

# THE NEW TIMES

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

VOL. 52, NO. 12.

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

DECEMBER 1988.

Registered by Australia Post-Publication No. VBH 1001.

## THE BASIC SPIRITUAL CONFLICT - LOVE VERSUS HATE

*by Eric D. Butler.*

**C.H. Douglas stressed that the Law of Love, as taught by Christ, so far from being a piece of mere sloppy sentimentalism, was the most brilliant exposition of a far-reaching political principle. The Law of Love partakes of Truth, as witnessed by the fact that when applied it results in individuals evolving a completely different type of society than would otherwise have been the case. Free choice and voluntary co-operation replace compulsion.**

It is appropriate at this time that the Law of Love should be more carefully considered when those engaged in attempting to advance Social Credit through the League of Rights movement, are in the amazing situation where they are being charged with "hate-mongering" by the spiritual descendants of those Pharisees who demanded the crucifixion of Christ because He challenged the very essence of their philosophy.

The Pharisees were the proponents of a collectivism, which elevated the group and its manipulators over the individual. Institutions were more important than individuals, a concept that Christ challenged with His famous statement, "The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath." Associations between individuals were all codified in a type of rigid legal system. It is not surprising that the Pharisaical spirit manifests itself with support for all forms of centralisation, irrespective of the label they bear.

Christ's central message was clear: He had come that the individual might enjoy the life more abundant. Having been sent by the Father, he was the source of all Truth, which was the path to freedom. "Ye shall know the Truth and the Truth shall make you free." The discovery and application of Truth was the way to reach freedom. "I am the way," said Christ: "Follow me."

Christ brought the message that every individual was of value. Even the prostitutes counted. The Kingdom of God was within each individual, who partook of the nature of God because he had been created in God's image. The Kingdom of God was within every individual and he could search for it. This was shattering news and threatened the collectivist philosophy of the Pharisees, which required compulsion.

### REGULATING RELATIONS THROUGH LOVE

But if individuals were born to know freedom, then how were their relations one to the other to be regulated? The answer was provided: The Law of Love. Love your neighbour as yourself, which means that if all individuals accept the view that all individuals are of value in the eyes of God, then they must respect the

rights and the freedoms of their fellows. In the most practical sense, love for one's neighbour results in a voluntary association and a respect for one another which does not require compulsion. A completely new type of society starts to emerge. Over a period of time societies did emerge strongly influenced by the essence of Christ's teaching concerning the Law of Love.

Even before the early Christian Fathers had, after considerable disputation, agreed on what books should be included in what is known as the Holy Bible, the yeast of the basic features of Christ's message was fermenting across Western Europe. Although much of the story has been lost in the mists of time, it is certainly true that the essence of Christ's teaching had reached the British Isles at a very early period and took firm root. The concept of Common Law, the tempering of justice with mercy, the stress on such was the value of each unique being in the eyes of God, that every individual must be assumed to be innocent until proved guilty all grew out of the Christian influence. There was a high degree of love and respect for one another, which was reflected in the social and constitutional development in England. There was a time when a man's word was his bond, that business could be done with a shake of the hand, where an individual could safely leave his home unlocked. Today the individual is advised not even to get married unless first a firm written contract is drawn up!

The ethos of Australian mateship was a reflection of acceptance, even if unconsciously, of the Law of Love. But there has been a progressive poisoning of society as trust between individuals is eroded. The old Pharisaical spirit has become dominant and hatred and vengeance is preached by those who seek to destroy a Christian oriented movement like the League of Rights. Consider the advice of Elie Wiesel, the Zionist who by some miraculous means managed to survive the super-efficiency of the Germans at Auschwitz (as did so many others!). Wiesel has written, "Every Jew, somewhere in his being, should set apart a zone of hate — healthy,

virile, hate — for what the German personifies and what persists in the Germans."

### HATE VERSUS LOVE

Wiesel spells out the gospel of hate for all Christians, writing, "In truth, Auschwitz signifies failure of two thousand years of Christianity." Christians collectively are responsible for what Zionist propagandists alleged happened at Auschwitz. This is the message of the modern Pharisees, the driving force behind the

obscene campaign of vengeance against those who allegedly committed war crimes half a century ago. Unless Christians return to their basic Faith, understand that the Law of Love is being challenged by the Gospel of Hate, and defend themselves in a true Christian manner, then Calvary will be replaced by Auschwitz as the very pinnacle of human suffering. The central battle to be fought today is that same battle between two diametrically opposed philosophies two thousand years ago, which resulted in the Crucifixion.

## ZIONIST INFLUENCE BEHIND ANTI-AUSTRALIAN LEAGUE OF RIGHTS CAMPAIGN

The proposed all-party investigation into the Australian League of Rights by the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs is unprecedented in Australian history. Even some critics of the League have warned of the far-reaching implications of a parliamentary investigation of an organisation which by general consent has broken no laws and which rejects violence as a means of resolving the nation's problems.

In order to understand what is happening, it is essential to bear in mind that over many years both spokesmen for the Marxists and the Zionists have violently denounced the League, with Zionist leader Isi Leibler stating on more than one occasion that the League must be destroyed and prevented from influencing mainstream Australian politics.

One of the first major Zionist-sponsored attacks on the League was the publication of Mr. K.D. Gott's little hate book, *Voices of Hate*, in 1965. Mr. Isi Leibler has over the years referred to the Gott "study" as the most authoritative work on the League and its National Director, Mr. Eric Butler. *Voices of Hate* is a mish-mash of material, much of it irrelevant and misleading. The nastiest smear in the book concerns Dr. H.V. Evatt's Second World War enquiry, statements made at this investigation concerning the alleged wartime activities of Mr. Eric Butler and other prominent Social Crediters, and what Gott described as a "seamy episode in his career".

