

THE NEW TIMES

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

VOL. 50, No. 5.

MAY 1986.

Registered By Australia Post—Publication No. VBH 1001

Australia and New Zealand Edition. Published in Melbourne and Auckland

TERRORISM: THE FORGOTTEN FACTS

by Ivor Benson

Who has benefited from the American air strike against Libya? Has it ended terrorism? These questions are answered by South African journalist and political commentator Ivor Benson in the May edition of his *"Behind the News"* available from Blomfield Books, 26 Meadow Lane, Sudbury, Suffolk, England CO 10 6TD.

Something very important has been missing from the torrent of words about the recent United States strike against Libya and about international terrorism in general.

That which is missing makes all the difference between a presentation of facts that is true and one that is dangerously false and misleading.

It is the difference between what we are permitted to know and to say and what we are not permitted to know and say, what we dare to say and what we are afraid to say.

If we are to understand any situation it is necessary to bring together *all the facts* that belong together, and not just some of them.

The missing facts on the subject of international terrorism are those that have to do with the grievances, which gave rise to the terrorism.

What sense is there in condemning terrorism while avoiding any consideration of its possible causes? Men do not perform these acts of violence, sometimes at the sacrifice of their own lives, only for the fun of it.

Don't Arabs have any legitimate grievances? Can they be expected to submit tamely to the seizure and occupation of their country?

Western politicians and journalists are prevented from addressing such questions by a taboo as potent as any to be found in a primitive jungle society, a taboo that forbids any discussion of the Jewish role in national and international affairs. This taboo is itself a form of terrorism, so much harder to withstand because harder to understand.

The Palestinian Arabs were the victims of one of this century's biggest and most flagrant acts of injustice, or of war, and were left with a simple choice - either to submit and suffer or fight and suffer. They chose to fight and have been fighting ever since they were dispossessed of their country.

Is it possible that the Jews have some other explanation of what happened, some explanation that might exonerate them? Here is an answer to that question, provided by David Ben Gurion, first Prime Minister of Israel, quoted by Dr. Nahum Goldmann one-time president of both the World Zionist Congress and the World Jewish Congress:

"If I was an Arab leader I would never make terms with Israel. That is natural: we have taken their country. Sure, God promised it to us, but what does that matter to them? Our God is not theirs. We came from Israel, it is true, but 2000 years ago, and what is that to them? . . . They only see one thing: we have come here and stolen their country."

Can it be disputed that the Israelis' continuing state of war with the Palestinian Arabs and last month's United States strike at Libya is an attempt to legitimise with force and terror the Zionist action in grabbing Palestine?

The rhetorical answer to that question, as we have been constantly reminded down the years, is that there is much more

involved than the seizure of the Arabs' homeland — no less than Israel as a "bastion of resistance" against Soviet expansionism in the Middle East.

But, why should we believe an argument that the Jews themselves do not believe? Writes Dr. Goldmann:

" . . . Without Russia, the state of Israel would not exist today. Not so much because the Russians voted for its creation as because in 1948-49, at the time of the Arab invasion, all Israel's arms were of Soviet origin. Israel must not forget what Ben Gurion, with his usual courage, never ceased to point out. 'If I am now receiving you in a Jewish state', he used to tell Israeli TV reporters, 'it is a lot more thanks to the USSR than to the United States. . ."

Ben Gurion in his time said much more to dispel the much touted in the West, that the Israelis see their little state as a bastion of resistance to Soviet expansionism.

THE CONTROVERSY OF ZION'

How, in spite of the presence of this supposed armed "outpost of the West", did the Soviet Union secure a foothold in the eastern Mediterranean? Again, we have an answer from the man who was for many years the principal spokesman of the Jewish nation all over the world, Dr. Goldmann: "The Russians then seized the opportunity to get into the Middle East by the Arab door. And if today they still have an interest in the Jewish state it is paradoxically because it was Israel which brought them a political victory they had awaited for centuries".

All the facts that belong together would include the whole programme of violence, terror and international lawlessness which resulted in the dispossession and expulsion of the Palestinians, plus the violence used since then in efforts to crush resistance and prevent retaliation - not to mention the continuous extension of Israel's territorial boundaries.

This use of force and flagrant disregard of what remains of international law included two invasions of Lebanon, the massive shelling and bombing of civilian targets in Beirut and a bombing attack on the PLO headquarters in Tunis.

The American action last month, partly launched from Britain, means that the Zionists are now bent on drawing all the nations of the West into a war against the Palestinians and their Muslim supporters, a war which the Zionists know they can never hope to win on their own.

However, let us not be misled by the apparent immediate purpose of the present pressure on Libya, which is to stamp out terrorism against Jewish targets.

Other, much larger purposes have to do with plans to put the whole of the Arab world through the international political wringer in preparation for its ultimate incorporation in a planned New World Order - a purpose being promoted simultaneously from both sides of the Iron Curtain.

In this expanded scenario Libya is seen more as a prize to be won than as an offender to be punished. What is required in

Libya, as President Reagan has already indicated, is an amenable (that is, subservient) regime to replace the present independent and self-directed one powered by oil wealth and a passionate Islamic fundamentalism.

But wait! Doesn't Libya have a defence pact with the Soviet Union? Again, let us not be deceived by mere appearances.

If there should ever be an invasion of Libya by whatever combination of forces - as was, in fact, recently mooted in Washington and Tel Aviv - we need have no doubt how the Soviet Union would react: exactly as in the case of the Israeli invasion of Egypt, then a Soviet "ally", when, in 1967, the famous "hot line" between Washington and Moscow came into effect and both the great powers agreed not to interfere.

Reactions to the American bombing attack on Tripoli have

been less favourable than might have been expected: a Gallup poll showed that two out of three persons in Britain thought that Mrs. Thatcher was wrong in allowing the Americans to launch their attack from bases in Britain.

