

THE NEW TIMES

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

VOL. 56, No. 6.

Registered by Australia Post- Publication No. VBH 1001

JUNE 1992.

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

THE MURDOCH ASSAULT ON THE MONARCHY

by Eric D. Butler

The Republicans in Australia, as elsewhere, have quickly seized upon the highly publicised allegations of the marital problems of Princess Diana to claim that because of what is termed a "Royal crisis" the time has come to abolish the Monarchy. As every married couple knows, there are stresses and strains inside every marriage. But the media campaign which seeks to depict the Prince of Wales as such a heartless monster that his wife has been driven to try to commit suicide five times, is much more than the gutter press seeking to boost circulations by exploiting the personal problems, real or concocted, of prominent members of the Royal family. It is the latest in a long term policy by the Murdoch media to destroy Constitutional Monarchy, which Rupert Murdoch regards as an obstacle to the internationalism he and his international banking backers seek to promote.

All the available evidence suggests that the Murdoch media sees in the latest "revelations" concerning Princess Diana an opportunity to destroy the institution of Constitutional Monarchy. In Australia Murdoch's national daily, *The Australian*, has editorially claimed that the establishment of a Republic is "inevitable" and that evolution towards this end should proceed in an orderly manner. As yet there have been no personal attacks on the Queen, she being invulnerable to the types of tactics used against other members of the Royal family. But there have been snide suggestions that it is most "undemocratic" that the Queen does not pay income tax. The financial independence of the Crown enables it to fulfill its proper function. There is no suggestion by the Royal critics that everyone should be paying far less taxes, and that financial independence for all should be the objective in a society rich in real wealth.

PERFECTION NOT POSSIBLE

A defence of the institution of Constitutional Monarchy does not require that the Monarch be seen to be perfect in every way, the Monarch being a human being, not a saint. The evolution of the British Constitutional Monarchy, as part of a constitutional development which has sought to protect the right of the individual by dividing power, thus providing checks and balances against the abuse of power, has taken place over a long period of time during which the private lives of some of the Monarchs were scandalous. But as pointed out recently by Mr. B.A. Santamaria, probably Australia's most distinguished Roman Catholic lay commentator, the institution of the Papacy had, particularly before the Reformation, Popes whose personal lives fell far short of the Christian ideal. Mr. Santamaria was referring to the recent scandal in Ireland where a prominent Roman Catholic Bishop was exposed as having fathered a son and used funds designated for the Church to bribe the mother into keeping silent about the affair.

Mr. Santamaria pointed out that following the Reformation, partly a revolt against corruption inside the Church, the Papacy was well served by a number of extremely pious and outstanding

Popes. Because many marriages fail is not a very logical argument for abolishing the institution of marriage. Corruption in police forces has always been present, generally reflecting the moral standards of the communities in which the police operate. It is easy to criticise the behaviour of members of American police forces, but law enforcement in America is being attempted in a society that has become increasingly violent. Abolition of

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 people of the Crown Commonwealth and those of the United States of America, who share a common heritage.

police forces would open the floodgates of anarchy.

LITTLE TRUTH FROM ANDREW MORTON

Whatever is the truth concerning the personal relations between Prince Charles and his wife Princess Diana, who has bravely continued to carry out her public duties in the face of a cowardly and disgusting media campaign, it will not be discovered by reading the type of book written by Andrew Morton, particularly as it has been endorsed and promoted by the Murdoch media. It should not be forgotten that it was Rupert Murdoch's media, which assured its readers that the faked diaries of Adolf Hitler were genuine. One thing is certain, however: both Andrew Morton and the Murdoch media have made a lot of money out of the attack on Prince Charles and Princess Diana.

Even if the media is successful in helping to break up the marriage of Prince Charles and Princess Diana, it is simply not true that this automatically signals the end of Constitutional Monarchy, an institution that has survived far worse crises than that projected by the mass media. Comparisons are being made with the crisis, which resulted in the abdication of Edward VIII, the Duke of Windsor. The general view of this crisis is another example of distorted history. Like his father, George V, who had publicly drawn attention to the deficiencies of the financial system during the Great Depression, the Duke of Windsor had expressed similar views and expressed his open outrage at the depression conditions being imposed upon the people. He was demanding that something be done. Modern day Republicans in the Australian Labor party could with some profit read what Labor leaders like John Curtin said in the Federal parliament when an Empire-wide campaign was being run to force Edward VIII out. They expressed themselves in favour of Edward.

The divorced Mrs. Simpson was but a handy means to remove a man who was perceived to be a threat to the financial establishment. While the 1700 Act of Settlement forbids the Monarch to marry a Roman Catholic, the 1772 Royal Marriages Act does not debar a divorcee from the Throne. There was no constitutional reason why Edward VIII should not have married Mrs. Simpson and retained the throne. Edward himself was not a divorcee. George IV continued on the throne even though separated from his wife Caroline. While her blatant adultery led her to being excised from all mention in the Book of Common Prayer, she was not, technically, barred from the throne.

