

THE NEW TIMES

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

Vol. 50, No. 1.

JANUARY 1986.

Registered By Australia Post—Publication No. VBH 1001

Australia and New Zealand Edition. Published in Melbourne and Auckland

A SOUTH AFRICAN - SOVIET UNION AGREEMENT?

By Eric a Butler.

Any suggestion that the present South African government and the Soviet Union could reach any type of an agreement produces a general reaction that this is unbelievable. But as I found in 1979, when I was refused a visa to visit South Africa, and again in 1985, when I was also refused a visa, the South African situation is not what it appears to be. My long record of support for South Africa, including lectures to South African security, armed forces, and the police, is a matter of record. The answer to why, in spite of the strong support I enjoy in much of South Africa's diplomatic and other services, I am now banned from visiting South Africa, is to be found by an examination of the Zionist-Marxist alliance to bring South Africa down. My book, "Censored History", is listed by one senior South African diplomat as one of the reasons I should not be permitted to visit South Africa again.

In a recent letter to *The Australian*, a Zionist Jew stressed that South Africa's Jews have been in the forefront of opposition to the policy of separate development. *The Australian* correspondent did not mention that the strong Zionist-dominated Jewish community in South Africa has not only been in the forefront of liberalism in South Africa, but has produced a number of the leaders of the banned Marxist movement, the most outstanding of these being the lawyer Bramm Fischer. As documented by the distinguished South African journalist and author, Mr. Ivor Benson, the Zionists inside Rhodesia were greatly concerned by his influence with the Rhodesian government. They were also concerned about my regular visits to the country. They were delighted when Ivor Benson left Rhodesia and obviously did not feel strong enough to keep me out. But they are now strong enough in South Africa, planned to go the same way as Rhodesia, to keep me out of this nation as it struggles for survival against the classical combination of subversion of all kinds within, while threatened with terrorist attacks from without.

One of the true prophets of this revolutionary century, Douglas Reed, wrote in *Far and Wide* "The money-power and the revolutionary-power have been set up and given sham but symbolic shapes ('Capitalism' and 'Communism') and sharply defined citadels ('America' and 'Russia'). Suitably to alarm the mass mind, the picture offered is that of bleak and hopeless enmity and confrontation.....But what if similar men, with a common aim, secretly rule in both camps and propose to achieve their ambition through the clash between these masses? I believe that any diligent student of our times will discover that this is the case."

THE FOURTH WORLD WAR

Another great prophet, Alexander Solzhenitsyn, predicted that the Soviet invasion of Southern Africa, using client Cuban troops in Angola and elsewhere was the beginning of the Fourth World War, and that this would decide the future of the world. At the conclusion of the Vietnam disaster, Solzhenitsyn had tersely commented that "The Third World War is now over, the West lost."

Following the Soviet invasion of Southern Africa, and the installation of Mugabe in power in Zimbabwe, David Rockefeller of The Trilateral Commission made a visit to what is now a major piece on the international power chessboard. Returning to the U.S.A. he repeated what he had said in Zimbabwe: "I don't think an international bank such as ours (the Chase Manhattan) ought to try to set itself as a judge of what kind of government a country wishes to have. We have found that we can deal with just about any kind of government provided that they are orderly and responsible." This comment reminds one of the famous statement attributed to one of the early Rothschilds, who said that as long

as he could create the credit of a nation, he didn't care who makes its laws.

An unnamed senior banking official was quoted in the *Wall Street Journal* of December 21, 1981, as follows: "Most bankers think authoritarian governments are good because they impose discipline. Every time there is a coup d'etat in Latin America, there is much rejoicing and knocking at the door offering credit." While President Reagan is warning Americans that they must oppose Marxist Nicaragua, the International Bankers have, for example, provided substantial loans to Marxist East Germany, which in turn has made loans to Nicaraguans. President Reagan was adopting a relatively moderate attitude towards South Africa until the International Bankers openly moved against South Africa, which suddenly discovered it has problems with its debt situation. One of the senior Rhodesian officials present at the meeting between Prime Minister Ian Smith, Prime Minister John Vorster of South Africa, and Dr. Henry Kissinger, told me of how Kissinger had used what he termed "meat-axe diplomacy" in order to force South Africa to apply pressure to Rhodesia to capitulate to "majority rule". It was made clear that unless South Africa did this, the financial and other consequences could be serious. If the South Africans thought that they were buying time at the expense of the Rhodesians, they are now learning that the power groups working towards their New World Order, of which the New Economic Order is a major feature, cannot be placated by any attempted compromises.

THE OPPENHEIMERS.

Mr. Harry Oppenheimer of the vast Anglo-American complex has always been in the forefront of the campaign to "liberalise" race relations in South Africa. His newspapers have consistently campaigned against the South African Nationalist party, a party whose hierarchy is now desperately attempting to accommodate the Oppenheimers without alienating their electoral base. Oppenheimer and his colleagues have defied the government by attempting to negotiate directly with the banned Marxist African National Congress. Oppenheimer supports the release of top Marxist Nelson Mandela, from prison. His support for a "liberated" South-West Africa (Namibia) indicates that he and his colleagues have no fear about the future of the enormous mineral resources here under a black Marxist government. But why should they when their diamond operations in Angola continue unimpeded, while in Marxist Mozambique, headed by Samora Machel, they have a very comfortable arrangement concerning diamond mining. The South African Government's close cooperation with the Machel government provides striking evidence of President Botha's willingness to have agreements with Marxist Governments.