Few of the persons questioned were stupid enough to believe that the attack would have the effect of reducing the incidence of acts of terrorism; on the contrary, the commonsense view is that there will be more terrorism than ever and that (possibly as required in some non-Arab quarters) more of it will be aimed at American and British targets.

It would be impossible to exaggerate the evil consequences to be expected from a planted erroneous belief that the Arab people are alone responsible for Arab terrorism and deserve whatever punishment they get — evil consequences both for the Arabs and for the peoples of the West.

THE ASSAULT ON AUSTRALIA

The essence of Australia's new defence strategy, described as one of self-reliance rather than alliances, is that Australia should concentrate upon preventing any enemy from making a landing in Australia rather than preparing to defeat him on Australian soil. Quite apart from the relatively small amount of Australian resources being devoted to any type of a defence strategy, the effective defence of Australia requires far more than a military strategy. A realistic defence programme requires an assessment of the nature of the threat to Australia's independence.

It is no secret that the Reagan Administration's attitude towards South Africa changed dramatically when the International Bankers announced that South Africa would be in trouble financially unless internal political "reforms" were implemented. Slavishly accepting the same type of financial Black Magic as other countries, the South Africans have mortgaged their country to International Finance. Financial orthodoxy, not a lack of military capacity to defend themselves, is the major Achilles Heel of the South Africans. Australia has an even bigger Achilles Heel as a result of the escalation of external debt under the Hawke government.

In spite of mounting protests, and even threats of violence, from rural Australia, over the coming years tens of thousands of Australia's farmers are going to be forced from their properties - *unless there are major changes to financial policy*. The growing destruction of rural Australia, and the businesses and towns which service them, is not taking place as a result of a foreign military invasion, but a more insidious type of invasion, one which is taking place with the connivance of Australian politicians. The very debt system which has been used to drive Australia's primary producers to over-produce, and to contribute to the gluts of primary production in North America and Western Europe, is being used to destroy rural Australia under the guise of "rationalisation" and "restructuring in depth."

THE BIG IDEA

We have over the years publicised the Big Idea of creating a global economic system under the label of the New International Economic Order. It was the master Communist strategist Lenin who said that the World Communist State could not be created without first creating a world economic system. This means that nations are progressively deprived of their economic independence. The nexus between International Finance and International Marxism has been graphically demonstrated with the enthusiastic support for the New International Economic Order by both Moscow and Peking. Anyone who has taken the trouble to look at the proposals of the New International Economic Order knows that vast sectors of Australia's primary industries are to be phased out. The rapidly declining state of the Australian dairying industry is an indication of the shape of things to come.

As it becomes increasingly difficult for Australia to service its external debt, those who control that debt are in the position to make increasing demands upon Australia concerning its internal affairs. While this development is taking place, Australians are being urged to free themselves from "narrow nation-

alism", and to see themselves as "World Citizens". The attack on nationalism has been a major feature of Marxist psychopolitical warfare. Treachery of various kinds flourishes as local loyalties are broken down. Contributing to this break down of loyalties is the programme of multiracialism, generally described as multiculturalism. The "silent invasion" of Australia started when misguided and treacherous politicians accepted disastrous changes in Australia's traditional immigration policy. As pointed out by one of Australia's most distinguished authorities on our immigration policies, Dr. John Dique, it is not without significance that all the English-speaking nations, including the United States, started to abandon their traditional immigration policies, designed to maintain predominantly homogeneous nations, at about the same time, in the early sixties.

Karl Marx understood how immigration could be used to defeat a nation when he said that the English would never make their own revolution, and that foreigners would have to make it for them. The predictions of Enoch Powell have become a dreadful reality in the United Kingdom. In times of great national stress, including times of external military attack, the more homogeneous the nation, the greater its chance of survival. And yet at a time of growing internal crisis in Australia, Australia's Minister for Immigration, Mr. Hurford, has been attempting to increase substantially the number of migrants to Australia. One of the more absurd arguments for increased migration is that it would benefit the depressed economy. If only Australia's large number of unemployed could grasp this argument, we might have the spectacle of the unemployed, oppressed small businessmen and struggling home buyers, grappling with high interest charges, forming welcoming committees to cheer the flood of migrants as they come off the planes and boats!

THE BEST MIGRANTS

The best and most desirable Australian migrants are Australia's children. But internal financial policies, coupled with depressing propaganda, much of it in the schools, have produced a situation where the birthrate has progressively fallen. Australia is destroying itself from within, and the further fostering of the multi-racial society can only increase the destruction. No realistic defence of Australia is possible unless present *internal* policies are reversed. This means a repudiation of all forms of international influence on Australia's domestic policies. No genuine programme of patriotism can be engendered while the surrender to internationalism, one of the most dangerous manifestations of this being international debt, continues.

As the Federal "Opposition" parties are trapped in the

same internationalism as the Hawke government, replacing Mr. Hawke with Mr. John Howard would not halt the growing retreat in the face of the enemies of Australian independence. A major part of the international assault on Australia was the introduction of foreign banks. Remember how, according to the "world's greatest Treasurer", Mr. Paul Keating, the introduction of foreign banks was going to produce more competition, and lower interest rates? And also let Australians remember that Mr. John Howard's

reaction has been that Mr. Keating stole his policy!

A NEW MOVEMENT

The defence of Australia requires, not one more power-seeking party, but a grass-roots movement represented by Australian patriots seeking to serve their fellows and their nation without thought of personal material rewards. We are optimistic enough to believe that the grass-roots movement is now evolving and that its leaders are starting to emerge.

