

THE NEW TIMES

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

VOL.58, No. 9.

Registered by Australia Post - Publication PP481667 100259

SEPTEMBER 1994.

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

BEHIND THE GREEN DEBATE

by Mark Mansfield, B.Ec.

The following is the text of a Paper given by Mr. Mark Mansfield at the 1994 Western Australian State Seminar of The Australian League of Rights, on Saturday, August 13. Mark Mansfield gained his Bachelor of Economics degree with distinction at the University of Western Australia.

In recent years development versus conservation battles have captured headlines in all States. In Tasmania, the building of the Wesley Vale pulp mill was stopped because of widespread protests against the mill. In Queensland, logging of the Daintree rainforest was halted by the Commonwealth government using the external affairs power. In New South Wales, plans by the Navy to relocate their munitions stores to the NSW South Coast were blocked by Federal Cabinet for fear of damage to a fragile environment. In Western Australia, protesters are mounting blockades against the logging of old growth karri forests in the State's southwest.

Why is there such a conflict on green issues? Who is creating it? Who is benefiting from confrontation on green issues? To answer these questions the agenda behind the green debate must be examined.

Wesley Vale, Daintree, Coronation Hill, the Franklin Dam. These names are synonymous with the battles between the environment and development, which heralded the arrival of conservation as a major political issue during the 1980s. In each of these cases, the conservation movement lobbied governments to put an end to these projects because they had justifiable concerns about the substantial impact that such projects would have on the local environment.

It is very hard for a largely city based conservation movement to identify waste and pollution that could be generated by such projects in largely pristine rural environments. Opposing such projects however, only deals with the symptoms and not the causes of environmental degradation. The greatest environment problems exist in our cities.

Australia is one of the most urbanised countries in the world with around 80% of the population living in cities around the coastline. The concentration of the population into such small areas is the source of most of the environmental damage in Australia. Most Australians spend their week travelling to work, slowly, in peak hour traffic congestion. Increasingly, this travel is being undertaken from suburbs further and further out from city centres as our cities sprawl uncontrollably along our coastline.

We now have problems with photochemical smog. Industry

emissions and vehicle exhausts contribute to a permanent blanket of brown haze over our cities.

Waste and sewerage disposal is a major problem. Gone are the days when sewerage could be pumped into the sea, because it is fouling the beaches we use for recreation. In a continent where water is a scarce resource, we are spending enormous

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, either described as public or private.

To encourage all 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.

resources to maintain quality water supplies for large population centres. The Western Australian State government has announced it is spending \$800 million to deep sewer the 40% of metropolitan Perth that has been using septic tanks, because waste products are leaching into ground water supplies used for drinking.

We are having problems with finding enough landfill to bury our rubbish. In the 'throw away' age, we have many single-use disposable products, which because they are made of plastics and other non-biodegradable materials only decay over centuries. There is planned built-in obsolescence in the big-ticket items which consumers purchase such as white goods, cars and electrical goods. If people only needed to buy these items once, whole industries, whose survival depends on turnover of production, would disappear. No real effort is made to recycle these items because our financial system does not deem it cost effective to do so.

Aside from the impact of cities on the physical environment, there is the more dramatic impact on our social environment. The cold and impersonal nature of big cities is breaking down community bonds. Why is crime and poverty a proportionately bigger problem in cities than in the country?

Our cities are consuming more and more resources at the expense of rural Australia and producing greater waste. In the jargon of the economic rationalists, our cities, because they are too big, are producing

diseconomies of scale. Professor Geoffrey Blainey commented a few years ago that small country towns produced more in exports than Canberra, a city of 350,000. Although Professor Blainey was speaking about Australia's bureaucratic city, he nevertheless made the point that small is beautiful.

Despite all the environmental damage caused by our cities being too big, they are still growing - at the expense of rural and regional Australia. Dramatic evidence of this decline can be gained by looking at the fall in the number of rural holdings in Australia. In 1967 there were around 256,000 rural holdings in Australia. By 1992, in the space of a generation, this had halved to 128,000 rural holdings, despite the same area of land remaining under cultivation. Rural populations are in decline.

Many farmers whose families have been farming for three or more generations have been forced off their land by debt and taxes. The philosophy of 'get big or get out' has been adopted, because costs can only be kept down by spreading them over increased production. There is no room in the equation here for the maintenance of the family farm. If it can't cope with punitive interest rates, escalating taxes and the handicap of government regulation, it must go.

