

# THE NEW TIMES

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

VOL. 52, No. 3

Registered By Australia Post - Publication No. VBH 1001

MARCH 1988.

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

## Middle East Time Bomb

*by Eric D. Butler*

**What is happening in Zionist Israel and its occupied territories is the outcome of a continuing policy, which goes back to last century. Although, as Douglas Reed points out in "The Controversy of Zion", the root goes back to 458BC when "the petty Palestinian tribe of Judah (earlier disowned by the Israelites) produced a racial creed, the disruptive effect of which on subsequent human affairs may have exceeded that of explosives or epidemics. Here the "Chosen Race" concept was born. That concept has been used to establish and maintain the Zionist State of Israel, one of the results being the Israeli-Palestinian violence now being witnessed on television.**

Throughout history there has been some far sighted Jews who have warned that the collectivist philosophy underlying Judaism in all its forms, must lead to inevitable disasters, rank and file Jews often being the main victims. It was Dr. Oscar Levy, the distinguished Jewish writer and philosopher, who wrote, "The question of the Jews and their influence on the world, past and present, cuts to the root of all things and should be discussed by every honest thinker". Levy made the following statement after reading a book by a well-known English author, Pitt-Rivers, dealing with the powerful Jewish influence in the Bolshevik Revolution, an influence once mentioned even by Winston Churchill, "We have erred, my friend, *we* have most grievously erred. And if there was any truth in our error, 3,000, 2,000, nay, 100 years ago there is now nothing but falseness and madness, a madness that will produce an even greater misery and an ever-wider anarchy... we are today nothing but the world's seducers, its destroyers... We who have promised to lead you to a new Heaven; we have finally succeeded in leading you into a new Hell... And it is just our morality which has prohibited all real progress, and — what is worse — which even stands in the way of every future and natural reconstruction in this ruined world of ours, I look at this world and I shudder at its ghastliness: I shudder all the more, as I know the spiritual authors of all this ghastliness."

### A CONTINUOUS POLICY

Political Zionism, strongly rejected by many Jews, is a special manifestation of the madness mentioned by Dr. Levy. It has produced a time bomb in the Middle East, with some of the more far-sighted Israelis beginning to warn of a catastrophic future. Writing about Zionism in *The Brief For the Prosecution*, C.H. Douglas said, "To the uninterested, Zionism is a slightly romantic semi-religious cult of much the same character as the Crusades... The real force behind the Crusades was probably very different to what we are asked to accept in standard history; and Zionism is something very different to a simple scheme for the return of the Jews to Palestine. That is incidental to the moulding of events and Governments to procure a World Dominion for 'Israel'. This objective involves a perfectly clear, coherent, and continuous policy on the part of the Zionists. The conditions for successive and major crises must be created and maintained in the world; the means required to deal with each crisis as it arises must be in the hands of Zionist Jews, directly or indirectly: and the use of these means must only be granted to the highest bidder in the surrender of power or the guarantee of its use in the interests of Jewry".

It was a military crisis during the First World War, when Great Britain and her allies were faced with the prospect of either being defeated, or of coming to peace terms with Imperial Germany, that Zionist influence resulted in the Balfour Agreement, a pledge to work for the establishment of a National Home for Jews in Palestine, in exchange for international Zionist support for the Allies. Zionist backing brought the USA into the conflict and resulted in a flood of

other support. It was the Balfour Agreement, which set a time bomb ticking in the Middle East. The Second World War produced the conditions in which the long-term Zionist policy was further advanced. Back in 1928, British Zionist Jew, Sir Alfred Mond remarked in a speech to New York Zionists: "Has it ever occurred to you how remarkable it is that out of the welter of world blood there has arisen this opportunity (of establishing a National Home in Palestine)? Do you really believe it is an accident? Do you really in your hearts believe we have been led back to Israel by a fluke?" (vide *Jewish Chronicle*, London, November 8, 1928).

### THREE POLICIES

In 1950 C.H. Douglas commented on developments towards the establishment of the World State: "There are, beyond all reasonable doubt, three *apparent* World policies at the present time: Zionism, Communism (with its ancillary policies of the Managerial State and State Capitalism); and World Government. It is more than probable that at the highest levels these are all one; that the U.S.A., Moscow

## 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 politics 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.**

and Messers Bevan and Dalton (of the British Labor Government) are all working to the same end, although with a limited comprehension of what that end will be. *But that end involves conflict, as the only alternative to the threat of conflict*". (Douglas's emphasis). There was an historic statement by the prominent British Zionist and advocate of Sovietisation by stealth, Mr. Israel Moses Sieff, that it was "Only in war, or under the threat of war", that the British peoples would accept centralised planning. The Middle East crisis is a major feature of a growing global crisis, with every intensification of the crisis being used to attempt to move mankind towards the World State. The evidence is beyond dispute that at the highest levels of international politics top Zionists are playing a major role in the merging of the world's economies via the New International Economic Order. President Reagan's acceptance of a merging with the Soviet Union, (previously described as the "Empire of Evil"), and Communist China, now being "reconstructed" along with the Soviet Union, is an admission that he has surrendered to the higher policies of International Zionism. This explains why President Reagan is unable to apply to Israel the type of pressure essential to curb its expansionist policies.

While Zionist strategists are obviously concerned by the rising tide of rebellion among the Palestinians on the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, the results of which are at long last bringing the Palestinian issue before the peoples of the world, the biggest threat to the Zionists' control of events comes from Israelis themselves, with growing numbers grasping that they are caught up in a drama which they see threatening their own future. There is little evidence as yet that Zionist domination of the American Congress has been weakened appreciably. There is some disquiet among rank and file Jews around the world, but not as obvious as that developing inside Israel, where Israeli official policy is being increasingly criticised. It was during the naked invasion of Lebanon, the bombing of Beirut, and the massacres in the Palestinian refugee camps, that for the first time large numbers of the Israeli people openly demonstrated against official Israeli policy.

### THE LEGACY OF 1967

The military expansion of Israel as a result of the 1967 Israeli-Arab conflict masterminded by the Soviet Union, sowed the seeds of the further intensification of a crisis which has seriously affected the whole Moslem world and directly and indirectly added to a growing global tension. Mr. Abba Eban, Israeli Foreign Minister when Israel conquered the West Bank and the Gaza Strip in 1967, has joined with those Israelis who are attempting to reassess Israel's situation in relation to what is happening. Eban said recently, "We cannot live any longer with the illusion that permanent immobility is tolerable. The situation is deforming our youth and degrading our democracy. We have to decide are we to absorb the Palestinians and turn Israel into a Muslim State, or are we to become, like South Africa, a country in which people are denied their rights".

