

THE NEW TIMES

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

VOL. 53, No. 9.

Registered by Australia Post-Publication No. VBH 1001.

SEPTEMBER 1989.

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

IS THE A + B THEOREM STILL RELEVANT?

by Eric D. Butler.

Social Credit has passed through a number of phases since C.H. Douglas first discovered that there was a basic flaw in the generally accepted finance-economic costing system, and offered a precise solution to reflect reality. As admitted by Douglas, he initially felt, as an engineer, that once he brought his discovery to the attention of those who might be expected to grasp its far-reaching significance they would take corrective action. Douglas did not take long to discover that he was not dealing with a technical question, but with something more important, that of philosophy. There were those who understood that while the defect in the finance-economic system remained, this ensured that those with the monopoly of credit creation were assured of a process of increasing centralisation of power. What Douglas was challenging was the age-old will-to-power, sheltering behind the worship of abstractionism.

Anyone who has read Douglas's first two major works, *Economic Democracy*, followed by *Social Credit*, knows that so far from Douglas being a "monetary reformer", he was only concerned with finance as a mechanism being used to prevent the individual from being in the position where, in free association with his fellows, he could gain ready access to a heritage built up over many generations, and dramatically increased as a result of the first Industrial Revolution. During the early phase of Social Credit there was intense debate concerning Douglas's assertion that under generally accepted financial rules industry was generating prices at a faster rate than it was distributing incomes. There were a number of proofs of the disclosure made by Douglas, one of these being that in order to sustain the economic system, a progressive expansion of financial debt was essential.

Eventually Douglas provided a mathematical proof of the deficiency of purchasing power in what is known as the A + B Theorem, which is outlined by Douglas in *The Monopoly of Credit*. There was keen debate about the theorem with what Douglas admitted was some high quality criticism. But this criticism, along with unfolding events, merely confirmed the correctness of what Douglas said. When it was first formulated, a number of Melbourne Social Crediters, most of them professional men, had the Douglas Theorem submitted to several mathematicians at the Melbourne University, who confirmed its correctness. In more recent times it has again been submitted to leading mathematicians who have also vouched for its validity, while it has also been confirmed with the use of computers.

FABIANS DISLIKED PURPOSE

Numbered among those with the ability to grasp the financial aspects of Social Credit were two of the founders of the Fabian movement, Sidney and Beatrice Webb. Douglas has related how after discussing the financial aspects with the Webbs, and successfully answering all objections, the two Fabians came to the basic issue, which was not the technicality of finance, but that they objected to the purpose of the Douglas proposals. They quickly saw that a financial policy which guaranteed the individual genuine freedom and independence, would make it im-

possible to subject the individual to the type of planning promoted by the Fabians.

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.

Having convinced himself, with the aid of the critics, that his analysis of the finance-economic system was completely correct, with further dramatic confirmation being provided by the start of the Great Depression, during which support for Social Credit quickly became worldwide, Douglas then moved to the next phase of his work. It was clear that the overwhelming majority of people, with the best will in the world, were not basically interested in, nor could they be expected to understand the technicalities of finance. But they could grasp, when pointed out to them, that there were no physical problems concerning adequate production to sustain a reasonable standard of living for all, that the only problem was lack of money, purchasing power.

Douglas then directed his attention to the political problem, outlining a strategy for uniting electors to demand results from their elected representatives. The basic question was how to make use of political democracy in order to make economic democracy a reality. But Douglas found that many found his concepts of political democracy as difficult to grasp as his concepts of economic democracy. Social Credit sheds a blinding light on most human problems because of a completely different way of looking at things. It was Francis Bacon, often described as the father of modern science, who enunciated a different, and more realistic, way of looking at problems. Douglas stressed the vital importance of the Baconian inductive approach to economics. The distinguished Jewish but anti-Zionist philosopher, Dr. Oscar Levy, is remembered for his statement that the ideal is the enemy of the real. Numbered among many of the profound statements made by Douglas, is that which works best is moral; it partakes of Truth. The rules of the universe transcend human thinking, said Douglas, and if the aim of man is maximum satisfaction then he should not idealise, but attempt to discover what works best, and be governed by reality.

A NEW WAY OF LOOKING AT ECONOMICS

A.R. Orage, the literary figure who "found" Douglas, has recalled that it took him a full twelve months of hard thinking to come to grips with Douglas. Douglas offered a completely new way of looking at economics, finance and politics. The true purpose of production was consumption, and the true cost of production was consumption, said Douglas. These and other statements had the same shattering effect on conventional thinking, as did the new concepts brought by Christ.

It is true that the "learned" leaders of the Pharisees were

upset by the thought that their power over the individual could be destroyed in the same way that there are those today who reject Douglas's proposals because these would deprive them of power over their fellows. But it is also true that there are those whose conceptual patterns are so set that the breaking of them would require a traumatic mental revolution. Douglas expressed the view that the major hope of salvation for mankind was the demesmerising effect of events, although he also feared that such an effect would be too much for some people.

