

THE NEW TIMES

\$12 per annum post free.

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

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

VOL. 50, No. 6.

JUNE 1986.

Registered By Australia Post—Publication No. VBH 1001

Australia and New Zealand Edition. Published in Melbourne and Auckland

THE THREAT OF WAR

Several years ago a Japanese Cabinet Minister was commenting on the growing world economic crisis, with all industrialised nations finding it increasingly difficult to export their surplus production, thus achieving that objective held up as the ultimate achievement by the financial witchdoctors of that Black Magic known as "sound finance": a "favourable balance of trade". The Japanese Cabinet Minister said, hopefully in jest, that it appeared that another war was necessary to solve the problem. He was, of course, referring to military war, which enables all the combatants to "export" vast quantities of their productive capacity. Since then the world economic crisis has deepened and the struggle to export surplus production, both primary and secondary, has intensified. Spokesmen for Australia's desperate primary producers have recently proclaimed that they have "declared war" on the European Economic Community.

The madness of the export mania has been demonstrated by governments subsidising exporters. The Australian National Farmers' Federation proposes to spend up to one million dollars to establish a permanent lobby in the EEC. And while Australian primary producers are attempting to export their production into Western Europe, the EEC is striving to reduce its own massive food and wine surpluses by heavily subsidising exports to the Communist bloc and other countries, this in turn resulting in the Reagan Administration subsidising food exports.

While President Reagan preaches the virtues of reduced trade barriers, the "import-restraint" trade reform bill recently passed by the Democrat-controlled House of Representatives has sent shock waves through West Germany, Japan and Taiwan. EEC Washington representative Sir Roy Denman has been quoted as saying on May 22 that if the bill becomes law "reprisals" would be taken. The essence of the Washington legislation is that all countries with large trade surpluses with the United States must reduce the surpluses by 10 percent a year for four years, or face retaliation. Textile, steel, lumber and footwear industries in the U.S.A. have been hard hit by imports, many of these from Asian countries with relatively lower wage costs.

Australian textile manufacturers are expressing increasing concern about the threat of imports from Asia. This concern has heightened as a result of statements by Prime Minister Hawke at the time of his recent visit to Communist China. Mr. Hawke said that Australians had to be prepared to take imports from Communist China. This is what one would expect from a prominent member of the Socialist International, a Fabian Socialist, and a strong supporter of the New International Economic Order.

"HISTORIC" U.S.A. TRADE BILL

During his visit to the U.S.A. last year, Singapore Prime Minister Lee Kwan Yew, whose domestic economy is suffering from the effects of the world economic crisis, said, "What is at stake is the issue of war and peace — not the simple preservation of jobs in plants that are no longer competitive internationally". But there is a state of war when one nation is forced into conflict with other nations in what is often described as "the fight for foreign markets". When the recent U.S.A. trade bill was passed by an overwhelming majority in the House of Representatives, House Speaker Thomas O'Neill said that the bill sent an "historic message that the people of the United States will no longer stand by and watch American industry be replaced by foreign industry". While the U.S.A. is attempting to protect its

own industries by keeping imports out, it has caused friction with Brazil by threatening to impose sanctions to punish Brazil for its heavily protected computer industry. Latin America's most industrialised nation is attempting to defend its local computer industry against American exports. Brazil's politicians have introduced a bill to slap back at American companies in Brazil by limiting the amount of profits they can send back to the U.S.A. and by doing away with investment and tax allowances.

THE ECONOMIC CAUSE OF WAR

Writing on "The Causes of War" in *The Monopoly of Credit*, C.H. Douglas said that "So long, then, as we are prepared to agree, firstly, that the removal of industrial unemployment is the primary objective of statesmanship, and secondly,

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.

that the capture of foreign markets is the shortest path to the attainment of the objective, we have the primary economic irritant to military war always with us, and moreover, we have it in an accelerating rate of growth, because production is expanding through the use of power machinery, and undeveloped markets are contracting. Any village which has two grocery shops, each competing for an insufficient, and decreasing, amount of business, while continually enlarging its premises, is a working demonstration of the economic causes of war - is, in fact, itself at war by economic methods". Douglas wrote this in 1931, eight years before the outbreak of the Second World War, which for a period solved the problem of poverty amidst plenty by getting rid of the plenty, and which averted the mounting challenge to financial orthodoxy.

But the problem of overproduction has been returning with a vengeance. And the "nuclear balance of terror" has ensured that there has, to date, been no world military conflict. What, then, of the future? The Big Idea, which is taking shape in the form of the New International Economic Order, is to plan the economies of the world on a global scale, 'rationalising' the domestic industries of the nations, which means closing down many of them. A major part of the programme is to build up the underdeveloped Third World, which means shifting vast resources from the developed nations.

A CHAMBER OF COMMERCE PREDICTION

The test of true science is accurate prophecy. At a time when businessmen are thrashing around looking for some answers to their problems, they might consider one of the most significant documents to come out of the Great Depression of the 'thirties, a report prepared and agreed to by some of Great Britain's most outstanding business and industrial leaders. The Report was prepared by a special committee of the Southampton Chamber of Commerce and quickly obtained an international circulation. The Southampton Report analysed the finance-economic system and confirmed the Douglas analysis that modern industry was progressively distributing insufficient purchasing power over any given period of time, to meet total prices created in production over the same period, and that one of the consequences under financial orthodoxy, was escalating debt and a constant drive to solve the domestic problem by exports.

