

THE NEW TIMES

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

VOL.52, No. 5.

Registered by Australia Post-Publication No. VBH 1001

MAY 1988

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

BEHIND THE ANTI LEAGUE OF RIGHTS ATTACK IN THE AUSTRALIAN FEDERAL PARLIAMENT

by Eric D. Butler

In a carefully orchestrated move, five Senators in the Australian Parliament spent one hour on April 27 smearing the Australian League of Rights. As one Canberra journalist said to me in an interview, it was one of the most "extraordinary" events he had ever witnessed. The sustained attack, in which three National Party Senators and two Liberal Party Senators, participated, has been warmly received by the Fabian and other Marxists, Zionist leaders, and a gaggle of anti-League fanatics.

It is impossible to assess the deeper significance of this latest anti-League campaign without grasping the nature of the total programme to destroy traditional Australia and the unique position in which the League of Rights finds itself. The attack was mounted with the full approval of the Fabian Socialists, who on this occasion did not need to contribute, leaving five "conservative" Senators to re-hash much of what the Fabians have been saying for years.

The "extraordinary" nature of the Senate attack was that it took place immediately following a motion on an Appropriation Bill, moved by the influential Victorian Jewish Labor Senator, Robert Ray, whom *Hansard* records as saying, "That the Bill be now read a second time." But immediately Senator Boswell rose to his feet stating, "I rise to bring before the Senate a matter of extreme importance and to make good, honest and decent Australians aware of the dangers associated with the Australian League of Rights"

Hansard records Senator Boswell has having started to attack the League of Rights at 12.44 p. m. But before the Senate session began, a motion by Senator Reynolds was agreed to, stating that "... at 12.45 p.m. the Senate consider Government Business, Order of the Day No. 6 (Appropriation Bill (No.3) 1987-88 for a period not exceeding 1 hour and 15 minutes". But instead of the Senate starting to discuss an Appropriation Bill at 12.45 p.m., Senator Boswell triggered off the anti-League smear, which ran for approximately the whole period allocated to a discussion on the Appropriation Bill.

MANIPULATING THE SENATE

Immediately following the concluding remarks of Senator Tambling of the Northern Territory, who said, "... I would hope that the comments of Senator Boswell today will stimulate a lot of Press and community discussion on this particular issue. They are most timely." Senator Cook, Western Australia, Minister for Resources, moved that "the Bill be now read a second time", and then sought leave, which was granted, that the second reading speech be incorporated in *Hansard*. A speech which was never delivered, but incorporated in the *Hansard* report later, was set aside in order that the time allocated to discuss an important Appropriation Bill, could be devoted to a carefully planned attack on the League of Rights!

Supporters of the Liberal and National Parties might care to ask for an explanation of why there was such blatant collusion between the Labor party and National and Liberal party Senators to misuse the Senate, at a time when it was being broadcast, to launch a national attack on the League of Rights. Not surprisingly, Zionists "welcomed" the attack on the League. It was Mr. Isi Leibler, now a prominent member of the International

Zionist movement, who bluntly said at the time of the Land Rights controversy in Victoria, that the League of Rights had to be denied any access to mainstream Australian politics. It was following an historical land rights rally in the Victorian provincial City of Warrnambool in 1984 that Leibler arrogantly descended on the leader of the Victorian Liberal party, Mr. Jeff Kennett, to demand that no member of the Liberal Party be permitted to appear on the same platform with Eric Butler. The same demands were made of the Victorian National Party, Mr. Ross Edwards who, to his credit, refused to give Leibler the assurances he sought. Kennett weakly capitulated, even declining my suggestion that I call upon him.

While some Members of the National and Liberal parties resented the Zionists' arrogant demands, the Fabian Socialists

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.

enthusiastically promoted the anti-League campaign. Fabian Socialist journalist, K.D. Gott, whose vicious little hate booklet, *Voices of Hate*, was promoted by Isi Leibler and the Zionist propaganda machine, was engaged by the Hawke government to "monitor" the Australian League of Rights. Dr. Ken Coghill, Parliamentary Secretary of the Victorian Labor Party Cabinet, launched a series of anti-League attacks. Well-known writer Phillip Adams, a prominent Fabian Socialist publicist, and strongly pro-Zionist, was brought in to the anti-League campaign. Sir Robert Sparkes, President of the Queensland National Party, assured Isi Leibler that he was strongly opposed to the League of Rights. The Zionist influence has been the major influence in the on-going anti-League campaign, *irrespective of which politicians have been promoting the campaign.*

A RE-HASH

The latest attack on the League contains a re-hash of stale, and in many cases, silly attacks on the League going back over 40 years. Whoever briefed Senator Boswell forgot to tell him that his own President Sir Robert Sparkes, dissociated himself and the Queensland National Party from the "neo-Nazi" smear 17 years ago. Even former Federal National Party leader Doug Anthony was forced to retreat from this smear when flooded by a wave of irate letters from the many League Members and supporters who had served in the armed forces during the Second World War, some of them highly decorated. The only new allegations to emerge from Senators Boswell, Stone, Baume, Lewis and Tambling, is that the League of Rights has been promoting the rather bizarre claims by Mr. Peter Sawyer. It is a matter of record that both privately and publicly I have dissociated the League from allegations, which, in many cases, are simply untrue, and from wild predictions, which have been disproved by events.

Some of Peter Sawyer's recent statements raise serious questions about his motives. His appearance at the present time, with conspiracy theories so blatantly silly that it is hard to believe that even the author actually believes them, has proved a godsend for those seeking to discredit the League and its exposures over many years of the on-going programme to attempt to centralise power over the individual. The documentation concerning this

"THE TRUTH ABOUT THE AUSTRALIAN LEAGUE OF RIGHTS"

by Eric D. Butler.

