

# THE NEW TIMES

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

VOL.53, No.6

Registered by Australia Post - Publication No. VBH 1001

JUNE 1989

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

## SOUTHERN AFRICA: A NEW CHAPTER

*by Ivor Benson*

In spite of the dramatic developments in the Soviet Union and Communist China, Southern Africa still remains a major factor in the struggle for the world. South African writer Ivor Benson, in the April issue of his *"Behind the News"* (P.O. Box 1564, Krugersdorp, 1740, South Africa) provides a background assessment of the new chapter in Southern African affairs.

The implementation of United Nations Resolution 435 from April 1 marks the opening of a new chapter in the struggle for Southern Africa, for on that day there began in South West Africa, now called Namibia, what the media have described as "a process leading to free and fair elections" seven months later.

An updated account of the undeclared war against the Republic of South Africa can be summarised under three main headings:

\* *Namibia:* That vast mineral-rich territory which until World War I was a German colony and has even since been administered by South Africa as a protectorate, will now under go the same revolutionary process that has reduced so many other former colonies to the condition of Third World basket cases, requiring enormous financial and other assistance from the industrialised countries of the West.

An invasion by South West Africa Peoples Organisation (SWAPO) guerrillas across the border almost from the moment of commencement of the UN-supervised transition process, in total disregard of the so-called settlement agreement, does not auger well for the kind of rule that will follow when, as expected, SWAPO takes over the government of the territory.

\* *South Africa:* The security situation inside the country is much improved. A Black revolutionary movement, funded and masterminded from abroad, has subsided; order has been restored in the huge Black townships and terrorism by Black against Black almost entirely stopped. It is now the "White revolution" of the Afrikaner working class, rallying mainly around Dr. Andries Treurnicht and his Conservative Party, which is getting most attention in South Africa.

What the replacement of P.W. Botha by F.W. de Klerk, both as leader of the party and as president, will mean is still far from clear; there is nothing to learn from Mr. De Klerk's utterances since he took over as party leader.

\* *The World:* There is a perception that a huge increase in race-oriented political strife all over the world, plus serious racial strife inside many Western countries, is fast draining the energy out of an artificially contrived worldwide antagonism towards South Africa.

The anti-apartheid campaign, conducted in many forms, has lost much of its credibility, a process much hastened recently by the disgrace of Winnie Mandela, wife of the gaoled terrorist leader Nelson Mandela.

Anyone trying to understand what is happening in South Africa needs to be warned in advance that the picture presented by Western politicians and media corresponds hardly at all with reality.

### 'WORLD OF LIES'

That is why the refutation of separate instances of falsehood in the political warfare against South Africa can have no effect whatever in setting the record right. The truth, or at any rate some of it, must be stated in the form of valid generalisations which will help the reader to build up in his mind a more coherent and intelligible total picture of events. Here are two such generalisations:

\* The revolutionary change, which has taken place in Africa (and in many other places) since the end of World War II, and is now threatening South Africa, is the product of an invading imperialism of highly concentrated finance capitalism

### OUR POLICY

To promote loyalty to the Christian concept of God, and to a society in which every individual enjoys inalienable rights, derived from God, not from the State.

To defend the Free Society and its institutions - private property, consumer control of production through genuine competitive enterprise, and limited decentralised government.

To promote financial policies, which will reduce taxation, eliminate debt, and make possible material security for all with greater leisure time for cultural activities.

To oppose all forms of monopoly, whether described as public or private.

To encourage electors always to record a responsible vote in all elections.

To support all policies genuinely concerned with conserving and protecting natural resources, including the soil, and an environment reflecting Natural (God's) Laws, against policies of rape and waste.

To oppose all policies eroding national sovereignty, and to promote a closer relationship between the peoples of the Crown Commonwealth and those of the United States of America, who share a common heritage.

wearing the disguise of "Black nationalism". That explains why "Black nationalism" gets enormous financial support and sympathetic media publicity while any manifestation of "White nationalism" anywhere in the world is anathematised.

An international financial power having its centre in the West and a communist Imperium with its centre in the Soviet Union are merely two aspects of a *single* world-revolutionary movement which has given the world an age of conflict and tragedy unprecedented in recorded history. As historian Oswald Spengler remarked shortly after the Bolshevik Revolution, "There is no proletarian movement, not even a communist one, which does not operate in the interest of money. . . ."

The Soviet Union as an economic and military giant is almost wholly a creation of Western high finance and big business.

Those trying to understand what is happening in Southern Africa also need to be reminded that the practice of political fraud on a scale unprecedented in recorded history has given rise to a flood of rhetorical language consisting of little more than cant words and phrases.

For example, when the editor of the London *Daily Telegraph* refers to "changes" in South Africa that will "satisfy the world", and when he says that "most of the world" requires Black majority rule in South Africa, he is guilty of using cant — having himself, no doubt, been deceived by the same cant. The "world" to which he refers is a figment of the imagination. The "world" knows very little about South Africa and cares less. The world is in a parlous state and can hardly be "satisfied" with itself.

"Black majority rule" is another figment of the imagination, for where in the world is Black majority rule to be found? "Liberation", "independence", and "freedom" are other cant words being used to disguise the fact that no Black community in Africa has been liberated and that not one of the newly created states is independent. The only people who enjoy an expansion of freedom are the puppet Black leaders of these states — and they are all held on a financial leash.