### REFLECTING THE GOTT SMEAR

The Gott smear has been repeated over the years, and has been resurrected during the latest assault on the League. The truth is that having initially sought to ingratiate himself with Mr. Eric Butler and his colleagues, Dr. Evatt tried to smear them because of their leading opposition to his proposed major changes to the Federal Constitution. The man who headed the wartime enquiry, Mr. Justice Reed, produced a report, which was completely unsatisfactory from Dr. Evatt's point of view, the result being that it was never published. Section 61 of the report was laudatory concerning the loyalty and public service of Mr. Eric Butler and his colleagues. Gott made no reference to this.

The League of Rights obtained large supplies of *The Voices of Hate* (and still has copies) and sold them as evidence of the type of smearing tactics the Zionists were prepared to use against the League.

One of the most revealing comments in *Voices of Hate* is that "it must be admitted....that he (Butler) is plausible and charming and outwardly a model citizen with an air of dedication to community welfare." Mr. Gott went on to comment that it was these "qualities" which led to Eric Butler becoming a local Shire Councillor, and "they are also qualities which, in some ways, make him a far more dangerous and effective anti-Semite.. . ." Isi Leibler has expressed similar views about League of Rights supporters, observing that they project themselves as "Christian gentlemen".

What many of the League of Rights smearers cannot understand is that League of Rights supporters act in accordance with their Christian Faith; that in fact they are what they claim to be. But, as witnessed by the latest parliamentary and other attacks on the League, the charge is made that the League's support for traditional values and institutions is a veneer behind

which there is a "hidden agenda". The critics have not outlined what this "hidden agenda" might be. But it is evident that what worries those who have a vested interest in maintaining and manipulating the modern political party system, is the fear that the Swiss concept of the electors having the right to initiate, and to veto legislation, is seen as a great threat.

### "NEO-NAZI" NONSENSE

Among the many charges being levelled against the League is the silly claim that the League of Rights is a "neo-Nazi" movement whose activities are undermining the electors' faith in the democratic system of government. The Swiss people would be amazed to learn that they have a "neo-Nazi" type of government. The biggest ethnic group in Switzerland is German speaking, and it is a fact of history that Hitler's National Socialist movement had practically no effect whatever among the German-speaking Swiss. While there are many idiots and sloppy journalists engaged in the anti-League campaign, the promoters are well aware of what they are attempting to achieve. A major objective is to destroy the influence of the League.

This is an appropriate time to recall that in 1984, when the League of Rights was primarily responsible for the effective nation-wide campaign against the revolutionary Aboriginal Land claims movement, with even the Opposition parties being forced to retreat from their original support for the programme under the Fraser government, Zionist leader Isi Leibler arrogantly arrived at the Victorian State Parliament to tell Liberal Opposition leader Jeff Kennett that no Liberal Party Members should appear on the same platform with Eric Butler or any other League speaker. The Fabian Socialist Labor party readily agreed to the Leibler demands. Leibler made it clear that the League's influence should be destroyed among mainstream political movements.

One result of this was the re-surfacing of Leibler's "authority" on the League of Rights, Mr. K.D. Gott, who, much to the astonishment of many people, was engaged by the then Federal Labor minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Mr. Clyde Holding, who announced that Mr. Gott was to be paid \$55,000 for six months to "monitor" the Australian League of Rights, and to report upon its activities. But the Gott project failed to produce more than the type of smearing being re-hashed in 1988. It was only necessary to read the Zionist press to see that the appointment of Gott had the warm support of Isi Leibler and his colleagues.

### PREPARING FOR A MAJOR BATTLE

As the political situation in Australia continued to unfold basically along the lines foreshadowed by the League, with the League playing a leading role in a developing grass roots movement which successfully opposed the Bill of Rights, the ID card proposal and the September 3 referendums, the Zionist strategists and their allies have realised that the League's influence

was growing, and was certain to continue growing. Another major offensive had to be initiated.

*The Age*, Melbourne, a major instrument of secular humanism and liberalism in Australia, has played a major role in furthering Zionist strategy. Anti-Zionists like well-known Civil Libertarian John Bennett are denied any access to *The Age*. Attempts to correct even blatant errors of fact in *The Age* have been in vain.

With growing opposition to the proposed enquiry into the

League of Rights inside the Federal National and Liberal parties, there are some who doubt whether the enquiry will proceed. Mr. Eric Butler has offered to appear either before parliament or before the all-party Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs, without success. It is highly probable that what has taken place over the past nine months, has been an attempt to lay the groundwork for a renewed massive anti-League attack in 1989. We are in possession of information which suggests that what has developed during 1988 is but the preliminary skirmish for a major battle to be fought next year.

## THE RIDDLE OF MRS. THATCHER'S SPEECH

In the following article, Mr. Ivor Benson, the well-known South African journalist, in his October issue of *"Behind the News"* (P.O. Box 1564, Krugersdorp, 1740 South Africa), analyses in depth the potential far-reaching implications of Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher's opposition to the creation of a Western European Federation.

The direction which British politics takes in the next year or two could have consequences of enormous importance for Britain, Europe and, indeed, the whole world.

It is hardly surprising that Mrs. Thatcher's speech at Bruges on September 20 produced enormous reaction, signifying bluntly that while she is Prime Minister Britain will tolerate no further erosion of national identity and self-determination.

That means, if she really means what she says, that Britain will be a major obstacle in the way of a planned European superstate modelled after the United States of America. And it is not going to be possible to obstruct plans for a European superstate without stopping — even setting in reverse — a revolutionary-process of political change which began at the turn of the 20th century and has proceeded at an accelerating pace since the end of World War II.