In one chapter, "A Critical Situation", the Southampton Chamber of Commerce predicted:

"There is.... one consideration arising out of this analysis which demands special attention. It has been shown that the bulk of money originates in bank-created credit-loans, which have to be liquidated in full. It has been shown that the defect in the system renders it impossible for industry to recover its cost of production and liquidate its debt obligations. It follows that the weaker units of the industrial and financial system must become eliminated or absorbed by the stronger units. These stronger units are stronger by virtue of their ability to eliminate their competitors. Thus a process of centralisation develops quite naturally in both the industrial and financial fields. Because the control of financial policy must carry with it the control of all economic activity, it would seem that the powers of government must pass into the hands of the most powerful financial group as financial power becomes centralised internationally. That this is by no means an unlikely result is plain from the proposals being put forward for the centralisation of national central banks under an international financial institution. It is being further suggested that national central banks should be made completely independent of control by national governments, so that any such centralised world hierarchy of finance would form World Government with complete power over communities. We view the progress towards such a state of affairs with alarm".

Since the above fears were expressed, The Bank of International Settlements was firmly established before the Second World War, and operated throughout the conflict. The Bretton Woods Agreement towards the end of the Second World War brought into existence the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. As the international debt burden increases, and the international trade crisis deepens, the programme to

increase the powers of the International Monetary Fund is advanced. The threat of large-scale military war and the deepening world wide economic crisis have been exploited to condition the peoples of the world to believe that there is no alternative to the New International Economic Order.

UNDER THE THREAT OF WAR

Just prior to the outbreak of the Second World War, the subversive Political and Economic Planning organisation (PEP), backed by Big Finance and Fabian Socialists, made the historic comment that such was the character of the British people, that it was only under war conditions, or "threat of war", that they would submit to large-scale central planning. Headed by Israel Moses Sieff, a chain store monopolist, PEP said that the Soviet Union provided the type of large-scale planning favoured by PEP. It is not without significance that British "Conservative" Prime Minister, Harold MacMillan, was closely associated with PEP before the Second World War.

It can be said with complete certainty that the Bid Idea for a Centralised World State is never going to materialise; it flies straight in the face of Reality. But the attempt to create the World State must result in growing economic and social friction with a type of developing civil war. The survivors of this type of war will be those who understand the basic causes of friction, and who do not make the mistake of becoming embroiled in false conflicts. Modern party conflicts are a type of phony war in which the only winner is centralised power with all its various manifestations. Realistic political action requires support for any move, which will weaken centralised power. Survival depends upon maximum diversity. The lure of the philosophy of Bigness should be rejected. A survival policy requires that individuals invest some of their resources in a programme of self-development, the most essential feature of which should be knowledge of all aspects of Reality. This will ensure that valuable but limited resources are not expended on futile activities.

REALITY WILL TRIUMPH

Nothing can now halt the escalating momentum of the war for the world. The many types of casualties will mount. But through all this the realities revealed by Social Credit remain a constant torch of light, showing the way through the darkness. Everyone who remains loyal to those realities, and who acts in accordance with them, is playing a role in ensuring that eventually Reality will triumph over evil. The Mills of God grind slowly, but they do grind. There is one aspect of Reality which all plotters and planners fear: creative initiative backed by knowledge, and those unrehearsed events which enable a relatively few people to decisively change the course of events from what they otherwise would have been.

HEALING A DIVIDED NATION

by Rev. Cedric Jacobs, M.B.E.

A courageous Christian Aborigine exposes the socialistic land rights programme and puts forward a constructive solution for helping Australians of Aboriginal background. Contains considerable wisdom, with a final chapter suggesting constructive financial policies to bring all Australians together. It is not too much to say that this book could have a profound effect on the future of Australia. Essential reading for Christians who have been misled by some Churches on land rights.

\$6.00 posted from all League bookshops.

THE SMEARING OF SIR RAPHAEL CILENTO

The Murdoch newspapers in Australia, *The Australian* and *The Sun*, Brisbane, launched a vicious and cowardly attack on the late Sir Raphael Cilento on June 10th, charging that Sir Raphael had been suspected of having Fascist and Nazi sympathies during the Second World War.

These smears come at a time when there is a Communist-Zionist campaign to have an Australian investigation into alleged "Nazi war criminals" who came to Australia following the Second World War. The infamous Simon Wiesenthal has aided the campaign to have an Australian investigation.

The anti-Cilento smear is no doubt designed to attempt to create the right type of psychological atmosphere in which to stage a Nazi witch-hunt. As revealed by Mr. Eric Butler in his book, *The Truth About the Australian League of Rights*, an answer to Phillip Adams, who has been a regular contributor to *The Australian* for some time, some incredible developments took place in Australia during the Second World War, with numbers of loyal Australians being interned without any concrete charges being laid against them. The most outrageous case was the internment of supporters of The Australia First Movement, the most prominent of these being the well-known literary figure, P.R. Stephensen. The sensational charges made in the Commonwealth Parliament were subsequently demonstrated to have been completely fictitious.

