

THE NEW TIMES

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

VOL. 51, No. 12.

Registered By Australia Post-Publication No. VBH 1001

DECEMBER 1987.

Australia and New Zealand Edition. Published in Melbourne and Auckland.

DELIVER US FROM EVIL

by Eric D. Butler

The distinguished Australian scientist, and former Governor of the State of South Australia, Sir Marcus Oliphant, once remarked that he had not believed in the reality of evil until he became a Governor dealing with governments and politicians, after which he became a convert, accepting that evil did exist. In referring to the reality of evil, Sir Marcus was presumably concerned with the misuse of power and its corrupting influences. He once made the penetrating comment that Australians now lived under a type of elected dictatorship. He might well have said the same about every other "democracy", where the act of casting a political vote is used by politicians to claim that they have received a mandate from electors to pursue policies, which generally are in defiance of the will of the electors. The perversion of the democratic concept is a manifestation of evil.

Merely praying to God for deliverance from evil does not of itself achieve that objective. It is often said that there is a deadly battle in the world between Good and Evil. But those who wish to make a meaningful contribution to that battle must fully understand what they mean by the terms Good and Evil. Good is related to, and synonymous with God, while Evil is often said to be of the Devil. If God and Reality are accepted as meaning the same thing, anti-God policies are those, which conflict with Reality. The exiled Russian writer Solzhenitsyn has summarised the views of millions when he says that there is no hope for Civilisation unless men return to God. But a "return to God" has little meaning unless it is taken to mean the implementation of policies, which are in accordance with reality. "Releasing reality", as Douglas said, requires acceptance that the rules, or truths, governing the Universe transcend human thinking and that the maximum human satisfaction can only be obtained by discovering what those rules are, and then obeying them.

UNREALISTIC UTOPIANS

In today's world of increasing totalitarianism, itself a manifestation of Evil, it has become unfashionable to accept any concept of absolutes, particularly the absolute termed God. Puffed up with a false pride, many see themselves as God, an elite, seeking to plan their lesser fellows in their special Utopia. The hell known as the Soviet Union is the product of Utopian thinking. It is not without significance that many of the early Utopian planners of this age, people like George Bernard Shaw and H.G. Wells, became increasingly pessimistic towards the end of their lives. The Brave New World they envisaged resulting from universal education, the "liberation" of the individual from "religious myths", the lowering of the voting age, and State planning, has not emerged. The future looks bleak to those who contemplate the world through the eyes of the secular humanists. But, to the Christian, the very state of the world helps to provide hope for a better future.

Many people have a problem understanding the true nature of Evil, feeling that, for example, an evil person is a nasty and repulsive individual. But some of

the most evil men in history have been pleasant as individuals. Evil exists where an individual has a power over his fellows, which no individual should possess. Lord Acton perceived this with his famous axiom that all power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely. Solzhenitsyn commented on the subject, instancing the example of the Soviet judge who, as an individual was erudite, charming, a lover of classical literature and music, loved gardens and forests and could sometimes be seen affectionately patting children on the head as he passed. But the same man sent thousands to the hell of the concentration camps convinced that he was "doing good".

POWER WITHOUT RESPONSIBILITY

A former Australian Premier once protested strongly against a reference to Mr. David Rockefeller, the well-known International Banker, as one of the most evil men in the world. He knew Mr. Rockefeller personally and had always found him a most pleasant and courteous man. I have no doubt that this is how many people have found Mr. David Rockefeller as an individual. However, it was the same David Rockefeller who, following his visit to Communist China for the purpose of establishing his Chase Manhattan Bank there, wrote an eulogistic article on Communist China for the *New York Times*, stating that Mao Tse-tung's China was one of the greatest and most successful social experiments in the recorded history of mankind. It has been conservatively estimated that at least 50 million Chinese perished in establishing Chairman Mao's version of Communism. If David Rockefeller had actually lived through the "social experiment" he praised, it is highly unlikely that he

Christmas Greetings

We wish our readers throughout the world a Happy and Holy Christmas. May they and their families be blessed at this time, and given the moral strength to go forward to carry on the fight against Evil in the New Year.

would have expressed such an opinion. By financing massive economic blood-transfusions to countries like Communist China and the Soviet Union, International Bankers like David Rockefeller are demonstrating the reality of the very ultimate in evil, by using financial power to assist the most murderous and soul destroying regimes in recorded history, without having to accept any personal responsibility for their policies. Such men are accessories to monstrous crimes against hundreds of millions.

Every policy, financial, economic or political, which robs the individual of the power to govern his own life, and to take personal responsibility for the choices made, is evil, and those who are engaged in imposing such policies are evil. The justification for such policies is the elevation of means to an end. The most deadly manifestation of this is the teaching that economic activities, and "full employment" are ends.