With a new smear campaign being directed against the Australian League of Rights, Eric Butler's heavily documented exposure of similar campaigns, carrying the same allegations of "neo-Nazism", is a MUST.

Here is a piece of censored Australian history which the smearers try to pretend does not exist. Prime Minister Hawke's Zionist friends do not want to be reminded of the collaboration between the Zionists and the Hitler regime. The pseudo-intellectuals who have hi-jacked the Australian Labor Movement do not like to be reminded of John Curtin's original support for Social Credit, or of the Labor Party's support for "The New Times".

And what did the wartime Commission set up by Fabian Socialist Dr. H.V. Evatt actually say about Eric Butler?

This masterpiece is packed with vital information concerning every aspect of the on-going smear campaign against Eric Butler and the League of Rights.

Price: \$7.00 posted from Box 1052J,
Melbourne, or from all League State addresses.

programme has been carefully provided by a number of competent investigators, and never disputed. No realistic examination of the world situation is possible if it excludes the Zionist factor. I am well aware that a number of investigators have, for what they feel to be good tactical reasons, tended to ignore or "play down" the Zionist factor. But, as demonstrated in the Australian Senate attack on the League of Rights, the Zionist influence cuts through party political and other divisions. As stressed by the distinguished anti-Zionist Jewish writer, Dr. Oscar Levy, "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." The Zionist movement, in all its manifestations, is a threat to the whole world, including the rank and file of those people who call themselves Jews. Courageous Jews who oppose the threat, men like Dr. Alfred Lilienthal, are labelled "anti-Semites", a graphic demonstration of how this term has, through constant repetition, become a powerful political swearword.

"A FORM OF SICKNESS"

While Zionists like Isi Leibler are certainly genuine fanatics, it is difficult to accept that they actually believe, as Senator Boswell and his colleagues suggest, that the "public face" of the League, with its support for traditional values and traditional British institutions, merely serves to mask a "hidden agenda" which includes "neo-Nazism", "racism" and much else. Leibler once complained that League of Rights leaders presented themselves like "Christian gentlemen". The idea of a Christian gentleman is alien to the Zionist Jew consumed as he is with Nazi witch-hunts, everlasting vengeance and retrospective "justice". I have never met one of my army colleagues who suffered under the Japanese in Changi, on the Burma Railway, in Japan, or anywhere else during the Pacific War, expressing a wish to hunt down those who treated them more brutally than any other group was treated during the Second World War. They do not forget the past, but it is past, and why poison the present and the future by wallowing in a never-ending hatred? This is a form of sickness. There comes a time to forget and forgive.

Modern wars have witnessed a return to the type of barbarism, which the Christian influence had mitigated against. Many of those who served in the Second World War witnessed, or even participated in, activities quite alien to their normal behaviour. At a time when even the most bestial murderers are likely to be released from prison in a relatively short time, why spend the taxpayers' money in seeking out, with the aid of the Soviet bloc nations, alleged war criminals living in countries like Canada and Australia? The League of Rights completely opposes the whole concept of war-crime trials being urged by both the Zionists and the Communists. Presumably this is further evidence that the League is "neo-Nazi". I challenge the legal, constitutional or moral right of the Zionist State of Israel, established at the expense of the indigenous Palestinians, who suffered some of the worst terrorist activities of this century, to sit in judgment on anyone like John Demjanjuk, whose alleged crimes were committed at a time when the State of Israel did not exist. I note that the eminent British jurist, Lord Denning, with whom I came in contact during the early days of the Common Market battle, has recently challenged the legal right of the State of Israel to try people like John Demjanjuk. Presumably the veteran judge is also a "neo-Nazi"!

WHERE IS THAT "HIDDEN AGENDA"?

If Senator Boswell and his colleagues really believe that the League's activities defending traditional values and institutions, are but a "front" for a "hidden agenda", then surely elementary commonsense would suggest that after operating for over 40 years, the League should be making some moves towards attempting to implement this agenda. A "neo-Nazi" programme suggests an attempted seizure of power. But instead of seeking power, the League has been in the forefront of a campaign designed to de-centralise all power back into the hands of the people through the implementation of the Electors' Initiative Referendum and Veto system. Reading through the anti-League

Senate speeches indicates that this campaign is causing consternation. With the proposed constitutional amendments in place, the Australian electors would be in the position to challenge a wide range of government policies, including the current immigration policy and the exploitation of the External Affairs section of the Constitution, to enter into international conventions for the purpose of legislating internally without consulting the Australian electors.

Normally there are relatively few Senators present during debates, not unless a major issue is to be decided, so obviously the arranged Senate attack on the League was not primarily designed to influence Senators. What, then, was the purpose of this exercise? What was the purpose of Senator Boswell seeking to have published in *Hansard* a chart outlining the structure of the League of Rights, originally published in Andrew Campbell's book, *The Australian League of Rights* (1978)? Perhaps the answer to this question is indicated by the final remarks of Senator Tambling, who said, "... I would hope that the comments of Senator Boswell today will stimulate a lot of Press and community discussion" Senator Boswell declined Channel Nine's Current Affairs programme to debate me, agreeing only to be interviewed in the same programme. Although Channel Nine had to send a helicopter nearly 40 miles to pick me up at a country centre in Western Australia, and later have me driven back by taxi from Perth, an expensive operation, the interview was never shown. Obviously it was felt that my handling of Senator Boswell was not what was anticipated!

