THE NEW TIMES

"Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free " - **John 8:31.**

VOL. 58, No. 12. Registered by Australia Post -Publication PP481667 100259 **DECEMBER 1994.**

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

DOES THE TRUTH REALLY MAKE US FREE?

by Eric D. Butler

At the most famous trial in history, the man in charge of the trial, Pontius Pilate, responded to the claim by Christ that He had come that men might know the Truth, which would make them free, by asking the question *"What is Truth?"*. Pilate did not wait for an answer, promptly washing his hands of the whole affair. Christ had taught that those who sought to discover the Truth must search for it. In one of his most memorable statements, C.H. Douglas said of Social Crediters, "*We are trying to release reality.*"

One of the most dangerous of the many myths which dominate Mankind at a time when it is claimed that Science has freed man from all forms of superstition, is that man should treat Science as some type of new God. Not so long ago it was generally believed, even by those who described themselves as educated, that it was impossible to put a man on the moon. This belief was reasonable at the time it was held; man had not yet *discovered* the wide range of knowledge which made it possible for man to achieve what was previously thought impossible.

In one sense it was correct to call the moon project "a great scientific achievement", even a miracle. But the different types of scientists who worked on the project did not create the truths, which made the project possible. They *discovered* truths which when brought together enabled man to do something he had never done before. This was a special manifestation of the releasing of reality.

The history of the development of civilisation is one of progressive revelation of various types of truths. Numerous examples could be given of that exceptional individual who possesses what might be best described as *insight.* The great prophets of religion have been those who have possessed intuition, which cannot be expressed mathematically, or in any other "rational" manner. How do we measure love? There are such things as spiritual truths. Christ enunciated one of these when He taught that human beings should love one another. He stressed on various occasions the importance of love. The rationalist may scoff at spiritual truths, but the reality is that *when applied* they have transformed man's environment and encouraged the growth of a different kind of culture. Graeco-Roman Europe was *transformed* by the impact of a spiritual truth brought by Christianity. Europe was for centuries known as *Christian* Europe, one in which there were concepts of decency, fairness and chivalry, these previously unknown.

Government and the associated question of power were subordinated to the truths, which Christianity had brought. When Christ spoke to those whom He moved among, He did not attempt to use logic. In His life he manifested the nature of God. He spoke often of God's kingdom, but when asked about it, and when it might come, He replied *"The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: Neither shall they say Lo here, Lo there! for behold the Kingdom of God is within you."*

But Truth is not an end in itself, but a means to an end. When man has found it, he must then incarnate it.

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.

Faith without works is death. Douglas stressed the vital importance of the Doctrine of Incarnation, this enabling man to enjoy true freedom. The future of Christian Civilisation depends upon sufficient people who call themselves Christians, understanding this most important of all Truths.

FEDERAL LABOR M.P. ATTACKS RACIAL HATRED BILL, 1994.

Speaking in the Australian Federal Parliament on November 15, West Australian Labor Member, Graeme Campbell, delivered one of the most courageous addresses heard in the parliament for a long time. The robust language recalled the type of addresses, which Labor Members of the past occasionally gave. These Members were Australian nationalists, not internationalists like Prime Minister Paul Keating and his colleagues.

The fate of the Racial Hatred Bill, which Zionist spokesmen have openly indicated is directed against the League of Rights, will be decided in the Senate early next year. The widespread distribution of Graeme Campbell's parliamentary address will help the Australian people to understand the far-reaching implications of the government's legislation and why it should be vigorously opposed. All Senators should be contacted.

The following is the *"Hansard"* report of the Campbell address, with our cross-headings added:

MR. CAMPBELL (Kalgoorlie)(10.32 p.m.) - The honourable member for Macquarie (Ms. Daahm) gave us a definition of racism. I did not have a university education, but I can give the House a much more succinct, current and germane description of racism and of a racist. A racist today is anyone who wins an argument with a multiculturalist.

I believe the Racial Hatred Bill is an insult to Australia and Australians. It is an absolute disgrace that it has even been brought before the parliament and it will be an infamous day in our political history if it is passed. This is one of the most draconian pieces of legislation ever brought before the parliament in peacetime. It is in the same class as the Communist Party Dissolution Bill, and the case for it is shot through with mendacity and misrepresentation. The fact that this bill is before parliament and may well be passed says a great deal about our political leadership.

Our system has always been able to cope with corrupt individual politicians, but when entire political parties have been intellectually corrupted the system begins to break down. On key issues such as immigration, multiculturalism and Asianisation we have a tyranny of the minorities and a disenfranchisement of the majority. This bill is the starkest indicator of that process so far.