The famous Christian philosopher, St. Thomas Aquinas, quoted one of the early Christian Fathers as stating that "The elevation of means into ends is the essence of sin." C.H. Douglas no doubt had this in mind when he wrote, "Institutions are means to an end, and I do not think it is too much to say that the elevation of means into ends.... constitutes an unforgivable sin, in the pragmatic sense, that it brings upon itself the most tremendous penalties that life contains."

The true purpose of economic activity is to obtain for the individual, with the least amount of effort, what he genuinely requires. A financial system exists to ensure that the individual can order from the economic system what he requires. The worship of a system of money symbols as a reality is another manifestation of evil.

REALISTIC FAITH

Douglas quotes the Christian philosopher who said to him that most of the sins so widely publicised, are but pimples compared with the sin of robbing the individual of his most Divine attribute, creative imitative, through centralised power. The progressive centralisation of power in all fields, and the drive towards a World State, is the dominant feature of the contemporary world. Unfortunately, many become paralysed in the face of every new manifestation of centralised power including the use of computers and other forms of technology. But the realist knows that the increasingly disastrous results flowing from centralisation of power are a manifestation that they are violating absolutes. As the wise and witty G.K. Chesterton said, "The man who insists on jumping over the cliff not only violates the absolute called the natural law of gravity; he demonstrates the truth of the law."

The disastrous plight of the world is, paradoxically, one of the great hopes for a regenerated Civilisation; it demonstrates that there are absolute truths and that when Man returns to accepting these absolutes and seeks to subordinate all human activities to them, regeneration will take place. If there were no absolutes, no God, then man's condition would be hopeless. What is taking place would be without meaning. What is required is not a blind Faith, but one based on the same type of reality, which sustains the captain of a ship as he steers by a compass on the darkest and stormiest of nights. He knows that the compass always reflects reality, and that so long as he is guided by that compass, he will reach safety. Christianity provides such a compass. Let us remember this during the Christmas Season, a time for renewing faith in the ability to defeat Evil by seeking Good.

"THE PLANNED DESTRUCTION OF THE U.S. DOLLAR"

by Jeremy Lee

When the National Australia Bank published its significant October 1986 newsletter under the title: "THE WORLD ECONOMY - THE SEARCH FOR MECHANISMS OF TRANSITION", it was, in fact, calling for the shift of decision-making from Canberra to the United Nations. The specifics were carefully concealed beneath some lofty rhetoric. But there's no mistaking the intent behind this sentence: -

" . . . The development of the new global economy demands a fundamental realignment of policy-making power, away from national governments to some as yet undefined institutional order, where the traditional nation-state plays a more significant role..."

Anyone with half an ounce of political acumen will immediately recognise in that sentence all the stuff of which the Trilateral Commission is made. David Rockefeller's 'baby' was shaped round the international Utopian dreams, which appeared in 'Ziggy' Brzezinski's "Between Two Ages." He looked forward to a world of "interdependence" with a complete philosophical accommodation between Communism and Capitalism.

One can hardly say whether the author of the National Australia Bank article was conscious of all this - or was merely picking up fag ends of a thought-process from higher up. Leaders in the Soviet Union, however, know exactly what it's all about — and are positioning themselves accordingly.

70TH ANNIVERSARY OF BOLSHEVISM

A full-page advertisement in *The Australian*

last year, inserted by the Soviet Embassy in Canberra, called for the establishment of a New International Economic Order. The Soviets thus aligned themselves with a major plank of the A.L.P. platform. Professor Anthony Sutton, in his *Pheonix Letter* (November 1987) reported: -

" . . . The Gorbachev speech to the Central Committee on the 70th Anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution is important. Gorbachev seems to confirm the movement to a world planned society.... although that was not his intention.

Our text is the abbreviated TASS translation printed in THE NEW YORK TIMES. The full version is not yet available.

We are struck by certain Gorbachev references not picked up by THE NEW YORK TIMES nor by any Sovietologist that we are aware of at

NEW TIMES - DECEMBER 1987

this time.

"INDUSTRIALISATION (in 1930) RAISED THE COUNTRY TO A FUNDAMENTALLY NEW LEVEL IN ONE HEAVE . . ." (Gorbachev cites the Magnitogorsk plant).

Neither the New York Times nor Gorbachev mentions the fact that Magnitogorsk and every other major plant in the 1930 First Five Year Plan was built by a western firm. Soviet industrialisation was a western achievement, not a Soviet achievement. "IT WOULD BE A MISTAKE TO EQUATE THE NEW ECONOMIC POLICY AND WHAT WE ARE NOW DOING AT A FUNDAMENTALLY NEW LEVEL OF DEVELOPMENT."

The New Economic Policy (NEP) of the 1920s was a temporary reversion to capitalism. A Leninist "one step back" before the "two steps forward" of Stalinism. The message here is that the current policy of "perestroika" should not be compared by Marxists to the 1920s New Economic Policy. Obviously Gorbachev does not want westerners to compare today with the 1920s and 1930s. The "new" Soviet joint venture policy is described as a new policy whereas it is remarkably similar to the 1920s concessions policy.