This is a policy of financial collectivism. In Russia, the Communists collectivised by murdering 25 million farmers, with the result that Russia could not supply all its food needs and was reliant on the capitalist West to feed it. In Australia,

we are sending family farmers broke and handing their farms over to large agri-business firms who run the farms as factory farms. This only results in over cropping and overgrazing, as the land is belted to make a buck.

Big business ignores the reality that farms cannot be operated like factories, mass-producing goods. Factories, because they are enclosed environments, can operate 24 hours a day, but farming is governed by the seasons. This is in stark contrast to the family farmer who nurtures his land, because he wants to hand his farm on to his children in a condition, which is better than when it was passed to him.

Collectivism, whether by financial means, or government policy, is the cause of physical and social environmental degradation. In Australia, the Commonwealth government has found a devastating way of using centralism to undermine our social environment.

Until 1983 few Australians had heard of the Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage. In 1982, the Tasmanian Hydro-Electric commission planned to dam the Gordon River in order to build a hydroelectric power station. The Tasmanian Labor and Liberal parties both supported the building of the dam, when the Tasmanian Parliament voted to approve the dam in June 1982. This approval triggered a storm of protest from environment groups in opposition to the dam, led by the

Tasmanian Wilderness Society under Dr. Bob Brown. Protesters mounted a blockade at the dam site. The Commonwealth Liberal government of Malcolm Fraser proceeded to nominate the South West of Tasmania for World Heritage Listing with

"The danger which at the moment threatens individuals' liberty far more than any extension of individual enterprise is the Servile State; the creation of an irresistible and impersonal organisation through which the ambition of able men, animated consciously or unconsciously by the lust of domination, may operate to the enslavement of their fellows. Under such a system the ordinary citizen probably would be far worse off than under private enterprise freed from the domination of finance."

- C.H. Douglas in *Economic Democracy*

UNESCO, despite the opposition of the Tasmanian Liberal Government. The South-West of Tasmania was listed as a world heritage area on 14 December 1982 by the World Heritage Committee in Paris.

During the 1983 Federal election, the Labor Party campaigned on using the Commonwealth government's powers to stop the building of the dam, in order to shore up green votes. As events turned out, one might say those were very green voters being manipulated to produce an outcome, which few people would want. With Labor's election in March 1983 came the passage of the World Heritage Properties Conservation Act, which sought to give the Commonwealth government the power to regulate World Heritage listed uses. The Commonwealth government was so concerned to protect South West Tasmania that the Attorney General, Gareth Evans, earned the nickname "Biggles" by authorising spy flights by the RAAF to photograph progress on the dam.

The Hawke government issued a regulation under its new legislation forbidding construction of the dam without its approval. The Tasmanian government commenced legal action in the High Court to have the legislation overturned. Sir Harry Gibbs, Chief Justice of the High Court, stated that the Court

was not interested in whether or not the dam should be built on environmental grounds. The Court was only concerned with whether the Commonwealth government had the power, under its World Heritage Properties Conservation Act, which implemented the World Heritage Convention, to halt construction of the dam.

On July 1, 1983, in a 4-3 decision, the High Court found that the Commonwealth did have the power to stop the building of the dam because Section 51 (xxix) of the Australian Constitution, the external affairs power, gave the Commonwealth government the power to give effect to the international treaties and conventions which it had signed. This was despite Section 100 of the Australian Constitution specifically guaranteeing the States full control and use over their waterways.

Opposition to the building of the Franklin dam started as a campaign by conservation groups to preserve a wilderness area from environmental damage. What resulted was the Commonwealth government gaining the power to enter into foreign treaties and use them to override the Australian Constitution, the laws made by State parliaments and State governments, and the lives of the Australian people.

Was the dam necessary? Apparently not. A report titled *Compensation and the Dam*, from the Economics Department of the University of Tasmania found that the Hydro-Electric Commission had over-estimated industrial demand for electricity. The report found that it would have been cheaper to implement energy conservation measures and build a small thermal power station.

It also found that each Tasmanian household was subsidising large industrial users of electricity by \$190 per year, while small business was subsidising large industry by \$25 million a year. The report suggested that this was destroying jobs in labour intensive small business in favour of mainland-controlled, capital-intensive large industries, to help keep Tasmania an economic backwater.

It was almost as if the Franklin dam was an *agent provocateur* for the policy of centralism. Where big business was unable to get subsidised electricity from a dam, the Commonwealth gained the power to subvert Australia's constitution and laws.