Much depends, therefore, on precisely what has been going on in the mind of Margaret Thatcher and in the minds of that tightly knit group of advisers who surround her at 10 Downing Street. Do they understand the implications of resolute opposition to the incorporation of Britain in a European superstate? And if Mrs. Thatcher and her advisers really mean what she said at Bruges, is it not too late now to try to save what is left of British national self-rule?

We shall not have to wait long for answers to such questions, for, as the editor of *The Spectator* remarked. October 1: "It will be interesting to see whether Mrs. Thatcher will be as firm in making practical British decisions about the European Economic Community on the basis of these beliefs as she is in stating them in general terms. The story until now has been of stirring declarations, followed by actual results distressingly satisfactory to Brussels."

That will ring a bell of recollection in the minds of those who have been watching political developments in many different countries, more particularly since the end of the last war: the political leader makes a general declaration of purposes and intentions which corresponds exactly with what most of the people believe and feel to be in their best interest; he then proceeds with an interminable succession of separate policy decisions, most of them attracting little or no attention, which have an exactly opposite effect.

We cannot, therefore, be certain that Mrs. Thatcher's speech at Bruges, a masterpiece of populist rhetoric after the manner of Abraham Lincoln, will not be followed by further concessions aimed at reducing Britain to the condition of a mere province in a new superstate. Indeed, her government would merely have to go on doing what they have been doing ever since Mrs. Thatcher took up residence at 10 Downing Street.

If Mrs. Thatcher did not mean what most people understood her to mean, what could have been her purpose in "roughing up" the Euro-enthusiasts, including some of Britain's own EEC representatives? Well, quite soon there are to be

elections for the European Parliament at Strasburg, and Mrs. Thatcher — whatever her long-term intentions may be — has clearly stolen a march on the Labour Party and other opposition groups by informing the British electorate that all the Conservative Party candidates will be staunch defenders of Britain's separate national interest. She has seized the "high ground" of increasing popular distrust of the EEC.

### HISTORY IS NOT PREDICTABLE

Unfolding history, however, has a way of springing surprises. The Thatcher rule in British, European and world politics during the next decade could turn out to be quite different — from causes beyond Margaret Thatcher's control.

Enoch Powell, expelled from Edward Heath's "shadow cabinet" for his rightwing views, including stern opposition to British entry to the EEC, is inclined to accept Mrs. Thatcher's Bruges speech at face value and has suggested that she was "preparing the ground for pulling Britain out of Europe if the Community encroaches any further in Parliamentary sovereignty".

Mr. Powell, never a Thatcher fan, in a speech on September 27 described "this latest foray against the EEC" as quite different from many others, because this one was a tactic, as he put it, of "going for the jugular". He summed up:

"When the Prime Minister uses a British chat show or a Spanish television programme to attack usurpation by the EEC of parliamentary control over taxation or economic policy, this is gratifying evidence that a savage internecine fight is being waged in government between the go-right-aheaders and the about-turners, and that the latter have got the bit between their teeth."

If so radical a change of attitude has occurred in the centre of Britain's governing party, what could have been the cause of it? One explanation offered in the leftist press is that it is entirely her own personal power as a political leader that Mrs. Thatcher is now bent on defending.

That may be so, but in holding on to her present power — far greater possibly than that of any other national leader in the West today — she may find herself having to rely increasingly on populist support — the only kind of support, which, in anthropological terms, can be regarded as legitimate.

### 'A FORCE OF NATURE'

However ridiculous in many ways Britain's involvement in the Falklands drama, one important lesson of it will not have been lost on Margaret Thatcher: that there is a huge reservoir of electoral support available to any leader willing to fan the embers of national pride and will.

Now if Mrs. Thatcher continues to "prepare the ground for pulling Britain out of Europe", she must expect a substantial curtailment of support of another kind which has sustained the

## BASIC FUND CHALLENGE

It has become increasingly clear that the future of Traditional Australia is linked with the future of the League of Rights. To enable the League to launch next year the biggest offensive in its history, it is essential that the League's Basic Fund, set at \$60,000, is over-filled. Readers of League journals have rallied magnificently in response to the all-party assault on the League, with already the Fund being more than half-filled. But the great majority has not yet responded. The future of the League, and the nation, is in their hands. Send an appropriate Christmas present NOW. All contributions to Box 1052J., G.P.O., Melbourne, Victoria, 3001. Unless requested, receipts not posted.

Conservative Party in the past — that which comes from "the City"; that is, from centres of great financial power. This is the power source personified by Edward Heath, the former Prime Minister, for whom a British national identity is wholly expendable.

Mrs. Thatcher could, therefore, find herself manoeuvred by circumstances of history over which she has no control into a counter-revolutionary role, increasingly dependent on populist — that is, nationalist — support. If, as Mr. Powell suggests, she is already the leader of a strong enclave of "about-turners" inside her own party, her chances of survival in the coming struggle would be greatly enhanced.

Assuming, then, that Mrs. Thatcher has been cast in the role hopefully assigned to her by Mr. Powell, there are two major factors to be taken into account in calculating her chances of holding onto the power she now has:

1. — her character as a leader, her ability to hold the Conservative Party in one piece under the impact of the hostility that can be expected; and
2. — the potentiality and power of the parliamentary opposition; what chance do they have of dislodging the Conservatives in the foreseeable future?