Yeshayahu Liebowitz, well-known Israeli philosopher, says "Israel must find a way to liberate itself from the curse of brutally dominating another people. If we don't get rid of these territories... Israel will become a Fascist State". Official Zionist policy is to hold the West Bank and the Gaza Strip as a part of the Messianic Zionist programme of expansion. Already hard line Zionist expansion has resulted in 70,000 Israelis becoming settlers in the occupied territories. These settlers are increasingly threatened by rising Palestinian unrest and violent resistance, which shows every sign of growing. The Israeli government is now faced with what is an unsolvable problem — *unless it is conceded that the only solution is self-determination for the Palestinians with a withdrawal by the Israelis under conditions, which guarantee their future security*. But the hard-line Zionists exploit the security question to mask what is the real objection: to maintain the present occupied territories as a sacred part of Israel, allegedly promised to the Jews by God.

However, with a Palestinian birthrate which is double that of the Israelis, the present Palestinian population of 1.3 million will pass that of the Israelis just after the turn of the century. Israel would be facing an even greater Palestinian population now if the Gulf States had not drained away at least half the natural Palestinian increase in the occupied territories since 1967.

Philosopher Liebowitz argues that unless Israel can find a way to permit the Palestinians to become a normal nation, then eventually the views of the hard-line Rabbi Meir Kahane may prevail. Kahane was elected to the Israeli parliament at the last elections on a policy of physically moving all Palestinians out of Greater Israel. The

American-born Kahane says, "When the time comes, those Arabs who don't accept compensation (to leave their homes)... will be put on trucks and shipped out. But it won't have to happen. The day the Arabs turn on their radios and hear that Kahane is Minister of Defence they will evacuate themselves."

The Kahane policy would almost certainly inflame the whole Moslem world to the point where some type of Holy War would be possible. And yet what is unthinkable today could become a reality tomorrow as the time bomb of the growing Palestinian population ticks mercilessly away. Professor Aroon Sofer, a leading demographer at Haifa University, says that the Israeli policy of permanent occupation of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip becomes increasingly more difficult as the number of 18-year-old Palestinian rioters will soon equal the number of 18-year-old Israeli conscripts available to try to control them. The time will soon come says Professor Sofer, when the Israelis will be pinned down by a problem with more riots and more killings. The Kahane policy, or a similar one, will start to look more attractive, but with chilling consequences for the whole world.

Unless Israeli public opinion can force a defusing of the time bomb created by the Zionist policy makers, it is certain that the worst is yet to come in the Middle East. Developments will either result in a worldwide revolt against all manifestations of Zionist global strategy, with benefit to all, including the rank and file of the Jewish people, or will be exploited to shackle still tighter the diabolical policy of centralising all power. One of the great watersheds in human history has been reached, and, as Dr. Oscar Levy says, the "Jewish Question" is a major feature of that watershed.

### The Majority Vote

In an address on *Responsible Government In a Free Society*, given in Australia during his 1969 visit, Dr. Geoffrey Dobbs of Wales said, "It is worth looking at the precise nature of this 'mandate': a majority vote based upon the principle of one man one vote. It is in fact, a completely anonymous statistic — a mere summation, not of the will, but of the *opinions* and feelings of a large mass of people at a particular moment in time, after they have been exposed to electoral persuasion and propaganda.

"The underlying assumption is that the *opinions* of every man or woman are of precisely equal value; otherwise it would be meaningless to summate them. But this is blatantly ridiculous! No one would dream of acting on such an assumption in the relatively simple matters of everyday life. Is everyone's opinion of equal value on how to repair a car, on whether a picture is a genuine Old Master, or whether a person has cancer? Would anyone in his senses accept the verdict of a majority vote on such matters?

"It is obvious that in any matter requiring knowledge, the formation of a correct opinion is possible only for the few who have the necessary knowledge, and even they may be wrong, but they are at least more likely to know when they are wrong. A majority, therefore, is almost certain to be wrong about the facts, but in addition, its opinions are notoriously and openly manipulated by means of the mass media; so that, in fact, a mass vote, far from giving equal weight to the opinion of each voter, is merely a gift of multiple voting power to the manipulators of public opinion.

A majority vote, therefore, is the reward for the cleverest, the most ruthless and the most accurately timed manipulation of opinions, which can fluctuate wildly from day to day, but are supposed to represent the Sacred Will of the People, on a basis of One-Man-One Vote-Value, on One Day every few years when there is a General Election. A successful political party, therefore, must time its assault on public opinion so that it reaches the maximum effect on Election Day. Spring the trap too soon, and too many of the victims may have time to detect some of the lies, to distrust the promises and to reject the propaganda in the cooler light of consideration. Spring it too late, and it does not matter how the electors would vote the day after the Sacred Day — their views are no longer Democracy. Only on one day in 1,000 or more are the views of the ordinary people even pretended to exert some influence on the Government; so that, once it has got its majority on The Day, it does not matter two-pence that the measure it carries out are overwhelmingly detested by the people; it has got its 'mandate' from The People, i.e. its anonymous statistic of manipulated opinions on one day, and that is supposed to constitute 'democracy'".

# EEC Plan for Identity Cards

From "Home", U.K., February

The following is the text of an address by Mrs. Horsfield to the British Housewives' League on 27th October 1987, at their Autumn Meeting in London.

At a time when the European Communities Act was a mere Bill passing through Parliament, the following extract from Sir William Blackstone's eighteenth century Commentaries was sent to all peers:

"It was a known apophthegm of the great Lord Treasurer Burleigh that 'England could never be ruined but by a Parliament': and as Sir Matthew Hale observes, this being the highest and greatest court over which none other can have jurisdiction in the kingdom, if by any means a misgovernment should any way fall upon it, the subjects of this kingdom are left without all manner of remedy. To the same purpose, the President Montesquieu, thought I trust too hastily presages; that as Rome, Sparta and Carthage have lost their liberty and perished, so the constitution of England will in time lose its liberty, will perish: it will perish wherever the legislative power shall become more corrupt than the executive.'

