraded state of parliamentary politics in which a deceptive cunning, developed and refined by many years of experience in the selling of goods, plays an increasing role in the selling of politicians, and in which, more obviously than ever, the "power of the people" is more than the power of those who can tamper with their minds.

*We understand that *International Management* may be seen in the Marensky Library of the University of Pretoria. **See article on Murdoch in *Behind the News* of March 1984.

EX PRIME MINISTER FRASER'S "SOLUTION" TO DEBT CRISIS

When we read that Australia's former Prime Minister, Mr. Malcolm Fraser had told Mr. Barrie Dunstan, Financial Editor of *The Herald*, Melbourne, he had a solution to the international debt crisis, we lost no time in rushing to ascertain what Mr. Fraser may have discovered in the political wilderness that he had failed to discover in office. Miracles do occur, and there have been a few — admittedly, extremely few — examples of ex-politicians admitting that their eyes have been opened to truth after leaving office. The story is told of a former Deputy Prime Minister of Australia, the late Sir Arthur Fadden, moving a vote of thanks in Brisbane to Mr. Eric Butler at the conclusion of an address of International Communism, during which Sir Arthur said he had learned more about Communism from one address than he had learned during all his years at Canberra.

But a study of Mr. Fraser's "solution" to the debt problem reminded us of the statement concerning members of the Bourbon dynasty, who allegedly learned nothing and forgot nothing. Having broken all his major promises to the Australian people, and having spent seven years in imposing new record taxation and debt burdens on the Australian people, Mr. Fraser appears to believe that this dismal record qualifies him as an international leader who has answers to the world's problems. Like Mr. Willy Brandt of Western Germany, Mr. Edward Heath of the United Kingdom and Mr. Pierre Elliott Trudeau of Canada, Mr. Fraser appears to believe that a failure in domestic politics is a qualification for some type of international statesmanship. No doubt former New Zealand Prime Minister Sir Robert Muldoon, who heavily pawned New Zealand to the international bankers, also feels that he is also now qualified to become an international consultant, advising on the problems of the world.

Anyone capable of doing simple arithmetic can readily understand that the total volume of financial debt can never be reduced if practically all money is created by the banking system in the form of financial credit, is issued as an interest bearing debt. Completely ignoring all other factors, interest charges alone ensure that total debt must expand to prevent a complete collapse of the finance-economic system. As the banking system is the source of all new money, created in the form of bank credit, it is elementary that no community can say, put \$115 back to a banking system which had only issued \$100. The problem can only be pushed into the future by more debt creation. One disastrous result is an expansion of economic activities far beyond what is required to meet the genuine requirements of consumers. This in turn helps to foster the madness known as exporting to obtain a "favourable balance of trade".

Mr. Fraser has nothing to say about the actual creation of debt. What, then, does this Oracle propose to do about the debt crisis? The answer is amazing: "extending the loans

further." Irrespective of the length of the loans owed by nations to the international banks, many nations are finding it impossible even to meet the interest bills on the loans. All that Mr. Fraser is suggesting is another version of what the financial witchdoctors now describe as "re-cycling" or "rolling over" the loans as they fall due.

While some of the world's bankers are as invincibly stupid as the Frasers, there are those who understand clearly that the

maintenance of the debt system inevitably creates the conditions essential for the imposition of increasing centralisation of all forms upon the desperate peoples of the world.

The best contribution failures like Mr. Malcolm Fraser can make to the deepening crisis they helped to create, is to retire to the political background and to devote themselves to something they understand. We are informed that Mr. Fraser likes fishing.

COUNTRY WOMEN'S ASSOCIATION CRITICISES LAND RIGHTS

The following is from "*Elders Weekly*" of June 21:

One issue, which has attracted more public debate than anything else in recent WA history is that dealing with Aboriginal land rights. Many organisations have had their say, including the Country Women's Association of Western Australia, which has sent a detailed submission to Premier Brian Burke.

The submission is repeated here, latest instalment in the long-running discussion. It was sent to Mr. Burke by state CWA president Mrs. Lola Lundy.

Throughout the past 60 years the Country Women's Association has established a proud record as a caring organisation concerned about ALL people regardless of colour, creed or political persuasion.

While we have steadfastly worked to alleviate social ills, help educate the under-privileged, provide opportunities for the disadvantaged, donated material goods to the needy, we have never — by thought or deed — suggested that one sector of the community should have the "right" to privileges not accorded to any other sector. Our members would never subscribe to such a proposition.

We have provided self-improvement courses for Aborigines, just as we have provided self-help courses for lone parents and struggling young farmers, but never at any stage have we implied that one particular group should be entitled to preferential treatment in the eyes of the law.