Since the Franklin dam case the Commonwealth has used the World Heritage Convention to stop logging of the Daintree

"So long as the debt system is maintained (viz: the payment of interest on loans or investments by way of cheap food), soil erosion must inevitably be the consequence, and that system accompanies economic expansion and international trade. So long as industrialism is expanded, soil area must be diminished and soil productivity exploited. As Jacks and Whyte wrote in The Rape of the Earth: 'The unprecedented economic expansion during the nineteenth century has been followed by a worldwide biological deterioration of the land'."

- H.J. Massingham in *This Plot of Earth*.

in Queensland and the Lemon Thyme Forest in Tasmania. A committee of bureaucrats in Paris is World Heritage listing areas of Australia, and then telling Australians how they should manage these areas, thus presuming that Australians cannot be trusted to look after their own country. Most Australians would be insulted by this suggestion.

If the conservation movement believes that World Heritage listing is a last resort to protect fragile environments in Australia from irresponsible developers and State governments, then they are sadly mistaken. It appears that there is a much wider agenda to World Heritage listing than concern for the environment. In 1989 Brazil became the first country to cede control of some of its World Heritage listed rainforest to UNESCO in return for a \$12 million write-off of its foreign debt. This was referred to as a *debt for equity swap*. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, more commonly known as the World Bank, sees debt for equity swaps as a means of controlling resource development. Given Australia's foreign debt is now over \$200 million; one must ask when will we begin to receive the same treatment as Brazil?

Last year the Commonwealth government ratified the Convention on Biodiversity, which resulted from the big environment conference held in Rio de Janeiro in December 1992. On the drawing board is the ratification of the UN *Convention on Desertification*. This latter convention is concerned with regulating land use in an attempt to halt the spread of deserts destroying land for agriculture.

The Commonwealth government is already using the High Court's Mabo ruling to attempt to take control of the regulation of Crown lands away from the States, where it is claimed that native title has not already been extinguished. This is a major problem in Western Australia and less so in the Eastern States. When this treaty is ratified, it is quite conceivable that the Commonwealth government will use this treaty to attempt to regulate all land in Australia.

However, the Commonwealth government is not just stopping at using treaties and conventions to regulate the environment. Last year, it created the Commonwealth Environment Protection Agency, duplicating the role of the equivalent State-based EPA's in an obvious move to eventually replace them. It is headed by Barry Carbon, who was the chief executive of Western Australia's EPA, before the WA government declined to retain his services. The Commonwealth is now proposing to transform its EPA into the National Environmental Protection Council (NEPC).

The NEPC is to consist of the Commonwealth, State and Territory environment Ministers, who will produce enforceable national pollution standards for air, land and water. Such standards would require a two-thirds majority of the council to be set, and can be overturned only by the Commonwealth Parliament. The State and Territory Parliaments would forgo all their powers to set their own pollution control standards. It is envisaged that the Commonwealth would run the bureaucracy for the NEPC.

The thinking behind such a council assumes that environmental standards set in Canberra should apply to all of Australia, regardless of the differences in local environments. Australia is not a uniform environment. National environmental standards remove control from the local people who live in

their environment and best know how to manage their environment. Standards provide no incentive to achieve better than the prescribed standard and because of their inflexibility; they often prevent people choosing the lowest cost response to meet environmental objectives. The NEPC also assumes that it is the fount of wisdom for setting standards.

To date, the Western Australian government is the only State government to oppose the NEPC.

Bureaucracies, set up with the best of intentions to help prevent damage to our environment will always fail because the financial cause of environmental damage is ignored.

In an age of increasing automation, labour is being displaced from the production process. Australia has more than 10% of its work force unemployed, yet no one is suggesting that we have a shortage of productive capacity to supply all of the food, clothing and shelter needs of all Australians, as well as the many other goods and services we consume. Advertisers are begging us to consume the produce of our productive system.

From observation, it appears that we do not need to have all of the work force employed in order to provide a comfortable standard of living for the whole population. This has been apparent for decades. Australia, in common with every other developed nation, has seen a steady increase in the unemployment you have when all industries are producing at full employment.

However, many people in Australia live in poverty because they are unemployed or have low incomes. Note that they are not poor because they do not have work. They are poor because they do not have sufficient money to consume enough of those goods and services already produced, and which are surplus to the requirements of those who have sufficient incomes to maintain a comfortable standard of living.