THE LEAGUE'S INFLUENCE

Senator Boswell indicated his fears, or those who prepared his material for him, by saying, after commenting that "It had been claimed that the League is responsible for printing and distributing more political literature than all the other major parties put together", that "Over the past twelve months I have seen an alarming escalation of the League's activities. It has made inroads into the churches, the charismatic churches, the fundamentalist churches and established churches." Senator Boswell went on to make the conventional attack on the League because of its support for Social Credit policies. Senator Boswell's understanding of Social Credit may be judged by his comment that Social Credit states that "if only a government would print more money and lend it at token rates of interest, then all problems would be solved and everyone could live in a virtual Utopia". This is, of course, a blatant misrepresentation of Social Credit.

Senator Peter Baume, Zionist Jew from N.S.W., followed Senator Boswell with a vitriolic outburst with little factual content. Senator Baume is concerned about how the League is financed. There is no secret about this; it is financed by a large number of good Australians putting their hands in their pockets to finance a grass-roots movement, which relies primarily on a large number of unpaid volunteers. Senator Baume criticises the League of Rights for preaching "an anti-immigration line, which is opposed to non-white immigration into Australia." The League, of course, along with Australians like Professor Geoffrey Blainey, fears that the policy of attempting to create a multi-racial Australia is a danger to Australian social stability. Further, it believes that the nation's immigration policy should reflect the views of the majority of the Australian people. Presumably this democratic idea does not appeal to Senator Baume, a keen advocate of the holding of War Crimes trials in Australia.

Senator Lewis of Victoria proved that he was more than willing to support the Boswell smear, saying the League of Rights "can no longer be dismissed as a harmless organisation of a lunatic fringe. It uses its extensive front organisations and with modern technology is able to mass-produce pamphlets, literature, sound cassettes and videos . . . The speakers are skilful and articulate and speak with authority on local, national and international issues."

Senator Lewis is also concerned that the League is "hiding its real agenda behind a screen of what is described as community concerns." Presumably Senator Lewis was talking as a party politician, speaking to a brief of political smearing, not as a lawyer. If he were wearing his lawyer's hat Senator Lewis would, of

course, be obliged to produce hard facts to substantiate his allegations that the League of Rights is an "evil organisation." But he didn't.

BEHIND THE PARTIES

What emerges from the Senate farrago of nonsense lies and attempted smearing, is that behind all the political parties there is deep concern about the escalation of the influence of the League of Rights. The blatant manipulation of the Senate, with Fabian Socialists, Liberal and National party Senators singing the same anti-League tune, primarily to lay the ground for an attempted countering of the League's influence, is confirmation of the fact that the League stands as the one movement which through its long experience and expertise, has the potential to encourage the building of a bulwark against the emerging programme to betray Australia's sovereignty. Australia is now entering the most critical period in its history and explosive events can be anticipated in the immediate future.

I do not under rate the capacity of the forces of the Anti-Christ to attack the League of Rights in a variety of ways. The League has suffered some casualties over the years, and no doubt will experience more. But over the years the League has been progressively developing, and will continue to do so, because the foundations upon which it has been built are secure. As events unfold, the Senate smearers will be exposed for what they really are: front men representing forces, which are completely alien to traditional Australia. But by their activities they have, no doubt unwittingly, helped to demonstrate that those forces are a reality. I remind the good Senators of what the great Edmund Burke once said: We grow stronger as a result of that which we fight against. The League will be stronger as a result of the latest attempt to destroy it. I thank the Senate for their valuable contribution.

PROFESSOR WALKER EXPLAINS

Professor Geoffrey Walker outlines the
Swiss Constitutional System.
An excellent audiotape.

Single copy: \$4 posted; 20 for \$30.

PATRICK WALSH FOR AUSTRALIAN TOUR

We are pleased to announce that Mr. Patrick Walsh, former under cover agent with the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Research Director of the Canadian League of Rights, and consultant to a number of anti-Communist governments around the world, will be conducting a tour of Australia later this year.

Patrick Walsh is generally regarded as one of the top intelligence experts in the Western world, and will be providing an update on the state of the struggle for the world. His last work, *The Unholy Alliance*, documenting the close link between Political Zionism and revolutionary movements, has been a sensational best seller.

Patrick Walsh's Australian tour is in the planning stages only, although there is a firm booking for the Annual Sydney Regional Dinner on Tuesday, September 27. Mr. Walsh will be the guest of honour at the Annual New Times Dinner on Friday, September 30.

Those interested in obtaining Patrick Walsh's services while in Australia are requested to contact the League's National Headquarters, Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne, as soon as possible.

THE HYPOCRISY OF U.S. FOREIGN TRADE POLICY

by Dr. John Coleman in "World Economic Review", April 1988, Box 507, Chalmette, U.S.A., 7004.

Our readers may like to know that the Anti-Apartheid Act adopted in 1986 by the Rainbow Coalition of the U.S. Congress, is proving a serious embarrassment to the United States of America. According to figures supplied to me by the U.S. Department of Commerce and the Office of Strategic Resources, in the 12-month period this infamous piece of legislative folly has been in existence, U.S. imports of key metals and minerals from Soviet Russia have risen as follows:

- Chrome Ore 157%
- Rhodium 386%
- Platinum sponge 17%
- Ferrosilicon 377%
- Platinum bars 321%
- Antimony 4,783%
- Industrial Diamonds 4,900%

Needless to say, the U.S. taxpayer is having to foot the bill for the enormous price tag increase which accompanies Soviet Russian imports. The irony of the situation is that the above imports are produced solely by slave labor. The C.I.A. knows of the location of Soviet Russian slave camps. It knows that they number in excess of three hundred, housing close to sixteen million hapless captives.

Here is what Senator Jesse Helms, US Senator from North Carolina had to say on the subject:

"Now, our intelligence community knows where all of these gulags are, and they still number in the hundreds. Our intelligence community knows that the railroads which haul these goods, this sensitive sophisticated technology to market, were built by work gangs under police guard at a frightful cost in human life and suffering. Our intelligence community knows that mines which produce the commodities used in Soviet plants are worked by men and women under a sentence to work themselves to death". (Congressional Record S14136, October 13, 1987).