We occasionally get a glimpse of the underlying reality in unexpected ways. Here, for example, is part of the opening paragraph of an article in *Optima*, the glossy house magazine of the giant Anglo American Corporation, which dominates the economy of Southern Africa and is now spreading its tentacles worldwide through another giant conglomerate called Minorco:

"These are sobering times for black resistance to apartheid. Little more than two years ago, a rampant black extra-parliamentary movement was seeking ways to expand its growing power; today it is beleaguered, and seeking ways to survive. Since the nationwide State of Emergency was declared in June 1986, the State, whose imminent collapse some activists had confidently predicted, has shown that it possesses the physical capacity not only to survive but to largely immobilise its 'militant' black opponents."

And so the concepts of "capitalism" and "communism", supposedly our century's deadly opposites, calling for the massing of huge and costly armaments on both sides of the Iron Curtain, are seen to merge together and become indistinguishable.

The same dreamlike phenomenon occurred during Mrs. Margaret Thatcher's visit to the central African states, as she handed out millions of pounds of British taxpayers' money and was greeted as "Comrade Margaret" with clenched fist salutes.

In eastern Zimbabwe she visited a camp where British military instructors are training soldiers from Mozambique, whose task it will be to defend President Chissano's "Marxist regime". And from Maputo in Mozambique we get the news that the Soviet foreign minister, on a visit to this "Marxist State" has expressed approval of the UN's programme in Namibia

designed, as he remarked, to convert one of the last of the colonies into a "democratic state".

Genuine discussion of developments in Southern Africa has been rendered extremely difficult because the words required for discussion are continuously undergoing a change of meaning. What has happened to the language of politics bears some resemblance to money: just as money has ceased to represent trustworthy units of value, so have words ceased to represent trustworthy units of meaning.

The result is "language inflation" or dishonest language — like monetary inflation and *dishonest money*.

### NOT DECEIVED

The Tory backbencher, Mr. Terry Dicks, criticised Mrs. Thatcher for turning a blind eye to inequalities and injustices in Zimbabwe on her visit to that country.

Mr. Dicks said he was "amazed" by the content of her speech in Harare, adding that the Prime Minister had failed to highlight the lack of freedom, justice and equality in Zimbabwe while calling for the same things in South Africa.

"There are thousands of political prisoners in Zimbabwe who will never see the light of day. Freedom exists only for Mugabe and his supporters, and there's no equality", he said.

### NAMIBIA: THE REALITY

"Supposedly robbed of its natural wealth by a century of colonial exploitation, Namibia seems to be doing rather well", writes Stephen Robinson in the *Sunday Telegraph*. He goes on:

\* When the South Africans finally disappear across the Orange River next year, they will leave behind them a formidable road and rail network, first-class hospitals in Windhoek, four-star hotels and good restaurants. They will also leave an international airport, which puts the rest of Africa to shame, and a direct-dial telephone network, which actually works.

The lobby groups at the United Nations have managed to convince the world that Namibia would be a rich country if the racist regime would stop sucking it dry. But the economy only limps along at all because Pretoria has thrown billions of pounds at the territory in the 70 years it has been ruled as a fifth province of South Africa. Namibia has been treated with absurd financial preference compared to the rest of the republic: rather as the British Government throws money at Northern Ireland as though it were a solution to intractable political problems. (Stephen Robinson, *end of quote*).

### "HEALING A DIVIDED NATION" by Rev. Cedric Jacobs, M.B.E.

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

This tremendous book by Aboriginal leader Cedric Jacobs carried an inspiring message for all Australians during the historic bi-Centennial year. Irrespective of their backgrounds, all Australians are urged to work together to build upon the best of the past for an even better future.

A book, which deserves the widest possible distribution.

Price \$6 posted from all League bookshops.

# ZIMBABWE TODAY — AND TOMORROW?

by Caroline Hicks.

**Mindful of the proliferation of the instant expert for whom three days in the rugged interior of a five star Hotel, in almost any Third World country, is the main qualification for Ministerial debate and ultimate government policy, one is encouraged to feel that three months in Zimbabwe may justify some unsolicited observation"**

Armed with invitations from friends and relatives and a determination to desist from voicing any personal view, political or otherwise, in a country where one is after all a guest, all neatly planned procedure is momentarily overthrown during those first truly exciting moments of arrival in Africa. Whether the relief of a safely completed flight to Harare or the enveloping warmth of climate matters little, the memory lingers on.

The elegant and beautifully maintained suburbs of Harare are mainly, but by no means exclusively, the domain of the decreasing numbers of Whites for whom the much maligned gin-and-tonic-by-the-pool way of life is some compensation for their years of loyalty to the country they knew as Rhodesia and some consolation for their now present position as financial prisoners under a system which not only prevents them leaving the country with realistic assets for the start of a new life elsewhere, but restricts annual holiday allowances to the equivalent of 140 pounds, for anyone leaving the borders of Zimbabwe. An increasingly prosperous African middle class is everywhere to be seen and home ownership and private enterprise are the order of the day. At this point the three-day expert departs, after the inevitable 'useful talks', accompanied by beaming Comrades confident of further financial assistance from Great Britain or indeed any other country willing to sanction loans without probing too closely its specific use.