Undeterred by such a warning our legislature turned the Bill into an Act in 1972, thus fulfilling this prophecy. Fourteen years later our constitution was to be further enfeebled by Act of Parliament and in 1986 a Bill amending the European Communities Act was presented to Parliament by a Conservative Government led by a patriotic Prime Minister but again, despite much vigorous protest by worried constituents, Parliament gave its legal backing to the Single European Act. Everything, including the shouting, should now be over.

The arrogance of the Community institutions is now absolute. The Commission now controls the laws of twelve sovereign nations. One legislation was treated as a formality to endorse the programme and timetable it had published in June 1985 to harmonize all laws throughout its empire by 1992. This programme was adopted by the European Council in September 1985 and Mrs. Lynda Chalker put her name to it on our behalf in February 1986.

Although treated as a formality it is a requirement of the Rome Treaty that "such amendments shall come into force after being ratified by all Member States in accordance with their respective constitutional requirements." So the deed had to be done by Act of Parliament, by way of an incomprehensible Bill. "If it were done when 'tis done," said Macbeth while contemplating murder, "then 'twere well it were done quickly". Quickly it was done and quietly too.

The actors in this drama knew their parts. In the House of Lords the BBC did not televise proceedings when the Single European Act was being discussed. The gentlemen of the press, who have been trained to believe that the public is not interested in EEC matters, discreetly left the Press Gallery when the European Communities (Amendment) Bill was debated, following the lead of the MPs who did not want to waste any time on such formalities. A few faithful Parliamentarians made a fuss so the Government applied the guillotine and that was that. At the Third Reading of the Bill on 10th July 1986 only 43 MPs voted against it and the Commons was able to adjourn for its Summer Recess in good time, leaving the Lords to work on into the Recess under cover of a parliamentary news shadow area. The Third Reading of the Bill in the House of Lords passed off without incident on 3rd November 1986.

## FRONTIERLESS MARKET PLACE

At that time only Denmark had already completed her formalities. It was, in fact, from a Danish MEP that we first learnt of Lord Cockfield's 300 proposals. Britain's own appointee is the Commissioner for the Internal Market, and

it was Mrs. Elsie Mammerich who at our 1986 AGM introduced us to his White Paper in which he set out the timetable for the completion of this great frontier less market place serving a population of 320 million.

According to the Single European Act the nation state is due to expire on 31st December 1992 so that European Union can be born on 1st January 1993, although the Final Act does allow our legislature to play its part by publicly adopting the Commission's 300 proposals. The Parliamentary Whips will be very busy people during the next four years. MPs please note, the Final Act says: "Setting the date of 31st December 1992 does not create an automatic legal effect" to the Commission's programme, but it will do if MPs act like automatons.

Lord Cockfield, in his White Paper, talked of dealing with problems "on the basis that the frontiers will have been abolished". This in itself creates problems. How does a government govern a nation without frontiers? A Select Committee of the House of Lords had already puzzled over this in 1983. A nation without frontiers poses problems of security. If a population of 320 million has a free run throughout the Union how do the authorities apprehend the terrorist, the drug pusher, the illegal immigrant or other miscreant if there are no checks at ports and airports? The Commission's answer was to strengthen what they called the external frontiers and issue every inhabitant with an identity card whilst giving the police the power to stop and detain anyone who fails to establish his identity to their satisfaction. Linking the police forces of the Union together by sophisticated machinery would follow so that information known to one police force can be instantly transmitted to another. French attempts to introduce machine-readable identity cards found an impediment being raised by the French Privacy Commission; they should only be introduced if the information on the card could be read by the holder, they said.

So we had in 1983 Lord Scarman asking: "Why set up a system of internal controls which may threaten individual liberties when we already have a system which does not and which works, according to the evidence of the Home Office" and Lord Templeman saying: "I cannot see that any political party of any complexion could possibly go to the electorate any time between 1980 and 2020 either in its manifesto or during its term of office and say, "We must have an identity card".

## IDENTITY CARDS

In June 1984 elections to the European Assembly took place without a murmur even about identity cards. In June this year candidates standing for election to our Parliament at Westminster were equally reticent. Rates reform was promoted as a good thing and got a mention in the Conservative Party's manifesto; the politicians took Lord Templeman's advice and *refrained* from saying: "By virtue of our Membership of the

## Basic Fund Lag

The Australian League of Rights' Basic Fund of \$60,000 is still approximately \$7,000 from its objective. Will the majority who have not yet contributed please not fail the minority who have given so generously. The future of Australia depends upon the maintenance of the League's educational, advisory and action programmes. The Fund must be closed next month. All contributions to Box 1052J G.P.O. Melbourne. Vic 3001.

Community we are bound to set up the machinery for issuing each adult with an identity card, because our frontiers are being abolished by our Commissioner Lord Cockfield, and we will not be able to exclude people we do not want to come here but will instead have to catch them as and where we can. To this end it will become an offence not to register your name and address with a registration officer in your region and notify him when you move. He will issue you with an identity card so that should the police stop you as you go about your business you will have proof of your identity and your right of residence. We have been charged to do this by the Community so we are calling it 'The Community Charge'."

Not only must the laws but also police forces be controlled from the centre if security within the Commission's empire is to work smoothly. Having deceived us about the true purpose of the community charge the Government has to continue with the deception. Little by little we are being conditioned to accept the grosser infringements of our liberties. Any event that can be harnessed to their purposes is being used. Take for example the case of football fans going badly wild. The Government responds by suggesting that Clubs issue all fans with identity cards. Furthermore, when travelling abroad let them be escorted by their own police. How will we like to have international matches policed here by the visiting team's policemen? Not much but it will be a great exercise in trans-national policing.

No doubt Lord Scarman's analysis of the reaction of the common man to security checks by police has influenced Government strategy. When considering these matters in 1983 Lord Scarman asked a witness: "Why is it unobjectionable if a policeman asks for your driving licence but objectionable if he should ask for an identity card?" Because we accept that we do not want unlicensed drivers on the road, he was told. Then he put it in this way: "If a policeman seeking to identify me asked me to produce a passport, I could say no. If he asked me, and I am not driving a car, to produce a driving licence I can say no. But if a policeman with a system of internal controls asked me to produce an identity card, I have to do so or else." Under the pretext of clamping down on drunken drivers spot checks on motorists have recently been carried out by police possibly in an attempt to gauge public reaction to the principle of spot checks for it will be the police who will bear the brunt of public hostility to a system of internal controls.