Those who like Mrs. Thatcher and those who detest her, of whom there are legion, are evidently of one mind in bestowing on her the title of "Iron Lady". Beyond all dispute is the fact that she is strong-willed and decisive, qualities all the more conspicuous because so many of the men with whom she has had to

deal since she entered politics were in varying degrees, to use her favourite expression, "wet". Whether right or wrong, she makes up her mind and sticks to her guns.

Anthony King, Professor of Government at Essex University, considers at some length (*Daily Telegraph*, October 6) "whether there might be illuminating parallels between Mrs. Thatcher's unique brand of premiership and Machiavelli's political precepts" — in particular, the precept that a leader who cannot be both loved and feared should choose rather to be feared than go on trying to be loved. The rationale is simple: love is at the discretion of those led, while fear is something a leader can command.

Mrs. Thatcher, King says, measures up well to these standards. She has no trouble in winning the affection and loyalty of those with whom she is in daily contact at 10 Downing Street — but in her relations with fellow ministers, civil servants, Conservative members of parliament, etc. her distinctive weapon is fear.

Her methods are happily more benign than those of Cesare Borgia, cited by Machiavelli, but equally effective in the changed circumstances of our time — "face to face fear — fear at first hand . . . hectoring, cajoling, threatening, wrong-footing, bullying, embarrassing and even humiliating her ministers . . . in this respect the Lyndon Johnson of British politics." Even a little froideur can be quite frightening. Not to mention the quiet vanishing trick performed by those who displease her, most often in the past for being "wet".

In today's sophisticated milieu, this awesome power cannot be entirely her own but must be shared by a small group of like-minded specialists for whom the "ogress" holds no terrors.

Paradoxically, therefore, a woman wears the trousers at 10 Downing Street like no other Prime Minister this century, with the possible exception of Churchill; some might say like no European leader since the end of the last war, with the possible exception of De Gaulle.

As for that "government-in-waiting", the prerequisite of modern parliamentary democracy, it would be hard to improve on one sentence of comment from Wallace Arnold, once a staunch Labour Party supporter: "Why is it, I wonder, that these days the monopoly on a sense of humour belongs to the Right?"

It has become impossible to take Britain's parliamentary opposition seriously. The Labour Party and the components of the former Liberal and Social Democratic Parties, as they struggle in vain to find out what they believe and what they should offer the electorate, have been giving satirical cartoonists and comic writers boundless opportunities for the exercise of their talents.

---

## MERGING THE SOVIET AND THE U.S.A. INTO NEW WORLD ORDER

American Senator Jesse Helms is one of the few American politicians who have grasped the meaning of the strategy behind the promotion of Mikhail Gorbachev as one of the great international statesmen of today.

*The John Birch Society Bulletin*, July 1988, provides the following excerpts from an address by Senator Jesse Helms, speaking against the ratification of the U.S.- U.S.S.R. INF Treaty.

Who can deny that the American people and Congress have been subjected to an unprecedented campaign by the major American news media to portray Mr. Gorbachev as a benign reformer whose only desire is openness and restructuring in Soviet domestic affairs and normal relations with the United States? How often have we heard about "glasnost" and "perestroika"?

Why should we applaud a restructuring, which is intended to make communism work? Why should we rejoice in a restructuring, which is intended to build a better Gulag?

Having heard the word "glasnost" so often on U.S. television and having read so much about it in the U.S. press, I asked my staff to look up the word in a Russian-English dic-

tionary. The media tell us that the word means openness, which leads us to believe that there is a relaxation of controls inside the Soviet Union and a new friendly attitude with the West.

The Library of Congress sent over to me a page from the Russian-English dictionary compiled by Professor A.I. Smirnitsky and published in Moscow. The entry under "glas" gives the meaning of "voice". The entry under "glasnost" gives a meaning of "publicity". Several specialists on the Soviet Union, who are native Russian speakers, have told us that the current usage means "propaganda".

This is a far cry from what the media would have us believe. But this distortion of the meaning of words, warfare in the field of semantics, is typical of the media diet that the Ameri-

## CHRISTMAS GREETINGS

**We take this opportunity to wish our readers and their families a Happy and Holy Christmas. May they be refreshed, physically, mentally and spiritually to resume in 1989 the battle on behalf of Truth against the forces of Evil.**

can people are being fed hour after hour, day after day, page after page, broadcast after broadcast. This distortion of the meaning of words is typical of the ethical standards of American journalists working today. These journalists, intentional or not, are not reporting the facts about the news. They are, rather, engaged in polemics and propaganda in a war on traditional American culture and values.

This campaign against the American people — against traditional American culture and values — is systematic psychological warfare. It is orchestrated by a vast array of interests comprising not only the eastern establishment but also the radical left. Among this group we find the Department of State, the Department of Commerce, the money center banks and multinational corporations, the media, the educational establishment, the entertainment industry, and the large tax-exempt foundations.

A careful examination of what is happening behind the

scenes reveals that all of these interests are working in concert with the masters of the Kremlin in order to create what some refer to as a new world order. Private organizations such as the Council on Foreign Relations, the Royal Institute of International Affairs, the Trilateral Commission, the Dartmouth Conference, the Aspen Institute of Humanistic Studies, the Atlantic Institute, and the Bilderberger Group serve to disseminate and to co-ordinate the plans for this so-called new world order in powerful business, financial, academic, and official circles.

The current psychological campaign against the American people in promoting the beginning of a new attempt at detente, which proceeds from an illusion of arms control. The INF summit is supposed to mark the initiation of a new phase in Soviet-American relations. This phase is intended ultimately to produce a convergence in the two systems.