Paradoxical though it may appear, the state of the world offers the only hope for regeneration. Disintegration of all kinds is the result of violating absolute truths. These truths remain eternal, ready to serve Man. "The truth shall make you free." Which brings us back to A + B. Every major problem afflicting Mankind today stems from an attempt to overcome the deficiency of purchasing power mathematically demonstrated by Douglas's theorem. The overdriving of the productive system, the appalling waste of natural resources, the hideous monstrosities of the Big cities, the mad "export drives", the frantic efforts to solve problems by making them even bigger, can in essence be summarised as an attempt to solve Man's problems by reducing Man to little more than a zombie; by the abolition of Man himself.

A DISCOVERY TO CHANGE HISTORY

It is not in the nature of reality that more than a relative few will attempt to understand the A + B Theorem. But the events resulting from the attempt to pervert the true nature of the production system may result in sufficient numbers grasping that the policies being imposed upon them are leading to even greater disaster, that such disaster is unnecessary, and that they can associate with their fellows to bring their political institutions under control, and through those institutions insist upon economic and financial policies of sanity.

This does not mean that those with the ability and the inclination should not study and master the technical aspects of Social Credit. Such knowledge must be available when electoral pressure demands the implementation of policies diametrically opposed to those being imposed today. Douglas's discovery of the deficiency of purchasing power, formally demonstrated by the A + B theorem, will one day be remembered as one of the most important discoveries in the history of mankind. Correct action based upon that discovery is the only hope of regenerating Civilisation.

MULTI-CULTURAL" AUSTRALIA

The ideologues determined to impose their multicultural dogma on the Australian people are even prepared to misuse statistics. Fabian Bob Hawke suggests that special legislation may have to be passed to reflect the alleged widespread ethnic diversity in Australia.

In spite of the fact that the 1986 Census shows that 74.6% of Australians are of Anglo-Celtic background, the much-publicised National Agenda for a Multicultural Australia distorts this, claiming that "less than half the population is of pure Anglo-Celtic origin". The National Agenda apparently sees nothing contradictory about its statement that "about one quarter of Australians have no Anglo-Celtic background" which means that 75% do have such a background!

The basic and dominant culture of Australia, which includes not only that rich and descriptive language which the great Shakespeare spoke, but a priceless Common Law system of justice and limited constitutional government, was developed by the Anglo-Celtic people. That culture, one feature of which has been toleration, possesses within itself the seeds for further growth and development.

In the past large numbers of distinguished people of non-

Anglo-Celtic background have eulogised what the Anglo-Celtic culture offered the world with many making distinguished contributions to that culture.

Numbered among the non-Anglo-Celtic masters of the English language were the Polish writer Joseph Conrad and the Chinese philosopher-writer Lin Yutang. Numerous other examples could be given.

No one who has attended a Robbie Burns night will dispute that Australians of Scottish background attempt to keep alive the memory of the man they regard as Scotland's national poet. The Irish contribution to English literature has been out of all proportion to the size of the Irish population. The Irish Edmund Burke is compulsory reading for those wishing to understand the development of British Constitutional history.

But there is little evidence to suggest that there is a Scottish or Irish ethnic vote in Australia. The original strong Irish vote for the Labor Party, which originally could claim to be anti-Communist, was primarily based on economics.

While it is right and natural that people of all backgrounds should seek and remember, if they so desire, their roots, it would be a tragedy for a young nation with such promise to be frag-

mented with an official promotion of non-Anglo-Celtic ethnic differences, fragmenting the dominant culture of the overwhelming majority of the people and denying the minority the opportunity to make its contribution to the further development of that culture.

Unity in diversity can only be developed inside a dominant culture and the institutions of that culture. This fundamental truth was ignored by those who dominated the Versailles Peace

Treaty at the conclusion of World War I, who set about creating artificial nations in which minorities were a source of constant unrest. Hitler had little difficulty exploiting the Sudeten German minority in Czechoslovakia.

Australia still has the opportunity of learning from the bitter lessons of history. Multiculturalism must be firmly rejected.

FINANCING THE CYCLE OF LIFE

by Edward Rock

Any discussion on finance, which does not establish the servant role of money, i.e., serving each and every individual, misses the point. Either money is subservient to economic democracy or it is not. If it is not then it is an instrument of control over the individual and the whole debt, taxation, inflation scenario can be justified as a means of exercising rewards and punishment by the oligarchic power administering the financial instrument.

The Christian view is that society is an organism, a pulsating, growing, and dying life force incorporating principles, which have as their main purpose under God of maintaining life over death. The life force is paramount to the Christian. "Let the dead bury their dead." The Christian has nothing to do with death but everything to do with life. Christ overcame death in order that we "may have life in greater abundance."

However, the whole wheel of life cycle, which is an integral part of God's creation, involves living and dying. A seed is planted, but until it germinates it is for all intents and purposes, dead. It does not live to that point because it produces nothing. It germinates and a plant grows, reaches maturity, produces fruit, then gradually dies, falls into the ground and provides organic substance for new life to germinate. That is how God manages creation, and with man's help, using his God-given gifts of intelligence, work etc., abundance of life is released. That is how the finance-economic system should work. There should be a continuous creation and cancellation of money to exactly parallel the life (economic) process. The whole production-consumption-finance process should duplicate the wheel of life process if man is to emulate God. "Be ye perfect as your Father in heaven is perfect."