As pointed out by Eric Butler, he and his colleagues were also threatened with internment following The Australia First case, allegations against them being made by Communists and pro-Communists. The same type of allegations being made against Sir Raphael Cilento were made against Eric Butler, the late Sir Stanton Hicks and others. Anyone who had ever said anything favourable about any aspects of the Nazi and Fascist regimes was listed as a possible traitor by what transpired to have been, at best, some extremely stupid and hysterical people.

Churchill himself had said some favourable things about National Socialist Germany and Fascist Italy, at a time, of course, when normal diplomatic relations existed between Great Britain, Germany and Italy.

In spite of the documents quoted by *The Australian*, in an article by Marshall Wilson, formerly with *The Age*, and originally from South Africa, claiming that Sir Raphael Cilento had been listed as one who should be interned "pending an indictment for treason", the fact is that Sir Raphael was never interned still less charged with treason. Clearly the allegations against him were about as substantial as those made against Eric Butler and other anti-Communists.

Sir Raphael Cilento was attached to the British Army in Europe as a medical supervisor and given the rank of Major General. He was in charge of the Belsen concentration camp and no doubt infuriated Zionists with his denial that there were any gas chambers there. This has, of course, now been generally admitted. Sir Raphael was later appointed to UNRRA (United Nations Refugee and Rehabilitation) under British General Sir Frederick Morgan, who was fired from this position following a startling claim that there was an organised exodus of Jews from Eastern Europe, who were well fed, well clothed and had plenty of money, and were part of a move into Palestine where the British were at the time desperately resisting Zionist terrorism.

Actually the Morgan revelation was based on information provided by Sir Raphael Cilento and his team of medical supervisors handling refugees.

It was Sir Raphael's role in Palestine as a senior UNO official that gained him the enmity of the Zionists. A close colleague of the distinguished and widely respected Count Bernadotte, Sir Raphael was lucky not to have been with Count Bernadotte the day he was murdered in cold blood by Zionist terrorists. Sir Raphael saw at first hand the creation of the Palestinian refugee problem and did his best to see that the Palestinian case was heard at the UN.

Sir Raphael's son, Dr. David Cilento, is correct when he says, according to *The Sun*, Brisbane, that his late father has been the victim of three generations of Jewish hatred.

Virtually forced out of the UNO because of Zionist-Communist pressure, Sir Raphael Cilento returned to Australia anticipating that his many skills and experiences would ensure some diplomatic posting. But Australia's Foreign Minister at the time, R. G. Casey, later to become Lord Casey and a Governor-General, told Roman Catholic Archbishop Dugig, a personal Cilento friend of long standing, that Sir Raphael could not be used because he had left UNO "under a cloud", been used over the years to deny Sir Raphael any official appointments upon his return to Australia.

Having made use of the Murdoch press to launch the smear against Sir Raphael, those responsible will leave it to the Communist and gutter press to pick up the smear, which will also be used against the League of Rights because of the support it enjoyed from Sir Raphael.

Fear of the Zionist smear machine has resulted in even some of those who have correctly drawn attention to the role of Mr. Mark Aarons of the Australian Broadcasting Commission concerning alleged Nazi war criminals in Australia, ignoring completely the support given to Aarons by the Zionists. *News Weekly*, a journal generally respected by matured political observers, even if only bought to read Mr. Santamaria, carried an editorial on June 4 in which it is correctly said that Aarons should be dismissed from his position with the ABC. But there is not one word about the Zionist support for Aarons and his charges. Senator Chipp, whose strong Zionist links is well known, suggested in parliament that the Aarons allegations should be investigated.

The smearing of former UN Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim, as another prominent pro-Nazi war criminal, and the Zionist allegation that "anti-Semitism" remains strong in Austria because the Austrians dared to vote for Waldheim in spite of Zionist "exposures", must be seen as part of an on-going Zionist programme. Investigation of Zionist allegations against Waldheim demonstrates how flimsy they are, just as flimsy as the allegations against Sir Raphael Cilento. What Ivor Benson describes in his new and extremely timely book, *The Zionist Factor* is a major one in modern politics and is ignored only by the ignorant and cowardly.

RUSSIAN EDITION OF "CONTROVERSY OF ZION" AVAILABLE

A Russian edition of Douglas Reed's great classic, "The Controversy of Zion" has been published and the Australian League of Rights will be handling supplies of this edition if there is sufficient interest. We understand that the retail price will be at least approximately the same as the English edition. Enquiries should be sent to Box 1052J, G.P.O. Melbourne, 3001.

REV. CEDRIC JACOBS FOR NATIONAL DINNER AND SEMINAR

The Rev. Cedric Jacobs, M.B.E., the West Australian Aborigine who opposes land rights, and author of the best-seller, "The Healing of a Divided Nation", will be the guest of honour at this year's Annual "New Times" Dinner, to be held on Friday, October 3rd, and will also participate in the League of Rights Annual National Seminar on Saturday, October 4th Both events will be a tremendous feast. As usual, the National Action Seminar will be held on Sunday.

COLONIALISM vs COMMUNISM: THE CONTRAST OVERWHELMS

LUANDA. Angola - A decade ago Portuguese colonialists would sit at sidewalk cafes on the Marginal, sipping coffee and reading yesterday's newspapers from Lisbon.

One recent day on the Marginal, a sandy-haired man could be seen dozing in a jeep, a copy of Pravda lying folded and unread at his side.

Curving along a crescent bay, the Marginal has long been the urban centre piece and the human heartbeat of this tropical capital. If Luanda was once the Rio de Janeiro of West Africa, then the Marginal was its Copacabana.