The U.S. Intelligence community also knows that no such camps exist in the Republic of South Africa. The U.S. intelligence community also knows that the recently confirmed Secretary for Commerce, C. William Verity, Jr., has spent many years in cooperating with so-called "trade" officials of the Soviet Union, in reality, members of the KGB. Speaking in Verity's Senate confirmation hearings debate, Senator Helms made the following observations:

"It is largely however, because of men like Mr. Verity and some businessmen like him that the Soviet Union today poses such a serious military threat to the United States of America and the free world.... The nomination of one of the leading proponents of America's Western trade with the Communist world, C. William Verity, Jr., as Secretary of Commerce, may have serious long-term consequences for the future of the country as well as for the future of the free world." (Congressional Record S 14125, October 13, 1987).

Senator Helms went on to say:

"Mr. Verity has been the key agent in the United States for developing the Soviet trade.... Finally, Mr. President, Mr. Verity's long and intimate association with the US-USSR Trade and Economic Council, the primary lobby for the Soviet trade, is enough reason to vote against his confirmation as Commerce Secretary. The Council is quite simply an arm of the Soviet Government, under KGB control, whose purpose is to subvert the U.S. economy. The Communists have always believed in war on all fronts — military, diplomatic, social and economic. The Council is an instrument of that subversion." (Congressional Record S14136, October 13, 1987).

Senator Helms then detailed how the actions of Verity and USTEC benefit the Soviet Union in the arms race. In a telling passage, Helms stated, "At the same time this kind of trade is costing the American taxpayer countless billions of dollars for increased defense expenditures which are needed to counter the increased capability of the Soviet military-industrial complex.

Mr. Verity and his fellow lobbyists want to keep making money from trading with Communist countries, but they do not want the American people to know about the magnitude of the trade for the simple reason — that the American people would be aghast if they knew the truth had it been available". (Congressional Record S14141 October 13, 1987)

To secure the truth about the US-USSR Trade Council one organization had to take the F.B.I, and the United States Department of Justice to court under the Freedom of Information Act, Section 5, USC 552. The C.I.A. denied its appeal for copies of the US-USSR Trade Journal and generally adopted an uncooperative attitude. Nevertheless these agencies were not able to stop it from getting all the information needed about USTEC.

Again quoting Senator Helms: "Unfortunately the Department of Commerce (Now headed by Verity) has participated in what amounts to a cover-up of the trade of American corporations and banks with the Communist world. The Department of Commerce clearly does not want the American people to have the truth. One half of the stock (shares) of the United States-USSR Trade and Economic Council is held by the Soviet Union.... Mr. President, I would draw Senator's attention to a report entitled 'Intelligence Collection in the USSR Chamber of Commerce and Industry', which was prepared by the State Department, based on a C.I.A. study."

"This report documents fact that the KGB and Soviet GRU military intelligence both have numerous agents working in this chamber . . . The report states that this Chamber has representatives working within the United States-USSR Trade and Economic Council offices in New York City. It is highly interesting that the report (CIA) describes the chairman of USTEC, Yevgeny Petrovich Pitovranov as a KGB Lieutenant General. Mr. Pitovranov is a colleague of Mr. Verity's on the executive committee of the United States-USSR Trade and Economic Council" (USTEC). (Congressional Record S14141 October 13, 1987).

I want to point out a few glaring inconsistencies about the newly appointed U.S. Secretary of Commerce, C. William Verity, Jr. He has consistently sought to deny information about his relationship with USTEC and the Soviet Union to the American people; Mr. Verity is a selective believer in human rights; Mr. verity believes that politics should not interfere with trade; Mr. Verity is quite happy to closely associate himself with known KGB and GRU agents. Again, quoting from Senator Helm's speech:

"Mr. Verity and his colleagues are now literally selling the Soviet Union the rope with which to hang the free world. Now I haven't come to this conclusion hastily, and not without a study of the record. ..."

"Mr. President (President of the U.S. Senate), Mr. Verity and his colleagues have consistently sought to deny this information (trade with Soviet Russia) to the American people, and thus far they have been successful."

"We have the absurd situation where hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of technology have been exported to Communist countries, and are being exported to Communist countries—the Soviet Union, Bulgaria and countless others. And you know what, Mr. President? All this information has been kept secret. For 2 years I have been pleading with the administration to furnish that information, and I always get a response saying 'Well, we are working on it'....There is no reason to block disclosure of this information. The Soviets know, the Commerce Department knows.... but nobody else is supposed to know, least of all the American people, whose liberties and security may well be at stake in this matter."

Now, either President Reagan doesn't know what is going on or else he is hoodwinking the American people. He said "Non-Strategic Trade". Let's see what Senator Helms disclosed in the US Senate. Pointing to a massive stack of computer print-outs, Helms said: "This is one printout after another dealing with the

Communists. This happens to be a general list. Here is one to Bulgaria. Here is one to East Germany. I will not unroll it all. Here is another computer printout — this to Czechoslovakia, containing all sorts of sophisticated technology" (emphasis added).

Senator Helms then indicated that after threatening the White House to hold up Verity's confirmation, the lists were provided to him with a covering letter: "That afternoon, it was delivered to me (the lists), but with a cover letter saying in effect *You can have this, but you can't let the American people know about it.*" (Congressional Record S14125 and S14135 October 13, 1987). As for President Reagan's "non-strategic trade" claims, look again at what Senator Helms said to the contrary, as already quoted viz: "We have the absurd situation where hundreds of millions of dollars worth of technology have been exported to Communist countries. . . ." So much for the President's "non-strategic trade"!