Therefore while production is in existence, whether long-term capital production, buildings, plant machinery, etc., or short-term production, food, clothing, etc., the life cycle of that production should be represented by its equivalent in financial terms. When the production dies, is consumed, that finance should be cancelled.

Douglas came to this understanding when he discovered the basic flaw in finance economics, the deficiency

of purchasing power as proven in the A + B Theorem. In effect what he discovered was there is no sustaining life force maintained in the life cycle of production, *which is compatible with the production-consumption process as it affects each individual*. His proposal that the deficiency be measured and calculated exactly, and then distributed to each individual in a given geographic-national-social context would correct that deficiency and enable the wheel of life cycle in the production-consumption process to operate to perfection.

These are the principles, which are beyond dispute in the Christian-Social-Economic-Finance context. The technical details are something else again, but present no greater difficulty to the technician than the difficulties encountered in any form of higher calculus. Certainly no more difficult than that encountered by the totalisator at any racecourse capable of working out the exact dividends payable as a result of the information fed to it.

The great problem is the moral problem of "doing unto others as you would have them do unto you." Political democracy is one thing, quite acceptable, everyone should have the vote, no strings attached, wonderful stuff, a great reform. But economic democracy? Financial democracy? With everyone entitled to a financial vote payable as part of the cycle of life generated in the production-consumption process? That is something entirely different. It means that sinners should be treated the same as saints and we cannot have that. Sinners have to be punished, and who better to punish them than we who know better. Especially those of us who are authorities on doctrine and scripture.

It would be impossible to implement the dividend principle (just another extension of free enterprise and the company dividend) without challenging the debt system so fundamental to the present method of creating credit. To challenge the debt system would involve redefining the role of money as a symbol whose only function was to represent reality. That would involve tearing it down from its pedestal as a false god invested with the means of controlling society.

RE-WRITING HISTORY

To many people, history is what has been written down. But it is always dangerous to rely on written history to relate what allegedly happened in the past. In many cases, what has been written down only reflects the views of the writer. Or it can be completely distorted. Written history in the Soviet Union has recently been changed. It is now formally admitted that there was a secret pact between Hitler and Stalin on the eve of the Second World War. It had previously been denied that such a secret agreement had been reached, the documents confirming the pact, held by the West German government, being denounced as fakes.

The Soviet admission came ten days ahead of the anniversary of the signing of the Soviet-German Pact on August 23, 1939. This pact was the signal for the start of World War 2, Stalin's view being that such a war must end with the Soviet the main victor. Events proved Stalin correct, but only because his agents throughout the Western world were responsible for treachery at the highest levels.

The correction of the Soviet version of history comes as part of the Gorbachev strategy to expose the follies or worse of his predecessors, particularly Stalin. A Soviet commission set up to examine the Hitler-Stalin Pact comes to the conclusion that it demonstrated the "imperialistic" nature of Stalin's foreign

policy. Today's Soviet leaders dismiss the view that signing the pact gave the Soviet a breathing space to prepare for the German invasion 22 months later, stating that it served to lull the Soviet leadership into a false sense of security.

Much of written history only serves to mask real history, which Douglas described as crystallised politics, policies pursued over a period of time. The examination of events as a series of disconnected episodes, fails to reveal such policies. The episodic view of history presents the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbour as a completely treacherous and unprovoked attack on the USA. But like the Soviet peoples, the Americans and other peoples have been denied access to the truth that the Roosevelt Administration deliberately manoeuvred, first to topple the pro-Western Japanese

government headed by Prince Konoye, and then to provoke Japan into action as the only possible means of bringing the USA into the world conflict.

Those responsible for this programme had a long-term objective, one of which was to break up the old British Empire and to co-operate with the Soviet Union to work towards the establishment of a World State. The establishment of the United Nations was a major step towards this objective.

How many people are familiar with the secret history of the establishment of the United Nations? The plight of the world today is the result of the type of history, which often is suppressed.

CONGRESSMAN PAUL FINDLEY'S BOOK OF REVELATIONS

The following review of a U.S.A. Congressman's exposure of Zionist influence on American politicians appeared in the April 1986 issue of the U.S. journal "Instauration".

Admiral Thomas Moorer was chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff at the time of the 1973 Arab-Israeli war. Mordecai Gur, later commander-in-chief of Israeli forces, was then the defense attaché at the Israeli embassy in Washington. Gur came to Moorer demanding that the U.S. provide Israel with aircraft equipped with an advanced air-to-surface anti-tank missile called the Maverick. But the U.S. itself had only one squadron so equipped, so Moorer told Gur:

I can't let you have those aircraft. We have just one squadron. Besides, we've been testifying before the Congress convincing them we need this equipment. If we gave you our only squadron Congress would raise hell with us.