## THE DEBT SLIDE

But the three-month visitor may just ponder: what of the African working class, whether urban or rural? Bearing in mind that due to the hard work, efficiency and good housekeeping of Prime Minister Ian Smith and the White population, Prime Minister Mugabe and his Government inherited a healthy economy and soundly run country without, one might add, one penny of help from Great Britain. A very different situation is now emerging and the legacy of prosperity is disappearing and the usual slide into debt, inefficiency and corruption is beginning to take its toll as it has in most other independent African countries. Ministers and officials are paid handsome salaries, plus expenses and, with a rapidity which would do credit to the Stock Exchange, have garnered portfolios of property and investment both in Zimbabwe and abroad of considerable wealth. One Minister, to his undoubted credit, rose from cook-boy to head of one of the largest and most important government departments, and is now a known millionaire with immense influence: 'good for him', we cry although on closer inspection his methods of self-improvement may leave much to be desired. Determined to add to his considerable existing wealth with the purchase of a White-owned estate about to be sold, he arranged a roadblock and re-routed the traffic during the time of the auction; not surprisingly this 'bijou' residence became his for a knockdown price!

Vast expenditure is allocated to such projects as a Sports Stadium at \$26 million (virtually unused except for Party Rallies) large new ZANU (PF) Headquarters and, most recently, a proposed 30% increase on the Rates to cover the cost of a new Civic Centre. Meanwhile the urban African waits anything up to 3 hours for a diminishing number of buses to take him home, knowing they may never reach him due to lack of spares, breakdown en route, burst tyres with no hope of replacement due to everlasting shortages, and almost any other vehicular shortcomings one cares to imagine. He suffers acutely from the rise in

the cost of living, and the increases in taxation, which make his already meagre income pitiful when faced with rising food bills, educational costs, the "extended family" of elderly parents not to mention years of repayment to his in-laws for the privilege of marrying their daughter.

## A SIEGE MENTALITY

Partly due to these conditions and partly due to the general breakdown of standards in most sections of society following the departure of the White population from positions of responsibility, robbery, with or without violence, has reached epidemic proportions. Security guards are commonplace on both private and commercial property and the average residence accepts a siege mentality after about 5.0 p.m. and becomes a veritable fortress. Distasteful as it may be to the liberally-minded, the facts are that most Africans will opt for White employers, especially on a domestic basis, rather than Africans, on the not unreasonable grounds that their own frequently exploit them whereas they will, in general, get a fair wage, decent working conditions and know exactly their terms of employment with a White employer. Many work in near idyllic surroundings and continuity of 20 to 30 years service in the same job with the same family is quite usual. They are also increasingly aware that the much-heralded benefits of the Socialist State are slow in reaching them. The innocuous request: "tell me about your family" directed at an African electrician prompted an articulate and well formulated outburst about the shortcomings of the Comrades who made such seductive promises in a bid for popularity and power, who have successfully disrupted the formal tribal traditions of pecking order and respect for seniority, and who are now powerless to provide remunerative employment in the urban areas to which they enticed the African working class. What a golden moment it would have been if British politicians had only been there to hear this electrician's entirely unprompted and surprising statement "we were better off under Ian Smith".

## A FRIENDLY PEOPLE

Zimbabwe is a beautiful country: varied, climatically ideal and, when properly managed, bountiful for all its population. Zimbabweans themselves are friendly, polite and possessed of a great sense of humour. They have a dignified approach to life and a care and love of their children, which should be a lesson to all of us. Much of the unpleasant side of Western life has passed them by and the general lack of bad language, loutish behaviors, spoilt children and litter are a continual source of pleasure to the visitor. It would be quite unjust to suggest that no positive steps are being made at government level for the good of the country but it seems largely a question of one step forward and two steps back. Britain's betrayal of Rhodesia at the time of UDI and sanctions is now a matter of history but the legacy of this act is the support of a Marxist regime, slipping more steeply into debt to international institutions and their inevitable stranglehold and domination of the countries beholden to them. And what price the African for whom 'world opinion' is supposed to be so concerned? And what price too for the remaining White population for whom 'world opinion' is quite definitely not concerned? Three months of travel in this country never once revealed any

act of 'discrimination', abuse, maltreatment or any other form of domination so glibly ascribed to the White population but they are naturally cynical that, if the situation deteriorates further, years of hard work and prosperity will be squandered to the detriment of both races.

### WHAT OF TOMORROW?

A relative recounted that during his final days of many years in the then Colonial Service he was present at a high-level conference to finalise details for independence in one of the northern African countries. During proceedings there was a knock at the door, which swung gently open to reveal an African woman with a large basket on her head. Quietly, and smiling disarmingly, she addressed the assembled company: "eggies Bwana?" How prophetic; there may be eggies today but what of tomorrow?

## IS OZONE DEPLETION ANOTHER HOAX?

No one doubts that the environment and its abuse is a serious matter. C.H. Douglas was one of the first to observe that built-in obsolescence and waste was one of the results of the perversion of the economic system in an attempt to make the debt system of finance operate. That system forces primary producers to tend to mine their soils instead of husbanding them. It is a system, which fosters waste of all kinds.

It is not without significance that many of the pioneers of the organic farming and gardening movement indicated an understanding of a finance-economic system, which forced primary producers to resort to short-term practices. Some like Lord Northbourne directly criticised debt finance. Some excellent material on the subject will be found in Father Denis Fahey's *Church and Farming*.