The psychological campaign that I am describing, as I have said, is the work of groups within the eastern establishment, that amorphous amalgam of wealth and social connections—whose power resides in its control over our financial system and over a large portion of our industrial sector. The principal instrument of this control over the American economy and money is the Federal Reserve System. The policies of the industrial sectors, primarily the multinational corporations, are influenced by the money center banks through debt financing and through the large blocks of stock controlled by the trust departments of the money center banks.

---

## JEW S PROMINENT IN "ABORTION HOLOCAUST"

**We publish without comment the following comment by the Rev. Father Paul Marx, O.S.B., in the August, 1987, newsletter of "Human Life International", which is issued from 7845—E Air Park Road, Gathersburg, Maryland, U.S.A., 20879.**

Dear Friend of the Babies,

There's a most ironic side to the widespread, furious objections of some Jews (and others) to Pope John Paul II's routine diplomatic reception of Austrian President Kurt Waldheim: the same segment of the Jewish community that accuses the Pope of insensitivity to the Jewish Holocaust not only condones but has more or less *led* the greatest holocaust of all time, the war on unborn babies.

It's obvious to anyone who's studied the abortion movement in the Western world as long as I have (25 years), that a large segment of the Jews that is disloyal to the teachings of Judaism more or less lead the abortion movement.

And it's high time that someone reminds these pro-abortionists that there's a holocaust going on that dwarfs even the horrible Jewish one, taking 50 million lives every year, worldwide. It has now engulfed three-quarters of humanity, with no end to the killing in sight. Jews who are pro-abortion must face up to their complicity in the violent deaths of 22 million infant victims (so far) in the U.S.A. alone.

They should study the historical links that existed between the Nazis and the birth control-abortion movement in the U.S.A. They should recall that the Nazis promoted abortion massively among the Eastern peoples and forced Jewish women in concentration camps to undergo abortions — practices condemned by the Nuremberg Trials as "crimes against humanity". They should weep for the 40,000 Jewish babies killed every year in Israel. They should recognize — now that abortion is killing off the West — that abortion is Hitler's revenge.

Yes, I know there are various beliefs among Jews across the liberal-conservative spectrum, and that many Jews oppose abortion. Some are even pro-life leaders, such as the great South African Dr. Hymie Gordon of the Mayo Clinic, former abortionist Dr. Bernard Nathanson, New York's Rabbi Yehuda Levin, Rabbi

Jacobovitz in Britain, and others. Even so, I've discovered only one tiny Jewish pro-life group — Israel's EFRAT in the 70 countries I've worked in.

I also know that countless Catholics and Protestants helped to legalize and finance mass abortions in Western countries from Supreme Court Justice William Brennan to Senator Ted Kennedy. (I'll soon have much to say about pro-abortion Catholic congressmen and other prominent American Catholics, who often belong to the supposedly pro-life Knights of Columbus).

But I urge pro-abortion Jews to look into their own souls, as we all must do from time to time, and see whether they're not guilty of a monstrous inconsistency.

I urge them to heed the words of the valiant aerospace engineer, Dr. Kenneth Mitzner of California, who around 1970 founded the League against Neo-Hitlerism to fight abortion. (Sadly, his fellow Jews gave him virtually no help). After the Supreme Court's Black Monday decision in 1973, Mitzner wrote, "It is tragic but demonstrably true that most of the leaders of the pro-abortion movement are of Jewish extraction."

Again, in a letter to me of 17 July 1987, he declares: "Jews must decide whether we condemn Hitler and his followers because mass murder is intrinsically evil or whether our quarrel is just with their choice of us as victims. If our concern is only with the killing of Jews, we have no claim on the sympathies of the rest of humanity. Some Jews ask the world to weep with us for the Jewish victims of Nazism, and at the same time they promote the murder of innocent babies by abortion. Such Jews are the most contemptible of hypocrites."

Let me sketch for you the role these hypocrites have played, and are playing, in the abortion holocaust...

If you still have my book *The Death Peddlers* in your

library, notice how many Jews helped lead the infamous 1971 abortion-planning meeting in Los Angeles, which I exposed; some 40 percent of the speakers were Jewish.

No American doctor did more to promote legalized abortion than the late gynecologist Alan Guttmacher, long-time President of Planned Parenthood (PP) and founder of the Planned Parenthood Physicians (with its British counterpart). And no anti-life group today kills more unborn babies in the U.S.A. than P.P., with its chain of 45 abortion chambers where 95,000 babies die every year. Guttmacher and various Jewish colleagues also sat on the Board of Directors of the pioneering American Euthanasia Educational Fund.

Perhaps no one person fostered abortion legalization more worldwide than the late Dr. Christopher Tietze, a Jewish refugee who worked for the Rockefeller-founded Population Institute in New York and who was the darling of the abortion-promoting International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF).

Stanford professor Paul Ehrlich helped condemn millions of babies to death, including his fellow Jews, when he wrote his best-selling book *The Population Bomb*. Even though serious demographers have lambasted his scholarship (he wrote the book in two weeks), Ehrlich is the man most to blame for the public swallowing the hoax of overpopulation.

Another key figure in the American Holocaust was Anthony Bielensohn, the California state senator most responsible for legalizing abortion in that state in 1969. He's still voting for abortion today in the U.S. Congress. Bielensohn's counterpart in New York was Albert Blumenthal who led the drive for abortion there in the late sixties; Blumenthal is still in the New York legislature.

Of the six Jews in the U.S. Senate today, four are pro-abortion. The great majority of the 27 Jews in the House of Representatives are for "choice". The chief defender and funder of PP in the House is Henry Waxman of California (who's also an eloquent defender of homosexuals).