Gur responded, "You get us the airplanes; I'll take care of Congress."

Moorer was strongly opposed to the Maverick transfer, but was duly overruled by Congress, and by a President Nixon whose Watergate woes made him even more ingratiating than usual toward the Israel Lobby. America's only squadron equipped with Mavericks went to Israel.

Gur's line, "I'll take care of the Congress," will be vaguely recalled by a few close observers of the Washington scene, but only readers of *They Dare to Speak Out*, former Illinois congressman Paul Findley's brilliant survey of the Zionist Lobby and its foes, know how Admiral Moorer came to feel about this episode and similar manifestations of Israeli might:

I've never seen a President - I don't care who he is - stand up to them (the Israelis). It just boggles your mind ____

They always get what they want. The Israelis know what is going on all the time. I got to the point where I wasn't writing anything down....

If the American people understood what a grip those people have got on our government, they would rise up in arms. Our citizens don't have any idea what goes on.

Strong words indeed from a chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff! Americans "would rise up in arms" if they had even a clue as to "what goes on."

Now, at last, a few Americans do. Findley's stunning expose actually reached the No. 8 spot on the *Washington Post's* nonfiction bestsellers list. This was all the more remarkable because many bookstores made it almost impossible to obtain, forcing Findley to hand-deliver boxes of books to various places and to establish a toll-free 800 telephone number for orders.

In an effort at "damage control," the editors of the *Washington Post's Book World* called in Peter Grose, partisan author of *Israel in the Mind of America* and managing editor of *Foreign Affairs*, to write one of the most misleading reviews ever to (dis) grace its pages.

To most people it is news when a chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff practically calls for populist revolution, and when

scores of other leaders speak in a similar vein. But Peter Grose feels that the folks in Peoria already know the score:

Anyone familiar with the American political process is likely to greet this message with an only slightly suppressed yawn.

Mr. Findley has not discovered anything new in his investigations.... Why should people like Mr. Findley consider it an act of great personal courage to assert the strength of Israeli influence, a fact of public life that is already well known and assimilated?

Is it "well known and assimilated" that the President and other American leaders are being virtually held hostage in their offices in Washington, their every word and gesture monitored by a tightly knit army of Jewish dual loyalists? Is the average American aware that whenever more than three or four high officials gather anywhere in the State and Defense Departments, or at the White House, all of those present *assume* that every word spoken will be relayed to the international Israeli network by someone in their midst? — or that nearly the same level of well-placed paranoia pervades many congressional offices and most American embassies in the Middle East? — or that U.S. officials now recognise that the "top secret" classification is worth less when it comes to America's Middle Eastern affairs?

Findley's fifth chapter, dealing with Jewish-Israeli infiltration at the Departments of State and Defense, is the most shocking one in the book. But Zionist subversion and intimidation in the Oval Office, on Capitol Hill, and in academia, the churches and the media are also well covered. Nor is the sickening cover-up of the Israeli assault on the *U.S.S. Liberty* neglected.

Findley might well have titled his work, *The Book of Revelations*.

AMERICANS GREAT AND SMALL "LEARN THE ROPES"

A few days before he was elected President in 1960, John F. Kennedy stopped at an old friend's house in Washington. Charles Bartlett, a journalist, had introduced Kennedy to his future bride, Jacqueline Bouvier. Now the candidate needed to confide in someone he could trust that American politics was not like he had imagined.

A small group of rich New York Jews had just asked Kennedy over to dinner at the apartment of Abraham Feinberg, chairman of the American Bank and Trust Company. It had been an "amazing experience", he told Bartlett. One of those present, speaking for the group, offered "to help and help significantly" with Kennedy's campaign debt if, as President, he "would allow them to set the

course of Middle Eastern policy over the next four years." Kennedy told his friend that he reacted inwardly as a common American citizen, feeling "insulted" by the offer.

As late as 1984, Findley notes, this same Abe Feinberg was bringing the leading Democratic contenders, Walter Mondale, and Gary Hart, together for "private discussions" at his apartment.

Bartlett recalls relating the Kennedy episode to Roger L. Stevens, head of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts in Washington. Stevens responded, "That's very interesting, because exactly the same thing happened to Adlai (Democratic presidential candidate Adlai Stevenson) in Los Angeles in 1956."

Findley cites the non-Jewish strategist who told Stephen D. Isaacs, author of *Jews and American Politics*, "You can't hope to go anywhere in national politics, if you're a Democrat, without Jewish money." When Hubert Humphrey ran for President in 1968, 15 of the 21 who loaned him \$100,000 or more were Jews. Findley relates how, in 1978, when the issue of F-15 fighter sales to Saudi Arabia was before the Senate, a Jewish group persuaded Senator Wendell Anderson of Minnesota to change his vote by showing him that 70% of the previous year's contributions to the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee had come from Jews.