Which raises the question of possible agreement between

South Africa and the Soviet Union. I was reliably informed some months back that the Soviet Union, through some of its most skilled operators, was "sounding out" members of the Botha Government and its advisers on the possibility of some agreement. I was not surprised, therefore, when an obscure report appeared in *The Australian* of November 2, 1985, headed "S. Africa may Seek Soviet Metals Deal." A senior South African Minister, Mr. Peter de Plessis, in charge of the manpower portfolio, was quoted as saying that South Africa might seek to form a precious metals partnership with the Soviet Union if Western economic sanctions increased. De Plessis made the revealing point that "We already co-operate with the Soviet Union in the diamonds trade and we get on well." What the Minister did not say was that the Oppenheimer Du Beers operates an international monopoly of the diamond markets in association with the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union and Oppenheimer also have close arrangements concerning gold and platinum prices. Like the Rothschilds, Armand Hammer and others, Oppenheimer and his top colleagues move in and out of the Soviet Union quite freely. The Soviet's alleged "anti-Semitism" does not seem to worry these people.

THE STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS

The principal alternative supply of chrome and other strategic metals required by the West is the Soviet Union. An agreement between South Africa, which means the Oppenheimer Empire, and the Soviet Union, would force the West to pay a much higher price for these strategic metals. It would become increasingly vulnerable to external pressures. Such a development fits neatly into the programme for the New International Economic Order, a major feature of which is to bring the basic raw materials of the world under international control.

While the Soviet strategists could quite easily modify their

opposition to South Africa's racial policies, could a basically conservative South African public opinion be conditioned to accept what would be the most radical foreign policy change in South African history? A situation could be created that was so desperate that a South African-Soviet agreement could be advanced as "inevitable" in order to prevent complete disaster. The conspirators against Christian Civilisation are masters of dialectics.

Under reasonably normal conditions, and given time, the programme of compromise and defeatism being adopted by the Botha Government would produce an electoral backlash which has already developed to the stage that the government has been badly hurt in recent by-elections. At a General Election it is now certain that the Conservative Party would certainly win enough support to have the balance of power, and to start to influence policy off the present disaster course.

But what if the Botha Government postpones elections because of a major national crisis? That crisis can be produced by the continuing international pressure against South Africa. And a new and ominous element has been introduced into the situation with Comrade Mugabe's recent visit to Moscow and the Soviet promise of sophisticated military support. Should the white officers still in Zimbabwe carry out their threats to resign rather than be forced into open military conflict with the South African forces, the way would be cleared for a much greater Soviet influence in Zimbabwe. Under the cover of a national crisis, which threatened the very existence of South Africa, an arrangement could be made between South Africa and the Soviet Union along the lines already indicated, and with the backing of the Oppenheimers of the world of International Finance.

Speculative and fanciful? Yes. But anything is now possible in a world convulsed by the forces of international conspiracy and revolution.

MISTAKEN IDENTITY?

By Jeremy Lee.

During the Christmas period in 1984 the Rev. Jerry Falwell, head of the fundamentalist movement the Moral Majority, in the United States, stated that his organisation stood for a Christian America. Such a statement would go without saying amongst the millions of Americans who have rallied round the Moral Majority banner.

Not so well known, however, was the reaction to this statement from certain sections of the Jewish community, and Falwell's subsequent back down from his stated position.

The *'Chicago Jewish Sentinel'* (March 14 1985) carried this article:

"MIAMI BEACH (JTA) - the Rev. Jerry Falwell, leader of the Moral Majority, apologised for calling for the Christianisation of America. "We are wrong and we are sorry", Falwell told more than 1,200 Conservative rabbis attending the annual convention of the Rabbinical Assembly. "What more can I say?"

Marc Tannenbaum, director of international relations for the American Jewish Committee, who shared the platform with Falwell, told reporters later that Falwell's apology appeared "sincere, and the way has been cleared for the genuine dialogue between conservative evangelical Christians and the Jewish Community", Tannenbaum told his Conservative rabbinical colleagues who gathered for the 85th annual meeting.

Tannenbaum described Jews as being "deeply troubled" during the 1984 presidential elections by comments from both the Republican and Democratic parties.

The AJC Committee leader said that President Reagan had the support of 50 to 60 percent of the Jewish vote until he made his remarks regarding the Christianisation of America.

"When you say you need to restore America to being a Christian nation, to return to the conditions of our origins, that kind of mythologising is nothing more than the revision of American history," Tannenbaum stated.

Continuing, Tannenbaum declared: "I don't want to see 1984 repeat itself where Jews vote because they feel fear on both sides and a sense of political homelessness with nowhere to go. We have not sunk roots here and enriched this country to end up at the end of the 20th Century feeling marginal to society".

'MYTH' OF CHRISTIAN U.S.

One week later, the Jewish press spelled out more clearly

Tannenbaum's position. *'Jewish Week'* (March 22, 1984), said: "Rabbi Marc H. Tannenbaum has denounced as "myths and lies" the idea that America was once great because it was a Christian nation. "Spokesmen for the new Christian right who seek to Christianise America are promoting an ideologically-danger-

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.

ous myth for American democracy which must not go uncontested," Tannenbaum said at a ceremony honouring his 30 years of leadership improving relations between Christians and Jews.

Tannenbaum, director of international relations for the American Jewish Committee, received the fifth annual Earle B. Pleasant Interreligious Award presented by Religion in American Life. He is the first Jew to receive it. He said that the only time anything resembling a "Christian republic" existed in the U.S. was in the Massachusetts Bay Colony established in 1629. Tannenbaum went on to note that, according to a major church historian, "the great majority of Americans in the 18th Century were outside any church, and there was an overwhelming indifference to religion".

He added: "As a result of the vast labor and the rough, uncouth hardships encountered by the pioneers, frontier communities became coarse and partially wild societies, with little or no social restraints and filled with low vices and brutal pleasures."

Tannenbaum also said the writings of such Founding Fathers as Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson and James Maddison did not indicate that they perceived America as a "Christian republic".

He also denounced as myths the notion that the country was once more religious and moral than it is today.

"In the 17th and 18th centuries no more than 10 percent of the population was affiliated with churches and synagogues," he said, "America today is far more religious and moral, and that has taken place because of an atmosphere of freedom of conscience and voluntary commitment to religion. The campaign by some members of the new Christian right to elect only born again Christians to public office is anathema to everything America stands for. It violates Article Six of the U.S. Constitution, which forbids the exercise of a religious test for any citizen running for public office...."