According to Brian Hanson, a legal adviser to the General Synod of the Church of England, "there is nothing in Statute Law which prevents a divorced Monarch from continuing as

Supreme Commander of the Church. A divorced Monarch would not, however, be able to re-marry in the Church." Such a development could lead to the disestablishment of the Church of England, a development which many members of the Anglican Communion would regard as an improvement on a situation where politicians can and do exert influence concerning the appointment of Bishops. In his *Realistic Position of The Church of England*, C.H. Douglas pointed out there was a great deal of difference between the Church *in* England, as mentioned in Magna Carta, and The Church *of* England as it exists today.

EDUCATION NEEDED

The Constitutional Monarchy is, at best, regarded by much of the mass media, as a source of never-ending "human interest" stories, which increase circulations. What is needed is educational material examining the constitutional role of the Monarchy. Most of those advocating the abolition of Monarchy in favour of Republicanism are often motivated more by warped envy than by any type of logic. From a strictly utilitarian point of view, there is no evidence to suggest that any form of Republican government is better than the Monarchy. Over a long history, there has been only one Republic in Britain, that of Oliver Cromwell, who revolted the people with policies, which reflected his philosophy. It was Cromwell who was responsible for permitting the Jews to return to England, who prepared the way for the establishment of the Bank of England later, and a national debt.

As the famous Jewish writer and philosopher, Dr. Oscar Levy said, the ideal is the enemy of the real. The idealist, often the unconscious tool of the power groups, has his ideal of what he thinks *ought to be*. The realist knows that to expect what might be regarded as perfection in the members of the Royal Family is foolish.

But in all families, there are great variations in character and in talents. Princess Anne, for example, works extremely hard at her international charity concerning children. And she has a healthy dislike of the media. She has not been excessively smeared because her first marriage broke down. But Princess Diana, who has also worked hard at her public duties, and is a great favourite with most people, has been hounded because it is argued that her marriage is not the type of success the idealists would like. However, one cannot help feeling that the media campaign is as much directed at Prince Charles as at his wife. Is he seen as a potential danger to the collectivists and internationalists? Much of what he has been trying to say has not been well received by the controllers of the media.

Even the most rabid Republicans must admit that on occasions a wise and courageous Monarch can emerge who is able to resolve a major crisis. A striking example of this has been in Thailand, where the widely respected King called in the leaders of the two major political factions, including the leader of a military responsible for so much bloodshed, and ordered them to resolve a crisis tearing the nation apart. He then chose the type of Prime Minister he preferred.

Prince Charles has, as witnessed by what he has so carefully said on a variety of subjects, demonstrated that he has the potential to be a type of constructive influence as the world's crisis conditions deepen. He is a public figure who at least has the "right" enemies. The question of the future of Constitutional Monarchy in Australia must not be tied to the question of the state of Prince Charles' marriage. Even if Prince Charles never comes to the throne, the succession is assured in his two sons. That is what Monarchy is about: continuity. And roots in the past and continuity is what Prince Charles stresses in his famous Elizabethan address. Prince Charles offers far more substance

PRINCE CHARLES SPEAKS

AN EXCLUSIVE FIRST PUBLICATION

A new publication, "*A People's Prince*" is the first time that a collection of Prince Charles' major addresses, on a variety of subjects, has been made available for the public. The book has a hard-hitting Foreword by one of Australia's most distinguished Ambassadors and former Lieutenant Governors of South Australia, Sir Walter Crocker, who makes no secret of his admiration for the Prince.

This book carries a most appropriate title; the Prince articulates what the great majority of people feel about modern art, literature, architecture, education and much more, but who have little chance of expressing their views. The wide circulation of this book will have a regenerating effect throughout the whole English-speaking world. The League of Rights has obtained an early supply and copies may be obtained from all League addresses: \$15 post-free.

than the sick fare of the Murdoch media and those who follow its lead.

MEDIA VERSUS MONARCHY

A major question, which has emerged from the latest "royal crisis", is the role of the mass media in society. Douglas has compared the media with the role of the prostitute throughout history: power without responsibility. Lord St. John of Fasley, a leading authority on Monarchy, has gone to the root of the issue with his comment on the campaign against Prince Charles and his wife: "The whole matter casts a shadow over our parliamentary and constitutional system. I take the view that you cannot have a free society unless you have some type of interior moral restraints, which are freely accepted and freely imposed. If you get a situation where people feel that they can repeat stories, the press can sensationalise them....without any sense of responsibility whatever, that offers a threat to our whole society."

The mass media versus Constitutional Monarchy may emerge as one of the decisive conflicts in the struggle to regenerate a sick and dying civilisation.

A BILLION DOLLAR MYSTERY

Here is a subject worthy of an Agatha Christie mystery novel: Australia's largest bank, the Westpac Banking Corporation Ltd., has recently "stunned" financial markets with a pretax loss of \$2.32 billion in the six months to March. This is the bank's first loss in 175 years, after making a massive \$2.65 billion provision for bad and doubtful debts.

This report raises a number of questions: Where did the lost billions come from in the first place? Not one of the bank's depositors has complained that his account has been debited to make the billions of lost billions available. The news had only a slight effect on Westpac shares on the Stock Exchange. There is no suggestion that the bank's shareholders made available the lost billions. And where have the lost billions gone? Who has them now? And what about the \$2.65 billion written off because of bad debts?