In 1985, the 75 or so Jewish political action committees swung a very large portion of their donations (or "bribe money," as former Senator S.I. Hayakawa would call it) to Republican candidates, for the first time. Formerly, perhaps one-fourth of all national Republican money came from Jews; henceforth, it may well be half. Whether there will be a corresponding loosening of the Jewish grip on the Democrats remains to be seen.

Another Findley revelation which should bring more than "yawns" concerns Richard Helms, director of the CIA during the 1967 Arab-Israeli war. Helms is on record as saying that during this critical period no important American secrets were kept from Israel.

Atlanta Mayor Andrew Young, who served as U.S. ambassador to the United Nations under Jimmy Carter, recalls, "I operated on the assumption that the Israelis would learn just about everything instantly. I just always assumed that everything was monitored, and that there was a pretty formal network." When, in 1979, Young met privately with Zuhdi Terzi, the PLO's U.N. observer, he must have known that it would lead to his firing — which it did.

Former South Carolina Governor John C. West was the American ambassador to Saudi Arabia at the same time, and told Findley the same story:

I would never put anything in any cable that was critical of Israel. Still, because of the (Zionist) grapevine, there was never any secret from the government of Israel. The Israelis knew everything, usually by the time it got to Washington. I can say that without qualification.

Many American officials are sickened by the hemorrhaging of our technological and other secrets to Israel yet are unable to do anything about it. George Ball, who served as deputy undersecretary of state to two Presidents and as ambassador to the U.N. under one — a man who surely would have been secretary of state had he not stood up to the Zionists — told Findley that the Israel Lobby's single greatest instrument of power is the charge of "anti-Semitism". And, he added, the fear, which nearly every public official has of that label, derives from guilt nearly as much as shame. Not only does the "anti-Semite" stand disgraced before the world, but, unless he has done a great deal of independent reading and thinking, he may feel besmirched in his own eyes — which is sometimes the harder cross to bear. This is where the constant Holocaust propaganda pays off, a factor to which Findley devotes insufficient attention.

NEWTIMES - SEPTEMBER 1989

Though big names like JFK, Richard Helms, Andrew Young, John C. West and George Ball make for memorable and newsworthy quotes, most of Findley's book describes the deep traumas suffered by hundreds of ordinary people as they confronted, alone or almost alone, the organized might of Zionism.

The case of Mazher Hameed is all too typical. A native of Saudi Arabia, Hameed was once a highly respected and genuinely liked specialist on international security affairs employed by Georgetown University. Then in 1981, he was asked to prepare, for publication in the fall, a study of the special security needs of Saudi oil fields. About that time, however, the battle over the sale of AWACS intelligence-gathering aircraft to Saudi Arabia began to rage in the Senate (and the media). Everything possible was done to sabotage Hameed's study defending the Saudi's needs, and, further, to end Hameed's position and ruin his reputation.

Georgetown University has often had to confront the Israel Lobby, and insiders there know when a sacrificial lamb is required to save the institution's hide. Bit by bit, Hameed saw his world fall apart. Even when he personally enlisted the aid of some of Georgetown's largest corporate donors, the fatal trend could not be reversed. After Hameed's job had been terminated, the Zionist operatives on campus gave the knife one final twist.

On March 5 (1982) ... Hameed arrived at his office to find that it had been burgled during the night. Someone had managed to penetrate three locked doors and had then pried open the file cabinet next to Hameed's desk. The burglar had first to enter the office building, which was equipped with an electronic surveillance system using card readers. Then he had to enter the locked door to the office suite and finally the locked door to Hameed's office. There were no signs of forced entry. But the file cabinet was bent and the drawer had been wrenched open. Adds (an assistant): "This bore no signs of a common burglary. There were other valuable things that were not taken." In fact, nothing was taken at all. "It was such a lousy job, so obvious," says (another assistant), "that we concluded it was there to scare us."

The next day Hameed found that the post office box he used for some of his correspondence had been broken open. A few days later, the mailbox at his home was broken open. "Other weird things started to happen as well," recalls Hameed. "For example, I'd leave for the weekend and come back to find things in my house that didn't belong there.... like contact lenses."

Though the reader may feel he almost knows Hameed by this point, he is wholly unprepared for what Findley springs on him next:

Those incidents were particularly frightening to Hameed - and the contact lens prank needlessly cruel - because he is blind.

By the end of March, Hameed had left Georgetown in "disgrace". Many old "friends" would hardly speak to him. Yet the lamb's sacrifice had saved the "Arabist" community there. *The New Republic*, which for months had promised its voracious readers an expose of "petrodollar influence" at American foreign policy think tanks, abruptly called off the sharks, to honor its end of an implicit bargain which had seen Hameed and his project ruined.

THE LOWDOWN IS REALLY LOW

Here, in capsule form, are a few more of the many revelations, which *They Dare to Speak Out* has placed firmly on the national record. (In his review, Peter Grose warns librarians "(Findley's) book cannot be used as a reference source" because it conveys its anti-Zionist findings "with lip-smacking gusto" while pro-Zionist material is "given, at best, cursory treatment." By this standard, no book on the Third Reich ever published in New York can be "used as a reference source.")