At the forefront of the abortion legalization fight in the U.S.A. was the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), which is still staffed and supported largely by pro-abortionists of Jewish descent, although many Jews are hostile to the ACLU. In state after state ACLU promoted prenatal baby killing with an almost religious fervor. It has even gone to court trying to force hospitals to abort babies.

The four chief organizers of NARAL (formerly the National Association for the Reform of Abortion Laws, now National Abortion Rights Action League) were Jewish; NARAL was initially the most potent propaganda organization promoting abortion on demand in the U.S.A. Its leader, Bernard Nathanson, is now pro-life. Right now a number of Jewish groups are vigorously opposing the appointment of Robert Bork to the U.S. Supreme Court, always mentioning his contention that the *Roe v. Wade* abortion decision was unconstitutional .....

Several prominent Jewish organizations officially support the killing of unborn babies, including the American Jewish Congress, the National Council of Jewish Women, B'nai B'rith Women, the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, the Women's League for Conservative Judaism, and the National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods.

Pro-abortion Jews are prominent among TV/radio/movie executives, authors, columnists (such as the feminist Ellen Goodman), editors, and so on. The famous Lichter-Rothman studies of America's opinion-molders showed that 96 percent of the "movie elite" are pro-abortion, and 62 percent are Jewish. Among the "TV elite", 97 percent favor abortion and 59 percent are Jewish. A mere 90 percent of the "news media elite" are pro-abortion; 23 percent were raised in Jewish households.

At the first World Population Conference in Bucharest in 1974, I was a member of the only pro-life group attending a huge pro-abortion assembly sponsored by IPPF as a parallel meeting to

the official conclave. The authorities refused to show my pro-life films, while showing their own abundant pro-abortion audiovisual propaganda. I stormed into the office of the chairperson. She was Jewish. She relented only when I assured her that the world would hear about it if I couldn't show my films.

Ironically, my film presentation followed that of Harvey Karman, inventor of the Karman Cannula for "menstrual extraction" (early abortion). The often-jailed Karman posed as a Ph.D. in psychology; actually he had a master's degree in theatrical arts. At this Bucharest meeting I was astonished at how the abortion hierarchy of the whole world was present — especially the Americans. Many of them were Jewish, such as Joseph David, who's very active in advocating/justifying abortion in current historical/legal literature.

Also active and vocal at Bucharest was the king of the abortion propagandists, Lawrence Lader. He wrote the flagrantly untruthful but extremely influential books *Abortion I* and *Abortion II*. (Incredibly, Justice Blackman quoted Lader 11 times in *Roe v. Wade*, which legal scholars say was one of the worst pieces of legal writing in the history of the Court; he never cited the world-famous fetologist A.W. Liley once.)

Lader wrote two other devilishly clever books, the obscene *Breeding Ourselves to Death* and *A Foolproof Method of Birth Control*. The latter praises the Association for Voluntary Sterilization, another gulper of your tax money, now international in its operations. More recently, Lader's Abortion Rights Mobilization group has taken the American Catholic hierarchy to court, aiming to strip the Church of her tax exemption.

The militantly pro-abortion secular feminist movement was inspired by Betty Friedan. Even today some of its chief "spokespersons" are Jewish, e.g., Gloria Steinem. It was Jewish feminist Simone Veil who, as health minister, treacherously engineered abortion on demand in France in 1974, despite her own great sufferings in Auschwitz. This five-year "experiment" was ratified as permanent law on the last day of 1979, the Year of the Family.

During this incredible experiment in killing, Veil held a news conference in Paris in which she proclaimed, "We are out to destroy the family. The best way to do that is to begin by attacking its weakest member, the unborn child." Someone reminded her that no known society or culture has been without the family, that the family is universal in human experience, and asked her whether she had something better to replace it with. Typically, she ignored the question.

In Canada the leading abortion advocate and chief killer of unborn babies is Henry Morgentaler, who claims to have been in Auschwitz. Morgentaler has set up 11 illegal abortion mills in "Catholic" Quebec province. Now he's challenging the federal law in other provinces.

Currently prominent Jews are among the chief exponents of euthanasia in Germany, Austria and Holland.

Until recently, the real political power in Austria was in the hands of a fanatically pro-abortion Prime Minister, Bruno Kreisky, an atheist of Jewish descent. Kreisky almost certainly was present when we showed parliament a film of an 11-minute suction abortion. Why was there no Jewish outcry against his extermination of Austrian babies, including Jewish ones?

In 1974—75 I lectured against abortion more than 50 times in Austria, showing films I introduced to that country. In 1975 parliament legalized abortion on demand during the first three months of pregnancy. Although they're supremely sensitive about their own Holocaust, Austria's Jews gave my colleagues and me no help in stopping this new holocaust; on the contrary, they spoke eloquently for killing preborn babies. Today Austria is a dying country, with more abortions than births.

Among the chief crusaders for abortion in England, too, were prominent Jews. And I learned, in Buenos Aires that leaders of Argentina's two and one-half million Jews were pressing for

school sex education, which always includes contraception and (subtly) abortion.

American Jews always were *the* contraceptors in our society, despite their beautiful pro-life tradition and culture; today they average barely one child per "completed" family. Worldwide, the entire Jewish population is thinning out tragically — only about 15 million have survived Hitler and abortion.

From my research in Israel and my contacts with pro-life rabbis there, I think I can prove that Israel's Jews have one of the highest abortion rates in the world, if not the highest, computed as the ratio of killings to births. Strangely, while killing their own offspring, a good number of Israelis adopt Brazilian babies (preferably of German extraction). In the Holy Land I asked a pro-life rabbi and a professor about euthanasia also; the professor's wife blurted out, "They don't talk about it — they just do it".