What other business organisation could write off such massive debts, and post such an astronomical loss, and still stay apparently solvent? But what other business has the power to create credit money in the form of an interest-bearing debt? The reality is that the trading banks have a licence to do exactly this. As a result of the deregulation of banking, introduced by Treasurer Paul Keating and originally advocated by Treasurer John Howard of the Fraser Government, the Australian trading banks, with Westpac the most prominent, went in for a massive lending spree, in many cases urging people to go into debt situations which made them extremely vulnerable to any downturn in the economy.

When that downturn came, primarily as a result of a restrictive financial policy imposed by Central Banks, bankruptcies soared; the dole queues grew longer and social friction escalated. Australia's Federal Treasurer, now Prime Minister, Mr. Paul Keating, spoke of "the depression we had to have". But Keating was merely echoing the views of the Reserve Bank, as admitted by the recently appointed Deputy Director, Mr. Ian Macfarlane, who is reported by *The Australian* of May 22 as saying that the recession was the result of Reserve bank policy. He said, "All the decisions, all the restrictions in interest rates, have occurred because they have been recommended by the board of the Reserve Bank — the timing has been determined by the Reserve Bank and the size of the changes has been determined by the Reserve Bank."

Westpac's huge losses have therefore been related to the

policies of the Reserve Bank. But where did Westpac obtain the billions it loaned and has now "lost"? To large numbers of people this must appear to be some type of mystery beyond their comprehension. But in reality there is no mystery at all: Westpac created at little cost to itself, the billions it loaned as debt. Westpac has lost nothing, its depositors have lost nothing and its shareholders have suffered little except a temporary reduction in dividends. The big losers have been hundreds and thousands of Australians, suffering a situation, which cannot basically improve until the present policies of debt finance are radically altered. This is a task for the elected representatives of the people. But those representatives will not act until forced to do so by their electors.

In the meantime no one should shed any tears for Westpac or any other trading bank. An examination of their books will disclose that their assets have progressively increased. An Agatha Christie thriller might attempt to discover how organisations, which create nothing tangible, can progressively gain control of a nation's real assets.

BACKING ALL HORSES

The rising star of American billionaire Ross Perot as an Independent candidate for the coming American Presidential elections is a striking manifestation of the loss of support everywhere for the old, established political parties. In the early primaries in the USA, Pat Buchanan demonstrated that there were large numbers of completely disillusioned American electors. But Buchanan lacked the necessary finance to continue his campaign. His time could come in 1996.

In spite of his long service to the cause of internationalism, George Bush appears to be a spent force Democrat candidate Clinton has the open support of influential Zionists. But is it now revealed that Perot has considerable Jewish support. C.H Douglas once observed concerning the international Jewish power that it backed every horse in the power race. Occasionally, of course, some of the horses don't run straight! As Perot is apparently financially independent, he might prove a maverick who will not conform to the internationalists' programme. But we would have more faith in a Pat Buchanan, who has made it clear where he stands on internationalism and New World Orders. And he has met the Zionist power groups head on and survived.

REPUBLIC OR MONARCHY?

Because of current developments and the open drive towards Republicanism, with the Murdoch media backing the Republican movement, the theme of this year's League of Rights National Seminar, in Melbourne on Saturday, October 3, will be *Republic or Monarchy?* There will be an outstanding panel of three speakers to deal with an issue, which will decide the future of Australia. The Seminar will be opened by League of Rights National Director, Mr. David Thompson.

The Seminar will follow the Annual New Times Dinner on Friday, October 2. The price of the dinner is \$30 inclusive. Early bookings appreciated. Interstate supporters planning to attend the League National Weekend should make firm bookings now. Discounted airfares can be arranged.

WHAT IS TRUTH?

by P.R. Masson

This is the famous question asked by Pontius Pilate at the trial of Christ. But Pilate found the question too difficult and washed his hands of the affair. But in an article in *"The Social Crediter"* of April 10, 1942, entitled "The Nature of Truth", P.R. Masson deals with the question of truth in a most realistic and helpful manner.

It is doubtful if the solid unyielding and permanent nature of reality is fully appreciated. Our understanding and presentation may be imperfect because of the inherent difficulties of measuring and representation.

The "truth" depends on a number of factors; the understanding and accuracy of observation or measurement, the limitations inherent in words which affects the efficiency of representation at two points, first when the reality is expressed in words and secondly at the point where the words are converted back into a picture of reality in the mind of another individual. The accuracy of the picture will depend equally on understanding' at both stages.

Another factor is that there is commonly an accepted and understood degree of accuracy; "about six inches" may meet many general requirements of everyday life but is not nearly accurate enough if we are giving the measurement of an aeroplane engine component about to be machined.

At other times it can be said that absolute accuracy is both possible and customary in everyday use; the address of a house, to be of any service, must be given in sufficient detail so that it positively identifies one house only.