REVIEW OF THE CRISIS

It was during the First World War that the distinguished British engineer, C.H. Douglas, made a discovery of the greatest historical significance, a discovery with far-reaching implications concerning the future of Western Civilisation. Called in by the British government to solve problems in the British aircraft industry, Douglas discovered that under orthodox financial policies, industry was creating prices at a faster rate than it was distributing incomes to meet those prices. The technical proof, including the famous A + B Theorem, was subsequently provided in Douglas's works, particularly "The Monopoly of Credit", this containing a prophetic chapter demonstrating that the end result of an adherence to financial orthodoxy by the industrialised nations must be military conflict.

Douglas initially believed that once his discovery, and its implications, were brought to the attention of responsible men, they would grasp the urgent necessity to correct financial policy to ensure that a production system relying progressively less on human labour, but on a cultural heritage being rapidly expanded with new technology, would be regarded primarily as a means of providing the consumer with the goods and services he genuinely required. But Douglas made another discovery, one which many basically decent people find it very difficult to accept, that those operating the financial system were not only determined to resist any proposals which challenged financial orthodoxy; they were promoting programmes which, in essence, were designed to exploit the disastrous effects of orthodox finance to progressively centralise power over the individual. The ultimate end result of centralising all power must be some type of world power. Douglas was forced to accept that there was a progressive conspiracy against traditional Western Civilisation.

Ever since the first major revolution of modern history, the French Revolution, a number of writers have dealt with the manifestations of conspiracy against a Civilisation reflecting, however inadequately, the values of Christianity. But it was Douglas who demonstrated that the key instrument for centralising power was finance. While the operation of the credit creation banking system was a mystery to the great majority, the few who did understand it, like the Rothschilds, grasped how it enabled power to operate above both national governments and nations. And the development of the industrial revolution, which could have freed the individual on a scale never previously envisaged, was seen as a means of centralising power over the individual.

A DOUGLAS PREDICTION

The guns had hardly finished smoking at the end of the First World War, when Douglas predicted that unless there was a change in a financial policy which generated escalating debt, forced industrial expansion beyond what was genuinely required to meet consumer requirements, with increasing stress on the "fight for foreign markets" in an endeavour to overcome domestic problems, the end result would be the break up of Civilisation. That breaking up was already under way and would become cataclysmic during the lifetime of those to whom Douglas was addressing his warnings. Comparatively few heeded the warning. The basic realities of the danger were masked by the feverish industrial expansion-taking place, particularly in the United States, much of it geared to the reconstruction of Germany and the Soviet Union.

But the period of relative prosperity came to an end in 1929 with the onset of what was described as an "economic blizzard". This and similar terms were designed to create the impression that the depression was the result of natural forces over which man had no control. No one was to blame, although it was claimed by some that people everywhere had been "living beyond their means."

NEW TIMES -MAY, 1986

The truth of what happened is succinctly outlined by C.H. Douglas in *The Brief for the Prosecution*:

"At the end of October, 1929, the New York banks, without notice, called in practically every overdraft, and advanced the rate for 'call money' from a normal 3 percent to 30 percent, or more. The effect was instantaneous. Borrowers, for the most part in possession of large blocks of securities both American and European..... threw them on the market in order to obtain cash, either to meet calls or wages account. But there were no buyers for cash, since there was no cash. The banks had it all, although the country at large had the securities representing much of the funded wealth of the prosperous years.

"For about twelve months, American business staggered down the slope. Any slight improvement in the stock market (there was none in commodity markets) was greeted by an avalanche of selling orders. Where salaried workers were retained, they were presented with ultimatums requiring immediate acceptance of drastic salary reductions. Living standards, with consequent consumers' buying, fell faster than wage and salary reductions, as a consequence of widespread lack of confidence in the future - misgivings which were more than justified."

ADVANCING MONOPOLY

The Great Depression was used to advance the policy of monopoly everywhere, specially the Money Monopoly. A central feature of the policy was the establishment of Reserve Banks, these linked to the International Bank of Settlements. Central planning of all kinds became the "in" thing, the Soviet Union being quoted as the example to be followed. Events on the international scene were dominated by a long-term strategy, a major objective being the elimination of the British Empire. A Second World War was required for this, and the balance of power in Europe was destroyed by the building up of Germany and the weakening of Britain. The Second World War ended with the way cleared for the progressive liquidation of the British Empire, the establishment of the United Nations, and proposals for extending the Money Power internationally through the Bretton Woods Agreement and the establishment of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank.

Massive reconstruction programmes following the Second World War, tended to mask the inherent flaw in the financial-economic system. But what might be termed the "quiet revolution" proceeded under the impact of progressive inflation, one of the inevitable results of financial orthodoxy. International Finance extended its all-pervasive influence through the debt system. As the productive capacity of the industrialised nations increased dramatically as a result of the technological revolution, there was the growing "fight for markets" which, in the absence of "the balance of nuclear terror", would have led to the Third World War. But obviously anticipating this type of development, International Finance and its Socialist partners, had a blueprint ready

for a solution: The New International Economic Order. In essence, the N.I.E.O. proposes to run the whole world as one economic unit, "rationalising" production, the end result being a type of international Soviet system. Such a system can be guaranteed to rid the world of the "threat" of over-production and to centralise power over the individual to the stage where revolt becomes increasingly difficult.

THE EXPLOITATION OF CRISIS

The real history of this century, without going back any further, is the exploitation of every crisis to advance an on-going programme for centralising power. Further evidence of this on-going programme was provided at the last International Summit Conference, held in Japan. It was agreed that the current worldwide economic crisis required the "strengthening" of the International Monetary Fund, with power to direct the policies of the nations' Reserve Banks. Every increase in internationalism makes it more difficult for any individual nation to take independent action to solve its own problems. There is a constant propaganda decrying nationalism, which the internationalists correctly see as a major obstacle to their Big Idea. The concept of economic nationalism is attacked as a type of deadly sin, which must be eradicated.