APOLOGISING FOR CHRISTIANITY

The Rev. Falwell's abject apology to the Jewish Community, and his subsequent back down from the idea that America should be a Christian nation is something Christians should ponder very carefully. Falwell has taken a courageous stand on moral issues in a number of areas, and has been strongly attacked for doing so. Without his leadership there might never have been a growing Christian concern for the radically secular direction America is taking.

But on this issue, Falwell is tragically wrong. A strictly-fundamentalist position without any knowledge of the historical context of events before and after the time of Christ have led him into a deception which, if not re-examined, must ultimately end in a denial of the very basics of Christianity.

Something of this deception can be seen in an article "Christians, Jews Working on Joint Worship Details" which appeared in the *Los Angeles Times* (July 14, 1979):

"NEW YORK - Interfaith-inclined Christian and Jewish leaders, who have explored most aspects of mutual understanding in relative harmony, are trying to resolve a particularly sticky question - how to conduct inoffensive but enriching joint worship services.

Christians and Jews, both people of "The Book" acknowledging and worshipping the same God, have thus a unique relationship.

One of the most dramatic incidents in their dialogue was a recent daylong symposium sponsored by the National Council of Churches and the Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

"The problems inherent in joint worship have not yet been solved," said Rabbi Balfour Brickner.

But those attending the session expressed the hope that some of those problems could be overcome without reducing combined worship to its "lowest common denominator".

"Our parishioners are seeking more than a mere exercise in human relations," said the Rev. William Weiler, director of the NCC office on Christian-Jewish relations. "We are trying to establish guidelines that will make possible meaningful spiritual

NEW TIMES - JANUARY 1986.

rewards through joint worship."

A model service prepared for the symposium included recitation of the Ten Commandments and the Apostles' Creed, prayers from each tradition, including the Jewish prayer for the Torah and the Christian Lord's prayer as well as readings from the Psalms and the New Testament account of the Pentecost.

The symposium participants later agreed on guidelines being finalised jointly for distribution by Reform Judaism and NCC affiliates that prayers "Should be addressed to God alone... and should not be in the name of the Trinity."

Using the Lord's Prayer was not advised "not because of the Text itself but because of its strong historical identification with the Church alone." (*Emphasis added*).

THE ZIONIST POSITION

What, then, has led a man of Falwell's undoubted courage, faith and zeal onto a path fraught with so many errors and deceptions?

Falwell is attempting to follow Christ on the one hand and on the other he is convinced that today's Jews and the Israeli nation are chosen and ordained by God irrespective of how far they may stray from Christ's teachings, and of how much they spurn and reject His Name and His place in the Godhead. This position is scripturally and historically wrong, and must in the end lead to destruction.

Jerry Falwell has said - on his "Old Time Gospel Hour" on January 27, 1985: "I am a Zionist. I am a strong supporter of the state of Israel and the Jewish position everywhere and in the past 30 years of my ministry I have worked very hard to get Bible-believing preachers across America, evangelicals, fundamentalists to take a stand alongside the Jewish people to fight and stamp out anti-Semitism. We believe in the Abrahamic Covenant that God deals with nations in relation to how those nations deal with the Jew, the "apple of God's eye"

Implicit in that statement is the belief that today's Jews are the Israel of the Old Testament, and that Christ's New Covenant is compatible with a continuation in the 20th Century of the principles of the Abrahamic Covenant. Completely unexplained is Christ's scathing indictment of Pharisaism, which, as Abba Eban's recent documentary on the Jews on A.B.C. television stressed, is the basis of modern Judaism.

These contradictions are of momentous concern to modern Christians.

WAS THE UNITED STATES CHRISTIAN?"

Rabbi Tannenbaum's dismissal of America's claim to Christian foundations flies in the face of a lot of evidence. Consider the speech of the late David J. Brewer, a Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court, at Harvard College in 1905:

"The United States is classified among the Christian nations of the world. It was so formally declared by the Supreme Court of the United States. In the case of Holy Trinity Church vs. United States, 143 U.S. 471, that Court, after mentioning various circumstances, added, "these and many other matters which might be noticed, add a volume of unofficial declarations to the mass of organic utterances that this is a 'Christian nation.'"

But in what sense can it be called a Christian nation? Not in the sense that Christianity is the established religion or that the people are in any manner compelled to support it.

The Basic Fund

There has been the usual slow down in contributions to the Basic Fund over the holiday period. But the Fund has advanced to approximately \$34,000, which leaves a balance of \$16,000. Because of the League's careful costing and forward planning, "near enough" is not good enough, which means that we must have, at the minimum, at least the \$50,000 requested. As the majority has still not contributed, all that is required is a flood of smaller donations and the target will be reached. Do not let this matter drag on. Thank you.

On the contrary, the Constitution specifically provides that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

Neither is it Christian in the sense that all its citizens are either in fact or name Christians. On the contrary, all religions have free scope within our borders. Numbers of our people profess other religions, and many reject all. Nor is it Christian in the sense that a profession of Christianity is a condition of holding office or otherwise engaging in the public service, or essential to recognition either politically or socially. In fact, the Government as a legal organization is independent of all religions.

Nevertheless, we constantly speak of this Republic as a Christian nation - in fact, as the leading Christian nation of the world. This popular use of the term certainly has significance. It is not a mere creation of the imagination. It is not a term of derision but has a substantial basis - one that justifies its use. Let us analyse a little and see what is the basis.