"ACTING JOINTLY WITH THE OTHER COUNTRIES OF THE SOCIALIST COMMUNITY WE HAVE SEVERAL IMPORTANT INITIATIVES TO THE UNITED NATIONS INCLUDING A PROJECT FOR DEVISING A COMPREHENSIVE SYSTEM OF PEACE AND SECURITY."

This is important. The Soviets have just paid \$200 million in back dues to the United Nations. The Soviets do NOT give up \$200 million for no return. Their intent is to use the United Nations to further world socialism. But what does "peace and security" mean to the Soviets? "Peace" is a condition where absence of opposition to communism is guaranteed. Thus, "peaceful coexistence" does not mean peace in our sense of the word, but a condition in which "wars of liberation" can go ahead while discussing disarmament. We can expect a Soviet thrust through the United Nations to legitimise Marxist liberation and neutralise our efforts to restore these countries to true freedom.

" . . . FOR ALL THE PROFOUND CONTRADICTIONS OF THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD, FOR ALL THE RADICAL DIFFERENCES AMONG THE COUNTRIES THAT COMPRISE IT, IT IS INTERRELATED, INTERDEPENDENT AND INTEGRAL."

This is exactly the theme of David Rockefeller's Trilateral Commission, i.e. the world is interdependent and one world. We now find the theme of "interdependence" from both the Soviets and Western establishment types. A major recession and Constitutional revision could be used as a means of pushing us towards a merger with the USSR ... but without a Bill of Rights. ,

"WE ARE MOVING TOWARDS A NEW WORLD, THE WORLD OF COMMUNISM. WE SHALL NEVER TURN OFF THAT ROAD. "

These are the last three lines of Gorbachev's speech. It confirms the drive to world communism. "Glasnost" and "perestroika" (reconstruction) are devices to demonstrate to the West that there is no danger in a one world interdependent society. In fact, of course, "glasnost" has nothing to do

with freedom. The journal GLASNOST in Moscow has been closed down and the editors arrested. When the Congressional delegation was taken to the Krasnoyarsk radar site in Siberia they were allowed to photograph the radar installation but their cameras were confiscated when they tried to photograph the local airport. Glasnost is the appearance of reform without the substance . . ."

PROPAGANDA AND DISINFORMATION

The whole Soviet approach to the imminent New World Order has been carefully planned and thought out. In his book "Co-Operation" published by Novosti in Moscow in 1978, Soviet economist Ernest Obminsky said: -

"... The approach to the question of NIEO should be a strictly historical one . . . It is necessary to take into account every aspect of the dialectical interconnection between the underlying tendencies of world development and individual links . . . The upsurge in demands for the elimination of the "old" order came on the crest of the steady change in the correlation of forces in the world in favour of socialism . . . The very nature of the present confrontation, when it all too frequently develops into a struggle against relations of exploitation, against the capitalist order, attests to its qualitatively different content . . . the New International Economic Order cannot be anything but a mechanism possessing the ways and means of curbing the negative consequences of the capitalist method of production which is still continuing to function on part of our planet Equally obvious is the transitional nature of such a mechanism, which can, nonetheless, in Lenin's words, make up an "entire epoch" in the period of transition from Capitalism to socialism. Even during the preparations for the Genoa Conference in 1922 Lenin insisted on the maximum democratisation of the international economic order so as to achieve the maximum possible in conditions of the peaceful coexistence of the two world systems . . . the question of restructuring international economic relations on a just and equitable basis was originally put on the agenda of international affairs by the first socialist state in the world..."

It is therefore clear to those who understand the tactical use of dialectics that the so-called "glasnost" of the Soviet Union is no more than the latest version of what Lenin himself called "peaceful coexistence", and Kissinger later re-named "detente". It is a tactic to disarm the West while making strategic, military, economic and political gains. It involves a diplomatic offensive using propaganda and disinformation on a gigantic scale. *The Financial Review* (December 8, 1987) described how this is being done at the current Summit: -

". ... With timing that must have made even Bob McMullan or Tony Eggleton green with envy, US public opinion polls show that he (i.e. Gorbachev) has a remarkably high approval rating with the American electorate and a disapproval rating that is somewhat better than that accorded Mr. Reagan himself ... As a psychological basis for Mr. Gorbachev's visit to the United States, it could hardly be bettered.

According to press reports yesterday, pla-

toons of Soviet PR men have descended upon Washington and are organising press conferences, briefings and individual meetings with senior Americans without, in any way, consulting the US hosts of this particular meeting . . . "

FINANCIAL CRISIS A MECHANISM

However, the campaign did not start here. The Communists have been positioning themselves for some time. In a series of four major articles on the world economic situation, P.P. McGuinness wrote in *The Financial Review* (November 9, 1977): -

" . . . Both China and the Soviet Union have indicated their willingness not only to engage in trade — which they have always done — but to participate in the major international organisations as full partners.