The time has arrived for Americans to decide who its enemies are; the US State Department as much as anyone in Moscow. The US State Department is not a friend of our people. Our country must begin to break loose from the fear of CFR reprisals if it decides to conduct its own foreign policy towards South Africa, a truly independent sovereign state, unlike Canada, Australia and New Zealand, and just begin to act like one.

South Africa must begin to sell its minerals and metals to any country wishing to purchase from it. Let these countries resell to America at vastly inflated prices. They are doing that already, and the process will accelerate if State Department policy for South Africa prevails.

Our government can and must start now by freeing itself from the bullying and hectoring tactics of the US State Department and men like Wolfowitz. Don't allow America to place certain strategic items on its "exclusion" list. Say NO! It has been bullied and jerked around quite enough by the U.S. State Department. South Africa has the sympathy of the vast majority of the American people, even though the controlled U.S. media would have us believe otherwise.

MUCH MORE TO US

by Dewi Hopkins in "Home" U.K.

Russia likes to boast that it has no unemployment, and British politicians should, logically, be united in praise of this: unanimously professing to have a policy of full employment. That the policy rests on muddled thinking, or hypocrisy, is a fact to which due publicity has not been accorded, but an examination of the means used in Russia to implement it would provide some enlightenment.

They are, basically, hampering technology and putting people to work with hand-tools where advanced countries use machinery. Because this leaves huge deficiencies in goods and services, and because many intelligent people even under repression point out the brutal idiocy of the system, the dual purpose is served of mitigating the deficiencies and silencing the critics by consigning them in droves to slave labour with bare hands in varied extremes of terrain and climate within the Soviet Union.

Thus Maxim Gorky, praising the engineering feat of those who used such labour to build the Belomor Canal, wrote in *The White Sea-Baltic Stalin Canal* that, "Human raw material is immeasurably more difficult to work with than wood." People are the "human raw material" of industry!

Anatoly Marchenko (*Arkhiv Samizdat* 3197) describes labouring by hand in a Siberian timber plant with wet, heavy planks, women being set the same norms as men. The monthly production target for the whole crew must be met or no individual will receive his small bonus; yet this is almost impossible as the tasks are so ill organised, and days off have to be worked off-the-record. The trade union, part of the State's administrative system, is responsible for this state of affairs. The work is done in anything down to forty degrees of frost.

Hedrik Smith in *The Russians* tells of a young man being

taught to work a lathe in a factory. He suggested it could be worked faster and was told to shut up. "Next month they are revising the norms, so we slowed down on purpose."

INHERENT INEFFICIENCY OF FULL EMPLOYMENT

Such examples suggest the inefficiency inherent in full employment and slave labour if the desired end is production. The waste of "human raw material" might not be thought to matter very much — or even be considered a benefit — but the notorious inability of Russia to produce enough for its needs is beginning to be understood by its leaders.

Xan Smiley reported in the *Daily Telegraph* (9th October, 1987) that in a new drive to make Russian industry more efficient it had been acknowledged that unemployment would be a necessary consequence, and that many workers would have to be "freed" or "re-deployed". The terminology is quaintly contradictory: "freed" suggesting an end to bondage, but "re-deployed" an immediate return to servitude. Unprofitable State enterprises were to be shut down; 23% of coal-face workers to be "freed" over three years; 10—15 million people "released" from manufacturing by the year 2000; and 10 million farm workers put out of their jobs by modern technology.

Lest "freed" should be taken too literally, "a senior economist at the state labour committee said the right to work did not mean the right to choose one's place of work." (It is against the law to decline to be employed). Russia is still to be a total work state even though the work will no longer exist to be done. It will be interesting to see how the contradiction will be resolved. One might hazard a guess that it will be through job-creation and (if the Russians in October were observing the British Conservative Party Conference) 'workfare'.

We have less frankness from British Governments, which insist on regarding unemployment as a temporary 'problem', which they intend to solve. The application of science and technology to production means fewer workers. That is the aim of the productive process, and what the word 'efficiency' means in this context — maximum productive capability with minimum cost in terms of labour, energy and materials. The aim should be literally to free us and to make goods available cheaply. To create employment is to return to inefficiency and diminish freedom: half of us will be bureaucrats directing the other half into unnecessary or positively undesirable work.

PROVISION OF MONEY IS THE PROBLEM

The real problem is to provide money for all, including those not needed in production, to function efficiently as consumers — a challenge not to the intellect but to the will of our leaders, because the answer — the national dividend — has long been known.

The most common objections are not economic but vaguely moral. People must be kept out of trouble. People must

BASIC FUND FILLED

A last minute surge of support last month carried the League of Rights' Annual Basic Fund appeal past its objective of \$60,000. Once again only a minority of readers contributed, although many take the opportunity of contributing throughout the year when League speakers are visiting for meetings.

The League thanks all those who have made it possible for the League to continue its on-going work, dedicated to the defence of the Free Society and its institutions. The League has no outstanding debts, has increased book stocks and maintained all League equipment, including printing presses. The small surplus in excess of the League's Objective will be allocated against the 1988-89 Basic Fund.

not have empty lives. 'Handouts' are demoralising. Employment gives self-respect. St. Paul says that those who will not work shall not eat. And so on. It should be noted, however, that this sort of objection implies for the productive system another aim than efficient production and distribution. The second sort of aim defeats the first. We cannot pretend that by increasing the workforce we are increasing productivity. Yet the objections persist, and to Christians St. Paul's words seem to be a particular stumbling block.