### **TWO INTRODUCED AS ONE**

We find the Government introducing two reforms whilst pretending to introduce one. The reform of the rates is being given wide publicity but the second reform, the new administration of internal security, is being given none. Our liberties are being taken from us and we are not being told; although we do not like it, we can understand why Mr. Nicholas Ridley is defending the community charge against all comers. We understand his predicament and should like to see some good come from these retrograde reforms. We should like him to be the first Government Minister in this administration to look kindly upon married couples, couples that not only are married but also live together. We should like him to treat such couples more favourably when apportioning the amount due from them. Perhaps married couples, living together, should only be charged for one community charge or half a community charge each. There are a number of reasons why this can be justified. In the first place the community charge will be paid for out of taxed income and there are many tax penalties imposed upon marriage. A reduced community charge might go some way towards redressing the balance. Then we are told that married couples that are not separated will be held jointly and severally liable for each other's community charge. Only married couples will be in the position

of one person being liable for two charges. Furthermore people who marry and remain faithful to their spouse are less likely to become a burden to society seeking support from the public purse, than those who are unwilling to take on responsibilities and commitments of marriage. The Conservatives pay lip service to self-reliance. Now is their opportunity to reward it.

### **ONE OF PARLIAMENT'S LAST POWERS**

Lord Cockfield, as a guardian of the Treaties, is nudging us towards fiscal approximation but the Treaties only hold sway over indirect taxation. The community charge will be a direct tax and direct taxation is still the responsibility of the national governments. The Treaties do not give Lord Cockfield any power to make us harmonize or approximate or even hand over monies raised by direct taxation. Direct taxation is one of the last powers left to our Parliament. May Parliament in its wisdom use this one remaining power wisely and to the benefit of the people it represents.

In recent times Governments have used financial inducements to discourage people from marrying. Governments know that they influence people's behaviour by financial inducements. Let the community charge be an instrument of good, reversing the inducements of taxation that favour social disorder.

We should like to remind our Government that there is a higher authority than the EEC Commission; that this is a Christian country; that humanism is a false philosophy inspiring directives and tainting our laws. If England can be ruined by a Parliament then England can also be saved. If individual MPs can find the will then they will find that they also have the legislative power to perform great good.

## **B. A. Santamaria's Blind Spot**

**Mr. B.A. Santamaria, whose weekly column in *The Australian* is essential reading for students of contemporary national and international affairs, provides a classic example of how even basically sound philosophical people, can offer the most dangerously misleading ideas when they discuss economics.**

Along with Mr. Michael Barnard of *The Age*, whose weekly column is a refreshing contrast to the steady diet of Left-Liberalism provided by *The Age*, Mr. Santamaria defends in a most lucid manner the traditional Christian value system when discussing social issues. Valuable information concerning Communism is provided. In recent times Mr. Santamaria has even ventured to draw attention to the financing of the Communist nations by International Bankers. Possibly in an attempt to ensure that he is not linked with those "right-wing extremists" who believe in "conspiracy theories", Mr. Santamaria explains the financing of the Communist nations as merely an example of "short-sighted greed".

But when Mr. Santamaria enters the field of economics, he displays an appalling lack of understanding of realities. When Mr. Santamaria referred in one of his articles to the views of the distinguished British historian, the late Sir Arthur Bryant, on the subject of credit creation and debt, there were some of his better informed readers who felt that at long last Mr. Santamaria was going to devote attention to the core of the world's economic problems; might dare to ask the question, "Who should be the rightful owners of the financial credits created by the banking system?" Sadly, Mr. Santamaria has not faced this fundamental question.

Mr. Santamaria refers on occasion to the "distinguished Australian economist," Dr. Colin Clark. Like a number of economists, Dr. Colin Clark has frankly explained how the nation's money supply is created by the banking system in the form of financial credit, issued as an interest-bearing debt. But like John Maynard Keynes, who also admitted that banks create credit, when it was becoming increasingly difficult to deny, Dr. Clark has consistently failed to address himself to the question of the *ownership* of credit, except, by inference, as witnessed by his eulogies of Keynes, to support the view that the individual was not entitled to gain access to it as a right.

If one is going to offer some solutions to the problems of a

motorcar which will not go, the first essential is to gain some understanding of the basic principles of the car. It is helpful to know, for example, that a basic feature of the petrol driven is an electrical system, which, with right timing, ensures that petrol vapour is exploded inside a combustion chamber.

### **The Douglas Analysis**

With the precision of an engineer, C.H. Douglas analysed the working of the modern finance-economic system when the British government asked him to examine problems inside the British aircraft industry during the First World War. His examinations led him to see that the nation's economic system could only continue to operate with the continuous injection of new bank created credits for activities, which did not immediately increase the supply of consumer goods for sale. Douglas demonstrated, both inductively and deductively, that with the expansion of the industrial system, there was a growing gap between total prices and total purchasing power during any given period of production. A major military conflict obscures the problem of deficient purchasing power by a flood of production, which is not for sale; it is in reality "exported" to the military enemy. Under orthodox financial policies, this, of course, results in an expansion of the debt burden.

All attempts to prevent a complete collapse of modern economies require a never-ending expansion of financial debt. Any attempts to even slow down the expansion of debt, as was attempted in 1929, produce a major recession. But the continued expansion of debt to finance what are generally described as "expanding economies; must inevitably result in programmes of centralisation in all spheres, the argument being advanced that bigger is better and more efficient. As it is elementary that not all nations can solve their internal problem by an excess of exports over imports, thus achieving "a favourable balance of trade", it is not surprising that a solution is advanced in the form of Common Markets and a New International Economic Order embracing the Communist nations.

Mr. Santamaria has on a number of occasions advocated a policy of compulsory savings, primarily on the earnings of the young, the savings to be invested and used for building houses. It can be argued that some of the wages paid to the young are excessive, and that the young are perceived by business organisations as a lucrative market for a wide variety of consumer goods. But to argue that the production of consumer goods, much of them of little real and lasting value, prevents, for example, the building of houses, reflects a lack of understanding of the enormous potential of the modern production system. Compulsory savings schemes by the State are yet one more extension of the power of the State over the individual.

### **Accentuating the Problem**

Any form of saving, either voluntary or compulsory, has the immediate effect of reducing the amount of purchasing power available to buy what has been produced. But if those savings, along with tax revenues, are invested in more production, generally capital production, then the problem of a deficiency of purchasing power is accentuated. For the sake of simplicity, let it be agreed that in the course of producing goods with a total value of \$100 attached to them, \$100 is distributed in wages. There is sufficient purchasing power to meet the total prices. But if \$20 is saved, then obviously \$20 worth of goods cannot be sold. But if the \$20 is returned to the people after being used to finance, say, a factory, then it is elementary that when that factory starts to produce goods, it must try to recover the \$20 through prices. This is one of the factors contributing to a deficiency of purchasing power — a deficiency which is partially masked by an expansion of new credit, in the form of debt, for what is generally described as an "expanding economy."