A whole era in which organisations like the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the European Economic Community have been denounced as capitalist plots is ending. China is already actively engaged in negotiations with the GATT . . . the Soviet Union has indicated that it, too, might be interested in adherence to the rules of free trade and even to the IMF...."

This pre-positioning by the major Communist countries has quietly preceded the greatest Stock Market crash in modern history, which appears to be the forerunner of the destruction of the U.S. dollar as the world's reserve currency. It also appears that a substitute international reserve currency is being prepared. Whether this will be the European Currency Unit (ECU), which is reported to have a gold backing, or a "basket" currency unit based in the U.S. dollar, the ECU and the Yen remains to be seen. The close parallels between the trilateral plan and the Soviet scenario as set out by Ernst Obminsky can hardly be mistaken.

The deliberate destruction of the American dollar is being achieved through the universal weapon of debt. The stark figures were set out by international banker Peter G Peterson in the October 1987 issue of *The Atlantic Monthly*. Besides being Chairman of Lehmann Bros. Kuhn Loeb, Peter G. Peterson was also a member of the Socialist International-inspired Brandt Commission: -

"... How much, exactly, do we owe the rest of the world? Officially, our net position (what we are owed minus what we owe) at the end of 1986 was a *negative* \$264 billion. By the end of 1987 we will be closing in on a negative \$400 billion. The incredible speed of America's transformation from creditor to debtor can hardly be exaggerated. Only six years ago, at the end of 1981, the United States had achieved its all-time apogee as a net creditor, with an official position of a positive \$141 billion. Over the past six years, in other words, the United States has burned up more than \$500 billion, net, by liquidating our foreign assets and borrowing abroad. That's an immense flow of capital, even in global terms. By 1986 our net borrowing had dwarfed the fabled bank recycling of OPEC surpluses after the oil price hikes of 1973 and 1979. The sum was twice the size of all foreign interest payments by all the lesser-developed debtor nations, and about half the approximate dollar

value of total net investment in all less-developed countries combined . . . During the 1980s we have succeeded in nearly tripling the national debt, from \$645 billion (at the end of fiscal year 1979) to \$1.745 trillion) at the end of fiscal year 1986). We have, in addition, saddled ourselves with an informal debt of nearly \$10 trillion in unfunded liabilities in Social Security, Medicare and federal pensions. That astronomical figure is the difference between the benefits today's workers are now scheduled to receive and the future taxes today's workers are slated to pay for them. It amounts to a hidden tax of \$100,000 on every American worker, and its toll will be exacted on our children..."

Mr. Peterson's answer? He believes the United States must increase its exports, and reduce its imports to the point where it can pay its debts. He concedes, ruefully, that the task is virtually impossible. He ignores completely the fact that his suggested answer involves the transfer of this debt-mountain to America's future customers, all of whom are either trying themselves to export their way out of debt, or to maintain a position which is only marginally better than that in the United States.

It is extremely doubtful if Mr. Peterson genuinely believes his own argument, any more than does Felix Rohatyn, chairman of Lazard Bros, who has recently gone into print in the same vein. Both elsewhere have argued for world government and international control of the world's economic system.

In reality, America's impossible debt-crisis along with Australia's, Canada's and New Zealand's — will be intentionally and ruthlessly used as the goad for the acceptance of a new world money system.

The intended direction was carefully spelled out in a most significant article, which appeared in the Autumn 1984 edition of "Foreign Affairs" - the official publication of the Council on Foreign Relations (CFR). The article was by Richard N. Cooper, Maurits C Boas Professor of International Economics at Harvard University, and author of "The Economics of Interdependence". It was titled "A MONETARY SYSTEM FOR THE FUTURE", prepared for the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston to honour the fortieth anniversary of the Bretton Woods Conference:

A MONETARY SYSTEM FOR THE FUTURE

" . . . It is not premature to begin thinking about . . . international monetary arrangements in the remainder of this century. With this in mind, I suggest a radical alternative scheme for the next century: *the creation of a common currency for all of the industrial democracies, with a common monetary policy and a joint Bank of Issue to determine that monetary policy . . .*

The suggestion . . . is far too radical for the near future. It could, however, provide a "vision". These various considerations lead me to conclude that *we will need a system of credibly fixed exchange rates by that time . . .* Exchange rates can be most credibly fixed if they are eliminated altogether, that is, if international transactions take place with a single currency. But a single currency is possible only if there is in effect a single monetary policy. How can independent states accomplish that? They need to turn over the determination of monetary policy to a supranational body,

NEW TIMES - DECEMBER 1987

but one which is responsible collectively to the governments of the independent states. There is some precedent for parts of this type of arrangement in the origins of the U.S. Federal Reserve System...