What the world is threatened with is not the actual esta-

ishment of some type of World Government exercising financial and economic power, but with the complete break up of what remains of Civilisation. The Soviet Union has only been able to sustain itself with massive economic blood transfusions from the West. But the extension of the Soviet system must result in what has happened in the Soviet Union and other Communist nations. The momentum towards centralisation of power is now so great that it is impractical to talk about meeting it head on. This momentum will expend itself in still greater disasters. The essential requirement for the future is a Faith based upon Reality, and appropriate action taken for survival programmes and a process of regeneration. C.H. Douglas described Social Credit as practical Christianity.

A REALISTIC FAITH

During what the historians generally describe as the Dark Ages, the light of Civilisation was never completely extinguished. The task of the Social Creditor today is like that of the captain of the storm tossed ship on dark and treacherous seas; to hold fast to faith in the reliability of the compass being used to steer by. Social Credit provides the compass for guidance through a crisis, which will deepen before there is daylight ahead. Social Crediters have an awesome responsibility at this time in history. They must maintain faith in themselves and convey that faith to others.

HELPING RED CHINA?

by Robert Morris
in "World Freedom Report (U.S.A.) March 15, 1986.

With the massive infusions of military weapons with which we are endowing the Chinese Communists, it might be well to review the short history of our relations with that regime.

After World War II, the US State Department, in the war between the government of Chiang Kai-shek and the Communists, intervened on the side of the Communists.

Late in 1946, we imposed a total embargo on the Nationalists while the Soviets whom we had brought into the war, were arming the Communists with weapons they took from the surrendering Japanese Manchurian army.

The result was an enormous accretion to World Communism and of course the Korean War and the Vietnam War.

I have been told that the Senate hearings exposing this betrayal gave the Republic of China twenty years during which we assisted it with military support and started it on its economic recovery.

During that period, however, the Communists made one attempt to invade Quemoy but were defeated.

The State Department persevered however, and in 1979, President Carter unilaterally abrogated the treaties with the Republic of China, recognized Communist China, and withdrew from Taiwan.

Congress came right back, with a sense of indignation, and passed the Taiwan Relations Act which imposed on our government the obligation to supply Taiwan with sufficient arms to deter attack.

Again the State Department persevered and in August of 1982, joined with Communist China in a Communiqué which said, "The US government does not seek to carry out a long term policy of arms sales to Taiwan. . . and that it intends to reduce gradually its sales of arms to Taiwan, leading over a period of time to a final resolution."

Clearly this is in conflict with the Taiwan Relations Act, particularly because Deng Xiaoping has refused to rule out force to effect reunification and has even threatened an embargo against the Republic of China.

China's chairman, Hu Yao-Pang, in May of 1985 said, "Military might depends on a strong economy. In seven or eight years time, when our economy becomes strong, our national defense is modernized, and a majority of the people want to return, we may take some strong action."

Meanwhile, Deng openly declared that while he holds to a "flexible economy" he is not building capitalism but "Communism".

On foreign policy, Senator Patrick Moynihan has pointed out that in the last session of the United Nations, he (Deng) voted 86% of the time with the Soviets.

Communist China supports enemies of the US in Africa (SWAPO, ANC, Mugabe's ZANU and Khadafy), Middle East (PLO) and Central America (Sandinistas).

Meanwhile, we have been endowing the Chinese Communists with cultural, trade, educational, and now military assistance.

Deng does not express appreciation but denounces us for interfering in his internal affairs by sending arms to Taiwan.

On January 29, the Pentagon confirmed that we are giving Peking \$500 million for radar and navigational equipment to upgrade its jet fighters.

Earlier we allowed General Electric to supply gas turbine engines for Chinese destroyers and we are aiding them in the construction of an artillery factory.

Naturally our loyal friends in the Republic of China are alarmed, particularly when we begin to reduce our arms supply to them (a \$20 million reduction this year) in pursuance of a 1982 communiqué rather than adhering to the Taiwan Relations Act.

Not only are the Free Chinese alarmed but so are Malaysia, Indonesia and other allies against whom Peking has been waging a war of insurgency.

Peking is now tactically downplaying this insurgency while stressing its "four modernizations".

If our plan is to make Communist China a military and economic giant of Asia, these countries recognize that it spells their doom.

And to make the situation even more alarming, the more we aid the Chinese Communists the closer they are drawing to Moscow.

With President Nixon's opening to Peking in 1971, there were at least 12 differences between Red China and Moscow.

These differences have now been reduced to three: Afghanistan and the Wakkan Strip; Cambodia where Soviet surrogates are opposing China surrogates for control of that country; and the troops on the border.

With respect to that last item, most of the Soviet 54 divisions are east of Lake Baikal and therefore a threat to Japan and the US, as well as a threat to China.

The State Department has been shown to have been

demonstrably wrong in its policy after World War II (and we were able to show Communist subversion involved in that policy in the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee).

Here we are once again beginning to embargo the Republic of China but instead of the Soviets arming Deng's forces, we are saving them the trouble by supplying arms ourselves.

In view of this I ask, how can we be sure we are doing the right thing in arming an unregenerate Communist China?

MEN AND MOBS

Winter was hard; Easter was early; HOME was late; so here we are celebrating Easter after the event — when at last there is a little warmth as well as sunshine, a few daffodils and waves of crocuses. There is still the Easter History.

Ruthless men, like Caiaphas and his group, have always used mobs as tools to gain their ends. Little mobs to hunt down decrepit old crones and burn them on bonfires, or, more up-to-date, with motor tyres full of petrol; or to lynch people popularly screamed at as ill-doers — rapists, maybe, or child molesters — but with no proof other than the scream. Huge nation-wide endemic mobs such as produced the French Revolution, the Russian Revolution, Hitler's war. Large and small, they are gouts of raw energy wielded like flame-throwers by people outside the heat, for purposes not evident to those taking part.