Its use has had from the early settlements on our shores, and still has, an official foundation. It is only about three centuries since the beginnings of civilized life within the limits of these United States. And those beginnings were in a marked and marvellous degree identified with Christianity. The commission from Ferdinand and Isabella to Columbus recites, "It is hoped that by God's assistance some of the continents and islands in the ocean will be discovered." The first colonial grant, that made to Sir Walter Raleigh, in 1584, authorized him to enact statutes, for the government of the proposed colony, provided that "they be not against the true Christian faith now professed in the Church of England." The first Charter of Virginia, granted by King James I. in 1606, after reciting the application of certain parties for a charter, commenced the grant in these words:

"We, greatly commending and graciously accepting of, their desires for the furtherance of so noble a work, which may, by the providence of Almighty God, hereafter tend to the glory of His Divine Majesty, in propagating the Christian religion to such people as yet live in darkness and miserable ignorance of the true knowledge and worship of God." And language of similar import is found in subsequent charters of the same colony, from the same king, in 1609, and 1611. The celebrated compact made by the Pilgrims on the Mayflower, in 1620, recites: "Having undertaken for the glory of God and advancement of the Christian faith and the honour of our king and country voyage to plant the first colony in the northern parts of Virginia."

The charter of New England, granted by James I, in 1620, after referring to a petition, declares:

"We, according to our princely inclination, favouring much their worthy disposition, in hope thereby to advance the enlargement of Christian religion, to the glory of God Almighty....."

It is not an exaggeration to say that Christianity in some of its creeds was the principal case of the settlement of many of the colonies, and cooperated with business hopes and purposes in the settlement of others. Beginning in this way and under these influences, it is not strange that the colonial life had an emphatic Christian tone....

In several colonies and States a profession of the Christian faith was made an indispensable condition to holding office. In the frame of government for Pennsylvania, prepared by William Penn, in 1683, it was provided that "all treasurers, judges..... and other officers. . . and all members elected to serve in provincial council and general assembly, and all that have right to elect such members, shall be such as profess faith in Jesus Christ." And in the charter of privileges for that colony, given in 1701 by William Penn and approved by the colonial assembly, it was provided "that all persons who also profess to believe in Jesus Christ, the Saviour of the World, shall be capable... to serve this government in any capacity, both legislatively and executive."

In Delaware, by the Constitution of 1776, every officeholder was required to make and subscribe to the following declaration:

"I, A.B., do profess faith in God the Father, and in Jesus Christ, His Only Son, and in the Holy Ghost, one God, blessed

"Freedom Wears A Crown".

by John Farthing.

This brilliant defence of the Monarchical system, by the Canadian author, the late John Farthing, has come back in to print at a most critical time. The new paperback edition carries a splendid Introduction by the Premier of Queensland, the Hon. Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen, and there is an Appendix in which an outstanding authority on constitutional law examines and defends the dismissal of the Whitlam Government by the Australian Governor-General, Sir John Kerr, in November 1975.

Although written primarily from a Canadian viewpoint, the pro-Monarchist arguments of *Freedom Wears a Crown* have universal application. This scholarly work should be in as many schools and libraries as possible. Price: \$12.00 posted.

forevermore; and do acknowledge the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be given by divine inspiration." New Hampshire, in the Constitutions of 1784 and 1792, required that Senators and Representatives should be of the "Protestant religion," and this provision remained in force until 1877.

The fundamental Constitutions of the Carolinas declared: "No man shall be permitted to be a free-man of Carolina, or to have any estate or habitation within it that doth not acknowledge a God, and that God is publicly and solemnly to be worshipped." The Constitution of North Carolina, of 1776, provided: "That no person who shall deny the being of God or the truth of the Protestant religion, or the divine authority either of the Old or New Testaments, or who shall hold religious principles incompatible with the freedom and safety of the State, shall be capable of holding any office or place of trust or profit in the civil department within this State." And this remained in force until 1835, when it was amended by changing the word "Protestant" to "Christian," and as so amended remained in force until the Constitution of 1868. And in that Constitution, among the persons disqualified for office were "all persons who shall deny the being of Almighty God.".. .

Massachusetts, in its Constitution of 1780, required from governor, lieutenant governor, councillor, senator, and representative before proceeding to execute the duties of his place or office a declaration that "I believe the Christian religion, and have a firm persuasion of its truth."

By the fundamental orders of Connecticut the Governor was directed to take an oath to "further the execution of justice according to the rule of God's word, so help me God, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ."

The Vermont Constitution of 1777 required of every member of the house of representatives that he take this oath: "I do believe in one God, the creator and governor of the universe, the rewarder of the good and punisher of the wicked and I do acknowledge the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments to be given by divine inspiration and own and profess the Protestant religion." A similar requirement was provided by the Constitution of 1786.

In Maryland, by the Constitution of 1776, every person appointed to an office or profit or trust was not only to take an official oath of allegiance to the State, but also to "subscribe a declaration of his belief in the Christian religion." In the same State, in the Constitution of 1851, it was declared that no other test or qualification for admission to any office or trust or profit shall be required than the official oath "and a declaration of belief in the Christian religion; and if the party shall profess to be a Jew the declaration shall be his belief in a future state of rewards and punishments." As late as 1864 the same State in its Constitution had a similar provision, the change being one merely of phraseology, the provision reading, "a declaration of belief in the Christian religion, or of the existence of God, and in a future

state of rewards and punishments."

Mississippi, by the Constitution of 1817, provided that "no person who denies the being of God or a future state of rewards and punishments shall hold any office in the Civil department of the State."

BRITAIN TOO

It was not only in the U.S. that earlier statesmen were forthright enough to acknowledge the Christian origins and nature of our order, and to condemn practices which they believed impinged on a free and just society.

Thus, the great Magna Carta of 1215, having commenced with a declaration that its provisions were drawn up "by the suggestion of God and for the good of our soul and those of all our predecessors and of our heirs, to the honour of God and the exaltation of holy church, and the improvement of our kingdom. . . ." stated in clauses 10 and 11:

"If anyone has taken anything from the Jews, by way of a loan, more or less, and dies before that debt is paid, the debt shall not draw interest so long as the heir is under age, from whomsoever he holds; and if that debt falls into our hands, we will take nothing except the chattel contained in the agreement.

And if anyone dies leaving a debt owed to the Jews, his wife shall have her dowry, and shall pay nothing of that debt. . ."