Because our productive system is so efficient at producing goods and services, we are often producing more than we need and more than we can export. When gluts occur, if the stockpiles can't be sold they are destroyed. Our wool stockpile is treated as a national disaster because we cannot dispose of it. Millions of sheep were slaughtered to slow down production. In Europe, they are pouring their milk and wine lakes down the drain and destroying their butter mountain. This waste is criminal, especially when there are many people who go without merely because they do not have the money to consume. Why does this happen?

We have an economic system that says unless you work you shall not eat. It does not matter how destructive to the individual and the environment this employment is, or whether the employment is necessary, so long as it is employment. There are vast numbers of people unemployed in government and corporate bureaucracies, who do not actually produce anything useful. We are plundering our environment by wood chipping forests and excavating mine sites, and dumping the products from these activities at fire-sale prices on world markets, because the financial system says there is a profit in employing people to do this. We are afflicted by 'employmentism'.

Our financial system is the major cause of employmentism. Money is an inorganic symbol, which determines how resources are mobilised and consumed. Money is manufactured

"The career of science is strewn with discarded theories and exploded dogmas; the scientific faith is as riddled with superstition as any other faith. More so indeed, since no other faith has quite so blindly credited its own fallibility. The first scientists were modest men; they advanced postulates with diffidence and a respect for truth that they could only touch the hem of her garment. But the modern scientist is rarely distinguished for either."

H.J. Massingham in *This Plot of Earth*.

by our banking system as book entries, which these days mostly occur in computers. After creating these entries out of nothing, the banks then claim to own this money, and lend it at interest, to those people who undertake the activities of their choosing. Remember, we are only talking about an abstract symbol, not something real, not something organic.

Imagine if the Electoral Commission, who print all the ballot papers for the community to decide who it wants to govern it, said that because they print all the symbols with which the community makes this decision, they own the symbols and can fill out all the ballot papers themselves! There would be uproar!

But this is precisely what banks do. They claim to own the money and lend it against people's credit. This credit is the ability of individuals, companies and governments to produce goods and services, when they mobilise resources with money. If individuals, companies and governments have the raw materials, the technology and skilled labour to produce goods and services demanded by the community, but the banking system does not grant the symbols for this to occur, it does not happen. The whole of the real economy is held to ransom by those who create and distribute the symbols.

When the banks do make the symbols available on their terms, it is as an interest bearing debt. The trouble with interest is that it can never be paid off. If the banks demanded repayment of, say, the roughly \$300 billion in Australia at the moment at, say, an average interest rate of 8%, we would have to pay \$324 billion back at years end. You can't do this if there is only \$300 billion. Consequently, the interest is compounded as a debt.

The whole economy then slaves away at the impossible task of trying to repay the ever-increasing debt to the banking system. Family life, human personality and the environment are sacrificed for production. While production and consumption in their turn are sacrificed for monetary profit.

The economy does not exist to provide employment, something, which it is failing at anyway because of technological progress. It does not exist to pay debt. The sole purpose of production is consumption. This was stated in the encyclical letter '*Quadragesimo Anno*', by His Holiness Pope Pius XI in 1931, when he wrote:

"Then only will the economic and social organism be soundly established and attain its end, when it secures for all and each these goods which the wealth and resources of nature, technical achievement and the social organisation of economic affairs can give. These goods should be sufficient to supply all needs and an honest livelihood, and to uplift men to

that higher level of prosperity and culture, which, provided it be used with prudence, is not only no hindrance but is of singular help to virtue."

God has created the Earth and all that is in our environment. Man has been placed in stewardship over the environment in order to use it to bring order to his temporal affairs, so that he can concentrate on developing his personality. Resources exist to sustain individuals and families in dignity befitting their development. Production should be subservient to this. Money should be subservient to production.

The conservation movement has been sidetracked into exalting nature above the needs of man, because it lacks an understanding that finance is the root cause of environmental damage. If it is to play a valuable role in helping to put an end to policies of waste and pollution, it must understand and have a sound policy on debt and finance.

Genuine conservation is about enjoying the resources of our environment while preserving it for the use of future generations. It is to this end that our social, economic and environmental policies should be integrated, so that we can pass on a better world to future generations.