So that "truth" can be said to be a representation of reality expressed with sufficient accuracy to meet the requirements of the case. Any other representation is false and is a lie if the intent to deceive is present or if the refusal to use readily available information is deliberate. It is a lie to represent speculation without verification, as established fact (reality).

Two men on different ships writing their diaries on the same day as they crossed the 180th meridian might describe their reactions, the one as the happenings of Monday, the other as those of Tuesday — and both truthfully. This is simply a very special case where there is particular difficulty in correct representation for which there is a perfectly sound explanation. It is a complete misconception to deduce that a difficulty in representation in any way affects either the uncompromising nature of the movements of the sun or the position of the ships any more than it affects the overwhelming importance of representing correctly, i.e., being truthful.

Perhaps the now generally known and accepted statement that the earth revolves about the sun is a good example of the unyielding nature of reality. If it is a fact today, as most of us believe, then it was just as much a fact when it was generally held that the sun revolved about the earth. An indication that we have the truth in this matter is found in the fact that navigation is based on knowledge of the ordered movements of terrestrial bodies of which this particular knowledge is a part. Without further investigation we know that navigation can be said to "work" and nature would certainly withhold this approval if reality in these matters has been misunderstood or misapplied.

The fact that navigation "works," by which is meant that it does what we expect of it, not only confirms the correctness of deductions but it proves the truthfulness of the chain of individuals who interpret reality in tables and formulae, in the printing and in the use of the information as much as it depends on the truthfulness of the chronometer concerned.

But it is talking to the converted to stress the importance of truthfulness to navigators and people in such direct touch with the 'Laws of Nature'. The contrivance we have under discussion can be described as the "social mechanism" and it is a contrivance

that does not "work", or does not give mankind the conditions he desires and no stretch of imagination can even pretend that there is an appearance of tranquility and efficiency and an absence of indications of stress and strain which characterises a contrivance which is working efficiently. There is no reason to suppose that this failure is anything but a failure in our diligence and honesty in learning and using the 'Law of Rightness'* which governs man's needs and his obligation to his fellows.

Politics, economics, religion and education have a direct bearing on the social mechanism and it is in such activities we must expect truthfulness. Such terms as the need for "tolerance" in religion and the "right to one's opinion" requires closer examination than they usually receive. The 'Law of Nature' and the 'Law of Rightness' are utterly unyielding and intolerant and any untruthfulness in interpretation or in using our knowledge of reality must bring inevitable punishment — probably on whole nations. The navigator who was untruthful or inexcusably ignorant of certain facts or even careless would neither expect nor receive toleration so that it is at least suspicious that the claim should be so often advanced in other activities. When it is a question of religious beliefs, which are, but speculation there can be no objection to toleration provided they are not represented as anything else but speculation.

The "right to one's opinion" so often invoked in the social world in contrast to the world of reality known to scientists, sailors, engineers, farmers, is a highly dangerous tolerance. It can be stated in general terms that a difference of opinion, on matters of fact, which are verifiable, indicates ignorance or dishonesty on one side or both. Ignorance may vary from being excusable to the point where it shades into dishonesty.

It is certain that even if men can be induced into an easy compliance in matters which directly affect the social mechanism — nature will show no mercy, millions of men and women are today taking punishment for the lack of diligence and honesty in learning and representing the fundamental laws of Rightness. If, by showing less tolerance, we can force a standard of diligence and honesty on our politicians, clerics, economists, educationers, writers and journalists as high as we expect in navigation, there is no earthly reason why the social mechanism should not be made to work as satisfactorily as navigation.

Looked at in this way it appears to be merely false sentiment to be tolerant of falsehood as it is likely to be much easier and cause less suffering to expose falsehood at inception rather than allow it to become incorporated with powerful and superficially impressive organisations with a vested interest in the maintenance

DOUG COLLINS CANCELS AUSTRALIAN TOUR

The British-born Canadian journalist, author and lecturer, Mr. Doug Collins has been forced to cancel his Australian tour in late September because of open-heart surgery. Doug Collins expresses his deep regret but is keen to visit Australia next year, health permitting. It is not envisaged that there will be any complications with his heart operation.

of the falsehood which is the very basis of the dangerous influence and importance they have acquired.

The test of over-riding importance of any expression of ideas is really — Are they true? Do they conform to reality? If they do not they are, at best, but futile words or, at the worst, dangerous falsehood and require exposing as soon as possible. "No man is entitled to his opinion unless he believes it to be true," is a precept which would be accepted in all those activities of man which can be said to "work"; it is only when we come to those activities with a somewhat direct bearing on the social mechanism that we find such loose expressions as that of "every man is entitled to his own opinion" encouraged and, quite naturally, the result is chaos.

***"That is right which works"**

GULF WAR A MAJOR DECEPTION?

A desperate George Bush, closely associated with the programme of arming Iraq's Saddam Hussein during the time that Iraq was engaged in a major military conflict with Iran, has continued to insist that he will not tolerate any attempts by Iraq to rearm itself. He threatens military action if there is evidence that Iraq is not abiding by United Nations policies concerning nuclear weapons. It has been reported that the CIA has been allocated increased funds for the purpose of promoting any activities inside Iraq, which would lead to the overthrow of Saddam Hussein.