* Don Bergus, the former U.S. ambassador to the Sudan and a retired career diplomat, recalls, "At the State Department we used to predict that if Israel's prime minister should announce that the world is flat, within 24 hours Congress would pass a resolution congratulating him on the discovery."

* On October 3, 1984, the issue of duty-free imports

from Israel came before the House of Representatives, with both the AFL—CIO and the American Farm Bureau Federation vehemently opposed. Six congressmen supported the powerful farm and labor lobbies; 416 sided with Israel.

* Dissenting Jews have no more leverage with Congress than the rest of us. When, in June 1983, a delegation of 18 rabbis visited Capitol Hill to argue for an even-handed approach to the Middle East, they were almost ignored. Philip Klutznick, a legend in Jewish circles, who once headed the B'nai B'rith and many other Jewish organisations, became "virtually a non-person" in the community when he began speaking up for Palestinian rights. Today, some Jews call him "an enemy." As Findley explains, unless a Jew can obtain a Zionist establishment forum, he is almost powerless.

* Two prominent Illinois politicians, Adlai E. Stevenson III and Charles Percy, recently had their careers terminated by organised Jewry because they would not toe the Zionist line 100% of the time. As Findley demonstrates, both *did* support Israel 99% of the time, but vicious smear campaigns made them out to be practically anti-Semites. (Findley himself, when the Jews defeated him, had for 22 years in Congress "voted consistently for (massive) aid to Israel," and was sometimes, "highly critical of Egypt and other Arab states.")

* Secretary of State John Foster Dulles helped Dwight Eisenhower to be the one American President who ever — on rare occasions — stood up to Israel. Yet Dulles caught the drift of national affairs: "It's impossible to hold the line because we get no support from the Protestant elements in the country. All we get is a battering from the Jews.

* Israel often seems to have a better knowledge of American defense inventories than does the Pentagon. Les Janka, a former deputy assistant secretary of defense, says he cannot recall a *single* instance in which the Israelis did not ultimately get the "top secret" weapons they wanted.

* When the U.S. and Israel exchange military personnel, the benefits are one way. Israelis are let into our most secret laboratories, with all the rules ignored, while American officers in Israel are strictly forbidden to enter sensitive areas.

* A former CIA agent told *Newsweek* that "Mossad can go to any distinguished American Jew and ask for his help." The appeal is always the same: last time, when Jews (supposedly) did not heed the call, "the Holocaust resulted." A senior official at the State Department told Findley, "We have to assume that they (Mossad) have wire taps all over town."

* Jewish leaks have repeatedly undermined American relations with Jordan, Saudi Arabia and other moderate Arab states. Jewish conduits are known informally as "mail carriers" and may be "spotted in every important office." Gentiles try to fight back by bypassing Jews if possible when classified documents are handed out. When a super Zionist like Stephen Bryen enters an office anywhere in Washington, loyal Americans are almost subliminally aware of his presence.

* High officials all over Washington assume that nearly every week at least one delegation of "Important Jews" will pay them a personal visit, to ask deeply probing questions and make specific demands. Very rarely, a group of Arab Americans will call. If they do, they will be nervous, polite and reluctant to make any demands at all.

* Art Buchwald and other Jews have often denounced Arab contributions to higher education as "blood money", without providing evidence that any strings were attached. Alexander Cockburn lost his job at the *Village Voice* for accepting a \$10,000 research grant from a moderate and highly respected Arab institute. Many cases like Cockburn's have been documented, proving that simply matching Jewish "philanthropy" dollar for dollar will not solve the problem. Father Timothy S. Healy, president of Georgetown University, returned some large Arab gifts to that school partly because "his Jewish friends

screamed at him privately", even after he wore a yarmulke to a Jewish service on campus.

* The Jewish community has long enjoyed a "special right" in the National Council of Churches, one that loyal Christians can only envy. According to Findley, "A representative of one of the largest Protestant denominations observes that the American Jewish Committee had 'much more effect' on the content of National Council study materials than his office, even though his denomination accounted for the purchase and distribution of three-quarters of these publications."

* At a "peace conference" held in Sacramento in 1983, one of the keynote speakers was Rabbi Lester Frazen, who, the year before, had joined fundamentalist Christians in a jubilant march celebrating the utterly unprovoked Israeli invasion of Lebanon. Frazen and the official Sacramento "peace community" forbade the opponents of the invasion to commemorate its victims.

* The "aesthetic prop," which is often wielded by Jews to selectively portray *kibbutz members* as blond, blue-eyed and handsome, is forbidden to the Palestinians. In 1981, Jewish TV producer John Wallach caught hell from other Jews for his even-handed documentary on the West Bank. The most common complaint, he recalls, was that "too many" of the Palestinian children shown had fair, attractive features.

* In 1982, Richard Broderick, a columnist for Minnesota's *Twin Cities Register*, reported inequities in the American media's coverage of the Lebanon invasion. Local movie distributors, a leading source of advertising revenue, threatened Broderick's editor with the paper's destruction unless he was silenced. He was. Then, a while later, Broderick wrote a column describing how Minnesota Senator Rudy Boschwitz was using the media to manipulate public opinion in favor of Israel. Three weeks later, Broderick was out of job.