A basic principle of realistic financing should be that new production is financed out of new credits and that the rate of repayment of those credits should bear some relationship to the estimated rate of depreciation of what is produced. There is no doubt that there is an enormous misdirection of the production system, with colossal waste and economic sabotage in the form of what is known as "built-in-obsolence". Quality production is rejected as being uneconomic. The first Henry Ford boasted that a car manufacturer should aim to make a car, which would last a family for a lifetime. Such a policy would be a recipe for disaster today, with what are called standard cars being little better than tin cans with plastic fittings.

Even where Mr. Santamaria makes a plea for governments to act to save the traditional family, the basic unit of a stable society,

from further disintegration, and makes the constructive suggestion of a Housemakers' Allowance, based on the French model, he offers no other form of financing except taxation, in this case for the allowance to be financed out of the revenue from Payroll Tax. All taxation is little more than legalised robbery of the individual, but some forms of taxation are more iniquitous than others. Payroll Tax is one of these and is detested by all those attempting to operate industries. Payroll Tax is, of course, another financial cost which industry must attempt to recover through the price system. And like all taxation, it adds to the army of officials who are not only non-productive, but whose activities are a hindrance to those who are producing.

### **Good Intentions Not Enough**

It is physically possible for all mothers who so desire to stay at home, with tremendous advantages to the nation and to their families, without in any way interfering with the production system. Financing mothers by various forms of taxation merely helps to perpetuate the present policy of debt finance and control of the individual through taxation. Unfortunately Mr. Santamaria writes as if there is no other alternative, that "financial resources" are limited and that the best that can be done is to re-allocate them. The simplest and most effective way of financing the traditional family is for the government to establish a special National Credit Account and to draw from that account adequate new credit, created for that purpose, to pay adequate family allowances. Social dividends, including those prepared to retire early from a production system which does not require everyone's life-long services, financed with new credits, not more taxation and more debt, are essential for any genuine programme of regenerating the genuinely free society based on the stability of the traditional family.

The road to Hell is paved with good intentions. We do not doubt Mr. Santamaria's intentions, but based on his stated views, we must doubt his understanding of the realities of a finance-economic system being used to drive the whole world towards the Slave State.

## **A Rhodesian Traitor**

Mr. Alan Ross, reporting from Zimbabwe, previously known as Rhodesia, in *The Globe and Mail*, Toronto, of February 19, provides a revealing picture of Garfield Todd, one of those who helped to betray Rhodesia. It used to be said of Todd that he left New Zealand as a Christian Missionary to do good in what was then Southern Rhodesia, and that he did an enormous amount of good — for himself. Todd was a typical liberal. Elected Prime Minister under the banner of the United Party, Todd's programme of African "liberation" was so extreme that his whole Cabinet deserted him in 1957. Todd became one of the most detested men in Rhodesia.

The worst that happened to Todd under the Smith government was that he was placed under house arrest just prior to the Declaration of Independence in 1965, for twelve months, and again in 1972, for a further twelve months.

Alan Ross, who personally interviewed Todd, knighted in 1986, quotes him as saying, "Of course we were co-operating with the guerrillas. I'd have 20 of them sitting with their arms and their ammunition and their rocket launchers on the front stoop in the middle of the night. Very dangerous".

From his cattle ranch south of Bulawayo, Todd maintained a supply network for the nearby guerrilla camps. Todd, the liberal Christian missionary, was actively assisting the terrorists responsible for the killing of their own people, and for the massacres of many Christian missionaries.

Typical of his kind, and still ignoring realities, Todd expresses confidence in the future of a country, which is sinking under the one-party dictatorship of Comrade Mugabe. It would be instructive to know what Todd feels about the blatantly anti-Christian programme of the Mugabe government.

There are thousands of Todds around the western world who have played a major role in the retreat of the West against the forces of Evil, all in the name of liberalism.

## Zionist Censorship of Dissident Opinions

Mr. John Bennett is one of Australia's most respected libertarians, highly regarded even by some who disagree with him in some areas. His annual publication, *"Your Rights"*, has become a classic, packed not only with valuable information concerning a wide variety of subjects, ranging from "Rights of Victims of Crime", to "You and Your Neighbours", but containing in-depth articles on the various growing threats to individual rights and freedoms.

In the 1988 Edition, the fifteenth, John Bennett comments on the Zionist influence in the censorship of dissident opinions:

George Orwell said, "At any given moment there is an orthodoxy, a body of ideas which it is assumed all right-thinking people will accept without question. It is not exactly forbidden to state this or that or the other, but it is "not done"... anyone who challenges the prevailing orthodoxy finds himself silenced with surprising effectiveness. A genuinely unfashionable opinion is almost never given a fair hearing, either in the popular press or in the highbrow periodicals".

Orwell's theme is also dealt with by John Stuart Mill in his book *On Liberty* "The worst offence... which can be committed by a polemic is to stigmatise those who hold the contrary opinion as bad and immoral men. To calumny of this sort, those who hold any unpopular opinion are peculiarly exposed, because they are in general few and uninfluential, and nobody but themselves feels much interest in seeing justice done them; ...unmeasured vituperation employed on the side of the prevailing opinion really does deter people from professing contrary opinions, and from listening to those who express them".

O'Brien a member of the "thought police" in Orwell's novel 1984 said that "Who controls the past controls the future. Who controls the present controls the past".