"FOR FEAR OF THE JEWS"

Joseph Sobran is one of the USA's most distinguished journalists. He was a close colleague of William Buckley Jr., founding editor of the well-known American conservative magazine, *National Review*, until there was a falling out on the "Jewish Question". William Buckley's father was a friend of the famous British writer, Douglas Reed. It has long been stated that William Buckley Jr. was "terrified of his father's anti-Semitism". Sobran relates how Bill Buckley "warned me privately and urgently against criticising Israel . . ."

Sobran contributes a regular column, "Washington Watch", to *The Wanderer*, the USA's oldest Roman Catholic weekly and in his column of June 9, comments on how fear of the Zionist-Jewish propaganda machine results in many conservatives "playing down" the "Jewish Question", mentioned in three most important books, *By Way of Deception* by Victor Ostrovsky, *The Sampson Option* by Seymour Hersh, and *Special Tasks* by Pavel Sudaplatov. As the first two books are by Jews, while Sudaplatov was married to a Jewess and is strongly pro-Jewish, it has not been possible to use the "anti-Semitic" smear.

Sobran writes, "I could make a long list of Christian conservatives - Judaeo-Christians, so to speak - who are . . . timid - some of them mask their timidity behind belligerence against that great evil of our time, anti-Semitism; others pose as brave defenders of poor little beleaguered Israel. People have a way of praising what they fear, as everyone in Russia who dared to speak at all used to celebrate Stalin in the most fulsome terms. Yet looking back, we can now see that the praise itself was nothing but a barometer of inner dread, and the people who uttered it appear in retrospect despicable, sometimes-pitiable cowards. In the future, I'm sure, the now fashionable toadying to Jews will appear equally embarrassing, even to Jews.

"The obvious question raised by such craven conduct is whether the prevalent 'fear of the Jews' - the phrase recurs in the *Acts of the Apostles* - is rational or irrational. The news media certainly don't shy away from critical reporting on the Christian right or the Catholic Church, nor should they. But this is also to acknowledge that the Christian right and the Catholic Church accept criticism as legitimate or, at least, lack the clout to make it taboo. The organised though amorphous Jewish power does neither. (It is of course important to bear in

mind that most Jews aren't responsible for this, and it is morally and intellectually wrong to blame them indiscriminately . . .

"When I criticise Israel from the most obvious consideration of conservative principle and the Christian-American interest, I find that other Christians regard me as either notably courageous or as simply foolhardy. I don't think I'm either . . . but both opinions do show how *dangerous* people think the Jewish influence is - dangerous, at least to anyone who wants a career in politics or journalism . . .

This means that American public disclosure is being quietly and constantly warped by unseen pressures. It would be one thing if we simply had an explicit rule that criticism of Israel and Jewish political power is taboo. But an open taboo is almost a contradiction in terms. The essence of a taboo is the pretence that no subject is really being avoided, that (so to speak) there is no subject *there*. The power is immensely increased because it goes unmentioned, unmeasured, uncriticised. You can't even talk back to it if you can't talk about it. Any public debate is obviously bound to be distorted if Jews may say things about Christians which Christians may not say about Jews; the Holocaust can be blamed on Christianity, but it might cause a certain disturbance if the Communist slaughter of Christians, or even Israeli treatment of non-Jews, were singularly linked to the Talmud's teaching about Gentiles, or to its blasphemies about Christ.

"The older I get, the more I am impressed by the pervasive fear of the Jews or rather, pervasive in some critical power centres."

THE DANGER OF "MATHEMATICAL EQUALITY"

"No one doubts that all men are equal in regard to their being of the same race and nature and having the same final end to be attained by each, and as far as the right and duties that follow from that end are concerned. But as they are all unequally gifted, as they differ in qualities of mind and body, and as there exists among them almost innumerable distinctions of manners, tastes, and characters, nothing is more repugnant to reason as to wish to apply the same measure to all and to introduce a strict mathematical equality into the regulation of civic life."

- Pope Leo XIII in *Humanum Genus*,

WHAT IS BEHIND THE MASSIVE NATIONAL ANTI-LEAGUE OF RIGHTS CAMPAIGN?

by Eric D. Butler

The first day of official Spring was not a pleasant day for Federal Liberal Opposition leader Downer, nor was it an uplifting day for Australian taxpayers as the Parliament at Canberra was reduced to a circus as Prime Minister Paul Keating, aided by the mass media, stepped up a smearing attack on the League of Rights with the aim of further destabilising a Liberal Party, already in turmoil as a result of the new leader, Alexander Downer, suddenly firing his predecessor, Dr. John Hewson, from his shadow front bench. The major opening shot against Downer by Paul Keating was that back in 1987, when a junior Federal Liberal Member, Alexander Downer had spoken at an Adelaide Seminar devoted to a defence of the Australian Constitutional Heritage. There was little or no reference to what Downer had spoken about; his "crime" was that he had spoken on the same platform as the "evil", "anti-Semitic" and "racist" founder of the League of Rights, Eric Butler.