But while President George Bush expresses his concern that Saddam Hussein may still have ambitions to develop nuclear weapons, and stresses the importance of the Non-proliferation Treaty concerning the development of nuclear weapons, there is silence concerning the activities of the only Middle East nation which has built up a nuclear arsenal, Zionist Israel, while news of further nuclear testing by China does not deflect Bush from continuing with his open support for close trade relations with the Chinese Communist government. We have recently traced the growing development of what can be described as the China-Israeli axis.

Assessed in retrospect, it becomes increasingly clear that the Gulf War must be rated as one of the greatest deceptions of this century. The general picture of the Gulf War, as presented by the American controlled media, was that a massive United Nations force, the biggest put together since the end of the Second World War, was essential in order to fight a titanic war with "the world's fourth ranking military power". But this must have been one of the strangest military conflicts in history, with only a handful of minor skirmishes and not even one major battle. The casualty ratio was about 3000 to one in favour of the UN allies. 28 Americans only died in combat compared to perhaps 100,000 Iraqis. Red Cross statistics state that the Iraqi death figure was even higher.

What was billed as the biggest tank battle since the end of the Second World War was all over in 100 hours with only two Allied tanks lost. The much-publicised Iraqi bunkers turned out to be flimsy shelters covered with corrugated iron. The Iraqi army was little more than a paper tiger. Most of the soldiers, including a majority of the "elite" Republican Guards, were raw conscripts, with little stomach for any serious combat.

In an article in *The Toronto Star* of March 3, 1991, the *Star's* special military writer, Richard Gwyn, is quoted as saying that all Allied depictions of the Iraqi war machine were fraudulent, claiming that the wild claims about Iraq's military might were "one of the most brilliant campaigns of deception and disinformation in military history". Gwyn also claims that during the war with Iran, the Soviet sold the Iraqi's first class tanks with

second rate electronic systems since the Iraqis routinely sold them to the American CIA in exchange for USA satellite photos of Iranian positions. As for the much-publicised Iraqi chemical weapons, which failed to materialise, Gwyn claims that his sources of information stated, "Washington had known all along that Iraq had no chemical warheads to its missiles, thus no ability to deliver chemicals at a distance. And in the open desert, Iraqi's chemical shells for its artillery could be scarcely more than a minor irritant".

Gwyn's summary of the Gulf War is that there was no "Desert Storm": "We have instead witnessed Desert Slaughter". Not surprisingly, one American fighter pilot was quoted as saying that he and his colleagues were engaged in something akin to a turkey shoot. This was mass murder, not war.

And what was the purpose of this full-scale use of modern military technology against a minor military power? President George Bush said it had to do with building a New World Order. Zionist Israel was one of the main beneficiaries, with the destruction of the strongest potential leader of the Arab world. And what about the alleged concern about democracy in Kuwait? Kuwait remains as it was before the Gulf conflict: a type of feudal Arab despotism.

NEW ZEALAND MYTHS

Our New Zealand readers will be interested to know that, according to a "special survey" by Rupert Murdoch's major Australian daily, *The Australian*, that New Zealand is "abuzz with confidence". And that according to *The Australian's* economic editor, Alan Woods, "New Zealand is finally breaking free of the economic doldrums in which it has been wallowing for more than thirty years." Woods quotes Sir Walter Trotter, chairman of the monopoly organisation, Fletcher Challenge, as having recently said "Despite the hurdles still to be overcome, I want to tell you that I am more positive about the future of New Zealand than at any time in my business career." Woods also quotes optimistic comments by the New Zealand Reserve Bank, responsible for imposing the financial policies, which brought New Zealand to its knees.

But, as in Australia and elsewhere, optimistic statements, based upon projections, are not being borne out by events. Probably sensing this, Dr. Graham Scott, head of the New Zealand Treasury, is quoted as saying in a recent address that "We've seen three apparent or real recoveries in the past four years, die on the vine and many more died in the past."

It is probably true that, as the result of breaking much of the power of the Trade Union monopoly, New Zealand's manufacturing industries are operating more efficiently measured by conventional accountancy, but the basic problem confronting all developed nations is not the necessity for greater efficiency of production, but how to sell at a profitable price any increased production.

As a result of the "economic rationalism" introduced into New Zealand by the Labor government and being continued by the Bolger National Government, economic centralism has resulted in a relatively few becoming increasingly wealthy while the great majority find themselves worse off than ever.

'Science without Social Credit is sheer suicide. '

Famous British scientist, Professor Soddy (1943).

HAS BORIS YELTSIN BEEN INFLUENCED BY SOLZHENITSYN?

The famous Russian writer and prophet Alexander Solzhenitsyn says that he is now ready to return to his native Russia, presumably satisfied with the leadership of Boris Yeltsin. In an article in the respected German monthly *"National Uropa"*, which appeared last year, Wolfgang Strauss argued that Boris Yeltsin has been greatly influenced by the views of Solzhenitsyn concerning the regeneration of Russia. Extracts from the Strauss article appeared in the January issue of the monthly journal *"The South African Observer"*, P.O. Box 2401, Pretoria, South Africa. The big question mark concerning the future of Russia, is whether it is sucked into the deadly embrace of the World Bank and The International Monetary Fund.