Eighty-two years later King John's later successor Edward re-affirmed these sentiments in these words:

"Know ye that we to the honor of God, and of Holy Church, and to the profit of our realm, have granted for us and our heirs, that the great Charter of Liberties, and the Charter of the Forest, which were made by common consent of all the realm. . . shall be kept in every point without breach. . . ."

Four hundred years later, the sentiments had not changed. The "Solemn League and Covenant" taken by the House of Commons on September 25 1643, started:

"We, noblemen, barons, knights, gentlemen, citizens, burgesses, ministers of the Gospel, and commons of all sorts, in the kingdoms of England, Scotland and Ireland, by the providence of God living under one King, and being of one reformed religion; having before our eyes the Glory of God, and the advancement of the kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, the honour and happiness of the King's Majesty and his posterity, and the true public liberty, safety and peace of the kingdoms, wherein everyone's private condition is included. . . we have (now at last) after other means of supplication, remonstrance, protestations and sufferings, for the preservation of ourselves and our religion from utter ruin and destruction, according to the commendable practice of these kingdoms in former times, and the example of God's people in other nations, after mature deliberation, resolved and determined to enter into a mutual and solemn league and covenant, wherein we all subscribe, and each one of us for himself, with our hands lifted up to the most high God, do swear. . ."

This was followed by a lengthy commitment to "doctrine, worship, discipline and government, according to the Word of God", and to the "cause of religion, liberty and peace in the kingdoms . . ."

THE CORONATION

While such sentiments are sadly lacking in the Parliaments, Congresses and Houses of the English-speaking world of the 1980's, the crowning of the head of England, Canada, Australia and New Zealand still indicates allegiance and loyalty to Christ.

Involved in the Coronation of the Monarch are:

- * The Swords of Justice and Mercy (Romans 13:4)
- * The presentation of the Bible (Ephesians 6:7)
- * The Anointing (as in the case of David 1 Sam. 15:1)
- * The two Sceptres with Cross and Dove (speaking of functions of Ruler and Guardian, the Christian symbols surmounting these rods being significant of the Gospel of Christ).

Outstanding among the Regalia is the Orb, the round ball surmounted by the Cross. In presenting this to the Monarch, the Archbishop of Canterbury says: "Receive this Orb set under the Cross, and remember that the whole world is subject to the Power

NEW TIMES - JANUARY 1986.

The Alberta Experiment"

by C.H. Douglas.

"While it might at first sight appear that anything which could take place in a single Province of Canada must be of a less importance than movements involving great world powers, I venture to suggest that history will not endorse such a conclusion." — C. H. Douglas.

The events, which led up to the election in 1935 of a Social Credit Government in the Western Canadian Province of Alberta, and the subsequent developments, must be studied by those who wish to understand the real nature of the struggle for the world.

The 1984 edition of Douglas's work, *"The Alberta Experiment"* carries an Introduction by Eric D. Butler, and revealing background notes prepared by the man who personally represented Douglas in Alberta, and who saw at first hand the workings of The Money Power as it sought to subvert the Albertan government.

"The Alberta Experiment" is one of the most important political textbooks of the twentieth century and should be read and carefully studied by those who wish to halt the growing drive towards the World Monopoly State. Those not prepared to learn from the mistakes of history are doomed to keep on repeating those mistakes. Price : \$7.50 from League Bookshops.

and Empire of Christ our Redeemer".

The National Council of Churches would obviously prefer to dispense with such barriers to "interfaith unity". Would Jerry Falwell do the same?

THE CHOSEN PEOPLE

Although he may not have realised it, Falwell's position is also one being intensely debated in Israel itself. The argument was well illustrated in an article in *The Australian*, (September 13, 1985):

"Tensions on the West Bank are never absent, and violence is now proving the most successful recruiting agent for the extreme-right racist movement which is threatening to stab in the back any peace plan that Israel might consider.

The movement's inspiration is Mr. Meir Kahane. The Brooklyn-born rabbi, who last year succeeded in winning a seat in the Knesset at the fourth attempt, is trying to bring in two private members' Bills, which would forbid relations, including sexual ones, between Jews and Arabs. The Bills would also reduce Israeli-Arabs to second-class citizens.

Despite a new law-forbidding members of racist parties to stand for the Knesset in future, Mr. Kahane has just succeeded in winning a case before the High Court. According to the ruling, his two Bills must be accepted by the Knesset Speaker, Mr. Shlomo Hillel, who so far has used every procedural device to avoid putting them before the chamber.

The existence of the Rabbi's Kach Party is an acute embarrassment to the Government at a moment it is seeking to rally world opinion against the 10-year old United Nations resolution, which says Zionism is racism.

Although the Prime Minister, Mr. Peres, says he is not impressed by the opinion polls on the subject - which show that up to 10 percent of the population would now support Kach - he should be concerned by the appeal his party has among the young. A recent survey by the respected Van Leer Foundation showed that 50 percent of all high-school students were attracted by the Rabbi's ideas. Even more worrying are findings in army tests among young conscripts - who at present police incidents of stone throwing in the Nablus area - that there is little or no understanding or tolerance among them for the Arab population. The Rabbi's appeal lies in telling the world that the Jews are the chosen people . . ." (*Emphasis added*).

Thus, Rabbi Meir Kahane and Jerry Falwell are completely agreed on the "chosen people" concept - a position not

shared by considerable numbers of Jews and Christians; and a position whose consequences lead to a complete denial of natural justice for non-Jews, amongst whom currently Israeli Arabs and the Palestinian people predominate.

LACK OF EVIDENCE

The age-long dream of a homeland and nation-status amongst Jews has been so strong, and woven so completely into the fabric of rabbinic-Judaism, that distinction between race and faith has been blurred beyond recognition. The truth is that the big majority of Jews, both in Israel and elsewhere, have no lineal connection with the Israel of the Old Testament.