Apart from the reservations (surely acceptable) that an unfit person cannot be expected to work and, that it is better not to have a job than to work uselessly or harmfully (and we could think of any number of useless or pernicious jobs): those who quote Paul might reflect on the context in which he wrote those words — long before the industrial revolution could be even imagined; that in adjoining verses he specified productive (i.e. needful) work, not 'created jobs'; that he specifically warned against busy bodies; and that he never advocated depriving people of what was rightfully theirs. For it has always been painstakingly argued that the national dividend is a citizen's natural entitlement, not a 'dole'.

ENVY OR FEAR OF THE UNEMPLOYED

It is understandable that those in paid employment look sometimes in envy and self-righteousness at those who are not. Their censoriousness vents itself against those fortunate enough not to need wages or salaries, as well as those who cannot find decent, paid work or decently paid work. It is as well to remember this. Envy is not only intrinsically bad but also socially subversive. If we want stability we shall not encourage it. The fear of 'sturdy beggars' in Elizabethan times survives in hatred of 'scroungers'. It is not a new thing, though it becomes ever more acute. Mrs. Shelley explained the background to her husband's poem, *The Revolt of Islam*—

"During the year 1817 we were established at Marlow in Buckinghamshire . . . With all this wealth of Nature which, either in the form of gentlemen's parks or soil dedicated to agriculture, flourishes around, Marlow was inhabited (I hope it is altered now) by a very poor population. The women are lace makers, and lose their health by sedentary labour, for which they were very ill paid. The Poor-Laws ground to the dust not only the paupers, but *those who had risen just above that state, and were obliged to pay poor-rates;*"*

It is not only virtuous citizens that fear the unemployed but, more especially, governments. The unemployed have leisure, and their real difficulty is lack not of work but of money. Some are harmlessly occupied in 'fiddling'; most in making ends meet; but many in making the most of their newfound leisure. Governments do not like this last group. By its existence it tends to undermine the tyranny of orthodox economics and politics, which insist that the true end of man is labour, that the arbiter value is the State, and that the basis on which money is to be issued is work: "We cannot pay ourselves more than we earn." (The Prime Minister — on a number of occasions). To make-work the basis for the issue of money is to ignore the huge fortunes made by mere financial manipulation (hardly the sort of work Paul had in mind); and to undermine the hereditary principle — which we know has long been subject to attack.

This attack originates in socialist economic theory, and here I would repeat that the proposal for a national dividend is a proposal to give individuals what they are naturally entitled to *inherit*: that part of the nation's wealth that comes from nature itself and that part that has accrued from advances in industrial process resulting from the work, co-operation and brainpower of our ancestors. It is not a proposal to share out the product of current labour and invention. Those who consider themselves conservatives should be able to see that an attack on inheritance at one end of the scale goes hand in hand with a denial of this principle — or a refusal to admit that the proposal has ever been made.

But how have I wandered from Gorbachev's Russia to Mrs. Thatcher's Britain? It would not seem a strange association

to readers of the *Daily Mail* (15th October, 1987), which carried a major article, alongside its editorial column, entitled "Gorbachev Gambles on a Yuppie Revolution", and says that he, "is emerging as the unlikely champion of a most unlikely economic policy: Thatcherism."

'WORKFARE' OR 'REDEPLOYMENT'

So both Russia and Britain face the same question, "What about the unemployed?" Our own Government is veering in the direction of 'workfare', and it appears the Russians will do the same thing but give it another name — 'redeployment'. It is no more correct to say the Communists are turning to British Conservative principles in this than to say that Mrs. Thatcher is embracing socialist ideas. For what they both amount to is what provoked outrage among Conservatives when it was suggested by Labour in the forties: direction of labour. If there are real jobs that need to be done they should be advertised in the usual ways and carry remuneration at a proper rate; for the labourer is worthy of his hire. An unemployed person who for no good reason refuses a suitable job is *already* disqualified from receiving Unemployment Benefit; so obviously the 'workfare' proponents have something else in mind.

It is quite true that with any economic system that pays wages in return for labour there will be useful work that will not be done, because it will not be profitable for anyone to pay for it to be done. The idea of benefits being paid in return for 'community service' is therefore attractive, and the word 'community' is there to make it sound attractive; but 'the community' is an abstraction which, it will be found, is nearly always used to further an official policy. Someone will decide what service the community needs and which part of the community needs it. It is rather like the 'national interest' in the name of which things are done that do not benefit any identifiable person.

OR FREEDOM TO PURSUE ONE'S OWN INTERESTS

People not employed are free to pursue their own legitimate interests, which may include doing all their own work about the house and garden for which others would call in professionals, and so raising their own material circumstances to a more reasonable standard than their incomes would seem to offer. They are free to accept casual jobs for money (though the amount they are allowed to earn without loss of benefit is unreasonably limited). They are free to develop interests and talents

QUEENSLAND ANNUAL STATE WEEKEND

One of the highlights of the Queensland Annual State Weekend, to be held in Toowoomba over May 27—29 will be the presence of one of the "rising young stars" of the Australian League of Rights, Mr. David Thompson. Former National Director of the New Zealand League of Rights, David Thompson is currently NSW State Director of the Australian League of Rights. This talented young man will be presenting a Paper at the Seminar on Saturday, May 28 and participating in events over the weekend, which will start with the Annual State Dinner on Friday, May 27. National Director Eric Butler will give a keynote address.

Dinner bookings: \$15 single; \$29 double. Fees must accompany bookings.

In view of the national situation, it is anticipated that as many supporters as possible will be present from Queensland and northern New South Wales. The weekend will be a tremendous spiritual feast.