A stroll along the palm-lined avenue offers a taste of Angola after 10 years of independence and civil war.

In colonial days, many Americans made their first contact with Angola on the northern tip of the Marginal, at the city docks, United States Navy frigates and cruise ships frequently made Luanda a port of call.

Visitors were met by taxis, whisked to hotels and seafood restaurants and then often for day trips to Quissama National Forest to photograph, among other animals, elephants, buffaloes, and hippopotamuses.

In 1973, 156,000 tourists came to Luanda. Today, however tourism would be difficult. There are no taxis, no city maps, and virtually no restaurants. Foreign visitors and residents rarely gain government permission to leave the capital.

Luanda's port remains a hub of trade. But the harbor, which is dotted with freighters, presents an illusion of prosperity. A shipping agent said some of the ships have been waiting to unload for as long as four months.

Across a square from the docks is the Hotel Presidente, a 22-storey landmark built by the Portuguese to cash in on the tourism boom.

Completed shortly before independence, the hotel's first guests were a battalion of Cuban troops airlifted here to help Angola's Marxist Government consolidate power. The guests did so much damage that the Government hired a Brazilian company

to rehabilitate the structure.

Today the Presidente is a hard-currency hotel. The local currency, the kwanza, is not accepted. All visitors, Aeroflot pilots included, are asked to pay in American dollars.

Next to the hotel stands a half-finished 10-storey building. Such concrete shells are a common sight around the city, suggesting a building boom that froze at independence.

Blessed with sweeping vistas of the South Atlantic, real estate on the Marginal once commanded some of the highest rents in the city. Today many storefronts are vacant, their shelves bare. Broken display windows of banks and boutiques have not been repaired since the managers of the businesses fled 10 years ago.

In a faint stirring of economic life, two Western oil companies and three Eastern-bloc airlines have moved into abandoned offices on the Marginal. Aeroflot occupies the former offices of an insurance company.

But over all, the avenue's current decay is far removed from the days when fussy colonial authorities fined some shopkeepers for dilapidated facades and rewarded others for attractive display windows.

Traditionally, a major attraction of Luanda was a stroll along the bay side of the Marginal between two matching rows of palm trees. But generally, a stroll under the palm trees of the Marginal today turns into an obstacle course over a half-filled trench, around a broken bench, over a break in a sewer line, and past a pile of rotting garbage.

Older Angolans and Portuguese mourn the nonstop nightlife that drew people to the Marginal at all hours.

"You could go into a restaurant and get a steak like that", a black Angolan said, snapping his fingers as he drove past the boarded up seaside cafes and restaurants.

"You can't get anything here anymore," he said. "You can't get cloth, you can't get wine, you can't get beer."

The New York Times.

"THE FABIAN TAX-HUNT IS ON"

A recent television documentary on wind-power mentioned in passing that, at one period in history, the Dutch government taxed the wind that moved the giant sails of Holland's windmills. From this imposition developed "millers' language" — the passing of messages between one mill and another through the static position of the sails.

English history shows that chimneys and windows were taxed - until a population protested against the imposition and temporarily drove back the tax-gatherers.

Has the British spirit of former times evaporated? Today even more devilish examples of the "tax-gatherer's art" exist with sales taxes, capital gains taxes and value-added taxes - all collected by governments which, at the same time, assure the population that they are "wrestling with inflation".

Once, too, in history the tax collector had to go out to collect his taxes. He had, in other words, to face those whom he proposed to fleece. A dishonest or unfair tax must have been almost as painful for the tax collector to gather as for the taxpayer to give up.

Nowadays the tax collector never meets his victim. For him the pain of beset humanity has simply become the manila file in a cabinet, or the microfilm on a computer. Increasingly, he has transferred the job of collection itself to the nation's employers — who have sheepishly become the unpaid tax collectors of the nation, risking the long-term animosity of over-taxed employees for the short-term gain of industrial peace.

With such an array of buffers between taxpayers and taxpayers, governments have been free to spend more time in the field of tax initiation — forever seeking new and more subtle ways to extract blood from stones. The old and crude taxes on chimneys and windows have given way to a battery of taxes applicable to

every phase and step of economic endeavour. The English-speaking nations all average a total tax levy between 40 and 50 percent of national income. Its imposition is disguised in so many infinite variations between direct and indirect applications, between various tiers of government, that no taxpayer would have any chance of estimating how much he has paid over a twelvemonth period.

Considering the constitutional idea first started in the mastery of government over taxpayer is now almost absolute, and is a tribute to the triumph of Caesar over those under Caesar's subjection.

FRINGE BENEFIT TAX

Australia's new fringe benefit tax is a case in point. It breaks every rule of equity and justice. Being applied as it is to the nation's employers, it makes one citizen liable for paying taxes on the benefits enjoyed by another. It directly inflates costs. It is designed to exploit the worst aspect of human behaviour — envy, malice and covetousness. It is a tribute to the science of authoritarian government.

The Bulletin (June 3, 1986) gave something of a picture of the inflictions to be placed on the employer:

" . . . There are six pages on the tax liability, which occurs

Human Rights

"The law cannot itself guarantee human rights. Nor can any government. It is rational and active public opinion that offers the best assurance of progress."