Meanwhile the Knesset (parliament) has actually discussed the very real possibility of Israel's Arabs voting the Jews out of their own parliament in the foreseeable future, thanks to low Jewish birthrates. To remedy this, HLI's contact Rabbi Mordecai Blanck founded EFRAT (Society for the Advancement of Child-bearing), a tiny group of Orthodox Jews trying to raise the Jewish family birthrate.

Jews of all convictions must never forget their Holocaust, and I grieve with them over its victims. But again, Jews who are

pro-abortion must face up to their role in the greatest holocaust in all history, the abortion holocaust. They should also reflect on the truth that there have been other and even larger holocausts, e.g., the worst of all (tens of millions) in Red China under Mao; the Soviets' planned starvation of the Ukrainians (nine million); the twenty million Russians and 6.3 million Poles who lost their lives at the hands of Hitler; etc.

Pope John Paul II belonged to the anti-Nazi underground and has prayed at Auschwitz and Maidanek. The protests of pro-abortion Jews over his reception of the Austrian President were political and hypocritical; they had nothing to say about Waldheim visiting Jordan on his next stop.

The Waldheim affair was really only a subtle attempt to morally coerce the Pope into giving Israel full diplomatic recognition — and this scheme took in even the president of the American hierarchy who put out a statement sympathetic to the Pope's critics. He was rescued by Msgr. Daniel Hoye, General Secretary of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops, who issued a clarification.

In conclusion, I urge pro-life Jews and Jews who've never thought much about abortion to form specifically Jewish pro-life organizations and to take back the leadership of the Jewish community from the pro-abortionists. By doing this you will not only help save millions of non-Jewish babies, you may well help save the Jewish nation from the truly final "solution" of abortion.

---

## EMPLOYMENT, DEBT, AND 'THE END OF MAN'.

by Dr. Geoffrey Dobbs in the September, 1988, issue of "*The Welsh Churchman*", Woodland Place, Penarth, S. Glam., U.K.

In the General Election of June 1987, as in most previous Elections, Unemployment was a major issue between the Parties. Each had different plans for reducing it, but no party dared to face the full implications of the technological revolution which has so multiplied the productivity of labour that the routine work of producing all the goods and services which people can possibly need or reasonably want can never again require the full-time labour of the whole, able-bodied population.

In other words, unemployment has come to stay, and ought to be welcomed as a liberation from unnecessary routine labour, far better done by machines which have no lives to waste, rather than punished by reduction to a legally enforced penury.

The other matter which is always a major issue at all elections, and in fact in all politics, is money — its provision and expenditure. Here again, no party has dared to face the full implications of the monetary revolution, which has substituted a purely symbolic loan-credit, created by book-entries and repayable with interest, for a solid metal coinage of intrinsic value.

These questions go too deep to be answered at the level of current politics and economics, which are mainly concerned with coping from day to day, or year to year, with the failure to face these fundamental changes in human society. They go down to the purpose, to the End of Man, in a word, to religion. What is employment *for*? What is money *for*? What are science, invention and technology *for*? For what purpose were we created and endowed with the resources of this planet?

Too many Christians have evaded the duty of seeking a true answer to these questions by pleading a lack of expertise in politics and economics, as if *purpose* were a technical matter; as if, when they are being driven in a car, the *direction* were a matter solely for skilled drivers and motor mechanics!

No one calls a person who is not employed, but has private means, or a pension, 'unemployed'. It is *dependence* upon a job for a living, while lacking one, which characterises 'unemployment'. Financial independence transforms it into leisure; the

NEW TIMES - DECEMBER 1988

---

freedom to choose how and for what purposes to employ one's time and energies, whether or not one is paid for them. As long ago as the 1930's many people realised that, for the first time in human history, that freedom of choice could be available to all, in real economic terms. The limitations were then, as now, purely monetary.

According to virtually all professional economics and experts on finance, those monetary limitations are absolute. Our whole civilisation was created and is controlled by credit-finance, which is accepted as the immutable reality upon which all else is contingent. For many, perhaps most, people also, money is the ruling reality, as it is for the whole of our industry and commerce, aided now by the computer. As a result, our economy is now almost completely 'supply-led', rather than 'demand led'. It overrides everything else, including quality, honesty, mercy, economy, common sense, and, on occasion, even sanity. The extent to which peoples lives, and the earth's ample, but limited, resources, are wasted for purely monetary reasons is seen to be quite staggering, when one comes to look into it. As a single example, the full implications of the "junk mail" are worth following through. Ah! But it keeps people employed. Is that what men and women were born for?

What then is this 'money', which we worship as reality with our lives? It is a wholly artificial system of numerical symbols, created out of nothing by book-entries by certain men who have a monopoly, as a 'credit', repayable with interest, which has now reached usurious rates. To the rest of us, the borrowers, its name is 'debt', and the whole principle on which our society is based is that of the mortgage; "Take now, pay later!" Both on the personal and the international scale, Debt rules the World. 'Credit' depends upon 'confidence'. Both of these are words meaning 'faith'; very much the business of the Church, and of all Christians. In what, or whom, then should we have faith? In the eternal God and His Creation, which includes the enjoyment and stewardship of this generous, but limited, planet, or in the immutable reality of usurious debt and its creators? For Christians there should surely be only one answer; but surprisingly many of them unwittingly reveal their deep faith in the primary reality of money when they insist that, with enormous resources of human ability and materials being wasted or unused, the poor are poor because the rich are rich and even because the com-

comfortable are comfortable, so 'social justice' requires that the latter be taxed to relieve the former. There is, indeed, a scandal here in imposed and unnecessary poverty, but it is not primarily the scandal of wealth or comfort, but the scandal of monetary control.