The large-scale conversion in the ninth century of the Mongolian tribe the Khazars, from which the majority of European Jews are descended, is clearly recorded in the Jewish Encyclopedia. Nevertheless, the fact is often downgraded, or dismissed altogether by extreme advocates of the "chosen people" position, as yet another myth perpetrated by anti-Semites.

However, the publication of Arthur Koestler's "The Thirteenth Tribe" in April 1976 took the issue out of the confines of Jewish documentation into the public arena. Here was a noted Jewish historian, whose earlier works had attracted worldwide attention, publicly dispelling the conveniently-favoured, although erroneous, idea of a genetically and spiritually intact race, chosen by God, arriving at a predestined appointment after a journey through the diverse and blood-stained annals of history.

It seems unlikely that two such improbable partners as Jerry Falwell and Meir Kahane in this particularly mesmerising historical romance would be swayed by Arthur Koestler's evidence. Their particular tilt at the windmill of prophetic interpretation is far too consuming. But what of others?

Rabbi Raymond Apple, one of Australia's most noted Jewish commentators, when reviewing "The Thirteenth Tribe" in *The Australian*, (July 27, 1976,) wrote:

"But even if Koestler is right, what does it prove? That not all Jews can trace their descent back to ancient Israel, and some had ancestors who came from gentile tribes? That there is no such thing as a Jewish race in any scientific sense? True enough. . . . Koestler is at pains to deny that his argument implies that Israel has no right to exist. "That right," he says, "is not based on the hypothetical origins of the Jewish people, nor on the mythological covenant of Abraham and God; it is based on international law." Agreed. Israel's right to exist is provided for, recognised and guaranteed by international law, but history and the biblical covenant cannot be so lightly dismissed.

Even if not every Jew has ancestors who physically lived in ancient Palestine, every proselyte who enters the Jewish fold identifies as a matter of course with Jewish history and Jewish yearnings for the Promised Land. A proselyte joins not only a faith, but also a people, a culture, a covenant, and a set of ideas. . . ."

INEXPLICABLE

Rabbi Raymond Apple's argument is either inexplicable, or else an exercise in dialectical semantics so obscure as to only be intelligible to the Jewish mind. Scripturally, the Abrahamic Covenant is a racial one. By definition, the proselyte must be excluded. A proselyte may join a faith, but he cannot join a people. If the State of Israel is simply a religious community, that religion is the antithesis of Christianity, and repudiates the deity of Christ.

If it is racial, the proselyte - which includes the vast majority of Jews now living in Israel - has no legal historical right to be there.

The position of another distinguished Australian Jewish intellectual, Frank Knopfelmacher, is much clearer than that of Rabbi Apple. Reviewing Koestler's book in *The National Times*, (August 16-21, 1976) Knopfelmacher wrote:

"..... The vast majority of modern Jewry is quite unrelated to the "seed of Abraham" and it appears that the horsemen of Turkic and Slav chieftains, of Attila the Hun, and of Genghis Khan are more likely to have been the forebears of

the Jews than Abraham, Jeremiah, Jesus and St. Paul. For the heartland of modern Jewry — East, Central and Eastern Europe — from where almost all contemporary Jews trace their ancestry, did not contain the descendants of the Jewish Diaspora which came about after the second destruction of the Temple by the Romans, but refugees from a Turkic-Slavic kingdom — the Khazars Empire — which flourished at the time of Charlemagne, and existed between the seventh and thirteenth centuries. Its core lay within a quadrilateral defined by the Caspian and Black Seas, by the Caucasus and by the Volga. Its rulers and upper classes embraced Judaism probably AD 740.... In the long run the book is bound to clear the air by communicating an important truth widely, and by debunking most convincingly the pernicious self-genocidal doctrine held by ethnocentric Jews and by Jew baiters alike, namely that the Jews are the "chosen race."

Would that the eminently reasonable and historically-accurate views of Dr. Knopfelmacher on this question were capable of penetrating the understanding of the Rev. Falwell and Rabbi Meir Kahane, before they precipitate the racial crusade which is the prelude to world catastrophe.

THE REAL BATTLE

What, then, should be the attitude of Christians towards Israel and the Jews?

Israel, of course, has the right to exist. More than half its Jewish inhabitants were born there, and know no other home. But that right to exist is neither predestined nor racially justified. It is a right based on humanitarianism and natural justice.

It is a right, which must also be fulfilled for the Palestinians, who were evicted with the influx of European Jews when partition was agreed to in the Palestine of 1948.

Both Israel and the Palestine people must behave with a degree of civilisation that has been apparent in neither, once both have their entitlements met. The hitherto open favouritism given Israel by the West, which has engendered so much resentment amongst the Palestinians, should give way to impartiality, if peace is ever to be restored.

Christianity is not a racial creed, but a teaching and a way of life on how men must relate to God and to their fellows. It must, therefore, include a concern for government and economics within its ambit. For Christians to deny this truth is a denial of their own faith. There is no neutral position. Christ is either King, Mediator, Advocate and Redeemer - or simply one amongst a "plurality" of prophets through the pages of history.

Of His Coming Isaiah said (Ch.9: 7) "Of the increase of His government there shall be no end."

And to that end, the Christian must place himself in service — the service of Christ, "whose service is perfect freedom."

WHY MONEY SHOULD BE PRICELESS

by MARIE ENDEAN in "Home" U.K., October, 1985.

Can good news ever come out of Africa? War, disease, famine, hopelessness stalk that unhappy continent and numb us watchers in the West almost as surely as the victims themselves.

And yet there has been encouraging news. On 24 October 1984, A.J. McIlroy, the *Daily Telegraph's* reporter with the Unita forces in South East Angola, sent back an account headed "Unita's State within a State is Cashless." The good news is not so much about their war as about their economy.

It seems that Dr. Jonas Savimbi's forces now control one third of Angola where liberated bush communities are living satisfactorily, growing their own food, raising chickens and cattle, and even establishing cottage industries. Some materials and supplies are reaching them from outside but these are gifts. The people's needs are being met by help from the Unita movement to strict assessment of family requirements, and by barter among themselves or with neighbours.