All mobs need preliminary priming by indoctrination that bears down on key words: Aristo! Bourgeois! Jew! Racist! Apartheid! Fascist Pig! Rapist! and so on. Such indoctrination once took time and effort and personal contact. Nowadays saturation coverage by television has made the process much easier. Continual harping on selected themes and images from a selected standpoint, over and over and over again, supplies steady background indoctrination and suitable trigger words, provided that other points of view are allowed no more than token presence. The flame-throwers are, so to speak, continually primed and need only a skilled orator playing upon the trigger concepts to release a furious and directed turbulence.

We in this country have prided ourselves on a solid and law-abiding way of resolving differences, and on being relatively unmovable, compared with our temperamental continental neighbours. This is no longer true. Mr. Scargill and his private army of miners showed what could be done; Brixton, Notting Hill, Toxeth, and Handsworth, together with organised bands of football fans, developed a taste for it. Teachers' and N.U.P.E. trade unions developed their own form of armchair-born mental mob with their strikes injuring children and ill people. All of them are emotionally inflamed by the clever use of words into a violent release of their subhuman herd-natures in pursuit of some immediate objective, which obscures the sight of their real aims. This is the characteristic of a mob; that the individuals composing it do not comprehend the objectives for which their furious action is being used. But obviously the more reasonable the short-term aims (as many are) the more fully they cover up the long-term policy.

How many miners realise that the real, in-depth, aim of their strike was not to get more money or even to stop the closure of the pits, but to polarise police and people, to set the police in military mode *against* people (in the one country where they were not) so that they might 'properly' be fought? So that they might be regarded as the 'enemy' in Brixton, Liverpool, Birmingham, etc? How many teachers realise that the objective of their strike is not to get more money - which could be done by more specific means (see HOME November 1985, p.1 *et seq*) - but to provide a hiatus in the education system, a generation of children ill informed, irresponsible, lacking in confidence or judgment, who some years on may well provoke such chaos in this once orderly nation as to let in extreme authoritarianism in one form or another? And to make certain of this, today's students, who should be in a position to guide and help the young people of this interregnum, are themselves being deprived of the background knowledge, which might give them the capacity to do so. Hence in this orchestrated turbulence cadres of violent lads, students or not, are suppressing by force and by threats the expression of views they disagree with, in the very place where all views should be listened to, considered, discussed, criticised and assessed. Most serious of all, in some cases university authorities supposed to be the custodians of understand-

ing, are bent upon pre-empting violence by disallowing visits from those (however orthodox) who are unacceptable to the violent, extreme few.

The only sound basis for co-operative society is individual and personal responsibility for known and recognised ends: individual responsibility of everybody, of each individual. And this applies in personal life, in business and in politics. There seems to be a rule about this: Never allow yourself to be organised for ends you cannot see and understand, often lurking behind the visible bait for action. If anyone tries this, contract out of the organisation.

Which is not easy; but it brings us back to Easter, and to the message of faith in renewal after our hard winter of discontent.

—April issue of *Home*. UK.

BIG BUSINESS AND SOCIALISM

Bolshevik leader Leon Trotsky indicated the close connection between Big Business and Socialism in his *History of the Russian Revolution*, p.29:

"The giant enterprises, above 1,000 workers each, employed in the U.S.A. 17.8 percent of the workers, and in pre-revolution Russia, 41.4 percent..... In Moscow the . . . percentage is even higher, 57.3 percent."

Stalin's writings stress the vital importance of destroying small-scale enterprises, describing these as the bastion of capitalism. Lenin said that the World Communist State could not be created without first creating an International economic system. This is exactly what the International Bankers are attempting at present.

PLANNING FOR 1987 CROWN COMMONWEALTH CONFERENCE

The 1987 League of Rights Crown Commonwealth Conference, to be held in Melbourne, Australia, will be a major step in the programme to develop an organic movement of English-speaking peoples from around the world, including the United States and South Africa.

It is probable that the Conference will be associated with the development of a proposed Anglo-European Fellowship, designed to support and to defend the undergirding values of all European people. We will be reporting on this development as information comes to hand.

It is planned that overseas visitors will have the opportunity of seeing much of Eastern Australia as part of a package tour. A group tour is planned for Canadian and American visitors, starting in Queensland and taking in Sydney on the way through to Melbourne. One of the highlights of the Melbourne programme will be the famous *New Times* Annual Dinner, held on the first Friday in October.

Canadians and Americans interested in taking advantage of the proposed group tour, of approximately three weeks duration, should contact Mr. Phillip Butler, Box 2797, Vancouver, B.C., Canada, V6B 3X2 as soon as possible. Arrangements can be made for those wishing to extend the package tour to take in New Zealand.

British visitors will find it preferable to make their own individual travel arrangements. They can "shop around" and take advantage of some of the discounted fares being offered for direct flights between the United Kingdom and Australia. However, it is proposed that British visitors should be included in some of the tourist plans for Australia. Forward planning will be essential and we invite prospective British visitors to contact The Australian League of Rights, Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne, as it is possible that British visitors have relatives or friends in Australia, and may wish to stay with them at some time. It will be important for the Australian organisers to have this information.

The Australian League of Rights would also like to know how many Australian supporters can extend private hospitality, particularly over the weekend of the Melbourne *New Times* dinner.

A REALISTIC REVIEW OF THE COMMONWEALTH

by Chas. Pinwill

The maintenance of Constitutional Monarchy is important, indeed essential, to the continuance of ordered constitutional government, and as an effective barrier to the grubby ambitions of politicians for power beyond the interests of the peoples of Australia, Canada, the United Kingdom and New Zealand.