The elites who have been pushing these policies realise that, even though they dominate the bureaucracies and academia, they are losing the intellectual argument. Their crude cries of 'racist' and 'racism' are proving less and less effective. Now they want a piece of legislation to compliment the declining power of the social sanctions against speaking out. It can be observed that one cost of increasing the cultural and racial diversity of democratic nations has been a decline in the ability to speak freely. We are moving from a democratic to an authoritarian model. We are urged to integrate with Asia, and of course the Asian model is authoritarian.

The Attorney-General (Mr. Lavarch) shows his indifference to free speech by calling it just another element of our democracy, which has to be weighed up with other elements. But this is just not the case. It is not just another element; it is the central element upon which our democratic system rests. When it is eroded for reasons as fraudulent as those the proponents of the bill have advanced, we know that our democracy is in danger. While such erosions may suit the commissars in power today, what happens when they lose power, as history shows that inevitably they will? What moral ground will they have to stand on when they have corrupted the political process? What values will they be able to turn to for their own protection?

Does the Prime Minister (Mr. Keating) or the Attorney General really think that the majority supports this bill, or even that it is justified? I doubt that they do. But, on the one hand, it will serve to stifle debate in those areas and, on the other hand, there is a powerful lobby group that has been pushing for them. Before I tread further along that path, I think it would be instructive to outline the sorry history of the push for this bill.

This is the second attempt to get this sort of legislation through. The Racial Vilification Bill 1992 was introduced to parliament in draft form at 8.01 p.m. on the second last sitting day of the year, 16 December 1992. In other words, it was done in such a way as to bring the minimum of attention to it. I, along with former Senator Peter Walsh, spoke out strongly against the proposed bill. As far as I can recall, we were the only two federal politicians from either side to do so.

IRENE MOSS'S REPORT

The bill in its draft form was also a disgrace. Even gestures and the wearing of politically incorrect T-shirts were made illegal under the bill. The civil section of the bill would have been administered by the Race Discrimination Commissioner of the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission, then Irene Moss, one of the people who most strongly pushed for the bill. The bill closely followed the recommendations of her report into racist violence, which is little more than an exercise in Anglo bashing. There is no doubt who this sort of legislation is aimed at.

The recommendations of two other reports were also used to justify the bill - the Royal Commission into Black Deaths in Custody and the report *Multiculturalism and the law* by the Law Reform Commission, then under Justice Elizabeth Evatt. It is clear in the texts that there was networking between the authors of these reports. However, both the latter reports recommended against criminal

sanctions. Only the report of Irene Moss supported criminal sanctions, which were contained in the 1992 draft bill and are also contained in the 1994 bill. I would urge interested academics that still care about free speech to analyse this Moss report closely, because this document, which I believe to be intellectually corrupt, is the main justification for federal racial vilification legislation.

The 1992 draft bill was supposed to lie on the table while people made submissions. A member of my staff asked the Attorney General's office how people could obtain the bill and was told it could be obtained from government bookshops. He asked two people in two separate states to ring government bookshops and ask for the bill and no one in either bookshop knew of the bill's existence. He then wrote letters, published in the *Age* on 24 December and the *Australian Financial Review* on 31 December 1992, bringing attention to what was happening.

It was only at the very end of 1992 that the Attorney General's public affairs section was brought in to coordinate the selling of the bill to the media and to organise a public consultation process. There was no proper submission process in place until then. It was clearly an afterthought. Advertisements appeared in early January 1993 letting people know that a submission process on the bill would be conducted and offering to send people copies of the bill, the second reading speech and a fact sheet. The written submission process, however, was held over the holiday break when most people would be thinking about anything else but politics, or perhaps so it was hoped.

The Attorney Department also tried to fix the result of the travelling consultation process by holding meetings in venues of groups most likely to support the bills, such as ethnic affairs commissions and so on. It also sent out letters asking these organisations to mobilise their members - that is, likely supporters of the bill - to be at the meetings. The attempt to stack the meetings, however, seems to have been largely unsuccessful. At any rate, due to the timing of the March 1993 election, the draft bill was wiped from the slate, but not before the bill had provided the model for bastard children in the form of a section for the broadcasting codes for television and immigration changes. Those immigration changes were used to block controversial historian David Irving from entering Australia.

Ethnic lobby groups continued to push for a racial vilification bill after Prime Minister Keating was re-elected. As the draft bill had been wiped from the slate, a new bill would have to be introduced. There was also of course a new Attorney General, Michael Lavarch. Again, there was a great deal of speculation about the racial vilification bill and when it would be introduced. It was originally thought the bill would be introduced early this year, but it has been continually delayed.