When approached by Channel TV 9 to do another of those "in depth" programmes on the League of Rights, allegedly because of the publication of a book by David Greason, *I was a Teenage Fascist*, and informed that the TV 9 team were prepared to come all the way from Sydney to a League Regional Dinner in Western Victoria, at Nhill, I quickly realised that something big concerning the League was being planned. As Prince Charles has said concerning the mass media, you are damned if you do not agree to co-operate, often with blatant inventions being used, but also damned if you do appear because one has little control over what is shown on TV or printed. I took the same view on this occasion as that taken by the late Malcolm Muggeridge when answering an opening question by a really sleazy TV interviewer who had asked Muggeridge why, as he had said some scathing things about TV as a media, did he bother to appear? I saw this interview in Vancouver, Canada, and can still see Muggeridge with a benign look on his face responding, "Well, I see myself as an organist in a brothel, gently playing *Abide With Me*, in the faint hope that some of my message might get through to the inmates." One smart-alec radio interviewer did not like this story, when I said I often felt like Muggeridge. The interview came to a sudden end.

SUSPICION AROUSED

It was during the Nhill episode that my suspicions were heightened when asked if the League could provide a video of the Downer appearance at the Adelaide Seminar. At that stage I had not even seen the video myself, although - along with Mr. Jeremy Lee, at that time an official of the League of Rights - I had spoken at the Seminar. An embargo was immediately placed upon the video. I have since looked at the video and must say that my memory of the event was refreshed. Alexander gave a brilliant address in defence of the Federal constitution. He attacked centralisation of power. And much more. What a pity he is not speaking out like this today! But Mr. Downer had an unfortunate experience on his way to the Adelaide Seminar. He was informed that he had been dropped from the Shadow Opposition Ministry. And Zionist leader Isi Leibler, who has said that one of his aims is to drive the League of Rights out of existence, has now admitted that after the Adelaide Seminar, he had contacted Mr. Downer to warn him against appearing on League platforms. Clearly

Alexander Downer remembers this episode, as he does how Zionist pressure forced reluctant Liberal and National Opposition Members to agree to the obscene and costly War Crime legislation. He also noticed the extent of Zionist influence when the Labor party, turning its back on its professed support of free speech, denied British historian David Irving a visa to visit Australia.

Shortly after wresting the Liberal leadership from John Hewson, Downer gave a major interview to *The Australian Jewish News*, stating that he "detested" the policies (unstated) of the League of Rights and was also opposed to allowing David Irving to visit Australia. He agreed in general with the necessity for the Racial Vilification legislation. Not surprisingly, the Zionists pronounced that they were reasonably satisfied with Downer. But Downer made the mistake of overlooking the fact that Zionist influence is much greater inside the Labor Party than inside the Opposition parties, and that Zionist strategists are quite willing to sacrifice Downer to suit their own long-term purposes. It can be taken as axiomatic that few, if any, modern party politicians become senior politicians without having been carefully screened. And there is the influence of the mass media, with its gaggle of reporters who today are secular humanists with few moral standards. Old-fashioned journalism is now out of date. In Australia a strong pro-Socialist bias is dominant among the journalists. Some, like Laurie Oakes, who played a major role in triggering off the current national anti-League campaign with a vicious article in *The Bulletin*, can only be described as pro-Labor hatchet men.

STUMBLING PERFORMANCE

With his stumbling performance on the Mabo Land Rights issue and the homosexual question, Downer had already indicated he was not the stuff of genuine leadership. It was not surprising therefore that when given the lash with the first anti-League allegation; he cowered away and left the media and Paul Keating to crucify him. What he should have done, of course, was to frankly admit that he had addressed a League of Rights seminar in 1987 on the Federal Constitution, and that he felt free to address or to associate with any group running a Seminar on an issue like the Constitution. He could have turned the issue back on Paul Keating, charging him with trying to prevent a Member of Parliament from speaking where

he liked. But the anti-League smear was already dominating the mass media of Australia and Downer, conscious of the Zionist influence, started weaving in a most unedifying spectacle. He could not remember whether the Seminar was a League sponsored function, and has outraged older Liberal party supporters in South Australia by referring vaguely to some "elderly couple" who persuaded him to speak at what he thought was merely some "Christian body".