After so much demonic suffering inflicted on them since Lenin's putsch of October 1917, the Russians have grown immune to the communist fever.

Not so with the liberal February 1917 revolution by Kerensky, which opened the way for Lenin. Not only the fallen Bolshevik Gorbachev, but also many "democratic reformers" are clamouring for the establishment of a liberal state.

In their ideological confusion they seek refuge in a copy of American capitalism or West European Social Democracy.

SAME PHILOSOPHICAL ROOTS

They are blind to the reality that Communism and Capitalism spring from the same philosophical roots: hatred of God, nation and race, egoism, hedonism and nihilism.

In both systems "society" elevates itself to a religion — the home of the rootless, emancipated proletariat.

"ENLIGHTENMENT" OF 1789

The world-famous Russian writer Alexander Solzhenitsyn, long an outspoken critic of both Capitalism and Communism, sees Communism as the consequence of the Humanist "Enlightenment", dating not from 1848 (Communist Manifesto) or 1917 (Lenin's putsch) but from the French Revolution of 1789.

The same "Enlightenment" - anti-nationalist and atheistic - is also driving Western nations to destruction, as has been emphasised by Solzhenitsyn on many occasions.

RESTORING RUSSIAN HERITAGE

Boris Yeltsin showed the influence Solzhenitsyn has had on his thinking at his inauguration as Russian President.

He was sworn in on 10th July by Patriarch Alexei II, who said that Yeltsin's task lay not only in healing a sick state, but also in rekindling of Russia's national and cultural heritage, destroyed in the 75 years since the Bolshevik Revolution.

Yeltsin swore an oath, unheard of in the Kremlin since 1917: "I want to lead Russia out of the crisis. Russia is getting up off its knees. We pledge to transform it into a prosperous, sovereign state.

"I am unable to describe my feelings at this moment. For the first time in Russian history, the head of state swears an oath before his fellow citizens.

"For centuries the government has been aloof from the nation (volk). Now the time has passed forever in which the nation will be subservient. "

He went on to speak of "the tragedy of a failed experiment, littered with millions of corpses, "and of "the tragic end-result of social experiments and Utopian dreams."

FREEDOM MANIFESTO

In his Freedom Manifesto, which has been distributed in 26 million copies by the Russian government, Solzhenitsyn warns of the anarchy of parliamentary democracy.

The triumph of a second Kerensky-style liberal regime would lead to an economic sell-out and political humiliation of Russia. Worse yet, it would destroy forever the spiritual roots of Russian national rebirth.

He urges the establishment of a strong central directorate to oversee a gradual reconstruction of the Russian economy and society.

DECOLONISATION

In three essential respects one can see the influence of Solzhenitsyn in Yeltsin's actions since his election on 12th June 1991.

In the first place, Russia has followed a policy of decolonisation, of recognition of the right of the Baltic, Caucasian and Central Asian nations to independence.

Today the dissolution of the erstwhile Soviet Union into its constituent states is in full swing.

BANISHMENT OF COMMUNISTS

In the second place, Solzhenitsyn demanded the total dissolution of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and an end to its presence in the media and in economic and cultural life.

In line with this, Yeltsin on the 20th July decreed the separation of Party and State. On 23rd August, after crushing the communist counter-revolution, he decreed the end of Lenin's October Revolution.

In the presence of a speechless Gorbachev, he signed the decree banning the Communist Party on Russian territory. Next day, Gorbachev resigned as General Secretary and "advised" the Central Committee to disband.

STRONG PRESIDENCY

In the third place, on 22nd July Yeltsin decreed the formation of a strong presidential form of government, consisting of State Council of 16 members nominated by the President.

The West seems not to realise as yet what is really taking place. Instead of a change to parliamentary democracy, we see the establishment of a Russian nationalist power centre intent on restoring Russian dignity and tradition. This is precisely what Solzhenitsyn called for in warning of the danger of parliamentary anarchy.

HISTORIC DECREES

And in fact, it was not the parliamentary apparatus, which saved the Russian Republic from the communist counter-revolution, but rather the courageous solitary decision of President

MOB PSYCHOLOGY

"Gustave le Bon, whose writings remain the keystone of the arch of modern psychological warfare, discovered that the unconscious action of crowds may be greatly contrary to the character of the individuals comprising them. Thus a crowd may be hysterically brutal, whereas the individuals of whom it is formed may be actually slow to violence. This monumental discovery was the fact that it was the unconscious activity of crowds which had substituted for the conscious activity of individuals in determining the political characteristics of the present age."

- William B. Ziff, in *The Gentlemen Talk of Peace.*

NEW TIMES - JUNE 1992.

Yeltsin.

He issued two historic decrees on the 19th August, which caused the coup to fail. The first one branded the coup and its State of Emergency as high treason.

The second decree placed all executive power, including the KGB, armed forces and Interior Ministry, under the control of the "President of Russia, elected by the people."