A spokesman said that when they win their war they will

be sorry to have to be part of society "where money counts so much."

He should have said, "costs so much." Money, worldwide, has rarely been so expensive and this is affecting every nation. And all because of the way it is issued. "Nobody ever invented a better way of making money than selling it for more than it cost to buy. This is known as banking, and as long as bankers do not fall prey to greed or fear, they can pile up profits that would make Midas sick with envy." Thus wrote Stephen Fay in *The Sunday Times* of 21 October when reviewing a new book by Paul Ferris entitled *Gentlemen of Fortune - The World's Merchant and Investment Bankers* (Wiedenfeld & Nicholson).

Stephen Fay puts his finger right on the spot.

A random glance round the world at debtor nations, which cannot pay the interest on their debts let alone the debts themselves, suggests that the bankers are not so much greedy as totally inept. Or have some undisclosed aim in mind. US banks are now said to be borrowing from overseas to make up for the repayments and interest they have not been getting. What compounded madness.

The total foreign debt of the 39 African states south of the Sahara is now running at 36,971 million pounds and costing 7,615 million pounds in 1984 in interest.

Elsewhere the picture is even worse. Argentina's astronomical debts cost \$3 billion in interest payments alone which is something like 11% of her total export earnings. In May 1984 the increase in the US prime lending rate immediately cost Brazil an extra \$1.2 billion in repayments.

Resulting inflation is everywhere rampant in the Third World. Bolivia and Israel are victims of the world's highest rate now running in both countries in excess of 1,000%. In October the shekel was losing 2.3% of its value daily.

This syndrome of runaway inflation, rising deficits, slowing growth and high interest rates leads on inevitably to falling standards of living, widespread unemployment, cruel cuts

of all kinds. What wonder that political crises, revolution and growing anarchy are the order of the day.

WHAT IS THE NATURE OF MONEY?

So is it not high time to start asking questions about the nature of money, and about who creates and controls it, here as well as in the Third World?

Is it not a fact that virtually all new money is now a form of book-keeping known as bank credit, created by the banks as a debt under the general control of the Central Banks, and in such a way that irredeemable debt and inflation, that is depreciation of what it will buy, is inevitable? And are not debt and inflation the main causes of most of our social conflicts and miseries?

Christians, surely, should look deeper than the party squabbles and perceive that it is wholly wrong that an artificial bookkeeping system should impose a purely monetary poverty and frustration in the face of gluts of produce and of unemployed people and unused productive capacity. They should demand that the Monopoly of Debt-Finance should be broken to allow the creation of debt-free credit to enable otherwise irredeemable debt to be repaid and to set our economies free from its stranglehold.

We have entered the age of automation, of the computer and the silicon chip, encumbered with a banking system devised in the 17th Century. Unless it is radically reformed, we face the disintegration of our civilisation. To quote Lord Stockton's much acclaimed maiden speech in the House of Lords commenting on these new challenges, "All kinds of old beliefs on all sides will have to go by the board, Many old speeches will have to go by the board. Many old speeches will have to be torn up and many old attitudes will have to be changed."

First for the chop must be our fossilized ideas about the nature of money. Let us think afresh and use Unita's primitive example in Angola as a starting point for straightening our ideas and clearing away the mystique that has been allowed to enshroud an erroneous and unjust financial system.

IT'S WHAT YOU SAY -NOT HOW YOU SAY IT!

Journalists and satirical comedians have had considerable fun at the expense of the Queensland Premier, Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen, over his somewhat unusual use of the English language. All public figures, one supposes, must be prepared to put up with a little finger pointing and lampoonery.

However, one can also detect a hint of desperation in the constant repetition of Joh-bashing. It's no longer a reasonable bit of journalistic fun at a politician's particular idiosyncrasy; it has become a monotonously never-ending saga of ridicule.

What the Premier's detractors have failed to grasp is that most Australians are quite capable of discerning, through the jumble of half-finished sentences, double negatives and split infinitives, exactly what the Premier is conveying; and they agree with him. In fact, they often identify sympathetically with the Premier's grammatical lapses. They are, after all, common enough in the bars, at the racetracks and sale yards and on the street corners where John Citizen communicates with his fellows.

If syntax were synonymous with soundness and statesmanship, Gough Whitlam would have been far and away the greatest political leader of the past two decades. As an orator, he shaded all his contemporaries. But of course it's not. Intent is the real decider, however badly it may be expressed.

Take a recent article by Ian Miller, in Queensland's *Sunday Mail* (November 17). Miller's articles have become a monotonous 'put-down' of the Premier and the Queensland government each week. Consequently, they have lost any ability to wound, which is obviously Miller's purpose. This article was a verbatim transcript of the Premier's recent speech to the Northern Territory Convention. True, it was a mish-mash of half-finished and seemingly illogical sentences. Miller, no doubt, imagined his reading audience doubled up with mirth at the Premier's gram-

matical 'gaffes'.

However, by the end of the article, one knew exactly where the Premier stood on the issue of land-rights, the Ayers Rock fiasco and the Canberra bureaucracy. He thus succeeded where men like Gough Whitlam, John Howard and Ian Sinclair fail dismally. His speech was a resounding success, according to all reports. Miller, one supposes, can only explain that success by lumping speaker and audience together as 'reactionary Philistines'

Contrast the Premier's communication with the alternative. *The Australian*, (November 15) reported:

"Public Service jargon and academic gobbledygook threaten to undermine efforts by the Federal Government to create a new national organisation for Aborigines. Essential discussion papers being circulated among aboriginal groups are said to be so difficult to understand that many Aborigines fear they will not be able to voice their opinions.