Seigniorage in this system would automatically be distributed to national governments as their securities were purchased by the Bank of Issue, thereby giving them the purchasing power to buy goods and services . . . The currency of the Bank of Issue could be practically anything. Most natural would be an evolution from the present U.S. dollar, making use of the extensive dollar-based worldwide markets. But if that were not politically acceptable, it could be a synthetic unit that the public would have to get used to, just as it had to get used to the metric system when that replaced numerous national systems. The key point is that monetary control — the issuance of currency and of reserve credit — would be in the hands of the new Bank of Issue, not in the hands of any national government, no matter what the historical origin of the new currency happened to be. . . .

Monetary policy would be set for the community as a whole by a board of governors, who in practice would probably be finance ministers. No single country would be in control . . . Balance of payments within this regime would be as easy, or difficult, as it is between regions of the United States or any other large country today. The adjustment would be automatic, except insofar as it was cushioned by capital inflows induced by fiscal actions. Automatic balance of payments adjustment sometimes leads to unemployment, as following a shift in demand away from the products of a particular region or country. Fiscal policy in its various forms could be used to cushion such unemployment. In addition, my guess is that there would be considerable net immigration into the present industrial democracies by early in the next century...

The idea of a single currency is so far from being politically feasible at present — in its call for a pooling of monetary sovereignty — that it will require many years of consideration before people become accustomed to the idea...

It was suggested in the previous section that the choice of a currency for a one-currency regime is open and in a sense is arbitrary. It could be anything that is agreed, since money is above all a social convention. In fact the choice would be a politically charged issue, with strong if irrational objections to the choice of any national currency. If national currencies are ruled out, that leaves the European Currency Unit (ECU) and SDR (i.e. the IMF-controlled "Special Drawing Rights", sometimes called "paper gold" - Ed.) in today's world. **The ECU might meet the same objections in the United States and Japan as the US dollar would meet in Europe. That in turn leaves only the SDR, which is now defined as a weighted average of five leading national currencies: the U.S. Dollar, the Japanese Yen, the German Mark, the French Franc and the British pound. The new Bank of Issue could not issue IMF-SDRs unless the Bank was the IMF itself. But the Bank could use SDR as its measuring unit, and issue both currency notes and**

reserve bank credit in that unit. The future of the SDR would be immeasurably enhanced if private parties could conduct transactions in SDRs; indeed, that would be a necessary condition. It would also greatly facilitate the use of the SDR as a central bank currency, since the modus operandi of central banks in most cases is through private markets, and they need a medium, which can be used in private markets...

For such a bold step to work at all, it presupposes a certain convergence of political values as reflected in the nature of political decision-making . . . The proposal should be undertaken in the first instance by the United States, Japan and the members of the European Community..
.."

While Professor Cooper who, incidentally, was listed as a member of the Trilateral Commission in 1978 does not believe we are 'ready' for his radical proposals he was writing long before Black Monday, October 19, when the U.S. Stock Market crashed by an enormous 508 points on The Dow, or 22.6% — a bigger percentage drop than the October 1929 Stock Market crash which triggered the Great Depression. The signs are the politics of crisis are being speeded up. Plans for a World Conservation Bank, using the 30 percent of the planet's land surface designated as wilderness areas for collateral is already under way (See ENTERPRISE, October 1987 for details). Those like Professor Cooper who believe plans for a world government are "progressive" are, in reality, madmen.

C.H. Douglas — a greater prophet than any caught the truth of the situation aptly in *The Social Creditor*, May 25, 1946: -

"Nothing is more remarkable than the contrast between the claims made for "Progress" both scientific and political and the steady degradation of human life. The phenomenon is analogous to, and in fact is part of the passive acceptance in the United States, in October 1929, of an overnight transition from abounding prosperity to economic collapse. The innate absurdity of supposing that a world which was capable of supplying every luxury on October 29, 1929, could be 'ruined' on November 1, is of the same nature as the claim that a nation which could fight the most devastating war in all history without suffering from lack of food, should on the cessation of hostilities take every possible measure to interfere with the processes by which it had previously lived. When, in consequence, not of war but of legislation, an alleged famine threatens, every explanation is adduced except the true explanation, that real credit — "the correct estimate or belief in the capacity of society to produce and deliver goods and services, as, *when*, and *where* required" — is breaking down.

We are in the hands of a gang of crooks utilising a pack of conceited careerists; and everyone knows it and is bored with the game. Ability to produce is greater than ever; but why should we? Don't tell us, because "ye are of your father the devil . . . abode not in the truth, for there is no truth in him . . . he is a liar, and the father of it.'

To which it could be added: his instrument of control is debt.

Gorbachev's "World Consultative Council OR Has the BROTHERHOOD attained UNIVERSAL power?

by John Cotter 38 Jill's Court, Barrie, Ontario, L4M 4L7,

Canada, October 1987.