MR. MARK LEIBLER PUSHES BILL

Mr. Keating finally announced that the bill would definitely be introduced before the end of 1994 at the 36th biennial conference of the Zionist Federation of Australia. The outgoing President of the ZFA, Mark Leibler, was one of those who had most strongly pushed for this bill, with criminal sanctions. The choice of venue for the announcement underlined from where the major lobbying pressure for the introduction of such a bill had come. Of course, other ethnic lobby groups and academics have been involved and Aboriginals have been used as a stalking horse, but the main driving force has clearly been the Zionist lobby.

Incidentally, at the same Zionist Federation conference the Prime Minister announced the formation of a multicultural advisory council to advise the government on so-called cultural diversity dimensions of the centenary of Federation and the Olympic Games - in other words, how the events could be used as opportunities to promote the propaganda of multiculturalism. The first and, at that stage, only member appointed to the multicultural advisory council was a lobbyist from the Zionist Federation of Australia.

This was also the meeting at which Bob Hawke, one of the high profile guests, got most upset at not being accorded what he thought was due respect for his work for Zionism. This included imposing a costly and counterproductive war crimes trial process on Australia. It also included the sacking of both Mr. Ron Brown and Mr. Tony Harris, the secretary and deputy secretary to the immigration department, at the behest of the lobby in 1990. These two were sacked because they resisted opening up a separate immigration category for Soviet Jews.

This incident is well known to anyone who takes an interest in immigration matters, yet when Verona Burgess of the *Canberra Times* in an article some time later repeated the fact, it was denied by one Jeremy Jones from the Executive Council of Australian Jewry in a letter to the *Canberra Times*. Not only did he deny the fact, but he also had the front to ask for an apology from the writer.

Neither the Zionist lobby or anyone else has the right to use state authority to deny inconvenient facts of history and remain unchallenged. Nor should we attempt to suppress people who make such denials. Mr. Jones has the right to deny the facts, but others should have the right to assert them. This is how we should approach those who deny the holocaust. They should be met with the facts and arguments in open debate and not suppressed.

MAJORITY OF JEWS OPPOSE BILL

I want to make it clear that in talking of the Zionist lobby, I am not talking about the great majority of Jews, many of whom, I know, are totally opposed to this bill. I am talking about a relatively small group in the Jewish community, disproportionately composed of authoritarian

zealots who have crushed or silenced internal opposition. Due to a combination of money, position, relentless lobbying and the manipulation of their victim status, they have a very powerful influence, both in Australia and abroad. I can hear the press gallery journalists now, tut-tutting and writing things such as 'a group he calls the Zionist lobby' as if such a lobby didn't exist and that I am just imagining things.

The bill is a reflection of the deeply authoritarian and intolerant mentality. Mr. Doron Ur, head of the Council of WA Jewry, when giving evidence to the Western Australian Standing Committee on Legislation on 27 July 1990 on the need for such legislation in Western Australia, stated:

> Why is this legislation so necessary? If it were up to me, we would have a Bill to sentence all people who incite racial hatred to death. However we do not have the death sentence in this State so that could not be done. However if such people were sitting in the places of the members of the Committee today, they would sentence me to death as they have sentenced to death most of my family in the past.

Nobody is denying the horror of the holocaust or our sympathy for the victims, but here is an example of the mentality, which wishes to impose draconian legislation upon us. On the one hand, in an Australian setting, it is paranoid and, on the other, it is totalitarian. Imagine the sort of country we would live in if the likes of Doron Ur were in charge.

In recent times, Doron Ur has been in dispute with the editor of the *West Australian,* Paul Murray. Mr. Murray had the temerity to criticise this lobby for its intolerance. In return he was attacked by Mr. Ur, who implicitly accused him of anti-Semitism. No doubt it is not much of a step from an accusation of anti-Semitism to an accusation of inciting racial hatred. Indeed, to many Zionists such an accusation seems to be one and the same thing. It is clear that in the perfect world of Mr. Ur it would not take much to be sentenced to death. Yet this man claims to be promoting tolerance.

It is just nonsense, as some claim, that this bill will not be used. It is clearly designed to be used. Mark Leibler, in his submission as President of the ZFA on the 1992 draft bill, stated, as reported by the *Australian Jewish News* of 12 February 1993, that racial vilification should be defined through "the eyes of a reasonable man of that religion, race colour or national or ethnic origin". No doubt Mr. Ur regards himself as a reasonable man. Mr. Leibler also wanted "artistic works, academic and scientific statements and fair reports or comments on matters of public interest to be subjected to scrutiny for racial vilification - in other words, subject to a politically correct censorship board. Is this an example of tolerance?