As such it is worthy of every respect and loyalty and the vigilance of its active defence. Primarily this has drawn back loyalists from a frank and realistic assessment of the British Commonwealth, as it is today, and this has not served the Queen, the Crown, the British peoples of the world, or finally, the world itself.

In the first half of this century, years in which most of the present generation were unable to participate, and indeed were not present, the greatest creative opportunity the Commonwealth ever offered was sold for a mess of pottage.

Consider a world in which Britain, Canada, Australia and New Zealand formed a meaningful family of like nations, with genuine bonds of blood, language, form of government, economics and defence. What result might this have brought to the world?

In natural resources it would have easily outranked the United States of America. Its population, it is true, would have approximated half that of the United States in number, though in technological capabilities, cultural maturity and cohesion as a people it would have suffered no such limitation.

The geographical distribution of these sovereign Nations in close co-operation in all areas of affairs is anything other than a liability. Britannia, with secure bases across the world, and in every ocean, and a strong merchant navy to facilitate "internal" trade, might well have continued to "rule the waves".

The spectacle of the Soviet and America facing off over the future (or not) of the world, would have had to move over for a third party and force at the dinner table; a third force easily taking the balance away from government-by-terror represented by the Soviets.

How then, and why, was this option for common sense and genuine commonwealth aborted?

The short answer is that under threat of "bankruptcy" from international finance, treachery within and pressures from without, largely Soviet, and in that order, the great hope of the world, the old civilising British Empire, is dying childless.

People wonder at the cohesive bond holding the present "Commonwealth" together. They need not. It is simple.

British people around the world would not countenance the break up of Empire easily. If break it did, that would have left the truly British alone, and free to establish the balance of force in a saner and freer world.

And what have we? Our Queen, God bless Her, in the midst of the nonsense of CHOGMs and "Commonwealth" conferences.

The dilemma of breaking up the British Empire, and yet inhibiting a Commonwealth of British peoples with real meaning, force and purpose in the world, was brought off with a charade.

The British peoples acquiesced in the destruction of their Empire for a psychological "sop". The Queen would be retained in a titular sense, which means in no sense, and a nonsense.

And this situation would be maintained. How? By granting as a permanent right, in exchange for this face-saver in defeat, regular access for those who never wanted, and never could, a place in a true Commonwealth of British peoples, to those who built and would on their own have developed into the future, a British world power.

And why do these now foreign Heads of Government continue to act out this charade? To cadge for aid, to threaten with embarrassment if the British people's real interests do not give way to sundry shabby third world Potentates, and other, though responsible leaders of their peoples who are, with their peoples and interests, no less foreign.

Without a vision the people perish. This axiom is no less true for British peoples than for all others. The British people are perishing.

The shock of loss of purpose, now called "the British disease", is very evident in the UK. That nation's colonisation by

the non-British "colonies" has made its peoples unrecognisable in its own large cities. Its workers are "working" for no perceptibly recognisable vision beyond the next feed.

Canada, Australia and New Zealand only find a small place under the hegemony of America, and not with that essential enthusiasm which alone can release the truly creative dynamic.

A world power of British peoples is physically possible, an imperative in the future of the West, and most needful for the sanity of the world.

A sufficient base is still there and will be for a very long time upon which to begin to build.

The path to this vision is blocked only by a herd of old cows, sacred ones. One is called "International Finance", another the "E.E.C.", and yet another is named "CHOGM".

Where is John Bull in all this bull dust?

PROBLEMS ABOUT TERRORISM

When does a terrorist become a freedom fighter? This is not an academic question. Sir John Glubb ("Glubb Pasha") raised this question some years ago when discussing acts of violence by Palestinians against the Israelis who had invaded their country and dispossessed them of their homes and properties. Sir John Glubb pointed out how, during the Second World War, the British and Free French forces committed acts of violence in France as part of the campaign to defeat the invading Germans. Sometimes the French people were victims of this violence. But no one described the British and Free French as terrorists. They were engaged in a war of liberation.

Heavy bombing by both the Germans and Allies during the Second World War, were responsible for heavy civilian casualties. The massive Allied bombing of the German city of Dresden, packed with civilian refugees at the time, resulted in carnage on a mass scale. Was this a terrorist act? Or do such acts of violence become legitimate acts when there has been a formal declaration of war?

South African Communist leader, Nelson Mandela, admitted frankly at the trial which found him guilty of plotting to overthrow the South African government, that what was proposed was bloody revolution. Mandela proposed terrorist activities, but is constantly referred to as a freedom fighter. Mandela's much-publicised wife, Winnie, has recently extolled the virtues of the "necklace" method of killing those blacks opposing the policies of the African National Congress. Does this make Winnie Mandela a terrorist? Or are the Mandelas and their colleagues "freedom fighters" engaged in destroying the whites who allegedly seized control of a country which did not belong to them? Why, then, are Palestinians engaged in acts of violence against the Israelis who took control of their country, described as terrorists and not as freedom fighters or liberationists?

Whether described as terrorists or freedom fighters, men (and women) will engage in acts of indiscriminate destruction so long as they believe their cause is just, and advanced by their actions. Consider what is happening in Sri Lanka, India and Ireland. Wherever there are minorities who feel they are being oppressed by majorities, there is the possibility of sufficiently desperate people being encouraged to acts of violence. The greatest stability has always been in those societies which are basically homogeneous, with a common culture, and where power is decentralised.

When Karl Marx said that the English would never make their own revolution, and that foreigners would have to make it for them, he obviously envisaged the creation and exploitation of an alien minority, which could be conditioned to believe that it was being "exploited", and "discriminated against". The Soviet

strategists backed the Zionist conquest of Palestine (which the Zionists now humorously refer to as the "liberation" of Israel) and then proceeded to exploit the resulting refugee problem. So long as this refugee problem remains, the Soviet has a permanent source of potential killers, irrespective of whether they are described as terrorists or freedom fighters. Needless to say, there is no suggestion that any effective action should be taken against the Soviet Union for its international programme of exploiting the real or imagined grievances of minorities.