Sir Richard Wild, former New Zealand Chief Justice.

when accommodation is provided to mineworkers, farmers, hotel and motel employees, and three pages on how to pay tax on airline travel. There are two pages on how to pay tax on board, and eight pages on how to pay tax on property supplied, such as goods, gas and electricity, land and building, shares, goods consumed on the premises, goods sold at employee discounts, and two pages on the taxing of entertainment provided to employees.

This tax means that farmers who provide employees or members of their own family working on the farm with housing, and with meat or milk, will now have to pay tax on the value of these benefits, the rural crisis notwithstanding.

A station hand living on a property with his family in a station cottage and receiving half a sheep a week calculated at a total of \$72 a week makes the farmer liable for a tax of \$35 a week which itself is not deductible. ..."

The Bulletin of the following week (June 10) added further examples:

"... A farmer who drives into town to buy spare parts and takes along his wife so she can visit the supermarket will incur fringe benefits tax because the vehicle was not then used exclusively for producing assessable income.

A shopkeeper who buys his child a birthday present and then subsequently puts him to work behind the counter will retrospectively incur fringe benefits tax, according to the way the legislation is presently worded. Then tax will cover safety awards, retirement presents and relocation expenses. Airfares provided to an applicant for a job will incur fringe benefits tax for the applicant if successful.

People using company cars will be required to keep log books with a daily record showing the date of each journey, the odometer readings at the beginning and end, the number of kilometres travelled, the purpose of the journey, the name of the person driving the car, the date when the entry was made and the name of the person making the entry, which must be in English and signed by the person making the entry. Farmers will also have to record each trip out into the paddock and whether it was to, say, deliver hay to their stock or to fix a fence...."

GEORGE ORWELL

This sort of tax inquisition is right out of "Animal Farm". It is far more than the collection of revenue. It is "social tax-engineering". Every action of every citizen becomes accountable to government, in triplicate. The tax is not even a revenue-raising mechanism in the accepted sense of the word. It is estimated it will raise about \$700 million, but will cost \$500 million to collect. Its real purpose is control mechanism.

It is being imposed by the same political spokesmen who are glibly urging Australians to accept a Bill of Rights to protect them against the "weight of government bureaucracy". Yet the proposed Bill of Rights has no section outlining the rights of taxpayers, which is where Magna Carta started. The greatest blow to tyrannous government is the establishment of severe limits to tax imposition, and very definite rights for those who have to pay.

What sort of taxpayers' rights need re-establishing?

YOUR SUBSCRIPTION, PLEASE!

As the rising tide of concern and anger sweeps across Australia, the League finds itself with the resources, physical and financial, strained to the limit. But we can and must meet the challenge if all League supporters fully cooperate. 1986 is shaping up as a make or break year. Extortionate charges by the postal monopoly are one of our greatest problems. Subscribers can assist to defeat that monopoly by paying subscriptions immediately they receive their expiry notice. Sending reminders is costly in terms of postage, and puts an added strain on our mainly volunteer staff. Can we please have the co-operation of all subscribers? Thank you.

Firstly, every taxpayer deserves to know exactly how much he has paid each year. Indirect taxes successfully prevent any chance of such a right.

Secondly, he should be fortified with the knowledge that there are strict limitations to what he is required to pay. The old biblical limit of ten percent would be a good starting point.

Thirdly, he deserves the right to withhold his tax from any expenditure, which is morally repugnant to him. Under present conditions this would be almost impossible to introduce. It could only operate if government was forced to withdraw from large areas where it has no business. But "taxation by consent" is a valid and essential principle in a free society.

Obviously, such principles are beyond the wit of modern governments and their oppositions. Only the sort of resistance, which produced Magna Carta in 1215, can hope to modify "Big Brother" in 1986. It springs from a victimised electorate, which has finally had enough of bureaucracy, manipulation and the grandiose scheming of politicians who believe they were born to rule.

DE-PERSONALISATION

The idea that collectivism, that is, the mental and practical treatment of human beings not as persons but as groups, categories or numbers, is primarily a matter of Left-wing political ideology is disastrously mistaken. In many respects it is as characteristic of the finance-capitalism of the West as of the political socialism of the East, for which it prepares us in the economic and sociological fields.

The trouble is that we are so used to being treated as units in a collective Lump that we take it for granted and do not grasp the extent to which it already limits and controls our lives. Once we leave the neighbourhood level it is, up to a point, inevitable that any central and remote government or other institution must treat us as units in a group or category, which is the main argument against centralisation. It is the totalitarian *extent* to which this is being carried which needs our urgent attention.

No one ever questions why, for example, civil servants, teachers, miners, policemen, and so on must all be paid the same, according to grade, or why 'the rate for the job' - whether the job is done superbly or deplorably - is such a sacred tenet for trade unionists, though the inconvenience of personal treatment is obvious, but quite another matter.

Equality is, of course, the sole and essential quality of units, but not of people. The tragedy is that most people now demand to be so treated, and have been taught to confuse equality with justice.

What is now destroying the quality of life is the depersonalisation of people into units for central manipulation, a trend which is being much accelerated by the computer - a machine which can deal only with units.