Findley recounts many similar tales of journalists committing what amounts, in economic terms, to suicide attacks. Yet this researcher knows, from his own work, of a great many other sacrifices which go unreported here, for want of either space or knowledge.

THE LONG ROOTS OF SUPPRESSION

It is almost impossible to find fault with the first 11 chapters of Findley's book (12 counting the introduction). The epilogue, alas, called "Repairing the Damage," is filled with the worst kind of cant — incredible as that may seem. Repeatedly, the author speaks of free expression, being inhibited only "on one subject" "in one vital area," "on one controversial topic." A liberal Republican all his life, Findley apparently cannot conceive that his grim experience since learning the other side of the Middle East story — *after* having served 11 terms in Congress — has been the same experience, shared even more bitterly for decades, by the thoughtful advocates of a dozen equally "unkosher" positions.

Yesterday, the writer of this article watched a *CBS Evening News* report on the crises in a white Philadelphia neighborhood where blacks are trying to move in. Naturally — inevitably — the reporter took the side of the blacks, and took it very strongly. Can Findley recall having *once in his life* seen a national news report where the cause of white resistance to the urban takeover

LAST CALL FOR DINNER

This year's Annual New Times Dinner, to be held at Nicholson Receptions, 193 Nicholson Street, Carlton, promises to be the most exciting ever with more than the usual panel of outstanding speakers. There are still some vacancies, but those wishing to attend are urged to book IMMEDIATELY.

\$25 per person covers everything, including refreshments.

NEW TIMES - SEPTEMBER 1989.

by minorities was championed? Yet this same CBS broadcast cited a recent Cleveland poll showing that 45% of all whites in the metro areas believe that "all-white neighbourhoods are best" — i.e., believe it strongly enough to tell a stranger at their door.

The truth is that the American media are many times more open on the issue of Palestinian rights (and Israeli wrongs) than they are on certain vital domestic topics. Yet Findley refuses to show any sympathy for the frustrated and badly frightened victims of those other forms of Jewish-leftist bullying with which *he happens to agree*.

The truth is that Findley is very well informed about Jewish strong-arm tactics in the 1960s and beyond, where Palestine is concerned, but woefully ignorant about earlier times and other places. In one place in his book, he gets all bent out of shape about the awful *New York Times* editors who, in 1982, struck a *single word* from the dispatch of their Beirut correspondent. When Thomas Friedman referred to "indiscriminate bombing" by the Israelis, the boys in New York blue-pencilled the adjective.

Poor Paul needs to have his consciousness raised! At the time

of the "Russian" Revolution, crack reporters from the *London Times* and other major Western newspapers watched in despair as entire dispatches were *regularly* tossed into the waste can by Jewish busybodies back at their home offices. In this way, the world was kept from knowing that a *Jewish Revolution* was, in fact, transpiring. The same thing happened almost as regularly with dispatches from Central Europe during the 1930s. A *Jewish network* — much of it actually *anti-Zionist* at that time — was determined that the world would never hear the German side of things.

In trying to explain *why* organized Jewry does the things it does, Findley comes up with a one-word explanation, "fear". So far he is correct. But behind that fear, for Findley, lays an equally implausible cause: the Holocaust. To him, Jewish history seems to have begun in 1933. Findley never pauses to reflect on the origins of the ancient phrase "for fear of the Jews," which, early in this century, had missions of well informed people trembling in countries like Germany, Hungary and Russia.

WORLD BANK POLICIES

Since 1976 the World Bank has lent the government of Indonesia \$660 million in an attempt to move three million people from densely populated Java to less populated islands. The Bank has lauded the project as "the largest voluntary re-settlement programme" in recent history. But much of the programme has been a major disaster, with serious environmental problems developing where large areas of rain forests have been destroyed for re-settlement programmes. Farmers have discovered that soils are too poor to produce. There are stories of local tribes being uprooted and badly treated as a result of the Indonesian re-settlement programme. None of these developments appear to worry those running the World Bank.

The World Bank contributed over \$6 billion in an attempt to make Communist Yugoslavia work. Even the World Bank has had to admit, in its 1987 report, that basic economic reforms have not been achieved. Like Poland, Hungary has been moving towards a degree of political liberalisation. But Hungary has a massive World Bank debt. Not surprisingly, there are growing demands that it is time that a full report of the detail of the operations of the World Bank was made available.

What the Bank is engaged in is the misappropriation of the real credit — the productive capacity — of the peoples of the developed nations and making it possible for it to be wasted on a massive global scale. We have no doubt that this is part of The Big Idea, and helps to ensure that power is progressively centralised on a global scale.