As C.H. Douglas observed, orthodox financial policies work towards producing a growing number of economically dispossessed who can be mobilised for revolutionary activities. The Marxists

argue that violent revolution by the have-nots against the haves is morally justified. Violence of one kind or another is inevitable under a policy of debt finance. Those exercising power on an international scale through debt finance openly outline a strategy, which in essence seeks to dispossess millions throughout the world under the programme known as the New International Economic Order. What could be more terrifying than the spectacle of seeing one's farm and family being destroyed? Are not the growing numbers of desperate people committing suicide, the victims of a diabolical programme of destruction?

These and similar questions should be asked at a time when there is so much talk about terrorists.

TO THE POINT

"The Bulletin", Sydney, of May 20th, carries a two-page advertisement for De Beers announcing that: 'the diamond market has turned the corner' because of what is described as "the strength and resilience of the centralised selling system". This is a sophisticated way of saying that De Beers operates a worldwide monopoly of diamond marketing. Needless to say, there is no reference to De Beers' fellow monopolist, the Soviet Union. But De Beers makes the significant comment that, "The need to abolish apartheid in all its forms and create a socio-political dispensation that gives fair and equal opportunity to all is now more widely recognised than ever before." It is announced that Mr. Nicholas Oppenheimer has succeeded Sir Phillip Oppenheimer as Chairman of De Beers, which hopes that the South African government will continue with more "reforms". Its Soviet friends must be delighted.

Psychologists use a term called "selective perception", which was put more clearly two thousand years ago as, "none so blind as one who will not see." Press reports state that Dutch War Documentation Institute researchers have compiled a 714-page volume, published by the State, of the alleged diaries of Anne Frank, the 15-year old Jewish girl who died in the Belsen concentration camp. Reports state that this publication is designed to contradict growing doubts concerning the authenticity of the diaries. One report states that Anne Frank died in the Belsen "extermination" camp. It is now generally admitted that there were no "extermination" camps in Germany during the Second World War. The biggest casualties at Belsen were the result of typhus and starvation, particularly during the latter stages of the Second World War. The Anne Frank Diaries are self-contradictory in places and an insult to commonsense. British historian David Irving, the man who exposed the hoax of the Hitler Diaries, an authority on forged documents, has told of his experience in trying to persuade Anne Frank's father to make available the alleged diaries for independent testing by a recognised British expert. Frank refused to have the test made.

* * * *

One of the most dishonest arguments used to push the reluctant British into the European Economic Community was that the EEC was being developed as a barrier against the Soviet threat. But the "barrier" continues to help sustain the Soviet with massive food exports at give-away prices. In the latest deal, the Soviet has brought 100,000 tonnes of EEC butter at 50 cents per kilo. The cost of storage has been \$5 a kilo. Last year the EEC provided the Soviet Union with seven million tonnes of cereals. The Soviet bloc nations paid only \$250 a tonne for cereals imported from the EEC. The Soviet is obtaining food at a fraction of the price being paid by EEC consumers. In spite of exports at low prices, the EEC still has mountains of food. The Soviet will be delighted to continue exploiting the situation. Soviet strategists must laugh into their vodka as they think of the EEC as a "barrier".

* * * *

Former Australian Prime Minister, Mr. Malcolm Fraser, one of the "eminent" persons meddling in the internal affairs of South Africa, has suggested a Lancaster House type of solution for South African problems. It was the Lancaster House conference and agreements in England which paved the way for the final disaster in Rhodesia, the imposition of a Marxist Prime Minister who lost no time in working towards the establishment of a one-party State.

NEWTIMES - MAY 1986

The fact that Malcolm Fraser still sees Comrade Mugabe as some type of success for his efforts brands Fraser as either being invincibly stupid - or worse. As Malcolm Fraser finds Mugabe acceptable it is not surprising that he is sympathetic towards Marxist revolutionary, Nelson Mandela.

When not engaged in helping to advance revolution in South Africa, Malcolm Fraser moves in the world of High Finance. A recent report from London says that Fraser has joined the board of a new investment board, the First Australia Prime Income Investment. Mr. Fraser is also on the board of a United States twin of First Australia Prime Income, which was enthusiastically welcomed when it was launched in April. Clearly Malcolm Fraser is acceptable in the higher echelons of international power.

* * * *

It is common knowledge that in certain parts of Australia, desperate farmers have turned to growing crops for drugs in order to obtain incomes. Recent reports from Bolivia, South America, reveal that Bolivian farmers have increasingly become the major source of the world's cocaine supplies. With the decline in the prices of tin and natural gas, the sagging Bolivian economy has been bolstered by the \$2 billion cocaine industry. Approximately 400,000 Bolivians now earn a living growing coca leaves or grinding them into the paste that is then processed into the pure narcotic and smuggled overseas. Without the illegal cocaine industry, now believed to be one-third of Bolivia's gross national product, the Bolivian economy would be in an even worse state than it is now. Bolivia could, of course, change its financial and economic policies. But reliance on the cocaine industry, with all its disastrous social consequences, is regarded as preferable to attacking the Money Power.

* * * *

President Aquino is having to face some of the realities of international power politics. She has had to make an emotional appeal to the international bankers to provide a concrete act of faith; she believes that an increase in the already heavy burden of foreign debt will enable her to help the poor masses. While President Aquino is appealing to the same international bankers who shackled Marcos with massive debt, she is battling with the communists, who are intensifying their aggressive campaigns, while in the Moslem South; Moslem leaders are threatening a holy war unless the region is granted independence. Mrs. Aquino clearly means well, but in the absence of some basic internal financial and economic changes, she will require something in the nature of a miracle

to survive. She could prove to be the Kerensky of the Philippino revolution.