'Big' industry and commerce, as well as most of the bureaucracy, now cannot deal with people at all (except through a few 'specialists' in public relations). Indeed, it is doubtful if they can deal with *anything* particular, requiring personal, human, attention. Personal service is now derided and numerical money has become the controlling objective, rather than the 'return' for such service. Advertisements are broadcast wholesale into every home, and vast forests are destroyed so that tons of waste paper can be circulated on a computer-calculation that some tiny fraction will give a monetary gain. The advertised goods are then piled up in a supermarket, which does not serve people, but allows them to help themselves and escape through a checkpoint. Clothes, shoes, etc. for personal wearing are produced in standard sizes for units of average size and shape, the lesser categories being eliminated as unprofitable. Public utilities send out standard bills, followed by standard threats, followed automatically by standard summonses. And our Race Relations and Equal Opportunities Laws now make it a legal offence to 'discriminate' between employable units of labour on grounds of sex or race or religion.

Is it surprising that many units of collectivity react by herding together in crowds or mobs to express their frustration,

while unstable individuals, deprived of responsibility and most other human qualities, try to assert their identity by irresponsible acts of violent self-assertion? For indeed, collectivism and anti-social individualism are mirror images of the same evil. What hope, then, can we have of escape from it? Surely, it lies in the exercise of personal responsibility, the refusal to be 'units' - a return to the Christian conception of the free and responsible man, which in turn arose from belief in One who "took upon himself the sins of the World" - the ultimate example of personal responsibility, and the denial of the worship of the collective.

May issue of "Home", U.K.

POINTS TO PONDER

In the welter of argument for and against a Bill of Rights based on the United Nations Charter, an interesting point was made in his submission to the Senate Standing Committee on Constitutional and Legal Affairs by Mr. Stanley W. Johnston, representing the United Nations Association of Australia, on July 22, 1985:

"... With ratification of the CCPR (Charter on Civil and Political Rights), Australia already has an effective bill of rights. That is our law now, and the Australian Human Rights Commission should enjoy full power to implement it with respect to the States as well as the Commonwealth. As former Attorney-General R.J. Ellicott said, a bill of rights is not required for implementation of the Covenant: P.R. Loof, United Nations norms and guidelines in criminal justice: from standard setting to implementation, AGPS, 1980, page 23. However, we do not share his fear of centralising the law: in matters of world concern, that is inevitable and desirable. The U.N. publication *United Nations Action in the Field of Human Rights* 1983 chapter 17.E mentions national institutions to promote and protect human rights. It commends the establishment of institutions like the existing Australian Human Rights Commission, but not national bills of rights

Mr. Johnston concluded his oral evidence in these words: "... The Declaration of Human Rights in 1948 is a document no less important than Magna Carta. It is much more widely known and respected than The Ten Commandments on a global basis

With the greatest respect to Mr. Johnston, we suspect the Ten Commandments will still be universally respected and observed long after the United Nations and its humanist pronouncements are dead and buried.

* * * * *

The Vancouver Sun, December 31, 1985, reported that Vancouver Crown prosecutors have stopped proceeding with hit-and-run charges under the provincial Motor Vehicles Act following a county court ruling that a section of the act is contrary to the Charter of Rights. The Charter of Rights required that a person should know that he is committing an offence. The Motor Vehicles Act requires motorists to stop when they have been involved in an "incident" but does not define what an "incident" is. The section is so vague; a citizen would not know when he had to comply, according to defence counsel Stan Tessmer. (From "*Bill of Rights or Bill of Violations*", Howard Carter, Logos Foundation).

* * * * *

'... A Labor Government would investigate the overall application of interest rates as they affect primary production and productivity, with the objective of providing low and reasonable rates of interest to those soundly based rural industries on which the economic health of the nation greatly depends. Labor believes that the staggering increase in rural debts has now reached such serious proportions that federal action must be

taken to stop the widespread collapse of many rural centres.... Labor's debt alleviation policies would take the form of making available to potentially viable properties long term low interest loans to pay off immediately the crippling high interest short term loans, which many producers have been forced to accept from financial institutions and hire purchase companies the same time a Labor Government will allow a holiday period of up to five years for potentially viable farmers as regards the repayment of principal and interest in order to allow farmers to strengthen their financial position.. "

LABOR'S FEDERAL RURAL POLICIES (Produced by the Australian Labor Party, Qld. Branch, May 1971.) (*Emphasis added*).

THE BASIC DEBT QUESTION

While it is true that financial debt is being created faster than it can be repaid, this process tends to obscure the fact that an enormous amount of debt is written off by those who create it - the banks. Governments also have written off debts, as witnessed by what happened in New Zealand under the last National Government, when a debt of \$300 million was changed into a credit as the railways were changed from a government department to a corporation.

Banks write millions of debt off when their debtors go bankrupt. As the banking system creates credit money at practically no cost, then obviously it loses nothing if a debtor goes bankrupt.

A Canadian economist, Dian Cohen, has recently suggested that Canada may get out from under its \$217 billion national debt by writing it off. *Globe and Mail* of May 9 quotes Cohen as saying that although no one admits it, massive debts are already being written off at home and abroad through the 'games' that the bankers and politicians play by mutual consent.

There is no doubt that if a nation wrote off its national debt, there would be relief for all. But only temporarily, if the debt system were continued. Like the Marxists, who are prepared sometimes to take a step backward in order to make an overall advance, the controllers of banking policy may, under the pressure of events, be prepared to accept a programme of debt liquidation — *providing that they were left with the power to create more debt.*

While any easing of present financial policies is to be welcomed, the basic question about credit creation is: Who owns the credit? At present those who operate the banking system claim that it belongs to the system, and thus is only loaned. This view must be challenged. Financial credit is created against real credit, a nation's productive capacity. The major factor in this productive capacity is inheritance in one form or another. This belongs as a right to the members of the nation, who should, therefore, get access to financial credit as a right.