Dissident thinkers who challenge the accepted version of the past cannot expect a fair hearing in Australia and are subject to "unmeasured vituperation". Thus my attempts to query the extent of the Holocaust of Jews in W.W.II have led to me being described as "more evil than Himmler and Pol Pot" (*Quadrant*), a "pathological raver" (*New Statesman*), "unhinged" (*Commentary*), "comic" and "bizarre" (*The Age*), "scum" (3AW) and "dangerous and foolish" (Derryn Hinch, 3AW). A play written by a Jew from Sydney called *"The Diary of Anne Frank — a Forgery?"* describes me as a vicious evil neo Nazi professional propagandist who poses as a civil libertarian and is utterly discredited. I am not afforded a right of reply to such attacks. Anti Zionist Jews such as Dr. Alfred Lilienthal and Noam Chomsky have defended the freedom of speech of revisionist historians querying the extent of the Jewish Holocaust and have supported many aspects of the case put by the Palestinians. But Jews belonging to the Zionist lobby have been effective in spreading disinformation (lies) about their perceived enemies and ensuring that no effective right of reply is given to those under attack. Disinformation about revisionist historians who claim that the extent of the Jewish Holocaust has been exaggerated, that the Jewish Holocaust is used daily in the media as a propaganda weapon for Israel and that other and often greater Holocausts such as the Ukrainian Holocaust are ignored, is common. Lies put out by the Zionist lobby about Australian revisionists include claims that their activities are financed by Arab oil money, that they believe there were no concentration camps in Europe in W.W.II and that there was "no Holocaust". Revisionists are usually given no right of reply to such claims.

The Zionist lobby, which has or has had key people in forward planning areas of education bureaucracy has been successful in introducing a Holocaust kit into many N.S.W. schools. The aim of the kit is as with other aspects of the Holocaust industry, to secure support for Israel. One largely unintended effect of the kit (and of the Holocaust industry) is to incite racial hatred of people of German extraction. There is no prospect of Education Departments sanctioning teaching kits about the Croatian, Cossack, Ukrainian or German Holocausts, since those groups, in common with Greeks and Italians, have negligible power in Australia compared with that of Zionist Jews. There is also no prospect of any Education Department allowing any material entering schools querying any aspect of the Jewish Holocaust. Thus the Victorian Education Department discouraged the distribution of *Your Rights 1984* in schools because one paragraph in a 400-paragraph book queried the extent of the Holocaust. Another book *A Survival Kit for Students*, was withdrawn from schools and pulped after pressure from the Zionist lobby which objected to a section which described Hitler as evil and cruel but also said he was popular in Germany.

Disinformation has also been spread about Libyan terrorism and threats to the Pacific area. The allegation that Libya was responsible for the Berlin disco bombing (used as a pretext for the attempt to assassinate Gaddafi by the attack on Tripoli) was never substantiated, and later information that Libya was not involved received little publicity. Disinformation on the front page of *The Australian* that a Libyan official was hiding out in Melbourne because he feared returning to Libya, when he was in fact freely living in Libya, was not retracted. Disinformation (lies) that Gaddafi had called for Australian Aborigines to resort to violence, which appeared as a front-page news item in the *Brisbane Telegraph* was not retracted. A false story put about by an *Australian Israeli Review* official that a Melbourne critic of Zionist policies was harboring a fugitive from U.S. justice was never substantiated or withdrawn. The alleged "fugitive" was not wanted for any offence, and had not even left the U.S.A.

The Zionist lobby exercises its power in such a way that it is a major threat to the civil liberties and freedom of speech of Australians. The issues involved in the conflict between the P.L.O. and Israel are not debated freely in Australia due to a degree of censorship of the case for the P.L.O. and intimidation by character assassination and death threats of those who have letters published documenting Israeli terrorism (this occurred to me). The conflict that has already led to a great increase in the price of oil (which greatly harmed the economies of the West) could easily escalate into a world war.

The case for the P.L.O. is censored by excluding P.L.O. spokesmen from Australia, and is harmed by the way the media ignores Israeli terrorism and highlights P.L.O. terrorism (compare the treatment of the Klinghoffer and Odeh deaths). P.L.O. supporters such as Faris Glubb and P.L.O. spokesmen have been refused admittance to Australia due to pressure from Zionist Jews. A United Nations conference scheduled to be held in Australia in 1987 was effectively cancelled because one representative at the conference would have been a P.L.O. spokesman. Mr. Hawke, whose door is always open to leading Zionist Jews such as Abeles, Liebler and Kornhauser, has never granted an interview to P.L.O. spokesman Ali Kazak. Hawke, who is a frequent visitor to the Synagogues of the 75,000 Jews in Australia and who gave three important talks at Synagogues in 1987, has visited only one of the Mosques of the more than 150,000 Moslems in Australia, and has not even visited the large Turkish Mosque within walking distance of his own electorate office. The Hawke Government has never explicitly condemned the Israeli invasion of Lebanon and has been muted in its comments on the massacre of Palestinians in the Shattila and Sabra refugee camps. Critics of various aspects of Zionist power and policies have their activities monitored by Big Brother Zionist surveillance agencies such as the media committee of B'nai B'nith, *The Australian Israeli Review*, the "Media Watch" section of the *Australian Jewish Times*, Jewish journalists such as Sam Lipski who writes for both non Jewish (*Bulletin*) and Jewish (*A.J.T.*) publications and also provides commentary for television, and W. and C. Rubinstein who are involved in both Jewish and non Jewish media. There is an unpleasant authoritarian and totalitarian overtone to some of this surveillance, and intimidation is used where appropriate. An inaccurate dossier on me kept by a Zionist surveillance agency which came into my possession, and which is shown to selected journalists to dissuade them from quoting me, indicates an extra ordinary degree of surveillance. There is no remotely comparable monitoring of the media and intimidation of critics by any other racial or ethnic group in Australia.

The totalitarian approach adopted by Zionist Jews to their critics is illustrated by the activities of Dr. W. Rubinstein, the author of *"The Left, The Right and The Jews"* in which the claim is made that Jews have become the new socio economic and political elite of the West. Dr. Rubinstein has written to a journal for librarians, (*"Incite"*) requesting librarians not to stock certain books of which he disapproved. He noted with approval that a warehouse containing books he disliked had been gutted by arson. He applauded the fact that David Irving, the U.K. historian whose books are widely available

in bookshops and university libraries and have been commended by leading U.K. historians such as A.J.P. Taylor and Hugh Trevor Roper was not invited by any University to give a talk during his recent visit to Australia. His columns in the *Australian Jewish News* (A. J.N.) draw attention to people whose views he dislikes, and contains suggestions as to how their views can be excluded from the mainstream media. He objected to a column by Terry Lane in *The Age* in which Hitler was depicted as not being totally evil, and noted with satisfaction that Lane's column had been terminated.