But this demand for preferential treatment is surely the basis of the demands by Aboriginal communities for "Land Rights".

Is there any country in the world where such a divine right exists? We think not, except perhaps for some artificially created negotiations in America with the Red Indian community, which, we understand, was ill conceived and has created grave divisions in the population.

Looking at the question from the point of view of "who was here first" holds little water if one looks at such countries as Great Britain and tried to sort out who should have finders-keepers land rights. If one pursues that line of argument one also needs to pursue the anthropological opinion that the Australian Aborigine did not originate in this country.

It was the coming of the white man that made the country bountiful. It was white government policy of "rights" for all that led to the degradation of the race through indulgence in alcohol.

Since that "right" was given, much as many of the Aboriginal communities themselves deplore it, it cannot be taken back. Nor would any thinking person suggest that it should be.

As Australian citizens they should have the right to destroy themselves with alcohol just as many others of the Australian population do. That however is an equal right, shared alike by all Australians.

Land rights on their terms is something different again. All Australians currently have land rights. Young couples both work hard and deprive themselves of pleasure in order to save enough for a small block of land on which to build a house, which will become the "home" for their future family.

But, although they have paid for that block of land and "own it", they still have to pay annual land taxes, water rates,

and rates to SEC if they are serviced by it. All this though, still does not give them unalienable rights to that land.

One only has to recall what happens when a major highway is proposed through an area to understand how little the term "security of tenure" really means.

Nevertheless Australians accept these terms when they stake a claim to a little piece of land. Similarly they accept that if they can raise the finance they may "purchase" a larger slice of land from which they can make a living by growing cereal crops, fruit, vegetables or raising of animals.

In their lifetime they may not be able to completely pay for that land, so that a debt is inherited by their descendants, but they accept this situation, exist and pay their taxes from their own efforts. They do not claim that the land is theirs therefore they should be allowed simply to live on it and be sustained by the Government through taxes raised by other sectors of the community.

It is not only Aborigines who have a "feeling" for the land. The farming and pastoral communities also have a "feeling" for the land now in production and providing a livelihood for many and a high percentage of our export income.

They recognise that the land is in trust for them to produce commodities that may produce export income that in turn keeps the wheels of other industries turning.

With mining royalties contributing substantially to the economy of this state, the decision to give the nod to or to veto mining should rest with the Government and not an Aboriginal tribe or land council, or any other owner or lessee. Mining could provide the finance for Aborigines or non-Aborigines to live off the land, but whether or not it does do so, the veto rules should be the same for all.

To suggest that the colour of one's skin should absolve one from responsibilities accepted by the remainder of the community is setting the seed for hostile divisiveness in the

VALE EDITH GOSTICK

It is with deep regret that we record the death of Mrs. Edith Gostick, a member of the first Social Credit Government in the world, elected in Alberta, Canada, in 1935. Mrs. Gostick had worked close to Mr. William Aberhart, the first Social Credit Premier, addressing many early Social Credit meetings with him.

With her husband Frank, Edith Gostick maintained a lifetime interest in Social Credit and was a staunch supporter of the work of her son Mr. Ron Gostick, National Director of The Canadian League of Rights.

We know that members of the "Social Credit family" around the world will join with us in expressing our deep sympathy to all members of the Gostick family.

Edith Gostick was one of the pioneers of a movement, which holds out the only hope of salvation for a Civilisation, which is in a process of accelerating disintegration.

community.

Not everyone in our society is equal in terms of housing, health and material assets, so by all means let there be social services for those who are genuinely in need but never ever should one group be given special laws over another. Those who are entitled to call themselves Australians, whether by birth or naturalisation, whatever their colour or origin, should have the same responsibilities, the same privileges and respond to the same laws.

As responsible Australians we have thought carefully on these matters, discussed them at length and now express the view That: The bitterness and hostility that condoning unalienable land rights to Aborigines will inevitably evoke will have grave repercussions throughout the whole nation.

Zionism

"I was in America at this time (1945) and thus saw the fulfilment of a prediction made in a book of 1943, when I wrote that, as the secret censorship was going, Chaucer, Shakespeare and Dickens would one day be defamed as 'anti-Semites'. I thought to strain probability, to make a point, but it happened in all three cases: a Shakespearean actor-manager visiting New York was ordered not to play *The Merchant of Venice*, Dickens was banned, and the defamationists put Chaucer on their black-list.

"A private organization [the Anti-Defamation League] which can produce such results is obviously powerful; there is nothing comparable in the world. Mr. Vincent Sheehan wrote in 1949, "There is scarcely a voice in the United States that dares raise itself for the rights, any rights, of the Arabs; any slight criticism of the Zionist high command is immediately labelled as anti-Semitic' . . .