The *administration* of the banking system should be left as it is now. But *policy* making must be in the hands of the elected representatives of the people who could, for a start, instruct the controllers of the banking system to issue debt-free credits created as a debt to finance deficit budgets, these debt free credits to be paid direct to individuals in the form of appropriate pensions and lower prices through a consumer discount system.

The power to create debt must be broken if Civilisation is to be re-generated.

EXTRA COPIES AVAILABLE

Extra copies of this special issue of "*The Survey*" are available for selective distribution. Bulk prices: 6 copies \$3; 12 copies \$5; 50 copies \$15; 100 copies \$25.

Order from Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne 3001.

NEW TIMES - JUNE 1986

TO THE POINT

In these days of deepening crisis, it is like a ray of sunshine to read some encouraging news. Reports from New York State that the future of the United Nations is threatened by a financial crisis. Grassroots pressure in the USA has resulted in Congress reducing its contribution. Under its own rules, the UN is not permitted to borrow more from outside because the statutory \$100 million reserve fund has been eaten into by gross overspending by the very members who fail to pay their dues. The Soviet Union is debtor. Agonized appeals to the USA for help are not being heeded. If the USA refuses to assist, then the Soviet will either have to start paying up or see the UN come to an end. If this happens, there will be loud cheers around the world. But the internationalists will be making every effort to ensure that the collapse does not occur.

"*Selling Hitler: the Story of the Hitler Diaries*", by Robert Harris, published in Australia by Penguin, provides an incredible story of how, along with others, the Murdoch press was hoodwinked into paying a large sum of money for diaries which were an elaborate hoax. It was British historian David Irving who first cast doubt on the alleged Hitler diaries, and who dramatically broke up the press conference in Hamburg, Germany, when he leapt to his feet and asked a series of searching and damaging questions.

Harris reveals in his book that even after establishment British historian Trevor Roper, changed his mind about the authenticity of the Hitler diaries, Rupert Murdoch ordered that the publication of the diaries should continue. What if the hoax had never been exposed? Historians would be using the material to present what passes for history. All written history must be regarded as suspect, often reflecting the bias of the writer.

David Irving has demonstrated that he does take pains to establish whether documents are authentic or not. He was unable to persuade the father of Anne Franck to have the much-publicised diaries subjected to independent examination. These so-called diaries are beyond doubt one of the most successful of the many literary hoaxes of this century. Millions believe they are authentic.

* * * * *

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 Demjanjuk, 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.

* * * * *

Du Beers Consolidate Mines, South Africa's main diamond producer, which controls the world's diamond markets in association with the Soviet Union, has announced a price rise of 7.5%. This will delight the Soviet bosses.

NEW ZEALANDERS IN THE SAME BOAT

by Bill Daly

The article, "*Horses for Courses*" by a British Correspondent in the April issue of *The New Times*, exposed the enormous danger white Australians face from the so-called multicultural programme being imposed by the Marxists and their liberal dupes. Exactly the same situation is faced by New Zealanders.

The effect of multi-cultural policies began in New Zealand in the 1970s with the adopting of race relations legislation. This led to the establishing of a Race Relations Office and later a Human Rights Commission, along with a kangaroo-style court known as the Equal Opportunities Tribunal. The Tribunal can impose financial punishment on those it finds "guilty" of practising discrimination on the grounds of race, sex or religion. While relatively few cases have yet been heard by the tribunal the mere fact of its existence provides for an insidious form of censorship and obedience to the new laws.

Those New Zealanders who are proud of the heritage they have inherited, and which was brought here by the settlers from Britain, are now in the ironic position of being against the law when they defend that heritage. Anyone complaining publicly at the large immigration from the Pacific Islands is liable to have a complaint lodged against him before the Race Relations Office. Like the white Australians, white New Zealanders have been given no opportunity for a referendum on immigration.

The propaganda against the traditional European culture increases almost daily, with the education system and television being used to undermine traditional sentiments and introduce a guilt complex among the whites. New Zealand's real history is, to use George Orwell's words, being pushed down the memory hole. The truth about former relations between Maori and white New Zealanders is being submerged by the new propaganda.

Apart from the Maori wars of last century - these mostly minor skirmishes compared to modern warfare — the relationship between Maori and white New Zealanders has been a friendly and peaceful one. Even during those wars large numbers of Maoris fought on the side of the British soldiers. But such facts are no longer being taught. Propaganda about multiculturalism and a complete misinterpretation about New Zealand's history are taught at our teacher training colleges.

The description by the writer of "*Horses for Courses*" of Australia as a white outpost in the world applies also to New Zealand. Australia and New Zealand are in the same boat together, and should South Africa go the same way as the rest of Africa, both countries are going to come under incredibly intense pressure. But since our most dangerous enemies are working inside our countries and are only a small minority, it is clearly possible for an informed and honest minority, accepting the responsibilities of genuine leadership to reverse and save the situation. And wherever it is possible responsible Australians and Zealanders need to co-operate.