The "elderly couple" was in fact well known in South Australian Liberal Party circles. Mr. Eric Issachsen, an ex-serviceman like so many League of Rights supporters, was a prominent South Australian professional man, closely associated with the Chamber of Commerce and other organisations. Unlike Mr. Downer, Eric Isaachsen frankly said that he had chaired the Downer Paper, that he had been a supporter of the League for thirty years and a member of the Liberal Party. I have no idea, but can guess, as to how a video of the Adelaide Seminar came into the possession of TV 7, but the manner in which it was used in the Federal parliament and be sections of the media, was striking example of how low the Australian media has sunk. The video clearly showed Eric Isaachsen introducing Mr. Downer, and at the conclusion of the address being thanked. But because Mr. Downer referred to "Eric", the *Melbourne Age*, for example, blatantly claimed that I was on the platform with Alexander Downer. As yet the *Age* has not corrected the falsehood.

A LIBERAL PARTY WITCH HUNT!

Having made the first retreat in this affair, Downer continued to go backwards. He was forced to admit that he did in fact know who had chaired his meeting, this setting the media off again in full cry about League "infiltration" into the Liberal Party. Downer immediately responded, with more headlines stating that there was going to be a "probe" into how much League "infiltration" had taken place. Presumably the Liberal Party is about to engage in a type of witch hunt, one which can only further increase tensions between those "moderate" Liberals who would be more at home in The Democrats, and those who still adhere to the traditional value system upon which the Liberals once prided themselves. I am not surprised by Democrat claims that large numbers of Liberals would like to join them in a new party. The one hope for the survival of traditional Australia is the emergence of a genuinely conservative movement, its major objective being to free Australia from internationalism and to foster financial and economic policies, which will enable a genuine nationalism to emerge.

Such a development will meet with fierce opposition by the mass media. Prominent in this opposition will be Isi Leibler and his associates who have never deviated from their declared intention to destroy the League of Rights. They have cheered every politician who has promoted anti-League campaigns. There was the call back in 1988 for an all-party investigation of the League, particularly of its finances. Prominent among these was former Queensland Labor Member Wright, currently in prison. As Wright, once tipped as a possible Federal Labor leader, had some knowledge of the League's financial policies, a League supporter having helped him to write his maiden speech in the Queensland parliament on State banking, it was

always a puzzle why he should have taken it upon himself to lead an anti-League campaign in the Federal parliament. As his sexual perversions, which led to his being sentenced to prison, were reasonably well known throughout Central Queensland, it is legitimate to ask did he feel vulnerable to blackmail? Perhaps one day Mr. Wright will explain his role in the anti-League campaign.

Whatever the final outcome, an anti-League campaign which has dominated the Australian media for some weeks, even spreading to New Zealand, is a major feature of basic coming changes in Australian politics. A closer analysis of the media campaign must await the future.

BASIC FUND SET AT \$50,000

The League of Rights' Basic Fund for 1994-95 has been set at \$50,000. a slight reduction from last year's target. The League has never asked for more than it believes its supporters can provide, and is sufficient to ensure that its on-going strategy is maintained. The current full-scale assault on the League dramatically demonstrates once again the necessity to keep expanding the league's activities In response to a letter from the Advisory National Director. Mr. Eric Butler, a selected number of older supporters have already "set the ball rolling" with some inspiring contributions.

The League's long-term strategy takes it through until the end of the century, by which time Paul Keating and his backers are confident that they can turn Australia into a Republic. Irrespective of what the critics say. the League's *influence* was never greater. The full time League team will be expanded with Mr. Terry Rogers being appointed as Victorian State Director. He will be making a Statewide tour to make contact with all key league supporters. We must stress that Terry Rogers has resigned from a professional position to volunteer his services. How many political movements can match this type of dedication? It is the volunteers who man the League's bookshops and provide the expertise, including the operation of computers, who make the League's national activities possible.

Providing that the minimum of \$50.000 is provided, the League is confident that it can build upon this and finance its expanding strategy. But without the Basic Fund it can achieve little. National Director David Thompson will be reporting on the Fund shortly. All donations should he sent to BOX 1052J, G.P.O. MELBOURNE. While we know that Labor Backbench Member Graeme Campbell has underestimated the League's influence, he makes a valid point when he says the League's financial resources do not match those of the Zionist lobby. But we are confident that we can continue to be more than a match for the Zionist totalitarian, and the growing collectivist disease.