In recent times it has been insinuated that the majority of the Australian population was responsible for fire bombings of Jewish property, including synagogues. This was implicitly used as ammunition in the push for this bill. There was a particularly grubby little segment along these lines on a show called *The Times*. As a matter of fact, most of these incidents occurred during the Gulf War and had to do with the Middle East. Ask ASIO about them. The recent one in Sydney was caused by an electrical fault and, according to an article in the *Sun Herald* of 13 November, police believe that three recent firebomb attacks on Jewish premises in east St. Kilda were carried out by other Jews - in other words, in interfactional fight. It is time we put things in perspective. By far the biggest racial problems we have are between and within ethnic groups, which have arrived since the end of the war. That is a fact, which is inconvenient to the multiculturalists.

ARROGANCE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL

In any consideration of the new Racial Hatred Bill, the public consultations and the written public submissions on the 1992 draft bill should have been taken into account and the results, at the least, made public. I placed a question on notice about the bill and, among other things, asked about the results of the 1993 public consultations and submissions. The Attorney General took three months to answer and made it clear that he would not be making the results public. This was a typical display of arrogance.

A public submissions process was conducted, yet the public was not to be informed of the result. I strongly suspected that the reason for this was that the results were not what the Attorney General wanted to hear. And so it proved. Freedom of information documents revealed what I had expected. Written submissions ran almost seven to one against the bill and the attempt to stack the public consultations process had clearly failed. The attempt of the Attorney General to cover up the results is merely a measure of the misrepresentation, intellectual corruption and deceit, which has marked the entire sorry history of the push for such legislation.

Of course, the legislation has been dressed up in the highest moral terms, but it has been driven by unrepresentative elites and minority groups, led by the Zionist lobby. While treating the results of the best measure of public opinion so far about this bill with contempt, the Attorney-General continues to rely upon the recommendations of three politically correct reports as support for the bill, most notably, as mentioned, the report by Irene Moss.

A former Premier of Queensland was once ridiculed in the media for not knowing about the division of powers in our political system, but the bulk of the media is quite happy to countenance a partisan like Irene Moss acting at one and the same time as advocate for supposed victims of racial intolerance, and inquirer into such supposed intolerance. Not only that, but she was to have also administered the civil section of the legislation she called for, as her successor will do if the law before us is passed.

There is absolutely no understanding or appreciation of just how improper it is for the same person to be advocate, judge and jury in one. Those who rightly uphold the general principle of division of powers in our wider political context should be deeply concerned about the blurring of such responsibilities in quasi-judicial bodies like the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission. Yet it is seen to be quite all right by the new class. This is the sort of new class law we are evolving - a de facto judicial system in which an accusation is taken as proof and the publicists are also the prosecutors and the judges. Not only that, but determinations of the commission can be registered in the Federal Court and become legally binding - a star chamber

usurping the authority of a proper court. This is supposed to be an advance.

This bill, among other things, is clearly designed to stifle open debate on matters such as immigration and multiculturalism at a time when both are increasingly coming into public disrepute. The dissembling of the Attorney General cannot disguise this fact. Much of the discussion about this bill has concentrated on the criminal sanctions, but even without them this bill would still be insidious.

The civil section of the bill would be a nightmare for public officials and private citizens. The mere threat of an action against them would be enough to inhibit open discussion. It is also an open invitation to blackmail. I have seen instances where this has occurred.

TO ENTRENCH ONE VIEW OF HISTORY'

This bill is also designed to entrench one view of history as holy writ. All aspects of history, no matter how horrible and distressing to some people, should be open for critical examination and discussion. We cannot rule a line on the study of the past. I really believe that if we do not make a stand on this bill then the authoritarian excesses will get worse. This is a principle that people can understand and it is firm ground on which to make a stand. Finally, I commend the attitude of a man who represents the true tradition of Jewish liberalism. Noam Chomsky, an intellectual who has no peer in Australia today. Mr. Chomsky is a true champion of civil liberties and believes we have a right to speak our minds on sensitive political and historical issues. Free speech is not just another value. It is the central value of our political system. The loss of such a right and on such dubious grounds would be a significant step on the way to losing our democracy.

AMERICAN WARNING ON GATT AND WORLD TRADE ORGANISATION?