During the 60 hours of the failed coup, Yeltsin was the political decision maker, Solzhenitsyn the spiritual one. Both together personify a reawakened Russia and the power of Russian national consciousness.

GOING OWN WAY

Russia is going its own way, fundamentally different from that of the boundless liberal capitalism of the United States. She does not wish to adopt the baseless value system of the "Enlightened" West, which is intrinsically hostile to individual and national interests.

There will be no triumph of a totalitarian parliamentary system under Boris Yeltsin. The Russian revolution of August and the national revolutions of the non-Russians are not the product of liberal capitalist concepts of reform and of a proletarian democratic society. Nor are they the products of the materialist "Enlightenment", of the French Revolution.

RADICAL NATIONALISM

The spirit of the Yeltsin era is one of radical populist nationalism, just as anti-capitalist as it is anti-communist. It is an uprising against the social fragmentation of the "multicultural society."

A whole era of multinational, multicultural confusion, in the name of International Communism, is being cast onto the rubbish heap of history — despised, hated and best forgotten. Yeltsin's Russia has no place for a Geissler, Wiezsaecker or F.W. de Klerk.

Russia is not marching back into the Middle Ages. It is breaking out of the prison camp of Western "Enlightenment", which brought it the most fearsome tragedy of its thousand-year history — Communism.

Without Liberalism, no Communism - Russia has learned its lesson well.

THE POLITICAL PROBLEM

The author of Social Credit, C.H. Douglas, stressed that the first requirement for a constructive change of disastrous financial and economic policies, was to obtain control of parliament while it still existed. The parliamentary system of representative government although badly subverted by what the former Lord Chief Justice of England, Lord Hewart, described as "The New Despotism", still operates and can be regenerated. With its Federal system of government, and a division of power both at the federal and state level, Australia is well equipped to lead Western Civilisation away from the disasters, which now openly threaten.

As observed by Eric Butler in a survey of the Canadian political situation, *New Times* May 1991, the Western based Reform Party headed by Mr. Preston Manning, son of the former Premier of Alberta, Mr. Ernest Manning, could prove a type of dangerous decoy, mobilising electors to take them in a different direction to the one they at least instinctively feel they should be going. Recent reports from Canada tend to confirm Eric Butler's analysis, with the Reform Party now purging itself of all those who are tinged with "racism". Perhaps the most revealing statement by the Reform Party is that even the questioning of a

"holocaust" casualties during World War II is "anti-Semitic" and "is not a legitimate historical thesis and has absolutely no place in the Reform Party". This statement, along with support for a "non-racist" immigration policy, explains why Preston Manning's party is regarded so favourably by the Canadian establishment media. The Manning attitude will also ensure that there are no problems in raising funds from Zionist controlled sources.

Australians should carefully heed the Canadian situation as they increasingly look for some type of alternatives to the present major political parties. All the evidence reveals that support for the two major political parties, Labor and the Liberals, is still declining. And the polls indicate that there is rising support for Independents. There is a growing grass-roots ferment, which is resulting in a change of thinking about economics and finance. The emergence of a new rural based movement, the Union of Farmers, which grew out of the Bankwatch movement, is one of the manifestations of what is taking place. Farmers, manufacturers and small businessmen are openly challenging the policy of reduced protection for Australian industries, while there is a rapidly growing understanding of how this policy is linked to an international programme.

While it is extremely unlikely that the minor Australian Democrats party can force its way into the House of Representatives at the next Federal Elections, the polls suggest that it should retain enough support to ensure that it continues to have members in the Senate, thus making certain that there is a division of power in the Senate. The stage is being set where good Independent candidates may be elected to both the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Unlike the Canadian situation, the Australian political scene is not likely to produce some new "reform" party with the backing of the establishment media. One possible problem is that the parties, well aware of the Independent threat, will be running their own "Independent" candidates and then relying upon their preferences. All Independent candidates should be subjected to the closest possible scrutiny and invited to sign a firm contract with electors. No candidate should be supported who will not give a written undertaking to work and vote for the introduction of the Elector's Veto, this enabling electors to force a referendum on any unwanted legislation or financial policy, with the government constitutionally obliged to heed the vote of the electors.

THE CENTRALIST MANIA

In a realistic sense, advocates of centralised power as a means of producing a better world are insane. Insanity is divorcement from reality. As the turbulent plight of the world graphically demonstrates that so far from producing harmony, centralisation creates growing friction, there is no evidence of repentance from the centralisers, but a determination to press on with their attempts to make their theories work.

The fragmentation of the former Soviet Empire continues, with the different ethnic groups determined to control their own destinies. The agony of the former Yugoslavia is painfully clear. Czechoslovakia threatens to split.

And just when the planners thought that their plans for creating the European Superstate were neatly in place, the Danes rejected the Maastricht treaties at a referendum, sending Shockwaves throughout Western Europe. A press report reads: "In European institutions, alarmed commissioners have been trying to press ahead with the timetable for union, even though the Danish referendum result, at least technically, renders those

plans null and void." The planners even attempt to ignore their own rules when they obstruct their drive towards centralised power.