"How is the oracle worked? By what means has America (and the entire West) been brought to the state that no public man aspires to office, or editor feels secure at his desk, until he has brought out his prayer-mat and prostrated himself to Zion. How have presidents and prime ministers been led to compete for the approval of this faction like bridesmaids for the bride's bouquet? Why do leading men suffer themselves to be paraded at hundred-dollar-a-plate banquets for Zion, or to be herded on to Zionist platforms to receive 'plaques' for services rendered?

"The power of money and the prospect of votes have demonstrably been potent lures, but in my judgment by far the strongest weapon is this power to control published information; to lay stress on what a faction wants and to exclude from it all that the faction dislikes, and so to be able to give any selected person a 'good' or a 'bad' press. This is in fact control of 'the mob'. In today's language it is 'the technique of propaganda and the approach to the masses', as Dr. Weizmann said, but it is an ancient, Asiatic art and was described, on a famous occasion, by Saint Matthew and Saint Mark: 'The chief priests and elders *'persuaded the multitude ... The chief priests moved the people..* —Douglas Reed in *The Controversy of Zion*

"THE CONTINUING FAMILY"

In his address to the annual Western Australian Dinner of The Australian League of Rights, Mr. Eric Butler said that the essential feature of The League of Rights was that of a continuing family. "As individuals we all eventually perish physically", he said, "but the family continues on. The family exists to nurture the individual, to provide the environment in which the individual can reach his or her maximum potential."

Mr. Butler paid a special tribute to former Western Australian State Director, the late Mr. Tom Baker, a man who had served his nation both in time of war and peace. Mrs. June Baker and family were present at the Dinner.

Referring to the 50th anniversary of the Douglas visit to Australia, his first call being Western Australia, Mr. Butler said that the ideas advanced by Douglas had influenced a

British family by the name of James. It was the meeting of June James and Tom Baker, which led to Mr. Baker's interest in Social Credit at the conclusion of the Second World War.

Mr. Butler said that Tom Baker had at his request accepted the State Directorship of the League at a difficult and crucial period in the growth of the League. Tom Baker's position was also difficult because he was a senior Federal public servant in a very sensitive situation. But he provided the type of leadership under which a growing number of younger supporters developed.

Mr. Butler recalled how the League had been formed initially in Western Australia by the son of a pioneer Social Credit family in Victoria, the Wellers Son John was on his way overseas. Tom Baker was a foundation member.

In a scathing attack on the "pathetic creatures" that attempt to smear the League of Rights as "neo-Nazi", Mr. Butler said that Tom Baker was typical of the many ex-servicemen who played a prominent role in the formative years of the League. "Tom Baker not only served his nation, but was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross for his courage and dedication", Mr. Butler said.

Former State Director Mr. Ray King, who also served in the airforce over Europe, paid a warm tribute to Tom Baker, stressing his great courage during his illness.

Mr. Butler said that one of the great privileges he enjoyed was the many deep friendships made with people like the Bakers. He thanked June Baker and family for a long and deep friendship, which no words could adequately describe.

NECESSITY OF A RELIABLE CHART

"It appears to us to be axiomatic that . . . religion, in the sense of binding back to reality, is of primary importance. Until you have some kind of reliable chart, you are a mere waif on the ocean. Clearly religion in this sense is a seven days a week matter, and requires to be distinguished carefully from 'good conduct'. It ought to result in good conduct, and in fact is the only test of good conduct, but that is something else again."

—C.H. Douglas

C.H. DOUGLAS WORKS BACK IN PRINT

With the passing of time the works of the late C.H. Douglas increasingly demonstrate the genius of one of the greatest men produced by Western Civilisation.

We are pleased to report that, following the republication of "Economic Democracy", "Social Credit" and "The Monopoly of Credit" three more of Douglas's major works have now been re-published:

"Whose Service is Perfect Freedom", with a Foreword by Dr. Tudor Jones. This work has been described as Douglas's favourite piece of writing. Essential reading for those who wish to understand the events, which paved the way for the Second World War. The Jewish influence in international affairs. Price: \$4.50

"The Brief for the Prosecution". Douglas's last major work. In his Introduction, L.D. Byrne writes, "The Brief for the Prosecution' is an indictment of those persons, groups and organisations responsible for the systematic sabotage of Western Civilisation as a prelude to fastening upon a bewildered and deliberately demoralised humanity, an all-powerful World Government — a tyranny of unspeakable horror". Price: \$6.00

"The Big Idea". A penetrating analysis of the evil forces destroying Christian Civilisation. Price: \$3.50

Available from all League addresses.