CENTRALISATION AND CONSTITUTION

The first issue of a new weekly, *The New American*, Belmont, Mass., 30th September 1985, contains a review by Dr. Charles A. Moser (Professor of Slavic Studies at George Washington University in Washington, D.C., and editor of *Combat on Communist Territory*) of a book by M. E. Bradford. The reviewer, in this article entitled "Remembering the Republic's Roots", writes:

"*Remembering Who We Are* is a selection of fifteen articles and addresses by M. E. Bradford, an eminent American historian who is a professor at the University of Dallas

"Several of the most important of these pieces deal with the question of just what the Founders of our nation and the Framers of the Constitution of 1787 believed they had created. Bradford also examines just what sort of nation these men did call into existence during that period of intrigue, which would explode into the French Revolution of 1789.

"He believes that the American and French Revolutions were entirely different. The Fathers of our country, he says, did not claim the 'metaphysical privilege of founders', that is, the right to establish something entirely unprecedented in human society. The Framers made no religion of political equality, they were not committed to 'perfectionism and its twin, the envious and cowardly dream of uniformity', as Bradford phrases it: nor did they at all insist upon 'mandatory brotherhood' of the sort, which drove fomenters of the French Revolution.

"Instead, he argues, they worked to restore as far as possible the legitimate social system which had existed before the advent of the King's tyranny and the outbreak of the Revolutionary War. They thought that the political structure they were establishing should not only be limited, but should protect and preserve the established social order, the already existing reality, and the traditions handed down from previous generations and derived for the most part from English practice. As the Founders debated at the Constitutional Convention and in the several states, their 'highest authority' was the appeal to 'experience' and to history, a discipline in which many of them were exceedingly well versed.

"In short, Bradford maintains, the founding of the American Republic was a profoundly conservative undertaking, in which already existing states entered into an agreement with one another to form a 'more perfect union' for the purposes of protecting liberty within an established social order. That agreement, once made, could also be abrogated if it ceased to be advantageous to all parties involved. That was the way the South — and indeed most of the country — regarded the Union until 1860.

"Of course, even while the Constitution was being written, there existed some philosophical radicals yearning for 'equality' in the French spirit who wished to establish an entirely new political entity. Thomas Paine was one of these. Seeking to be a citizen of the world, he went to France after the French Revolution. Eventually, he was arrested for ideological deviation and might have been executed had he not successfully appealed to the principles of the American Revolution and the advantages of American citizenship.

"But the 'refounders' persisted until finally, as Bradford sees it, they found their champion in Abraham Lincoln. The

Civil War resolved the question of the political structure. The Union was not a compact among semi-sovereign states from which they could withdraw, but instead a unified entity with its own philosophical and ideological commitments — a whole different from the sum of its parts.

"*Remembering Who We Are* concludes with Bradford's most controversial single work, 'The Lincoln Legacy: A Long View'. In this essay, he not only advances his interpretation of Lincoln as the man who successfully 'refounded' the Union on centralized principles, but he also draws up an indictment of Lincoln as a wartime President. He sees Lincoln as a man who seriously abused his powers as President, who helped to bring on the war to begin with, who needlessly prolonged it for his own political purposes, and who cloaked his dubious arguments in the rhetoric of morality. This indictment is written in a harsh tone — a tone quite out of keeping with that of the other essays in the collection - - and it will offend the vast majority of Americans who have simply absorbed the view of Lincoln as martyr-President. That view, of course, is embodied in the Daniel Chester French Lincoln Memorial in our nation's capital, very possibly the most impressive monument of a statesman to be found anywhere in the world. But scholarship should deal with historical truth, not with images, and we certainly should not be forbidden to examine even as strongly held a consensus as what is believed about Lincoln. Bradford knows, however, what a price he has paid for his intellectual courage.

"... M. E. Bradford is a man of the intellectual periphery, limited on the whole merely to mounting brief forays into the citadels of the intellectual establishment from his base in Dallas. A first-rate scholarly writer with a stimulating mind, his 'southern Conservatism' and his thoroughgoing rejection of the prevailing intellectual orthodoxy make it impossible for him to be accepted in our greatest universities. And, if he should by chance gain admission to one, he would soon be driven forth again

"It may well be that the tradition which Bradford exemplifies in this book will one day become the most powerful one in our culture, and eventually point the way to the restoration of true intellectual and political liberty across the globe."

—DR. CHARLES A. MOSER.

(Article quoted by permission.)

Note. —Comments on the words and actions of two American Presidents, Lincoln and Roosevelt, made by C. H. Douglas in 1946 and 1948 were reprinted in the September-October 1985 issue of *The Social Crediter*. The first appeared in the article *The Political Problem* and the latter in a "From Week to Week" note dated 17th July 1948, in connection with President Roosevelt's Inaugural Address in 1933.

In *Realistic Constitutionalism* (1947) Douglas said: "... one of the ablest commentators on 'Origins of the American Revolution', John C. Miller observes: 'In rejecting natural law, Englishmen also denied the colonists' contention that there were metes and bounds to the authority of Parliament. The authority of Parliament was, in their opinion, unlimited; the supremacy of Parliament had come to mean to Englishmen an uncontrolled and uncontrollable authority. Indeed the divine right of kings had been succeeded by the divine right of Parliament. . . . It was the refusal of Americans to bow before the new divinity which precipitated the American Revolution'."