But in recent times the conservation movement has been taken over by totalitarians that have exploited growing concerns about environmental questions in order to advance collectivist programmes, the essence of which is more centralised control. A state of near-civil war has been created in some areas where well-meaning young idealists attempt to prevent timber workers from falling trees without addressing themselves to the problem of how are these timber workers and their families to survive if they are deprived of the financial incomes, which are obtained by their activities.

### IGNORED SOLUTION

Only Social Credit offers a realistic solution to the environmental controversy. With a very few exceptions the current leaders of the conservation movements reject that solution. They also leave themselves open to the charge of hypocrisy when they fail to deal with what many see as a pollution of the public water supplies by fluoridation. Even more disturbing is the fact that exaggerated allegations are made about some environmental problems. All the available evidence suggests, for example, that North Queensland's rainforests have been managed in a reasonably responsible manner. The hysterical type of campaign to persuade all Australians that the only way to prevent the complete destruction of these forests is to have them placed under the Heritage Commission, this conveniently enabling the Federal Government to breach the Federal Constitution.

Reflecting the current worldwide campaign which projects a horrendous picture of the world's ozone layer being so destroyed that the world's climate will be dramatically changed, Australia's minister for the Environment, Senator Richardson, suggests that this is one question on which the Australian people might readily vote increased powers to the Federal government

in order that it might impose the controls necessary to "solve" the problem of the ozone. At the same time there is a highly orchestrated campaign to persuade the peoples of the world that nothing less than international controls will be sufficient to prevent a global disaster.

### HOW MUCH TRUTH?

But how much truth is there in the claims being made about the ozone layer? Over a long period of time we have observed a number of sweeping claims suggesting that scientists are "unanimous" concerning certain questions. It has been asserted, and still is, that scientists — a term which itself can be most misleading — are all agreed that the fluoridation of public water supplies is an excellent "public health measure", dramatically reducing tooth decay, and that no one is at risk. This assertion is blatantly false. Those with the expertise to make a judgment are far from being in agreement. It is beyond question that there has been a steady reduction in tooth decay in European countries where fluoridation of public water supplies has been generally rejected.

Then there was the worldwide campaign, which sought to frighten people into believing that a major nuclear conflict would result in a "nuclear winter" and perhaps the complete destruction of all life on earth. Those propounding this view, which appears to have originated in the Soviet Union, were given worldwide publicity while a number of eminent scientists who disputed the "nuclear winter" scenario received no publicity. We claim no special expertise concerning the subject, but content ourselves with the comment that human life has managed to survive vast climatic changes, including the Ice Age. We have no doubt it will survive further changes.

Which brings us to the subject of the ozone question. We are not qualified to express an opinion on whether chlorofluorocarbons are having such a disastrous effect on the ozone layer that they should be banned immediately before Mankind is overwhelmed by the "greenhouse effect". But we are qualified to draw attention to the fact that many eminent scientists have completely disagreed with what some describe as a "hysterical" campaign fostered by the media. Hugh W. Ellsaesser, of the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in California, one of the world's leading climatologists, has made scathing comments on what he describes as "pseudo science" being pushed by radical environmentalists. Writing in the *Atmospheric Environment* magazine in 1982, he said, "I can only conclude that . . . during the SST controversy the scientists involved in it took upon themselves to act as a priesthood by suppressing information by which, the laity could be expected to arrive at conclusions different from those espoused by the priests."

### TREAT WITH SCEPTICISM

In 1985—86 banner press headlines told the world that a dangerous huge hole in the ozone had been discovered by scientists associated with the British Antarctic Expedition led by Robert Watson. This resulted in a conference being organised in Toronto, where 17 nations, led by the United States and Canada, decided that the "hole" was caused by DGCs, and that there should be a 50 percent ban. But the "ozone hole" over the Antarctic had first been discovered in 1956 by a man generally agreed to be one of the world's leading ozone layer researchers, Gordon Dobson. Dobson and his collaborators described the "ozone hole" as a fascinating natural anomaly. This fact has been generally suppressed. Dobson's discovery was made at a time when chlorofluorocarbons were not in general use!

Environmental issues are too serious to be manipulated by social scientists in an attempt to organise Mankind into the global collectivist State. We will be reporting further on the ozone hysteria, but in the meantime recommend that the worldwide campaign be treated with scepticism.

# THE CHILD CARE AND CAREER DILEMMAS

by Phyllis Schlafly in "The Phyllis Schlafly Report", Box 618, Alton., Illinois, 62002, USA.

A recent Australian press report said that as a result of high interest rates and the Hawke government's financial policies, tens of thousands of Australian mothers are seeking work outside the home. The following article draws attention to the disastrous effects of a policy of driving women out of the home and encouraging them to accept daycare for their children.

The extravagant publicity given to a very few scandalous cases of physical or sexual abuse of children in daycare centers has obscured the more important danger in store for the majority of children who are placed there. It is "daycaritis" or daycare disease, an ailment that can be any of the many contagious diseases, which infants and babies catch so easily from other children.

Historically, infants have been cared for in the home. They need this relative isolation from disease. They should not have to face the big, bad world of disease until their naturally immuno-deficient systems have had a chance to develop some immunity to infectious agents.

A baby in the home is subject to diseases brought home by an older sibling, but these diseases usually come one at a time, and a new infectious agent isn't attacking every day in the year, as is the case in a daycare center. I still shudder when I remember having five children, including one three-month-old infant, with chickenpox at the same time; but that trauma did finally pass, it was not a week in week out occurrence.