Mrs. Phyllis Schlafly is one of the U.SA's most brilliant conservative writers. Her *"Phyllis Schlafly Report,* issued monthly from Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002, U.SA., is a source of most valuable information on major issues which affect not only the U.SA., but the rest of the world. The following is an edited article in the October issue of Mrs. Schlafly's report:

The House Republican "contract", orchestrated with such fanfare on the Capitol steps on September 26, includes a promise to pass the Balanced Budget Amendment. The whole thing is a fraud if those same Congressmen vote for GATT/WTO, which will sock us with a $31 billion increase in the federal deficit.

Another reason why the vote on GATT/WTO should be postponed until next year is that, if it is voted on this year, the "fast track" rules prevent the removal of offensive sections that absolutely must be deleted. Let's consider some of these offensive sections that have no place in a trade agreement.

(1) The World Trade Organisation must be removed. This 14-page Charter, surreptitiously added to the 22,000-page GATT/WTO agreement, would put the United States into a World Government of Trade, which will install a new layer of international regulation over the U.S. economy. In the WTO, we will have only one vote out of 123 nations (the same vote as Haiti or Castro's Cuba). The WTO rules will be made by hundreds of unelected foreigners living high on the hog in Geneva, Switzerland, and disputes would be decided by foreign tribunals meeting and deciding our fate *in secret.*

The World Trade Organisation section is actually a treaty, not a trade agreement at all. The U.S. Constitution requires that treaties, to be valid, must receive a two-thirds vote of the Senate. It is dishonest to bypass the constitutional requirement. The World Trade Organisation section should be submitted separately to the Senate as a treaty, and we should have ample time for public debate.

(2) Section 801 must be removed. Secretly added to the legislation by Clinton and Congressman John Dingell, this section gives a subsidy worth over $2 billion to the *Washington Post,* the *Atlanta Constitution,* and a consortium of other insiders. This hidden financial interest explains the lavish support given to Bill Clinton and to GATT/WTO by those big newspapers.

(3) Section 745, which authorises the U.S. Treasury to eliminate the guaranteed minimum interest rate on U.S. savings bonds, must be removed. This provision will steal money out of the pockets of millions of Americans who have put their savings in billions of dollars worth of these bonds.

(4) The portions of Sections 501-534 that make basic changes in U.S. patent laws must be removed. The right of inventors to get a patent is a constitutional right that has been a major factor in the innovative ideas that have raised our standard of living to the highest in the world. Our constitutional right to patent protection should not be diminished in any way by a "fast track" trade agreement.

(5) Section 742 requiring every newborn baby to get an IRS Taxpayer Identification Number at birth must be removed. This provision is the mark of a totalitarian state. It symbolises the centralised government control that the Clinton Administration is trying to exert over all Americans.

(6) Section 766, which is a mysterious change in pension laws, was obviously slipped into GATT/WTO to benefit some powerful special interest whom Congressional

committees refuse to identify. This section must be removed; changes in U.S. pension laws have absolutely no place in a trade bill.

Before it's too late, call your Senate and House candidate and demand that they promise (1) to vote **not** to waive the budget rules - *that* is the crucial vote. In addition, ask them (2) to postpone the vote on the GATT/WTO legislation until next year. (3) to demand a separate Senate vote on WTO as a treaty, and (4) to vote **no** on GATT/WTO until all the obnoxious provisions or giveaways are removed (such as the $218 million subsidy to the *Washington Post.*

SECRET MEDIA SUBSIDIES IN GATT/WTO

We've heard a lot from the media about the danger from "special interests" influencing legislation. We've heard a lot about the expensive "pork" that is tucked away in the fine print of the legislation. Now we learn that Big Media are at the head of the chow line, lap dogging the legislation but concealing their own financial interest.

Hidden in the 1,000-page GATT/WTO implementing legislation is a provision to give federal subsidies worth over $2 billion to the *Washington Post,* Cox Enterprises (which owns the *Atlanta Constitution),* and a consortium of insiders operating under the name Omnipoint. It's no coincidence that those two newspaper giants were the most obsequious in supporting Bill Clinton's candidacy in 1992 and are now the most vociferous in supporting the immediate passage of GATT/WTO.

The *Washington Post* editorialised for speedy passage while asserting that the GATT/WTO bill "contains no surprises, no provisions that have not been amply discussed." That's not true; the whopping subsidy was negotiated in secret and its revelation by competitors was a huge surprise to everyone.

Here is how the secret subsidy came about. In August of this year, the FCC adopted a fee formula for the valuable licences granted for PCS (personal communications service - a technological advance in cellular service). The fair market value of the licenses issued by the FCC to these three firms for the lucrative New York, Los Angeles, and Washington, D.C. markets is estimated by experts to approximate $3 billion.