In the Soviet newspapers PRAVDA and IZVESTIA, September 17th, 1987, Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev called for "a vastly expanded role in world affairs for the United Nations." His article was entitled THE REALITY AND GUARANTEES OF A SECURE WORLD. In view of the already substantial Communist control of the United Nations and widespread penetration of its specialized agencies, Gorbachev can only mean that the United Nations becomes a COMMUNIST WORLD DICTATORSHIP. Incidentally — and we must fervently pray accidentally the Pope himself in Detroit on the 19th of September, 1987, urged governments "to trust the United Nations." (Toronto SUNDAY SUN, September 20th 1987). At Detroit, "Pope John Paul *lauded* the United Nations organization . . ." as OUR SUNDAY VISITOR, October 11th, 1987 put it.

On September 16th 1987, the U.N. Association of the United States in a report called A SUCCESSOR VISION: THE U.N. OF TOMORROW had said much the same things as Gorbachev and the Pope.

In this article, however, let us examine the background to another highly significant remark of Gorbachev's in his same article. We quote from the Toronto STAR, September 26th, 1987, "In a rare article written for the Soviet newspapers Pravda and Izvestia, Gorbachev argues that "A world consultative council under U.N. auspices uniting the world's intellectual elite" is needed to help shape the future. "Prominent scientists, political and public figures, representatives of international public organizations, cultural workers," should all be involved, he writes.

Less than 20 years ago, the VOICE magazine (no. 73, 1970) wrote "The time is coming when these Elder Brothers of mankind will not only direct from behind the scenes of life, but move out and take their place as recognized and acknowledged leaders in the world."

We wonder whether "these Elder Brothers of mankind" and Gorbachev's "world consultative council" are not one and the same. (The VOICE, a vicious, syncretistic and occult NEW AGE magazine, was published from a Sussex, England address until 1973 when it moved to South Africa.)

THE BROTHERHOOD, UNIVERSAL?

First we must explain the term UNIVERSAL BROTHERHOOD (sometimes stated as WORLD BROTHERHOOD). The term UNIVERSAL BROTHERHOOD is one much used today, especially by Marxists and Freemasons. Of course we are all human beings, but there is the feeling that this essentially Masonic term is *designed to by-pass the supernatural brotherhood of the baptised in Jesus Christ*. Unfortunately Pope John Paul II frequently and indiscriminately has used this term — to Jews, to Moslems, and to the assorted mangle of man-made religions including African snake

worshippers at Assisi (October 27th, 1986) with disregard for the *supernatural brotherhood of Jesus Christ*. But if we take the word "brotherhood" in a collective noun sense as, for instance, in the Brotherhood of the Mafia, it becomes quite sinister, i.e. the 'Brotherhood's' power (read the Brotherhood of the Illuminati or whatever the behind the scenes world conspirators now call themselves) is "universal."

Let us examine the possible, nay probable background, to Gorbachev's "world consultative council" and the kind of "Peace" it would guarantee for us — the "peace" of a worldwide gulag archipelago, the "peace" described by St. Augustine as no more than "the cruel enforcement of injustice."

BACKGROUND TO THE UNIVERSAL POWER OF THE BROTHERHOOD

The BROTHERHOOD OF THE ILLUMINATI was formed by Adam Weishaupt in 1776 and supposedly dissolved in 1785. But just as the Comintern (Communist International), founded in Moscow in 1919, which was supposedly dissolved in 1943, is most certainly very much in existence today, so we feel the BROTHERHOOD OF THE ILLUMINATI IS STILL VERY, VERY MUCH ALIVE. In fact it may well be the "hidden hand" behind the TRILATERAL COMMISSION, the COUNCIL ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, the CLUB OF ROME (which has many members from the Iron Curtain countries including from Soviet Russia), the BILDERBERGER GROUP, the ASPEN INSTITUTE, the BROOKINGS INSTITUTION, the PUGWASH SYMPOSIUM, the DITCHLEY PARK FOUNDATION (England), etc.

With reference to the "hidden hand" apparently not to be 'hidden' much longer, the VOICE (June/July/August 1954) in an article headed "The Perfect Ones" said "These, the Elder Brothers of the race, usually move through the world unknown. They seek no recognition, preferring to serve behind the scenes." (Note the title THE PERFECT ONES very suggestive of Manichaeism.)

TESTIMONY OF WALTER RATHENAU

Further light was shed nearly eighty years ago, in 1909, when Walter Rathenau, a German millionaire Socialist Cabinet Minister and International financier, said, "only 300 men, each of whom knows all the others, govern the fate of Europe. They elect their successors from their entourage. These men have the means in their hands of putting an end to the form of any state which they find unreasonable." Rathenau held a similar position in Germany in World War I to that then held by Bernard M. Baruch in the United States (the U.S. War Industries Board). Rathenau's brother-in-law was the Comintern chief Karl Radek so Rathenau would be in a pretty sound position to know the truth!