Dr. Rubinstein has written extensively in *Quadrant*, a magazine rounded by a Zionist Jew, which follows a pro Israeli line. In one article he claimed (falsely) that I, of all things, had claimed there were no concentration camps in Europe in W.W.II. In another article headed "*Chomsky and the Neo Nazis*" he claimed that 3 revisionists (Professor Butz, Professor Faurisson and myself) were lone wolf malcontents who were possibly more evil than Himmler and Pol Pot (no right of reply of course). He quoted in that article from private correspondence between himself and the anti Zionist Jew, Noam Chomsky in which Chomsky refers to Dr. Rubinstein's deeply totalitarian mentality. Dr. Rubinstein's attitude to academic freedom and exchange of ideas may also be indicated by his approval of my "exclusion" from civil liberties debates in the media (the ACLU had letters in 6 mainstream papers in the 2 months prior to his allegation), and his failure to reply to letters from me asking how the existence of 35,000 Polish Jews in Australia could be consistent with the alleged near extermination of Polish Jews.

Other Zionist Jews and Zionist Goys (non Jews) have shown a similar distaste for traditional civil liberties and the free debate of public issues, which is basic to the functioning of a democracy. One Zionist Goy attempted with some success to secure the cancellation of TV appearances by David Irving, while another (an academic "historian" who referred derisively to Irving as a "pretend" would be historian who failed to document his claims) and was pleased that no university had invited Irving to give a lecture, did not know basic facts about concentration camps such as the use of Zyklon B to combat typhus.

Zionist Jews and non-Jews have been somewhat cavalier in respecting my civil liberties. I have been given no right of reply to the "unmeasured vituperation" directed against me previously mentioned. The Victorian Jewish Board of Deputies put pressure on the book distributor Gordon and Gotch to cease distributing the 1984 edition (the 11th edition) of the book "*Your Rights*" written by me. The Board objected to a paragraph in the book querying the extent of the Jewish Holocaust. Gordon and Gotch succumbed to the pressure and refused to distribute a reprint of the edition which included favourable reviews by a former Chairman of the ABC (Sir James Darling), a former Lieutenant Governor of South Australia (Sir Walter Crocker), a former Minister for Education for South Australia (Joyce Steele) and an author with more than 12 books to her credit (Lady Phyllis Cilento). Zionist Jews also put pressure on the Education Department of Victoria to ensure that *Your Rights*, which had been used as a legal studies textbook should no longer be used. Jewish groups have approached reviewers of *Your Rights* suggesting that they withdraw their reviews, and someone obtained access to some of the warehouse stock of the reprint and made the stock unsaleable through the use of an ink stamp. The extent of the over-reaction to one paragraph in *Your Rights 1984* is only explicable in religious terms — the official version of the Holocaust is a religion and those who query it are hounded as heretics.

The Deputy Chairman of the Human Rights Commission returned a free copy of *Your Rights 1984* perhaps because he felt he would be contaminated by having a book with a paragraph containing a dangerous idea in his room. The Chairman of the Commission, a group theoretically in favour of civil liberties and freedom of speech had previously failed to reply to six letters from me asking her to substantiate claims she had made about the Holocaust, in view of proposals by the Commission to introduce legislation similar to that used in other countries to jail revisionists (such as myself). The Zionist lobby, which is well represented on anti-discrimination and Human Rights Commissions, is the main source of pressure for legislation to restrict freedom of speech and inhibit historical research.

A pro Zionist group in the Victorian Council for Civil Liberties, which I founded in 1966, expelled me in 1980 because I had, as a private citizen, queried the extent of the Holocaust of Jews. Although I had written every VCCL newsletter from 1966 to 1980 and prepared over 90% of the Council's law reform submissions and answered the great bulk of enquiries from the public about their rights, I was

NEW TIMES - MARCH, 1988

## "New Times" Annual Dinner

The 1988 Annual "New Times" Dinner will be held on Friday, September 30, followed by the big National Weekend. This will be another tremendous event. Readers are requested to place the date in their diaries. Details later.

expelled without any charges being laid, without being notified of any hearing, and without being even formally advised of my expulsion.

The current president of the VCCL, Ron Castan (a Zionist Jew and member of Smorgan family) is so intent on re-writing the history of the VCCL that he has claimed that Brian Fitzpatrick who died in 1964 founded the VCCL. Since the VCCL was not founded until 1966 there are no press reports or other documents about its existence prior to 1966. However, despite this, Castan claims the VCCL under Fitzpatrick helped Jewish Refugees in the 1930s. O'Brien of Orwell's "1984" thought police would be interested in this. O'Brien said, "Who controls the past controls the future. Who controls the present controls the past". Even in relation to a trifling point about the history of a minor organization, the presence or absence of contemporaneous documentary evidence is decisive. The absence of contemporaneous documentary evidence of an alleged continental wide plan to exterminate Jews and the construction of "Gas Chambers" does not seem to worry believers in the new religion of the Holocaust, including skeptics such as Phillip Adams, who has claimed it is blasphemous to query the Holocaust.

The attitude of *The Age* to freedom of speech and allowing people under attack a right of reply is instructive. I have been attacked in five feature articles in *The Age* and letters from me in reply to these attacks have not been published. At one stage a sequence of 22 letters from me, either as President of the Australian Civil Liberties Union or in a personal capacity to *The Age* was not published. Several letters I ghosted for other people during this period were published. It is clear that my name at the bottom of a letter meant it would not be published. Some of the ACLU letters sent to *The Age* were also sent to interstate papers that (apart from the *Sydney Morning Herald*) often published them. The ACLU currently has a sequence of 16 non-published letters to the *Sydney Morning Herald*. The book review editor of *The Age* has written to me (more than 18 months after I wrote to him) stating that *The Age* would never review revisionist books such as "*The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*" by Professor Butz and "*The Dissolution of East European Jewry*" by Dr. W. Sanning.

*The Age* and the *Sydney Morning Herald* are the main source of Holocaustomania in Australia. Thus *The Age* ran 33 news items or feature articles about the Holocaust of Jews in a recent one month period (26,000 words) and nothing about the Holocaust of German cities involving the deaths of <sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub> million civilians, mainly women and children, and nothing about the greater Ukrainian Holocaust. Although according to "official" versions more people died in the Ukrainian Holocaust than the Jewish Holocaust, for every single word about the Ukrainian Holocaust in the Fairfax press (such as *The Age* and *Sydney Morning Herald*) there are in excess of 100 words about the Jewish Holocaust.

## "The Electors' Veto" Programme

The inclusion of the principle of The Electors' Veto, enabling electors to petition for a referendum on any government policy they are concerned about, in the Australian Federal Constitution, is imperative to halt the programme of progressively surrendering Australia to the internationalists. Most encouraging results have already been achieved, with business and other groups starting to consider the question.