However, Chairman of the House Commerce Committee John Dingell and President Clinton slipped Section 801 into the GATT/WTO legislation, which reduces the FCC fees to be paid by these three companies to about $875 million. Specifically, Omnipoint would get a $1 billion discount from the value of its New York PCS license, Cox Enterprises would get a $730 million discount for its Los Angeles license, and the *Washington Post* would get a $218 million taxpayer subsidy for its Washington, D.C. license.

Under GATT/WTO's fast track rules, these subsidies cannot be deleted or reduced before Jan. 1, 1995. The only way to eliminate these outrageous subsidies is to postpone the GATT/WTO vote until next year, after fast track rules expire.

AMERICANS WONT LIKE WTO

The proposed World Trade Organisation (WTO) is a new global organisation empowered to make and regulate the rules of global trade. WTO is a direct attack on American sovereignty, independence, jobs, and economy.

All WTO decisions will be made by the votes of the WTO Ministerial Conference on the basis of one-country-one-vote. Article IX states: "Each Member of the WTO shall have one vote . . . decisions shall be taken by a majority of the votes cast." Thus, the United States will have the same vote as Haiti or Castro's Cuba. Developing nations will have 83 percent of the WTO votes, and the majority has had years of practice in ganging up against us in the United Nations. More than three-fourths of WTO members voted against the United States on more than half of UN votes in 1993. In the United Nations, our interests are protected by our veto power, but no veto is allowed in WTO.

WTO forces the United States to change our laws to meet WTO obligations. Article XVI, paragraph 4, states: "Each Member shall ensure the conformity of its laws, regulations and administrative procedures with its obligations." Any country that must change its laws to conform to obey rulings of a world organisation has sacrificed its sovereignty.

The WTO will serve as a global tribunal for trade disputes. They will be adjudicated by the Dispute Settlement Body, a sort of a Supreme Court of Trade, which will make rulings, monitor national responses, and compel enforcement of its decisions. WTO rulings will be final. The WTO can impose trade sanctions and fines, and authorise retaliation, on the United States if we do not abide by its decisions.

The 28-page GATT/WTO *Understanding on Rules and Procedures Governing the Settlement of Disputes* states that all deliberations of the WTO Dispute Settlement Body will be secret and its decisions will be anonymous. Section 14 states: "Panel deliberations shall be confidential. The reports of panels shall be drafted without the presence of the parties to the dispute in the light of the information provided and the statements made. Opinions expressed in the panel report by individual panelists shall be anonymous."

What if we appeal an unfair decision? The same secrecy rules still apply. Section 17 states: "The proceedings of the Appellate Body shall be confidential. The reports of the Appellate Body shall be drafted without the presence of the parties to the dispute and in the light of the information provided and the statements made. Opinions expressed in the Appellate Body report by individuals serving on the Appellate Body shall be anonymous."

Obviously, there are no traditional American guarantees of due process, right to confront your accusers, etc. The judges on the dispute panels will be mostly, if not exclusively foreigners, and there are no conflict of interest rules. Our 50 states will not be permitted to defend their laws against challenges from foreign governments, since only national governments will have standing before WTO panels. *(Understanding,* Section 2.)

If we lose a WTO dispute panel decision, the WTO can give the complaining nation the authority to select, which U.S. industries must bear the burden of the WTO trade sanctions, and then impose tariffs on those selected industries. *(Understanding,* Section 2.)

Some have claimed that Congress has protected us against WTO's abuse of power by "reservations" or "exceptions" inserted in the implementing legislation. That

language has no legal effect whatsoever and is just window-dressing to deceive the American people. Article XVI of WTO, paragraph 5, states: "No reservations may be made in respect to any provisions of this Agreement."

Thus, Congress cannot "fix" or "exempt" any American rights or problems. If WTO passes, the language of the agreement will lock us into the World Government of Trade.

Why are U.S. corporations pushing so hard for passage of GATT/WTO? Because it will make it safe for them to shift their operations anywhere in the world - where there are 800,000,000 unemployed workers, and 50 workers can be hired for the wage of one American worker - and then have duty free access back in the United States. American jobs and economic security are on the line.

The U.S. Senate rejected the attempt to put us in a world trade organisation in 1947. We should do so again.

WHAT DOES NEW WORLD ORDER MEAN?

George Bush started our country on the risky road to what he called (but did not define) the "New World Order". Bill Clinton is only too happy to define it for us.

New World Order under Bill Clinton means using American troops like a mercenary Foreign Legion, to be sent into all sorts of foreign fights even though no U.S. national security interest is at stake. No U.S. national interest was threatened in Somalia, Rwanda, Bosnia, or Haiti.