GEORGE ORWELL'S MESSAGE IN HIS BOOK "1984"

George Orwell, a King's scholar at Britain's top-notch Eton College, was an important British Socialist who turned strongly against Communism after serving for a year with the Trotskyist forces in the Spanish Civil War. He then wrote two widely translated, best-selling anti-Communist books, "Animal Farm" and "1984". Orwell seemed to have stumbled across the trail of the "Brotherhood" for it is highly significant that in his book "1984", Orwell puts the following message into the mouth of O'Brien — "a man of mysteriously high rank in the Inner Party," who says: "I can tell you that the Brotherhood exists, but I cannot tell you whether it numbers a hundred members, or ten million. From your personal knowledge you will never be able to say that it numbers even as many as a dozen . . . You will have heard rumors of the existence of the Brotherhood.... The Brotherhood cannot be wiped out because it is not an organization in the ordinary sense.

TESTIMONY OF THE LATE SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

The citadel will be stormed under the banners of Liberty and Democracy: and once the apparatus of power is in the hands of the Brotherhood, all opposition, all contrary opinions, must be extinguished by death. Democracy is but a tool to be used and afterwards broken; Liberty but a sentimental folly unworthy of the logician. The absolute rule of a self-chosen priesthood according to the dogmas it has learned by rote is to be imposed upon mankind without mitigation progressively forever. All this set out in prosy textbooks, written also in blood in the history of several powerful nations, is the Communists faith and purpose. (Essay on Leon Trotsky in "Great Contemporaries", by Winston Churchill, M.P. Pages 168-9).

KHRUSCHEV AND THE COUNCIL OF ELDERS

The now defunct Cominform weekly journal (February 11, 1955, p.1.) recorded Khrushchev as proposing the promotion of Bulganin to the Chairmanship (i.e. Prime Minister) of the Council of Ministers of the USSR "on the instructions of the Central Committee of the CPSU and the Council of

Elders.'

Here is the extract exactly as it appeared in the Cominform weekly journal For A Lasting Peace, For A People's Democracy (Editor-in-Chief Pavel F. Yudin) (no. 6 (327), February 11th, 1955, p.1. columns 1 and 2: SPEECH BY DEPUTY N.S. KHRUSCHEV at the Joint Session of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR on February 8, 1955.

Comrade Deputies, on the instruction of the Central Committee of the CPSU and the Council of Elders, I wish to propose as Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics Comrade Nikolai Alexandrovich BULGANIN. (Stormy, prolonged applause).

The term "Council of Elders" is very similar to those used above to describe the leaders of Universal Brotherhood in occult and New Age literature. Not much is known about it. Even the late Lord Beaverbrooks influential London Daily Express (February 9, 1955) said: "Such a Council has never been mentioned before. ' Whatever it is, it must have been in a position to give "instructions" to "Dictator" Khrushchev about who should be made the Prime Minister of the Soviet Union!

The mysterious "Council of Elders" was further mentioned in the Moscow New Times weekly newspaper as urging the "putting an end to" the Solidarity Trade Union Movement in Poland. Here is the exact extract from Moscow's New Times, no. 45, November 1981, "The Council of Elders submitted to the SEJM (Polish Parliament) a draft-decree which raises the question of immediately renouncing the strike campaign and putting an end to all actions disturbing public order. '

A link can be discerned between the "Council of Elders" behind Khrushchev and the statement made by the late head of Princeton University Institute of Advanced Studies, J. Robert Oppenheimer (who was fired by President Eisenhower in 1954 as a "security risk" and because of "fundamental defects in his character") as follows: "I believe that only a world council of wise men can assure peace on a scientific basis." (Time, May 5, 1958).

Hmmm, "the Council of Elders"? "A world council of wise men"? Now where have we heard these terms before?

"THE PLANNED DESTRUCTION OF THE U.S. DOLLAR"

The War Crimes Amendment Bill is one of the most horrendous pieces of legislation introduced by the Hawke Fabian government. It parallels similar legislation in Canada, the coming second trial of Ernst Zundel in Canada, and the establishment of the Office of Special Investigations in the U.S.A., which has helped with the sending of Ukrainian-born John Demjanjuk to face an Israeli trial based on evidence supplied by the Soviet Union. In a courageous article in "The Age", Melbourne, columnist Michael Barnard examines the far-reaching implications of the Australian Crimes Amendment Bill. Mr. Barnard's article deserves the widest possible circulation.

Could Australians who took part in Allied bombing raids on Germany and Nazi-occupied Europe in World War II be deemed guilty of war crimes? According to informed interpretation of the War Crimes Amendment Bill, due for debate in Parliament this week, the answer is Yes.

This, of course, is not the stated intention of the proposed legislation, which nominally is aimed at

bringing to justice any Nazi war criminal or collaborator who might have slipped into Australia after World War II. But it is one of many unforeseen possibilities opened up by the bill as presently framed and highlights the dangers of legislation pitched at offences committed the best part of half a century ago in a totally different environment.

The wide-ranging implications of the proposed

war crimes law, which for a host of valid reasons is already causing grave concern among Australia's Ukrainians, Baltic and other Soviet satellite émigré and refugee communities, are only now becoming apparent.