THE MUSLIM FACTOR

A major feature of the global scene is the rising tide of what is often described as "Muslim fundamentalism". This rising tide has resulted in violence, which, as Prince Charles has pointed out, has closed many Western eyes to aspects of the Muslim religion, which the West must come to grips with. Those Western Christians who have converted to the Muslim religion invariably state that this conversion is primarily the result of what they see as a retreat by Christianity from its fundamental and traditional teachings. Much of the upsurge of Islamic fundamentalism is a reaction against the impact of what are perceived to be the worst features of Western-style cultures. There is also the same problem, which is polarising Western societies: the growing divisions between the rich and the poor.

Asian governments are increasing pressure, as are Middle East governments, to cope with those Muslims who are pushing for a return to traditional Muslim ways, the rule of Islamic Law and the creation of an Islamic State. Communist China is attempting to control Muslim communities in its Western provinces, where Muslim fundamentalists are fuelling a separatist movement in protest against Chinese rule. Western Chinese Muslims, estimated to total seventeen million, are close to Central Asia, where strong Islamic fundamentalist movements have already arisen.

In the predominantly Roman Catholic Philippines, the Muslim population total approximately five million, about one-eighth of the total population, and is concentrated mainly in the southwest of the country. The Philippines militia is attempting to destroy the Islamic fundamentalist group, which has been responsible for considerable acts of violence. There is talk concerning the possibility of greater local autonomy, although these are opposed by the more violent members of the Muslims.

Although Australia's biggest neighbour, Indonesia, is generally described as the biggest Muslim nation in the world, the government takes a strong stand against any suggestions for the creating of an Islamic State. Any suggestion by the fundamentalists of the creation of an Islamic State is regarded as subversive, with the death penalty for those found guilty. Authorities on Indonesia warn that the growing impact of Westernisation and the polarisation of the country will result in the same type of Islamic fundamentalist upsurge taking place in other countries.

What was once known as the Christian West, must if it is to survive, demonstrate that it offers a superior way of life. To do this, it must throw off the shackles of materialism being tightly fastened by debt finance.

HAVE YOU MADE YOUR DINNER BOOKING?

It's much later than you think, and once again there will be supporters seeking entry to the *New Times* Annual Dinner when it is too late to fit them in. This year's Dinner, to be held at The Victoria on Friday, September 30th, will enlighten guests on the incredible developments behind the Keating-Media-Zionist anti-League campaign. Guest of honour is British born Denis Walker, former Christian missionary in Southern Africa, and later Member of the Rhodesian-Zimbabwe Parliament, being forced to leave when his life was endangered by Comrade Mugabe. Now prominent member of the Monarchist League and Director of Fr. Arthur Lewis's Southern African Christian Group, Denis Walker was in South Africa just prior to the South African elections. No one can afford to miss what he has to say.

A panel of powerful speakers will address the Dinner. All bookings must be accompanied by \$30 per person. All guests must be ready to be seated at 7 p.m. There is a big programme. Pre-dinner drinks will be served from 6 p.m. onwards. Organisers reserve the right to decline bookings. Supporters and families only.

"The danger which at the moment threatens individual liberty far more than any extension of individual enterprise is the Servile State; the creation of an irresistible and impersonal organisation through which the ambition of able men, animated consciously or unconsciously by the lust of domination, may operate to the enslavement of their fellows. Under such a system the ordinary citizen would probably be far worse off than under private enterprise freed from the domination of finance." - C.H. Douglas in *Economic Democracy*.

DOWNER TAPE TO BE RELEASED

The now famous Downer videotape will be released at the National weekend - not before! The video also includes addresses by Eric Butler and Jeremy Lee.

Price: \$30.

ANNUAL NATIONAL SEMINAR

Three outstanding speakers: *Eric Butler*, exposing the long-term conspiracy to turn Australia into a Republic by subverting Municipal government. Unbelievable, but true. *Denis Walker* on the international importance of the Monarchy. *Nigel Jackson* on the spiritual and cultural implications of the Monarchy. Seminar starts at 2 p.m. Venue The Victoria, Little Collins Street. Entrance fee: \$5.00.

Printed and Published by The Australian League of Rights,
145 Russell Street, Melbourne, Victoria 3000.