Wealth and comfort have their responsibility towards the poor; it is the duty of giving. But taxation is not giving, but taking under threat of penalties. There is no love or merit in it either for the givers or the takers. It dries up good impulses on both sides. Many of us might well benefit from a simpler life with fewer and more lasting goods and gadgets and unnecessary comforts; and it is urgent that this Earth's ample, but limited, resources be no longer squandered on unnecessary, wasteful or destructive activities undertaken to give people wages. But as things are at present, with debt-money controlling rather than reflecting and enabling economic reality, to cut these down would merely add to the penurious unemployed. Surely there is something very wrong when people may not live simpler lives without impoverishing others!

These matters have been long discussed and written about ever since the 'poverty-in-plenty' days of the 1930's, when it first became clear that poverty in a technologically advanced society was a monetary phenomenon, not based on our productive reality. The solution which was put forward by the engineer C.H. Douglas, and widely supported by many Christians (including T.S. Eliot, Canon V.A. Demant and the Chandos Group) was that of the social, or national, dividend, paid equally to all without conditions, the amount being calculated to enable them to meet current prices collectively without incurring debt. This was to be combined with an anti-inflationary price discount — in fact a V.A.T. in reverse — an unprecedented use of money to lower instead of to raise prices.

All this was, not unnaturally, condemned and ridiculed by all the recognised experts on debt-controlled economics, since it was a direct challenge to their (unacknowledged) faith (or 'confidence') in the eternal and immutable nature of loan-credit finance. It would be practicable only by means of what, to them, would be unthinkable and impossible, an issue of debt-free money to counteract debt. A temporary 'solution' however, was found along orthodox financial lines in World War II, which provided destructive forces capable of coping with our productive powers, with 'jobs for all'. It is now very clear that the destruction necessary to provide 'jobs for all' with nuclear power and computerised automation, will also destroy what we call our civilisation; while the endless 'economic growth' and bureaucracy demanded by 'employmentism' financed by debt and taxation is doing it more slowly. Is this, then, to be our chosen 'End of Man'?

Is it not time that we Christians recovered our courage, and instead of following the secular world, gave our own lead in accordance with our faith in God's, not Man's reality, and our belief that there is redemption for debt, even on so universal a scale?

## THE FAMILY STORY: LORD DENNING

In his book *The Family Story* Lord Denning draws attention to the "supposed division between law on the one hand and morals on the other . . ." A great mistake, he calls it, and continues:

### (iv) Law and religion

So is the supposed division between law and religion. I know that a great number of people today think that law and religion have nothing in common. The law, they say, governs our dealings with our fellows. It lays down rigid rules, which must be obeyed without questioning whether they are right or wrong. But religion, they say, concerns our dealings with God: it is concerned with things of the next

world, not with the things of this world in which we are living.

That was the philosophy of law in which I was brought up. It is a philosophy, which still governs many of the lawyers of my generation. But it is a false philosophy. The truth is that although religion, law and morals can be separated, they are nevertheless very dependent on one another. Without religion there can be no morality: and without morality there can be no law.

### (v) State your case strongly

William Temple himself proclaimed on many occasions the Christian precept of love — "Thou shall love thy neighbour as thyself" — and sought to apply it to the complexities of the modern life and he found that "love finds its primary expression through justice". "Christian Charity", he wrote, "manifests itself in the temporal order as a supra-natural discernment of, and adhesion to, *justice* in relation to the equilibrium of power". He took the instance of a dispute between employers and workers on the verge of a strike. The Committee are to be actuated by love. Oh, yes, by all means. But towards whom? Are they to love workers or employers? Of course, both. But that will not help them much to determine what terms ought to be proposed or accepted. "Love" means in practice that each side should state its case as strongly as it can before the most impartial tribunal available, with determination to accept the award of the tribunal. At least that puts the two parties on a level and is to that extent in accordance with the command "Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself".

Now just see how that illustration bears on the work of the lawyer. "Each side should state its case as strongly as it can" — that is the task of the Advocate: "Before the most impartial tribunal available" — that is the task of the Judge. "With determination to accept the award of the tribunal" — that is the part of the ordinary man.

### (vii) Return to religion

So I ask you to accept with me that law is concerned with justice and that religion is concerned with justice. And hence I ask the question — What is justice? That question has been asked by many men far wiser than you or I and no one has yet found a satisfactory answer. All I would suggest is that justice is not something you can see. It is not temporal but eternal. How does man know what is justice? It is not the product of his intellect but of his spirit. Religion concerns the spirit in man whereby he is able to recognise what is justice: whereas law is only the application, however imperfectly, of justice in our everyday affairs. If religion perishes in the land, truth and justice will also. We have already strayed too far from the faith of our fathers. Let us return to it, for it is the only thing that can save us. *The Family Story*, by Lord Denning; Butterworth & Co. (Publishers) Ltd., 86 Kingsway, London, WC2B 6AB.

## SOCIAL CREDIT MORE THAN ECONOMIC SOLUTION

"Social Credit is not solely an economic solution to the present crisis — it has a profounder philosophical basis, rooted in human nature itself. Its vital aim is not merely to establish economic security without destroying individual initiative. It is interested in economic security for the very purpose of establishing individual freedom in order that man may develop according to his own initiative and capacity. The possibilities implicit in our age of plenty go much further than the problem of distribution or any other economic consideration. The struggle for physical maintenance becomes incidental. Man is at last freed to devote himself to those intellectual, emotional and creative pursuits, which alone can make life something more than mere vegetation. The expression of individuality is essential to the happiness of man."

- E.S. Holter in *The A. B. C. of Social Credit*.