Dr. Reed Bell, a Pensacola pediatrician who spoke at a January 1989 child care conference held in Washington, says that "children in daycare, especially infants and toddlers, are at increased risk for acquiring and spreading infectious diseases, compared to children not in daycare." He says they have more respiratory, gastrointestinal, skin and epidemic childhood infections, and are at a higher risk for serious secondary infections such as meningitis, than are children in home care.

Dr. Bell says that children in daycare have infectious diseases more often, they are more severe, and they have more complications, than children in home care. Dr. Bell listed a whole catalogue of illnesses that are prevalent in daycare centers. Daycare children are especially at risk for secondary bacterial complications such as ear infections, sore throats, tonsillitis, laryngitis, and pneumonia, as well as for invasive blood-borne infections. He told how daycare settings are responsible for community outbreaks of hepatitis.

While more daycare centers do not admit sick children, and in many cases it is against the law to drop off a sick child at the daycare center, the unpredictability of children getting ill comes into conflict with the perceived need of the parent to report to her job.

The result is a practice known in the daycare industry as "masking". This means that the mother gives the child aspirin or Tylenol to mask the child's fever and other symptoms so that the unsuspecting caregivers at the center will not detect the illness of the child until the mother has put in several hours of work on the job and perhaps can get credit for a day's work before the fever returns to the child.

The *Pediatric Infectious Diseases Journal* last year reported "the data are now convincing that half of children younger than age 3 years who are cared for in group daycare with more than 50 children are likely to acquire CMV". CMV stands for the very common virus Cytomegalovirus, which the magazine article defines as "a complex and poorly understood chronic infection" that is easily passed from one to another by all body fluids, including saliva, urine, tears, semen, and cervical secretions.

The transmission of infection through body fluids is an ordinary daily fact of life in daycare centers, where babies are

wetting and soiling their diapers, putting hands and objects in their mouths, and sneezing and coughing. Scrupulously sanitary conditions have only a marginal effect in preventing the spread of viral infection.

CMV is not only a hazard to the babies, but even more so to the mothers who take the babies home at night. This poses a specific danger to pregnant women because CMV is known to invade the womb very easily and can cause deformities in the unborn baby during the first half of pregnancy.

The mothers of babies in daycare are usually women of childbearing age and frequently do get pregnant again. This same medical journal states that about 40 percent of mothers infected with CMV during pregnancy pass the virus to their fetus, and "between 10 and 20 percent of infected infants whose mothers acquired a primary infection in the first half of pregnancy develop significant sequelae" (an abnormal condition resulting from a previous disease).

These "sequelae," or abnormalities, in the unborn baby range from hearing loss to severe mental retardation. There is no way to guard against them because, as the journal says, we do not know how to prevent CMV transmission from the daycare child to his mother, and *in utero* diagnosis for CMV infection or disease is not available.

The medical journal concluded that "hundreds of thousands of women will acquire primary CMV infection as a result of group daycare," and therefore "it is important to understand the effect of group daycare on the transmission of CMV." Indeed it is but, funny thing, we don't read about this problem in any of the literature or television specials promoting universal daycare funded by the U.S. taxpayers.

## A CHILD'S PLACE IS IN THE HOME

More and more research is piling up to indicate that a young child's place is in the home and there is no adequate substitute for the bonding and attachment that take place between a child and his mother. A secure attachment in infancy provides the basis for self-reliance, self-regulation, and ultimately the capacity for independence combined with the ability to develop mature adult relationships.

"The primary goal of parenting should be to give a child a lifelong sense of security — a secure base from which he can explore the world, and to which he can return, knowing he will be welcomed, nourished, comforted and reassured," according to child psychologist John Bowlby of London's Tavistock Clinic. Bowlby is one of many psychologists who emphasize the importance of what is called the "attachment theory." The child's ability to establish intimate emotional bonds throughout life, as well as his mental health and effective functioning, depend on the strength and quality of his attachment to his parents, particularly his physical and emotional contact with his mother.

Research by Mary Ainsworth at the University of Virginia, Mary Main at the University of California, and Alan Stroufe at the University of Minnesota has consistently shown that the pattern of attachment developed in infancy and early childhood is profoundly influenced by the mother's ready availability, her sensitivity to her child's signals, and her responsiveness to his need for comfort and protection.

When a child is confident that his mother is available, responsive and helpful, he develops a pattern of secure attachment.

Extensive research shows how patterns of attachment that have been developed by 12 months of age are not only highly indicative of how the child will act in nursery school, but how he will act as an adolescent, as a young adult, and as a parent.

While the scientific and medical evidence shows the importance of a mother's consistent and ready availability, it does not show the need of a perfect mother. Pediatrician and psychoanalyst Donald Winnicott, who was as influential in England as Dr. Benjamin Spock was in America, showed that the conditions for secure attachment, are fulfilled with what he called "good-enough mothering" and "holding" the child.

Winnicott said that adequate "holding" of a baby is indispensable to emotional development and essential for developing the child's capacity for empathy. The child should experience his mother as a "good and happy" person, and should also know that his mother sees her infant as a "good and happy" person. Later, the child internalizes and draws on these images to comfort himself when the mother is not present. These same images are a reservoir from which the child can draw as he comforts others in his adult life.

Pennsylvania State University psychologist Jay Belsky (a former advocate of daycare) has concluded that recent research reveals that infant daycare is "a risk factor for the development of insecure infant-parent attachment, non-compliance and aggression." Fifty percent of the daycare children he studied developed insecure attachments to their mothers and a wide range of negative behaviours.