As we have consistently pointed out, the concept of any type of harmonious Western European Federal Union has been doomed from the beginning. Speaking at a recent conference, *The European Movement*, organised by the Humanities Research Centre at the Canberra National University, Dr. Jeremy Black, a Historian from Britain's Durham University, poured scorn on the idea of a United States of Europe. Dr. Black said that the vision of a United States of Europe is more deeply rooted in political mythology than reality. Dr. Black claims that "even history is being reconstructed to lend credence to it", and that "There is a growing disquiet among many of us at these attempts to create a political mythology for the origins of Europe, to support the notion that this is the way things should be."

Speaking as an historian he says he is skeptical about whether there is any common feeling or sense of identity among the peoples of Western Europe. But this type of realism does not deter the planners, who attempt to push even harder for more centralisation as the problems of the present degree of centralisation increase. Eventually reality must shatter a political mythology, although this would be a most painful process.

APARTHEID IN THE USA

South Africa was made the whipping boy for the world's do-gooders, these acting as a front for the internationalists determined to bring South Africa with its vast mineral resources into the New World Order. It has now been disclosed from Moscow that the Soviet Union invested heavily in the South African Communist Party, something well known to all students of the Communist conspiracy, as a means of controlling the African National Congress.

But while the present South African government is being given international support for attempting to dismantle apartheid (separate development) in South Africa, the break up of the Soviet Empire has seen peoples of different ethnic backgrounds and cultures striving to establish apartheid. Seeking to preserve one's ethnic and cultural identity is a natural law, which the idealists, exploited by the international power groups, attempt to defy.

While the developments of the former multi-racial and multi-cultural Soviet Union are clear for all to see, with the unfortunate Kurds occasionally rating some media attention as they strive to gain independence and control their own destiny, generally overlooked is what has been happening in the USA. The famous "Melting pot" theory, which claims that peoples of different backgrounds and different cultures can all blend together in a harmonious one nation, is being defied by violent developments, the latest of these being the riots which started in Los Angeles and then engulfed most major American cities. It is not only conflict between blacks and whites, but black Americans are also expressing their strong feelings against Koreans, Vietnamese and Hispanic peoples.

The latest racial violence has accentuated a development, which has been under way for years in the USA: whites are in flight from the big cities, moving out into suburban and rural areas. Washington DC is a classic example of this. As the black population increased, the whites moved out. A recent report in the *New York Times* summarises what is happening: "The percentage of non-whites in main US cities has risen dramatically. In New York it has gone from 22 percent in 1970 to 49 percent in 1980. In Boston over the same period it went from 18 percent to 38 percent."

All attempts to prevent segregation in the USA have been a complete failure, including the attempt to integrate all students, irrespective of background, into the once educational system. Blacks as well as whites have suffered. Not surprisingly, there are those who believe that the USA is a nation in a state of terminal decline. The main lesson to learn from what is happening in the USA is that multiculturalism does not work. Australians and New Zealanders still have time to learn from what is happening in the USA and other parts of the worlds.

ANTI-CHRISTIAN BIAS

Zionist spokesmen insist that it should become a criminal offence for anyone to question the Jewish "Holocaust". British historian David Irving has been heavily fined by a German court for publicly stating that the alleged gassing of millions of Jews at Auschwitz was a complete hoax. Linked with the insistence that the "Holocaust" is now a type of religious faith is a campaign to blame Christians generally for the "Holocaust". There is increasing stress on the alleged "anti-Semitic" nature of traditional Christianity, with quotations from the New Testament being given as evidence.

Because Christians generally have not as yet dared to challenge the Auschwitz hoax, they are being forced on to the defensive. But apparently those beliefs, which are sacred to most Christians, can be challenged without any problems, as witnessed by Dr. Thiering's radical views about Christ. There was a time when such views would have been denounced as blasphemous. But today only a Jewish faith is regarded as so sacred that it is made illegal to even question it.

THE CONTROL OF CURRENCY

"Once a nation parts with its control of currency and credit, it matters not who makes the nation's laws. Usury once in control will wreck any nation. Until the control of the issue of currency and credit is restored to the government, recognised as it's most conspicuous and sacred duty, all talk of sovereignty and democracy is idle and futile."

— W.L. Mackenzie-King, Prime Minister of Canada,
Speaking in 1939.

TESTIMONIAL ISSUE NEXT MONTH

Time has not permitted a complete compilation and editing of all the addresses delivered at the series of Testimonial Dinners for Eric and Elma Butler for this issue, as planned. But the July issue will be enlarged for a full coverage of a series of dinners, which reflected the deep growth of the Social Credit movement in Australia. The last and biggest dinner, held in Toowoomba on Friday, May 29, was professionally filmed. Apart from Eric Butler's address in response to the numerous testimonies, there were addresses by National Director David Thompson and Assistant National Director, Chas Pinwill, and by Mr. Jeremy Lee. This Dinner was chaired by veteran League supporter Mr. Keith Fuss of Toowoomba. There were many outstanding highlights, some of them extremely humorous, resulting in a most memorable evening in keeping with the Social Credit spirit of optimism.