Mail bookings to the Conservative Bookshop, 461 Ann Street, Brisbane, 4000. Phone (07) 2884118 (after 6 p.m. only).

for which the economy has no use and offers no scope (and there is evidence of a flourishing of non-commercial arts, crafts and literature, as well as sports and out-door activities here and there among the unemployed). They are also free to help their neighbours, by performing practical tasks for them and by giving them companionship in a world that leaves many people lonely. Official 'community service' would rule out much of this, and the real community would be the poorer. If an unemployed person is indeed slothful he himself is the loser. If he is actively antisocial there are remedies.

In any case, even this lowest form of employment, directed labour, will be inefficient, because the money to finance it — the same money that is used to pay the dole — is ultimately debt-bearing and inflationary; because, as in the Gulags, norm-fulfillment will be 'fiddled'; and because many people at present harmlessly employed will be tempted to avoid it by taking to other work that would be better left undone.

Christian Britain seems content to let centralising debt finance tighten its grip on our lives. It is said that in Russia, quite apart from the State registered churches, there is a spectacular revival of a sturdily independent Christianity. Is it too fantastic to wonder whether it might wring from the State what our own powers that be cannot so far be persuaded to contemplate? Yes, probably! The Collective State has always known how to dispose of its surplus "human raw material". Our own archipelago is more discreet, and visible only to those with eyes to see.

**I would not wish, however, to be taken to support the ideology that underlies the poem itself. If I did I should quote the poet's preface - a passionate, noble and muddled manifesto and a precursor of much that is silly in 'liberal' thought.*

THE ISRAEL-CHINA LINK

What Marxist governments are saying publicly often camouflages what they are doing privately. Communist China, like the Soviet Union, has a long record of anti-Israeli statements, at the United Nations and elsewhere. But, as is the case of the Soviet Union and Israel, China has a long record of clandestine relations with Zionist Israel, dramatically exposed recently when it was revealed that Israel has been providing advanced military technology to China, and that China will make guns for Israel.

The role of the Israeli-born arms dealer, Zvi Gafni, raises the question of Zionist influence inside the Hawke government. A spokesman for the Australian Immigration Department, Mr. Denis Godfrey, is quoted as having said in Canberra on May 7 that a person with Gafni's record should not have been allowed in to Australia. Gafni was in Sydney last year, making use of a multiple entry visa issued in Hong Kong by the Australian consulate there.

Mr. Godfrey reveals that Gafni has been engaged in a number of espionage and criminal activities, including drug trafficking. But in spite of this he was provided with a multiple entry visa, which he used to visit Sydney for five days from April 6 last year. Mr. Godfrey says that "It's the Australian government's firm policy clearly not to allow anybody suspected of criminal activity to enter the country, particularly when that activity is likely to be a danger to the Australian community. In the course of our very strong checks — which have to be balanced against not deterring tourism — we take advice from other international agencies, and where there has been a conviction of a nature that could cause harm we take definite action to keep that person out."

But Gafni was not kept out. The suggestion is that this was the result of a "bungle". Australian Immigration Consul Mr. David Gray has confirmed that anyone applying for a multiple visa would normally have to provide his "bona fides". Asked how Gafni, who was convicted of possession of drugs in Hong Kong in 1986, and had been under investigation by the local Crime

Bureau since 1984, could have avoided checks, Mr. Gray said that "We rely principally on the information declared on the application form."

According to a police intelligence report to Hong Kong's Director of Public Prosecutions, Mr. Jim Findlay, QC, Gafni was originally targeted for investigation for suspected involvement in international arms dealing, illicit movement of computers to communist countries, cocaine smuggling and the distribution of counterfeit US currency.

"The source of this information was through one of the major US banking corporations and was graded as highly reliable", says the report, dated February 1 this year.

"Further information continued to be received from various sources as to this man's activities, and he was later found to be connected to a group who are currently involved in large-scale counterfeiting of credit cards."

By the time the police picked up Gafni on December 19, the scope of his alleged activities had widened considerably. According to the report to Mr. Findlay, Gafni was allegedly dealing in:

LOST and stolen US passports;

FALSE US military identity cards;

SALE of an identity document, possibly to the Soviet Union, for a NATO base in West Germany;

SALE to an undisclosed buyer of stolen infantry equipment stored by the US military in the Philippines;

NEGOTIATIONS with Chinese government officials in Hong Kong and the shipping of computer equipment to China for upgrading missile technology.

The report also described Gafni as a "useful" asset in Asia to the Israeli Government and warned that his activities in assisting China illegally to obtain advanced missile technology were "not in Her Majesty's Government's interests."

It is known the Israeli Consul-General in Hong Kong, Mr. Reuven Merhav, intervened unsuccessfully on Gafni's behalf in a bid to avoid the damaging publicity that would be associated with a trial.

To the acute embarrassment of the Chinese and Israeli governments, much of the detail of the covert arms dealing became public knowledge after the arms dealer's arrest. A local newspaper identified the five military scientists and disclosed they were employed by Israel's State-owned armaments manufacturer, Israel Military Industries (IMI).

As Israel and China have no diplomatic relations, forged passports had to be provided to enable the team of five top Israeli military scientists to visit China. The fact that they are employed by Israel's State-owned armament manufacturer leaves no doubt that the provision of the advanced military technology was approved by the Israeli authorities at the highest level.

No doubt on instructions from his Israeli masters, Gafni eventually reversed his attitude of not co-operating with the Hong Kong authorities, and pleaded guilty to the charges against him, thus removing the necessity of the prosecutors outlining his role in the top Israel China operation. Gafni has started a two-year prison term in Hong Kong. It will be instructive to see how much of this term Gafni serves — and what explanation the Australian authorities offer for the "bungle" which allowed this Israeli criminal agent to gain entry to Australia. We can only speculate on what he was doing in Australia, and who he saw.

"THE ESSENTIAL CHRISTIAN HERITAGE"

by Eric D. Butler.

This is the study of Christian roots of English constitutional development.