Of course all children's behaviour problems cannot be blamed on daycare. Belsky describes what he called the 'ecology' of daycare, by which he means the child's total environment including the mother's and father's emotional attitudes and skills, the family's socio-economic circumstances, and the behaviour of the mother upon reunion with the child.

Recent research by other scholars confirms that the greatest risks in non-maternal care come from the failure of the mother-infant attachment, which results from frequent and prolonged separations. Daycare infants are more likely to cry, more likely to be troublemakers, more likely to withdraw and be loners, more easily influenced by their peers, less cooperative with adults, and less likely to pursue tasks to completion. While it would be wrong to conclude that daycare harms all children, it clearly adds a significant level of extra distress and conflict to the all-important infant-mother-father relationship.

#### MOMMY TRACKS AND SEQUENTIAL CAREERS

An article in the *Harvard Business Review* of January-February 1989, written by a credentialed career woman, Felice Schwartz, argues that corporations should offer their management-level female executives a "Mommy track" instead of foolishly expecting them to perform like men with 100 percent commitment to their careers. This heretical proposal has upset the feminists like the little boy's assertion that the emperor has no clothes. Congresswoman Pat Schroeder denounced it as "tragic" and other feminist spokesmen are keeping their word processors hot by writing angry letters.

Ms. Schwartz comes from a feminist perspective. She admits that some women are "career primary" and says they should have every opportunity to rise to the top, in competition with men. But this decision, she points out, "requires that they remain single or at least childless or, if they do have children, that they be satisfied to have others raise them."

Ms. Schwartz argues that the majority of women are "career and family women" who could be induced to stay on the job if the company would offer part-time work, flexible hours, job-sharing, and a Mommy track with lower pay and reduced rates of advancement. She says, "Most career and family women are entirely willing to make that trade-off". She says this would be

smart business for corporations because it would enable them to keep talented mothers on the job and eventually realize their investment in them.

Meanwhile, *the American Medical News* has just published an article called "Medicine + Motherhood" featuring authentic accounts of women doctors who successfully and happily had "sequential careers." The article gave example after example of women who raised their children first and then went to medical school, or had their babies immediately after graduation or residency training, dropped out for 10 to 20 years, and then started a medical career.

No, they didn't earn as much money as some full-time career-primary doctors. But most sequential physicians earn more than \$50,000 and some more than \$70,000.

The article described the lifetime satisfaction enjoyed by these sequential women. They made comments such as, "I have had the best of both worlds of parenthood and a medical career . . . The time I spent with my wonderful daughters is worth every minute of the 10-year delay.... I would advise my daughters to have children early and pursue a professional career later."

Now that even the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post* have conceded that we are in the "post-feminist" era, it's time to shed some of feminism's silliness and bias against motherhood and recognize that, despite all the media propaganda and peer pressure on young women to become career-primary just like men, that's not what the majority of women want, especially if they are past 30.

Whether women want to be career-primary and childless, or mothers and then career women sequentially, or part-time mother/part-time careerist, is a personal choice. It's a choice that should be allowed by our laws and business practices, not be restricted by laws that require a mindless gender-neutrality.

Unfortunately, the federal Pregnancy Discrimination Act of 1978, and the proposals for federally-mandated parental leave and daycare for employed mothers, are incentives to push new mothers back into the workforce a few weeks after delivering a baby, where they rejoin the fast-track of competition against career-primary men and women. Mothers deserve other options, and a frank debate about the Mommy track could start making them available.

#### THE RIGHT TO WORK AT HOME

President George Bush works at home (as has every President since James Madison moved into the White House). No wonder he looks so relaxed, as did Ronald Reagan before him. Our Presidents don't have to cope with getting to and from work during rush hour, as do most Americans.

About 13 percent of currently employed Americans work at home, and we enjoy many advantages over those who travel daily to another workplace. We heave a sigh of relief every morning when we hear the helicopter traffic report about cars moving bumper-to-bumper at 20 miles an hour. We don't have to worry about auto accidents or street muggings on the way to and from a job. We don't need money to buy lunch or special clothes to wear on the job. If we have small children or disabled dependents, we do not have to hire special care-providers because we can tend to those duties simultaneously while working at home.

So what's the big deal? It's a free choice, isn't it — to take a job or work at home? Not exactly, because whether or not you have that choice depends on what kind of work you do, and the criteria are so silly that reasonable people can hardly believe them. I work at a word processor so nobody interferes with me — yet. But some women who do other kinds of work have discovered that Big Brother wants to stop them from working at home.

The homework issue is a women's issue because it disproportionately affects women. A much larger percentage of

women than men prefer to work at home for a variety of reasons: to combine paid work with care of preschool children or other dependents, a personal disability, to fit a more flexible schedule, to facilitate part-time work, lack of transportation, to continue as a one-car family, or because they live in rural or isolated areas.

Those who follow societal mega trends predict that the new technology mushrooming everywhere will be a great liberator that can make it possible for multi-millions of women to choose their own working conditions in the home rather than be tied to certain hours in an office or factory. Experts predict that as much as 20 percent of the workforce will be able to work in the home before the end of this century. This could be the answer to the employment problem of mothers of small children, almost half of who are now in the paid labor force.