The Australian League of Rights' special eight-page "*Survey*" on The Electors' Veto has been described as a "winner". With bulk printing quantities of the "*Survey*" can now be offered at greatly reduced prices: 1,000 for \$100; 100 for \$12; 10 for \$4. Prices include postage. 'Spread the good news'!

## World About to Begin Depression?

A spate of articles around the world continues to advance the theme that a major world depression is inevitable. The general theme is that the explosion of debt throughout the 1980s has made a major depression certain, and that the depression could be worse than that of the 1930s. One thing is certain: the imposition of another Great Depression would produce a situation which, providing it did not result in anarchy, would produce an unprecedented electoral backlash with demand for a change in financial policy. There is a far wider and deeper understanding of the role of finance in depressions than there was in 1929.

In an article by Christopher Wood, the New York based financial correspondent for *The Economist*, and republished in *News Weekly* of February 28, it is stated that "Because the stock market crash in late 1987 was twice as bad in percentage terms as 1929, the subsequent depression promises to be twice as bad, too." This statement implies that there will be a major collapse in the standard of living, with tens of millions becoming unemployed because of the closing of industries. But in spite of many forms of economic sabotage, including "built-in obsolescence", and excessive centralisation, the production and distribution systems of the Western nations are easily capable of providing all the basic requirements for civilised living.

Contrary to current mythology, it was not the Wall Street Stock Exchange collapse of 1929, which caused the Great Depression. The signal for the Great Depression was given late in October 1929, when the Wall Street banks, without the slightest warning, called in overdrafts and increased most overdraft rates from 3 per cent to 30 per cent, or more. The stock market reflected the despair of borrowers as they attempted to unload securities in an attempt to continue operating the economic system. The Hoover Republican Administration was completely discredited as the Depression deepened, with millions unemployed, and was replaced by Roosevelt, who had made many statements which suggested that once elected, he would introduce banking "reforms". In his Inaugural Address he criticised financiers, not all of them, but only those prominent during the Hoover era. Roosevelt made no criticism of the credit monopoly as such. As soon as he was installed, Roosevelt, surrounded by International Jews like Winston Churchill's friend, Bernard Baruch, Felix Frankfurter and others, reversed the policy of credit restriction, credit now being expanded to help finance the Fabian-style New Deal. Depression conditions started to ease.

Shortly afterwards, the Bank "of England", under the direction of the American-trained Montagu Norman, followed the American lead in easing credit restrictions. All of this was a matter of High Financial Policy. Those operating the international debt system today are well aware that it is mathematically impossible for the huge debts they have created to be repaid. In many cases, those in debt find it impossible even to pay interest charges. As the banking institutions responsible for the creation of the bulk of debt have done so with no cost to themselves, it is not surprising that they are also constantly writing off debt. They are losing nothing.

Those responsible for creating the debt are in the position where they can dictate how the economies of the world function. And so long as it is accepted as axiomatic that there must be increasing centralisation of economies, now taking place on a global scale, then politics are subordinate to economics, with growing pressures for political centralisation. Genuine self-government becomes increasingly meaningless.

The grand strategy of the debt merchants is to rely upon a host of planners of different labels, to urge that the problems created by the debt system be solved by a further centralisation of power. For example, the traditional family farm everywhere is finding it increasingly difficult to survive. And so it is argued that a new type of feudalism, known as corporation farming, is "inevitable". If the programme of centralisation can be taken far enough, the individual will have no access even to food and the basic necessities of life except through relatively few producers and distributors; he will be the victim of the Monopoly State.

As the British are finding, amalgamating nations, who are allegedly also now inefficient, means loss of sovereignty in all areas. Australians would also discover that they had lost their sovereignty in a proposed Pacific Common Market.

It is certain that the framers of today's international financial

## Social Credit Training Course

Many of our readers have, over the years, availed themselves of the special in-depth Social Credit Training Course, developed by veteran Social Creditor, Eric D. Butler. This course is conducted by correspondence under a panel of specialist tutors. The course consists of eight lectures sent to students progressively. Written answers are set for each lecture. Notes are supplied with the course, which students may work through at their own rate — although tutors like students complete the course in a reasonable time. Many outstanding League of Rights actionists have come out of this course, which is highly recommended. The fee for the course is \$80. Write to Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne.

policies are not going to risk a revolt by imposing a major depression, when they believe that they can reach the ultimate objective, World Power, through the current strategy of eroding the free society in a programme which will not result in too much resistance. Whether this strategy can ultimately be successful remains to be seen. It can never achieve the objective of the World State, such an objective being contrary to reality. But the attempt to defy reality could set back civilisation for hundreds of years.

Whatever tactics the Global Plotters decide upon, their programme is doomed to defeat. Social Crediters, with their grasp of what is involved, are equipped to foster a whole series of guerrilla-type activities on a wide variety of fronts, and in the process are recruiting increasing numbers to an understanding of the meaning behind national and international politics. Social Credit knowledge has made it possible to at least slow down the strategy of the Global Plotters and the hosts of planners.

We are confident that, should a major depression be decided upon, the Plotters would be indicating that they are desperate and wish to hurry their programme along. Such a development would bring the central battle for the world into the open. Whether that battle could be won for the philosophy of freedom would depend primarily upon the calibre of Social Crediters. Nothing is more important at the moment than to ensure that Social Credit understanding is maintained and expanded.

## Book on AIDS Cover-up

Mr. Howard Carter of the Logos Foundation has written an excellent book covering the basic aspects of the AIDS threat, drawing upon authoritative medical and other authorities. Mr. Carter not only gives the Christian, but the commonsense answer to the fearsome threat to the whole human race, and to civilised institutions. This book deserves the widest possible circulation at the present time — before it is too late to avoid a horrendous disaster.

Price \$4 posted from all League addresses.

## Investing In The Future

Once again we draw our readers' attention to the fact that the future of Christian Civilisation depends upon an extension of the Social Credit Movement in all its aspects, into the future. The Australian League of Rights is now so firmly based, with an on-going team of young and competent supporters guaranteeing the future that all legacies left to it are in safe hands. Over the years legacies, large and small, have been most helpful in sustaining and developing the League. All that is required is that supporters clearly indicate in their wills what they would like to leave as a League legacy. The official address of The Australian League of Rights is 145 Russell Street, Melbourne, Victoria.