One group representing 800 Aborigines at Roebourne, Western Australia, has returned all the documents to the Department of Aboriginal Affairs and demanded a translation into simple English. The 147 pages of discussion material contain such phrases as: "The progressive transfer of functions and related funds"; "thinking in relation to financial self-determination"; and "invitation of closely restricted significance". After spending some time poring over the papers, the Roebourne Aborigines simply gave up in disgust. Ms. Wendy Hubert, chairperson of the town's Ngurin Aboriginal group, said the Depart-

ment of Aboriginal Affairs, of all government departments, should be aware of the problem and be prepared to take a lead. Her group has returned the documents to the Government's task force..... In her letter, a copy of which was sent to Mr. Holding and *The Australian*, she says the trouble with the documents is that they are written in "too high English".

"..... You might say 'There are whitefellas who can help you with all this reading and writing' and this is true. Those whitefellas are you (and) people in your office. We want to be in control of our own information, not have to depend on people who might not give us a true story. ... You are our servants and that is why you have a well paid job," she wrote. "You are paid to make sure we have a fair go in this country. We want to have a word on this business, but if you don't give us the information in a way we can understand, you will not get the true word of 80 percent of Aboriginal people who have no educational qualifications. You will only get the word of the whitefellas who work with us and government people. Then you can't truly say you have the Aboriginal people's agreement to your plans to replace the National Aboriginal Conference....."

Perhaps the Aboriginal people of Roebourne would benefit by calling on the Queensland Premier to "translate" the long and windy circulars from Canberra. On the other hand, if the Aborigines really discovered what those departmental "whitefellas" were about, they'd give Mr. Holding away altogether.

Be that as it may, it's wot you say, not 'ow you sez it, wot really counts!

NO NEED TO FEEL GUILTY

by Neil G. McDonald.

"Pioneer Australians wiped out the aboriginals - shot them or with mercy put them in chains."

How true, and where is the evidence?

My late mother, Florence McGillivray, was born on a wheat farm in Victoria's Wimmera district. From the 1880's to the end of World War I she did not see an aborigine. Daily, she walked miles to a small schoolhouse - trudging home to a session of cow milking. From laundering on the dam edge, she used flat irons, and cleaned wick lamps. Apart from an annual visit to the Charlton Show, there was no escape from the family farm. Her only racial contacts were with an Afghan hawker and a Chinese market gardener. No aboriginals came within cooee. Neighbours, too, lived in a zone of toil and Sunday silence. The Bible was shared at the kitchen table and shoe cleaning was banned on the Sabbath.

Were these typical Aussie battlers the villains of our modern history books?

Where is the evidence of aboriginal slaughter? The bones, graves and accusations are fabrications - phantoms of imagination designed to create a sense of national guilt.

The pioneers from Britain and Europe were sturdy Christians. Outside the labours of clearing, fencing, ploughing, sowing and harvesting, they combined to build churches, which still dot the rural districts.

Few settlers had firearms, or knew how to use them. Aboriginals are genuine Australians too. They are entitled to live under the same laws, enjoy the same welfare benefits. Some receive additional compensations. The development of Australian cities is a benefit they are welcome to share. Or they can retreat to the silence and isolation of the coolibah trees.

Food and merchandise are available for the same prices and terms as to any other Australian whether born here or migrated here.

Why, then, should Land Rights divide Australia into areas denied to lighter coloured Australians? Discrimination is

used when Australians are refused entrance to reservations. Should Ayers Rock or Mount Olga or uranium areas be accessible only to Aborigines?

Special laws and conditions split Australians with the critical scythe of apartheid.... separate development. If it is a bad thing in South Africa, then equally apartheid has no role in Australia. Apartheid is like stepping on thin ice....full of risks.

Let Aborigines be subject to the same common rules as migrants from Italy, Greece and many other countries.

SO THEY SAY

by Harold Hotchkin.

How it began

"I have been ten years in Russia and have been in Petrograd through the whole of the Revolution . . . had ample opportunity of studying Bolshevnik methods. It originated in German propaganda and was, and is, being carried out by international Jews. The Germans initiated disturbances in order to reduce Russia to chaos. They printed masses of paper money to finance their schemes."

-Letter from the Rev. B. L. Lombard, M.A., to Lord Curzon, March 23, 1919.

Admiral Sir Barry Domville, K.B.E., C.B., C.M.G., spent three years in Brixton prison, without trial, during the Second World War, under the infamous Regulation 18B. His book, *From Admiral to Cabin Boy* is a mine of information concerning events that led up to the Second World War. I quote:

"Judmas is my copyright for the Judeo-Masonic combination, which has been the principal disturbing factor in World politics for many a long day. There is nothing new about Judmas; for several centuries now it has been behind most of the wars and revolutionary movements in Europe . . . And other parts of the world.

"This has not come about through lack of literature on the subject. There are books galore exposing the dangers to which the nations lie bare, as long as they leave these unconfined powers at work in secret behind the scenes.

"These books date back over a very long period, but specially large numbers have been published in recent years. These books will not be found exposed to view in library or bookshops, nor will any encouragement to read them be found in the Press or in book reviews. Judmas can take care of all these sources of information. It cannot prevent books from being published and read by those who get to hear of them, although sometimes whole editions are bought up, to prevent circulation." (Page 80).

"DICTATORSHIP BY TAXATION."

"It is no use realising that taxation is legalised robbery, is unnecessary, wasteful and tyrannical. If you stop at that, not only will you have to pay the taxes that you now have to pay, but as Sir Josiah Stamp, one of the Directors of the Bank of England, suggested a short time ago, with that engaging candour which we are beginning to expect from the Bank of England, 'While a few years ago no one would have believed it possible that a scale of taxation such as that at present existing could be imposed upon the British public without revolution I have every hope that with skilful education and propaganda this scale can be very considerably raised'

- C.H. Douglas in *Dictatorship by Taxation*

"THE ROOT OF ALL EVIL"

BY Eric D. Butler

A challenging new book with a message appropriate to the growing worldwide crisis. Many have already expressed their appreciation. \$2.00 from all League addresses.