The unions are upset about the prospect of millions of women working at home. Sol Chaiken of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union said, "If supporters of homework claim that it is necessary to enable mothers to keep their children safely supervised during the day, I would instead encourage them to put their energies to use in establishing a system of high quality, inexpensive day care centers." But that's exactly what these mothers have achieved when they work at home: high-quality, inexpensive care for their children, provided with loving constancy by their own mothers. They don't need to look elsewhere for what they already have.

The real reason Mr. Chaiken doesn't like homework is that the women are independent entrepreneurs who don't need unions. They can set their own hours, decide the quality of their own work environment, and work as much or as little as they please. They don't have to put up with bossy supervisors or disagreeable fellow-workers, and they don't have to pay transportation costs to get a job across town.

Bureau of Labor Statistics figures say that 18 million people do some work at home half of whom work at least eight hours per week in their homes. Three million of these are operating a home-based non-farm business, and 42 percent of these are women.

However, of those who work entirely at home, 71 percent are women. The number of women who work entirely at home is probably much higher than the reported 777,000 because so many are reluctant to admit they have home-based businesses for fear of running afoul of various restrictions.

The National Center for Policy Analysis of Dallas reports that legal barriers faced by home-workers are often complex, contradictory, arbitrary, and unclear; the cost of complying is excessive; the penalties for non-compliance are severe.

A survey made by the American Policy Association of Chicago found that 90 percent of 1,000 cities surveyed have some restrictions on home-based work. Restrictions range from requiring a special permit, to licensing or zoning regulations, to a requirement to appear before public hearings. The patchwork quilt of local restrictions on home-based work includes the following: 46 percent of the cities have restrictions on traffic, 42 percent have restrictions on outside signs, 33 percent have restrictions on on-street parking, 33 percent have restrictions on the employment of workers, 20 percent have restrictions on the amount of floor space used, 13 percent have restrictions on sales, and 11 percent have a prohibition on outside storage of materials.

Many of the restrictions were put on the law books years ago, when the purpose was to prevent the noise and dirt of manufacturing from infringing on the property rights of others in the neighbourhood. These restrictions have no relevance to the quiet and clean work, which people want to do in their homes in the Information and Computer Age.

Home-based work is a women's issue because 80 percent of employed women will have a baby, and most want flexibility

in their employment in order to meet the needs of their family. Women should have the option to do income-producing work in the home without the costs and harassment of outmoded laws written for a long-gone era.

### THE POLITICS OF DAYCARE

When President George Bush delivered his Budget Message to Congress on February 9, 1989 the conservative, pro-family approach to childcare came of age. With striking clarity, he said, "I support a new child care tax credit . . . without discriminating against mothers who stay at home."

The childcare tax credit is the plan that is fair to both employed mothers and homemaker mothers. As President Bush pointed out, the overwhelming majority of employed mothers used daycare by relatives and neighbors, churches and community groups, and families who choose these options should be just as eligible for tax-credit help as those who choose institutional care.

With his proposal, President Bush seized the initiative on the childcare issue and shot an arrow into the Achilles' heel of the coalition of interest groups, which has promoted federally financed and federally regulated daycare for the past year. There are four separate segments to this coalition, and each supports daycare for its own purposes.

The first leg in this four-legged coalition is the feminists. Their ideology has taught them for years that society's expectation that mothers take care of their own children is unfair, degrading, and oppressive to women. They think this is what makes women second-class citizens, makes wives a servant class, and impedes women's opportunity to participate full-time in the paid labor force and thereby achieve economic equality with men.

Feminist spokesmen and activists have taught young women to expect men to share equally in changing diapers and other child-tending duties. Since their rising expectations of changing human nature remain unfulfilled, the feminists argue that government must provide daycare for all children outside the home in order for women to have full equality with men in the workplace.

The notion of universal federal daycare did not originate with the feminists but with the so-called social engineers who used the 1970 White House Conference on Children to recommend "federally-supported public education be made available for children at age three."

That conference explained in its final report: "Daycare is a powerful institution. A daycare program that ministers to a child from six months to six years of age has over 8,000 hours to teach him values, fears, beliefs and behaviours." The federal legis-

---

### UTOPIANS SERVE WORLD PLOTTERS

"A Utopia is a comprehensive order, and it is significant that the *devisers* of imposed Utopias are invariably those people, organisations and races who manage their own affairs worst.

"Notice particularly the use of the word *devisers*. Observation of political affairs, and some experience of life, has convinced me that the real Plotters, while having the clearest possible conception of their own objective, rely in the main on the devisers of Utopias to provide them with a ready-made popular propaganda. Then, by control of the Press, Broadcasting, Political and commercial patronage and other mechanisms of social and economic power which can be summarised under the control of credit, the widest publicity and assistance is given to the particular Utopia which lends colour to the concentration of power (such as 'Abolition of private Property', 'The Classless State', 'Liberty, Equality, Fraternity'), and the Utopianists and their dupes wake up to 'The Dictatorship *over* the Proletariat' - the Slave State."

— C.H. Douglas, in *The Big Idea*.

lative proposal designed to implement that report was the 1971 Comprehensive Child Development bill sponsored by Senator Walter Mondale (D—MN) and Rep. John Brademas (D—IN), which called for a \$2 billion network of federal daycare institutions.

That bill passed Congress but was vetoed by President Richard Nixon, who called it a "radical piece of legislation" and "a long leap into the dark." He said it would "lead toward altering the family relationship."