* * * *

New Zealand's farmers are starting to become as militant as Australian framers. And, like Australian farmers, they have started to lose faith in an Opposition, which offers no constructive alternatives to the policies being imposed by the Labor party. Not surprisingly, there now is talk of a new farmers' party. Forming new parties is not the answer to the crisis now seriously affecting all the primary producers and small businessmen of the free world. The only hope is a grassroots movement, which insists that elected Members of Parliament exist to serve their electors.

* * * *

Alexander Solzhenitzen has joined the ranks of those charged with "anti-Semitism". Solzhenitsyn, whose wife is half-Jewish, states that if there are Jewish malefactors in his books, it is not because he blames the Jews for everything. The charge of anti-Semitism is, he says, "cynically used as a club by some" and, like other labels, "has lost its precise meaning in unthoughtful use. To approach a literary work with a measuring stick of 'anti-Semitism' is vulgar, revealing an underdeveloped understanding of the nature of a literary work. By this measuring stick, Shakespeare could be proclaimed an 'anti-Semite', and his creative work struck out."

One of the principal critics of Solzhenitsen's alleged anti-Semitism is Professor Richard Pipes of Harvard University. Pipes is known for his thesis that Communism springs from Russian character and tradition. Communism was imposed upon the unfortunate people of Russia from outside, and financed by international bankers. None of these were Russian.

* * * *

Zionist power in the United States was demonstrated by a decision in the US courts, endorsed by the Supreme Court, that the State of Israel could demand the extradition of an American citizen of Ukrainian background, to be tried in Israel for crimes allegedly committed against Jews during the Second World War. Already a number of absurd and contradictory allegations have been made against John Demjamjuk, who will almost certainly be found guilty on the basis of evidence collected in the Soviet Union by Israeli legal experts. One more example of Zionist-Soviet collaboration, verbal controversies notwithstanding.

* * * *

With the Law Council of Australia opposing the introduction of Identity Cards, it appears that a decisive influence has ended at least one totalitarian threat. The Law Council said it was concerned about the widening of the uses proposed for the ID card beyond its original purposes of checking tax evasion and fraud, and the absence of any privacy safeguards. The Council particularly objected to the proposed use of the card in social security, housing loans, immigration and passports.

* * * *

The Soviet Union has left no doubt about its intentions concerning economic relations with Australia. *The Stock Journal* of April 24 reports that the Soviet is pressuring Australia to take more of its manufactured goods - if Australia wishes to keep

sending wheat to the Soviet. In particular, the Soviet wants Australian farmers to take more of the Belarus tractors. These are not highly regarded by Australian farmers. *The Stock Journal* reports that "In addition to undercutting competitors' prices by roughly 30%, on the complete range, Belarus is offering 25% down-payment and no more payments for 12 months, with no interest accrued.

* * * *

ISRAELI REALITIES

One of the earliest Zionists said that the creation of the Zionist State of Israel was a peg on which to hang a far-reaching programme. C.H. Douglas observed that while the creation of the State of Israel was one of the major objectives of the Second World War, this policy should be seen as one designed to create the psychological conditions essential for the advancement of the World State idea. It is obvious that the great majority of the Jews of the world, including those living in the Soviet Union, have not the slightest intention of going to Israel to live. Many Jews bluntly state their abhorrence of the idea of living in Israel rather than, for example, New York or Los Angeles. Some still prefer to live in Germany!

Developments inside Israel ensure that the Zionist state remains a major piece on the international chessboard where the game of international power is being played. *Newsweek* is not a magazine, which could, by any stretch of the imagination, be described as anti-Zionist. But in its issue of April 15th, it provides a picture of Israeli developments, which reveals just how Israel can be a major destabilising influence in international affairs.

The younger generation of Israelis is becoming more "hawkish" and anti-Arab. "A 14-year old girl whom teachers called an 'excellent' pupil said that she Very much wanted to kill all Arabs"; one of her classmates described Palestinians as 'garbage'. 'We don't like the Arabs because they're not our race', concluded another 14-year old essay writer."

Newsweek comments "The 19-year old occupation of the West Bank and Gaza strip grinds on, dividing the country politically. Jerusalem's heavy hand there remains irreconcilable with the promise of Israel as a haven of oppression of all kinds. And in spite of Camp David, the gulf between Israel and its Arab neighbours seems as broad as ever."

Rabbi Meir Kahane is obtaining increasing support, advocating that Israel be run on strict Talmudic lines, and that the 1.7 million Arabs living under Israeli rule should be expelled with the West Bank and Gaza Strip incorporated into Israel. Several explanations are offered for this attitude, one teacher being quoted as saying that the school system was to blame. "The kids in my class are hardly aware that there are 600,000 Arabs who've lived in Israel since before the country was created, and who are entitled to the same treatment as any other citizen."

There are deep divisions between the Sephardic and Ashkenazim Jews, the latter being the driving force behind the terror campaign, which drove the Palestinians out of their homeland to establish the new State of Israel in 1948. One third of a group of teenagers said they were thinking of emigrating from Israel. So far from being seen as "the Promised Land". Israel has the greatest difficulty in attempting to maintain its population.

The *Newsweek* survey, written by Jews, confirms the revealing views of American Jew Jack Bernstein, as described in his book, *The Life of An American Jew in Racist Marxist Israel*. The description of Israel as an "independent" State is completely false; it is a parasitic State, which, without the massive international support, including military support from the U.S.A., would either collapse or be forced to adopt a very different attitude towards the Arabs. The Zionist leaders, like their spiritual bedfellows the Marxists, have always regarded the rank and file of the Jews as expendable troops essential for the advance of grandiose plans for remaking the world.