BOOKS "THE TREASURED WEALTH OF THE WORLD"

"A written word is the choicest of relics. It is something at once more intimate with us and more unusual than any other work of art. It is the work of art nearest to life itself. It may be translated into every language, and not only read but actually breathed from all human lips; not be represented on canvas or in marble only, but be carved out of the breath of life itself. The symbol of an ancient man's thought becomes a modern man's speech. Two thousand summers have imparted to the monuments of Grecian literature, as to her marbles, only a mature golden and autumnal tint, for they have carried their own serene and celestial atmosphere into all lands to protect them against the corrosion of time. Books are the treasured wealth of the world, and the fit inheritance of generations and nations.

"Books, the oldest and the best, stand naturally and rightfully on the shelves of every cottage. They have no cause of their own to plead, but while they enlighten and sustain the reader his common sense will not refuse them. Their authors are natural and irresistible aristocracy in every society, and, more than kings or emperors exert an influence on mankind. When the illiterate and perhaps scornful trader has earned by enterprise and industry his coveted leisure and independence, and is admitted to the circles of wealth and fashion, he turns inevitably at last to those still higher but yet inaccessible circles of intellect and genius, and is sensible only of the imperfection of his culture and the vanity and insufficiency of all his riches, and further proves his good sense by the pains he takes to secure for his children that intellectual culture whose want he so keenly feels, and thus it is that he becomes the founder of a family.

"Those who have not learned to read the ancient classics in the language in which they are written must have a very imperfect knowledge of the history of the human race; for it is remarkable that no transcript of them has ever been made into any modern tongue, unless our civilisation itself may be regarded as such a transcript. Homer has never yet been printed in English, not Aeschylus, nor Virgil even — works as refined, as solidly done, and as beautiful almost as the morning itself, for later writers, say what we will of their genius, have rarely, if ever, equalled the elaborated beauty and finish and the lifelong and heroic labours of the ancients. They only talk of forgetting them who never knew them. It will be soon enough to forget them when we have the learning and the genius which will enable us to attend to and appreciate them. That age will be rich indeed when those relics which we call Classics, and the still older and more than classic but even less known Scriptures of the nations, shall have still further accumulated, the Vatican's shall be filled with Vedas and Zandavestas and Bibles, with Homer and Dantes and Shakespeare, and all the centuries to come shall have successfully deposited their trophies in the forum of the world. By such a pile we may hope to scale heaven at last.

"The works of the great poets have never yet been read by mankind, for only great poets can read them. They have only been read as the multitude read the stars, at most astrologically. Most men have learned to read to serve a petty convenience, as they have learned to cypher in order to keep accounts and not be cheated in trade; but of reading as a noble intellectual exercise they know little or nothing; yet this only is reading, in a high sense, not that which lulls us as a luxury and suffers the noble faculties to sleep the while, but what they have to stand on tip toe to read and devote our most alert and wakeful hours to."

— Thoreus, the great American writer, in *Walden*.

CHANGING THE CONSTITUTION

In a letter to *The Advertiser*, Adelaide, of January 24, Graeme Neate, Acting Secretary, the Constitutional Commission, demonstrated the devious tactics of the Constitutional Commission, which, under the guise of merely furthering public discussion, is engaged in a programme designed to prepare Australians psychologically to accept major constitutional changes.

The Constitutional Commission, with its five advisory committees, was set up by the Hawke government as a part of the Fabian Socialist strategy for revolutionising the Federal Constitution by stealth. A large percentage of those on the advisory committees are well-known advocates of revolutionary changes, including the abolition of the Monarchy. Some who have appeared before these committees, presenting support for the traditional concepts underlying the Federal Constitution, have had the unpleasant experience of being virtually sneered at.

Graeme Neate says in his *Advertiser* letter that "One thing is clear — neither the Commission nor the Federal government can change the Constitution nor impose a new Constitution. The Constitution provides that it can be changed only when a majority in a majority of the States votes for such a change."

Acting in accordance with the nature of all governments, particularly centralised governments, all Federal governments since Federation have attempted to centralise power. But the overwhelming majority of referenda have been defeated by the electors who instinctively distrust all attempts to centralise power.

Aided by other centralisers, the Fabian Socialists evolved the strategy of exploiting the External Powers section of the Constitution to subvert it. All that was necessary was a sufficient number of High Court judges who would rule that because the Federal government had signed international conventions and agreements, it then had the right to legislate nationally to give effect to these conventions, irrespective of what the Constitution says. The Franklin River dam case dramatically demonstrated that the Constitution was hardly worth the paper it was written on. Appropriate international conventions can now be used to destroy the spirit and intentions of the Federal Constitution without the Australian people being consulted.

Contrary to what Mr. Neate says, Australians are the victims of a constitutional revolution. The present Opposition parties have contributed to this revolution and have as yet made no firm commitment to ensuring that the Australian people do have a direct say concerning the rules under which they live. It is not good enough for the Opposition merely to say that they would never misuse the External Powers section of the Constitution.

The most effective Constitutional protection would be a provision in the Constitution providing electors with the means of challenging any legislation before it was signed in to law. The Swiss Constitution provides the example, which can be followed. This can be suitably modified to meet the Australian situation.

SOCIAL CREDIT TRAINING COURSE

The eight-lecture Social Credit Training Course is an orderly introduction to the subject of Social Credit. It is conducted by correspondence under a panel of competent Social Credit tutors. Lecture notes are provided and questions set for written answers. Those who have worked through the Course will testify to the fact that this has enabled them to be much more effective Social Engineers in their communities.

The cost of the Course is \$20, which, for Australian and New Zealand students, should be sent to Box 1052J., G.P.O., Melbourne, Australia, 3001.