New World Order under Bill Clinton means risking American troops on such vague and undefined missions as "peacekeeping" (in places where there is no peace to keep, such as Somalia, where American soldiers were dragged through the streets in humiliation during our "peacekeeping" efforts), "restoring democracy" (to countries that never had democracy, such as Haiti, and putting in power a Marxist dictator [Aristide] who has publicly approved of the hideous practice of "necklacing"), and "nation-building" (using our combat troops to build a government, a police force, and infrastructure in foreign countries).

New World Order under Bill Clinton means converting the best fighting force in the world into what is essentially today a "peace corps", whose mission is to pick up the pieces of the carnage created by warring tribes in faraway places such as Rwanda. No one has come up with an answer to the question, why invade Haiti but not Cuba? If our mission were to "restore democracy" to other countries, Castro's Cuba would be a splendid place to start.

New World Order under Bill Clinton means asking the overpaid bureaucrats in the United Nations for the go-ahead to assign our troops wherever he thinks American media attention should be diverted. Clinton sought the approval of the United Nations to invade Haiti, but did not seek the approval of Congress, which the U.S. Constitution requires.

New World Order under Bill Clinton means assigning U.S. servicemen and women to serve under foreign commanders. He signed Presidential Decision Directive (PDD) 25, which specifically asserts his authority "to place U.S. forces under the operational control of a foreign commander."

New World Order under Bill Clinton means flagrantly violating two sections of the U.S. Constitution: Article I, Section 8 gives Congress (not the UN) the power "to declare war". Article II, Section 2 limits the President's treaty-making power by this clause: "provided two thirds of the Senators present concur". Clinton asked the U.N. not Congress, for permission to invade Haiti, and he intends to consider the GATT/WTO treaty passed if it gets a simple majority (not two-thirds) to the Senate.

New World Order under Bill Clinton means joining the World Trade Organisation, which would put American jobs, trade and economy under the control of a foreign legislature (where we should have only one vote out of 123), a foreign unelected bureaucracy in Geneva, and a foreign trade tribunal empowered to decide disputes in secret.

New World Order under Bill Clinton means signing the Law of the Sea Treaty, another international straitjacket designed to transfer American wealth and technology to Third World countries.

New World Order under Bill Clinton means signing the United Nations Treaty on the Rights of the Child, which would transfer traditional rights of parents over the upbringing, discipline, education, health and welfare of their children, to a new international bureaucracy. *(P.S. Report,* March 1993).

New World Order under Bill Clinton means ratifying the United Nations Treaty on Discrimination Against Women, which would transfer traditional rights of American women to a committee of foreign "experts" who would make rules about child care, "family education", abortion, comparable worth and even "interpersonal relationships." *(P.S. Report,* September 1990).

New World Order under Bill Clinton means a foreign policy directed by his Rhodes scholar pal Strobe Talbott, a lifetime advocate of world government and of ending what he calls the "obsolete" notions of nationhood and national sovereignty. *(P.S. Report,* June 1994).

(contd. from page 8. . .) Liberal electors gave their second preferences to the AAFI candidate. Even a small percentage of Green voters gave their second preference votes to the AAFI. This means that in a Senate election, an AAFI candidate could gain perhaps 15 percent of the vote, including preferences, in Kooyong. But Statewide, the percentage would be higher. What is emerging is a political movement, which has the potential to elect several members to the Senate, where they might hold the balance of power. One of the highlights of the Kooyong by-election was the spectacle of the Liberal party criticising Prime Minister Paul Keating for not disciplining West Australian Labor backbencher, Graeme Campbell, who entered the campaign supporting the AAFI candidate. If the AAFI can broaden their policy base and adopt a more positive title, they may well trigger the emergence of a new conservative political grouping in Canberra.

BASIC FUND PASSES $30,000

The current Basic Fund has now passed $30,000, a magnificent effort by only a minority of League supporters. The challenge is now to the majority to demonstrate that they are capable of matching the lead of the minority. All donations to Box 1052J, G.P.O. Melbourne, 3001.

RACE HATE BILL TO BE DECIDED IN SENATE

The most horrendous legislation ever introduced in the Federal parliament will be decided by the Senate early in the New Year. With the two major opposition parties, the Liberal and Nationals, now committed to opposing the Labor government's legislation, and promising to bring in their own version of what it describes as "appropriate" legislation, it now appears that the future of the legislation will be decided by the two West Australian Green Senators. This will certainly be the case unless there is a break in Opposition party ranks.