The chief ideologue of these child developmentalists is Edward F. Zigler of Yale University who testified on February 9 in behalf of a new bill sponsored by Rep. Augustus Hawkins (D—CA), which is really a reincarnation of the old discredited Mondale-Brademas bill. Zigler urged spending tens of billions of dollars a year to establish a federal network of daycare for all children headquartered in the public schools.

Zigler called for a "comprehensive school-based child care" network as an integrated system that would be "part of the very structure of society." He eagerly looks forward to the day when America will have 26 million children in some type of paid daycare.

The third component of the new daycare coalition is the liberal Democrats, who have been following a campaign strategy laid out during their retreat at the Greenbrier resort in White Sulphur Springs, West Virginia, in January 1988. Their game plan is to use "kids and politics" to try to reclaim the family issues that the liberals lost to the Republicans during the Reagan years. They think they can do that by taking over the baby-sitting of preschool children.

The fourth factor in the new daycare coalition is the social service professionals. This is the vast army of tax-salaried people who would like to expand their ranks, their pay, and their turf by taking over more social problems that require more care and more counselling, more staff and more funds.

This formidable, four-pronged coalition is loudly demanding a gigantic federal baby-sitting bureaucracy and apparatus. But it is unlikely that the liberals will be able to sell their risky and high-priced product because the American people don't want the feds to take over the raising of our children.

---

## SILENCING CRITICS WITH THE WORD 'ANTI-SEMITE'

By AL BENSON, JR., in *The National Educator*, (U.S.A.) January 1989.

How many people have cringed in fear over the years, physical, emotional, or professional fear, lest that dreaded epithet "anti-Semite" be hurled at them? Many have discovered truth in some critical area of our society, yet they have a mortal fear of expressing that truth to anyone, lest the label of "anti-Semite" be pinned upon them? Some well-known conservative organizations have decided not to touch the question of political Zionism, but rather to act as if such did not exist, lest they be labelled with that dreaded scare-word and lose their respectability. Thus, while in some areas these organizations present notable truths, in other areas their silence speaks volumes.

The Zionists have ever been experts at playing mind games. Read *"The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion"* sometime for a real eye-opener in the mind and word game area. One term they have used with chilling efficiency is "anti-Semite".

As long as this term has been so bandied about in the area of free expression, let's take a look at it. What does it really mean? Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary defines the word Semite thusly — "From Hebrew Shem. A member of any of the peoples descended from Shem." It continues: "A member of any group of peoples in southwestern Asia, chiefly represented now by Jews and Arabs but in ancient times also by the Babylonians, Assyrians, Aramaeans, Canaanites and Phoenicians." Note that according to this definition Arabs are also Semites. Could we then make so bold as to ask the question — is being anti-Arab today then also being anti-Semitic? If we answer in the affirmative, then we must conclude that Zionists, both political and religious, even Christian Zionists, are anti-Semitic.

Among those who profess the religion of Judaism today, can all trace their lineage back to the twelve tribes? Suppose, for the sake of argument that a family in Eastern Europe converted to the religion of Judaism in the 7th century A.D. and their descendants have ever since held to that religious profession? Does such a situation automatically make this particular family a family of Semites? Hardly! If not, then are you being truly anti-Semitic if, for some reason, you find it necessary to disagree with or oppose what this family does?

In New Testament times, the adherents of religious Judaism were nearly all Hebrews, and therefore of Semitic origin. This is not necessarily so today. The Chalcedon Report for

November of 1988 deals somewhat with the charges of anti-Semitism now being hurled at the New Testament by some Zionist radicals. The Report mentions, in passing, that, in time, most European Jews were of European stock — and hence, not Semites.

Over the years I've heard many people argue in favor of the Khazar theory. Books have been written to prove that the Khazars converted to Judaism en masse in the 7th century and are thus not Semites, but are racially different. Others have labelled this theory as "Khazar-mania". Whether this is really true or not misses the point. If it is true, then supposedly the Khazar Jews are to blame for the world situation, not the truly Semitic Jews. So if the Khazar Jews are on the hook, the truly Semitic Jews are off it.

On the other hand, Jesus roundly condemned the Pharisees (Matthew 23) and their followers (John 8) in His earthly ministry, and folks, let's face it, the Pharisees and company were not Khazars! So does this make Jesus and the New Testament writers anti-Semites? Not on your life! Jesus condemned the self-righteous Pharisees, steeped in the traditions of the Talmud, but He accepted the humble Jews who, by faith in Him, became part of His kingdom, His spiritual Israel. And the New Testament treated the Gentiles the same way. They had to repent and accept Christ as Saviour to become part of spiritual Israel just as the Jews did. Jesus took on the Pharisees because of their Talmudic leanings, not because they were Jews.

So, if today large numbers of the present devotees of religious Judaism cannot, in fact, trace their ancestry back to the twelve tribes, then how do they come to be considered Semites when they clearly are not? Interesting question!

But what is really at stake here is not blatant anti-Semitism, but knowledgeable anti-Zionism.

The term anti-Semite has been used most effectively as a scare tactic to silence all opposition to the aims of Zionism, and it has also been used to silence much opposition to Communism, as evidence can be shown to prove.

In closing, let me put forth one thought — sure to provoke serious consideration — that today's non-Semitic Zionists who attack Semitic Arabs and steal their land are the 20th century's true anti-Semites!