One QC who has analysed the potential of the bill for the lodging of complaints against both Australian servicemen and an even more controversial category — Jewish officials who cooperated with Soviet puppet regimes guilty of crimes in wartime Europe — is Dr. Anthony Endrey.

In an opinion prepared for the Captive Nations Council of NSW, Dr. Endrey writes: "Many Australian servicemen, a number of whom are now judges of superior courts in Australia, heads of government departments and other high functionaries, served with the RAF (RAAF) during the last war and as such, regularly took part in bombing raids on the continent. These aerial attacks systematically included so-called 'carpet bombings' in which purely residential areas were marked out on the map and saturated with bombs.

"Such attacks, therefore, resulted in the murder, manslaughter, grievous bodily harm and wounding of countless innocent civilians and constituted serious crimes under section 6 of the bill. Furthermore, they would not be excused by section 15 of the bill (defence based on laws, customs and usages of war) because the bombing of purely residential areas is expressly forbidden by the Geneva Conventions."

He further notes: "The Red Army commenced its sweep into Eastern and Central Europe at the beginning of 1944 so that most of the areas formerly occupied by Nazi Germany were under Soviet control well before the deadline contemplated by the bill. As soon as the Soviet Union was in control of these territories it set up puppet regimes and more importantly, the secret police, which immediately engaged in a vicious persecution of persons, opposed to communism.

"Local Jews played a prominent part in the setting up of communist regimes and the operations of the secret police and this fact is well documented.

" . . . Many Jews in these countries therefore committed serious inhumanities during the period covered by the bill which would constitute war crimes under the provisions discussed."

Dr. Endrey says a number of such people are in Australia and are known to the ethnic communities concerned. "It can be confidently expected that if the bill is enacted these communities too will raise accusations against the categories of persons mentioned and demand that they be investigated."

Such possibilities, says Dr. Endrey, "may, of course, be circumvented by an appropriate amendment to the bill confining its operations to persons in Nazi-occupied territories". This, however, "would be grossly discriminatory and expose the Government to charges of hypocrisy and electoral backlash."

One might consider that this alone should be enough to make the Government and those pursuing the lop-sided "Nazi" hunt with such zeal to think again about what is shaping up to be one of the most messy, divisive and dangerous (in the case of possible mis-carriage) pieces of law-making modern Australia has seen. But there is much more.

For instance, despite the contrary assertions by

PROFESSOR WALKER'S BOOK AVAILABLE

Professor Walker's book on the Swiss constitutional system, and how it could be applied in Australia, also answering objections, is available from all League bookshops or from League addresses.

"INITIATIVE AND REFERENDUM:

THE PEOPLE'S LAW"

Price: \$15.00 posted.

the Attorney-General, Mr. Bowen, in his second reading speech, that "the bill does not create offences retrospectively", the proposed legislation is a monument to retrospective inventiveness.

This view, expounded forthrightly by Dr. Endrey, is shared to a significant degree by the Senate all-party standing committee for the scrutiny of bills, which has pointed to sections that make participation in the deportation of Nazi victims or the internment in a death camp or slave labour camp a serious crime.

The Senate committee says it is particularly concerned at the apparently unprecedented extent and number of possible *retrospective* offences which might be introduced by the bill and which might "trespass unduly on personal rights and liberties".

The *'Australian Jewish Times'*, reporting at length on this development on 12 November, noted, "Jewish leaders are maintaining a concerned silence on the issue, which could spark a bitter debate involving ethnic communities and extreme anti-Semitic groups."

One of the most heinous provisions of the Australian bill is sub-section (5) (c) which defines as a serious crime "being by act of omission, in any way, directly or indirectly, knowingly concerned in, or party to, the deportation of a person so mentioned". Here, the key word is *omission*.

Not only would any gentile forced by the Germans into escorting or otherwise taking part in placing Jews in transports in Nazi-occupied territories be potentially guilty of "omission" if they did not rebel or turn on their Nazi masters, but so, it must be construed, would any Jews who cooperated with Nazi authorities.

The noted British historian Norman Stone, writing in *"The Spectator"* this year (18 February), discussed Jewish involvement in the terrible extermination process. *"One of the strangest facts of all is that a very great part of the extermination of the Jews was carried out by Jews themselves: Jewish committees chose the deportees to the camps, Jewish policemen escorted them to the trains, Jewish sonderkommandos cleared up after the gassings, and managed the internal organisation of the camps."*

Professor Stone goes on to acknowledge: It would be wrong for an outsider to condemn the Jewish councils, but obviously everyone would have been better off if they just had not existed at all, if they had just lost all those names and addresses . . . "

Once one assumes that position of understanding, however, one must apply the principle all round: one must struggle to understand the position of non-Jews swept or cowed by the terrible tides of war into acts they would find incomprehensible in peace. Is that the case today?