The Australian Jewish News of December 2, reports that one of the Green Senators, Chamarette, a former prison psychologist says, "I *will never support criminal sanctions because I know too much what happens in prisons*". But she says she might consider some alternative form of punishment.

Independent Senator Harradine is quoted as saying that he is concerned what effect the bill could have on the Jewish community, stating that it could have the reverse effect of what is intended. There is no doubt that the general public's perception is that Zionist leaders have been the driving force behind the campaign to have the Race Hate Bill introduced. It is common knowledge that there has been a deterioration in black-white relations since the Federal politicians have made every endeavour to placate those who have made a profession out of urging more and more concessions for Australians of Aboriginal background, even though in many cases there is little Aboriginal background in evidence.

Australians who believe in free speech under the common law, which protects all individuals against violence, as the national Socialist leaders in a West Australian prison can testify, should take careful note of which of their political servants are against free speech. They should specially note that the Australian Democrat Senators, headed by Cheryl Kernot, are solidly in favour of the Government's Race Hate Bill. They have also stated that they favour higher taxation, only qualifying this by expressing the hope that it will be imposed on higher income earners. It should be pointed out to the Democrats that eventually most taxation is passed on in various ways.

Australians concerned about the threat of the Race Hate Bill should make every endeavour over the holiday period to influence the voting of the Green and Democrat Senators, also that of Senator Harridine.

A MESSAGE FROM THE KOOYONG BY-ELECTION

Public opinion polls have consistently shown that an overwhelming majority of Australians are against any further non-European immigration and are opposed to the policy of multiculturalism. With demographic projections that a continuation of the present immigration programme would result in 25 percent of the population being of Asian background as Australia moves into the next century, these concentrated in a few areas, such as Sydney's Western suburbs, it can be predicted that immigration and multiculturalism are going to be issues of growing concern. With the two major political parties adopting what has been a virtually bi-partisan attitude towards these issues, it has been extremely difficult for the majority view to obtain political expression. Liberal Party leader John Howard was subjected to a venomous campaign through the mass media when he dared to suggest that the immigration issue had to be faced. The end result was his demise. John Howard, still obviously hoping for a Lazarus-type of political resurrection, now says that it was a mistake to try to raise the immigration issue. He has also softened his attitude on the Monarchy issue.

But while the major parties have tried to ignore the immigration issue, the emergence of a small new party, Australians Against Further Immigration (AAFI) has started to emerge. Most political strategists would see the title as too negative with the party having a very limited policy base. However, this small group, obviously with very limited finances, has progressively started to have an impact on the Australian political scene. At a series of recent by-elections, its vote has increased to the point where the group can no longer be ignored. After its relatively strong showing in the NSW by-elections, there was keen speculation about how it would fare in the by-election for Kooyong, Melbourne, originally held by one of the founders of the Liberal Party, Sir Robert Menzies. Upon his retirement, Kooyong passed to Andrew Peacock, from whom the Liberals expected big things. But Peacock's resignation was an admission that he had failed, and perhaps reflected a view that the Liberals were likely to lose the next election.

The selection of a former top official of the Liberal Party, Petro Georgiou, a man who had played a major role in influencing the Liberals on multiculturalism, was an indication of how far the Liberal party has been moved from its original philosophy. Sir Robert Menzies could claim with some justification that Australians were "British to their bootstraps". If Sir Robert were still alive, it would have been interesting to get his reaction to the modern Liberal party's candidate for Kooyong. And what would he have thought of a Liberal how-to-vote card urging electors in a wide variety of languages, including Chinese, to vote for Petro Georgiou, *with not one message in English?* Perhaps he would be as puzzled as the loyal elderly Liberal party worker, still giving out Liberal literature, but with a growing realisation that the Liberal party of Sir Robert Menzies has long since disappeared.

The Liberal party directed a venomous campaign against the AAFI, with the normal allegations of "racism", as did the Greens, who in one sense were fronting for the Labor Party, which did not run a candidate. Both the Liberals and the Greens, along with the strange assortment of Independents, including a tabletop dancer, put the AAFI candidate last in order of preference. The mass media were no help whatever to the AAFI, which conducted its campaign on a very limited budget. The AAFI realistically observed before the election that they would regard any vote in excess of 4 percent as satisfactory. But they obtained 8 percent, which was clear evidence that even in an electorate like Kooyong, with its large number of trendy liberals, there is growing concern about immigration and multiculturalism. Although ignored by the mass media, of even greater significance than the AAFI primary vote was the preference vote. Six percent of *(cont. previous page...)*

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