The World Bank, along with the International Monetary Fund, was established as a result of the Bretton Woods financial agreement late in World War 2. Plotters and planners of various types were looking ahead to the remaking of the post-War world. It is a matter of record that secret Soviet agent Harry Dexter White was the dominating figure at the Bretton Woods conference, although assisted by that darling of the Fabian Socialists, John Maynard Keynes. It is also a matter of record that the International Communist movement actively campaigned in favour of the Bretton Woods agreement. Communists in Australia were active in advocating that the Chifley Labor government ratify the agreement, which eventually had the support of all parties with only a few dissenters.

Any realistic study of history must examine the philosophical roots of policies. This approach reveals that labels can be most misleading and that time and time again International bankers and "anti-capitalistic" Marxists support the same basic policies, primarily because they share the same power philosophy. And so Soviet leader Gorbachev says that he completely endorses

the concept of the New International Economic Order, and is at one with International Banker David Rockefeller, leader of the association of International Bankers known as the Trilateral Commission.

Until the advent of Gorbachev Soviet leaders had never sought to join the World Bank, apparently satisfied that the West could be relied upon to continue providing the necessary economic blood transfusions to sustain the Soviet economy. But Gorbachev wants to move towards the next phase of global centralisation, with integration of the Soviet economy with other economies. And he obviously sees membership of the World Bank as a major step in the integration programme, with benefits for the Soviet economy. Presumably Gorbachev has studied the record of the World Bank. It makes revealing reading.

A RECORD OF DISASTER

The World Bank has loaned billions to Third World countries and the Communist regimes of Eastern Europe. The superficial argument has been advanced that these loans help improve the lot of the world's poor and entice the Communist countries to move towards free market economies. This claim has been made by the current World Bank president, Barber Conable. He has talked of "the creation of an economic environment for private-sector growth in developing regimes." But the results have been exactly the opposite, as witnessed in Marxist Ethiopia.

The World Bank has played a major role in propping up the brutal Mengitsu regime with 50-year, interest-free loans. Last year the Bank's contribution was approximately 10 per cent of the

Private organisations 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 Bilderberg 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 is promoting the beginning of a new attempt at detente, which proceeds from an illusion of arms control.

The INF (Intermediate Nuclear Forces) 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, Soviet and American.

- From April "South African Observer".

government's budget — over \$250 million. Yonas Deressam, President of the Ethiopian Refugees Foundation in the United States, has said, "They (the Marxist government) just take the money and laugh", going on to charge that "the World Bank has contributed as much to the agricultural disaster in Ethiopia as the regime itself".

During the '60s and '70s the World Bank lavishly financed the Julius Nyerere regime in Tanzania at a time when Nyerere was devastating Tanzania's agriculture and while Nyerere was attempting, with the aid of the army, the same type of forced re-settlement programme adopted in Ethiopia.

ERIC BUTLER TO SPEAK AT CALGARY SEMINAR

Our North American readers will be interested to know that Mr. Eric Butler will be one of the outstanding panel of speakers at the Annual Canadian League of Rights Seminar in Calgary, Alberta, over the weekend of October 20—21—23. Those wishing to attend should contact Mr. Ron Gostick, Canadian Intelligence Publications, now based at High River, Alberta, Canada.

BASIC FUND SET AT \$65,000.

The League has formally opened its 1989-90 Basic Fund Appeal. The "target" is set at \$65,000. There will be increased costs, but as usual the League is confident that these can be absorbed through expanding League activities. The need was never greater. All donations to Box 1052J., G.P.O., Melbourne. In order to save on postage, a crushing cost item, receipts not provided unless requested.

THE ROLE OF INDIA

Generally overlooked is the massive expansion of Indian military power. From the time of Nehru, Indian leaders have adopted a moralising attitude on many issues. They have been masters of the double standard, oppressing minorities while lecturing other countries, particularly South Africa. India is demonstrating a reluctance to disengage its remaining 45,000 troops in Sri Lanka. India's intervention in Sri Lanka was a manifestation of India's determination to use force throughout the Indian Ocean sphere.

The manner of India's interference in Sri Lanka suggests that the Indian government may well use its growing military force to interfere in any country in which there is a large number of Indians. Statements by Indian spokesmen at the time of the Rabuka coup in Fiji, suggested that they would not be adverse to the use of force in this situation.

The Soviet Union has played a major role in building up India's massive military power, now one of the most formidable in the world. And it is still being expanded. India is generally believed to be one of the world's poorer nations, one that requires the charity of others. Indonesia and Malaysia have both expressed concern about Indian military expansion. But India appears to be another of the Hawke government's sacred cows.

A question mark remains concerning the attempted shipping of arms to Fiji through Australia in May 1988. The build up of a large Indian population in Australia could produce problems between Australia and India in the future. There should be a big reduction in the intake of Indians into Australia, while a nation, which can spend such enormous sums of money on sophisticated weaponry, should be told that it does not require foreign aid of any kind.

U.S. - U.S.S.R. MERGER MANIA

By U.S. Senator Jesse Helms

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 work in a Russian-English dictionary.

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 a "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 meaning is a bit stronger than just "publicity." These specialists say that "glasnost" in 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 American 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.

PSYCHOLOGICAL WARFARE

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 centre 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.