

# THE NEW TIMES

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

VOL. 59, No. 6.

Registered by Australia Post - Publication PP481667 100259

JUNE 1995.

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

## IMMIGRATION, SOCIAL CREDIT AND AUSTRALIA'S FUTURE

*by Eric D. Butler*

**It was a refreshing experience to have a minister of the Christian religion come forward voluntarily to defend the central theme of Mrs. Robyn Spencer's address in favour of curtailing Australia's immigration rate, at the recent Regional Dinner of the League of Rights in northern Victoria. Robyn Spencer represents the movement known as Australians Against Further Immigration, a movement which has caused a political stir with its relatively impressive vote at a series of by-elections. It has naturally been charged by the mindless as being a "racist" movement. The Christian minister drew upon both Christian philosophy and biblical history to demonstrate that there is nothing un-Christian about people wishing to maintain a basically homogenous society**

In his excellent little booklet, *What is Social Credit?*, Dr. Geoffrey Dobbs writes that *the social credit* "is the name of something which exists in all societies but which has never had a name before (C.H. Douglas) because it was taken for granted." Geoffrey Dobbs writes that "The social credit is. . . a result, or practical expression of real Christianity in society, and it is the aim of social crediters to increase it, and to strive to prevent its decrease". Which raises the question of whether the social credit of Australia is being increased, or diminished, by the policy which deliberately seeks to create a "multicultural society". The reality is that all multicultural societies result in growing social tensions and frictions. Evidence of this can be seen right around the world. The ghastly state of the Balkans requires no comment.

Before the advent of multi-culturalism in Australia, it was not felt necessary to impose draconian legislation to prevent "racial vilification", with the threat, of imprisonment. The people who pioneered the development of Australia, predominantly of Anglo-Celtic background and reflecting in one sense the Christian Law of Love - this was the basic meaning of the Australian slogan of a "Fair Go for all" - have been generally tolerant and easy going. This traditional tolerance is being strained by the programme of multiculturalism, and the manipulation of ethnic minorities against the Anglo-Saxon-Celtic majority. As the kindly and tolerant Geoffrey Blainey, Australia's best-known historian, points out, even the Aborigines are being manipulated against the Europeans, this resulting in an "inverse form of racism". Those manipulating the minorities have no genuine interest in the long-term welfare of the minorities. But they make clear their dislike of any Christian based Anglo-Celtic culture. The author of Social Credit, C.H. Douglas, warned that British culture everywhere was the main target of a venomous attack by those seeking to centralise power on a global scale.

### **DIMINISHING THE SOCIAL CREDIT**

Douglas drew attention to Karl Marx's statement that the

### **OUR POLICY**

**To promote service to the Christian revelation of God, loyalty to the Australian Constitutional Monarchy, and maximum co-operation between subjects of the Crown Commonwealth of Nations.**

**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.**

British would never make their own revolution, and that foreigners would have to make it for them. The social credit of a society is diminished as it is fragmented by multicultural policies. Douglas observed that while a majority could rarely understand explanation of any given situation, "a homogenous, native-born majority is often instinctively right in its judgment of the nature of a situation."

Prince Charles has stressed that a nation, which wishes to survive into the future, must turn to its own roots. Every effort is being made to cut Australia's roots.

The underlying reasons for the multicultural and republican campaign is to cut Australia from its historic roots. Even those members of the Federal Opposition who, like John Howard, profess their support for the retention of the Constitutional Monarchy, are unlikely to speak out on this fundamental truth; they are concerned about what is termed "the ethnic vote". The ethnic lobby, dominated by Zionist activists, has already made it clear that in spite of reversing himself on past views concerning immigration, John Howard is not highly regarded. Whatever his own personal views, John Howard is under pressure from the multicultural and Republican supporters in his own ranks, who can argue that desperately required financial assistance for the coming Federal elections may be withheld if the Opposition appears to be adopting a bias against multiculturalism and further non-European immigration.

Professor Blainey has been brave enough to point out that the "White Australia" policy made sense at the time it was applied. Australia's capacity for survival as a stable nation in which required reforms can be peacefully adopted, would have been greatly diminished if a policy of restrictive immigration had not been adopted. It is not so long ago that all the major parties, including the Labor Party, supported the restrictive immigration policy. Today all parties claim that they were the first to abandon the policy. In his book, *Australia Betrayed*, West Australian Labor M.P. Graeme Campbell provides a lucid but condensed version of how a major change in the nation's policy has been engineered by a minority.

## **THE RETREAT FROM COMMON SENSE**

One of the most illuminating features of a dramatically changed situation is the breakdown of what was once known as commonsense. Much of the change can be attributed to the persistent promotion of the equalitarian dogma, one that was

given tremendous impetus by the French revolution. There is no such thing as equality in the real world. Equality means no quality at all. The hereditary factor is denied, particularly by those who pride themselves as being academics. And yet one only has to attend a race meeting to find that all those present are the closest students of the hereditary factor in racehorses. No one believes in the equality dogma. No one believes that all horses are equal. The fact that all horses may look basically the same does not alter reality. The breeders and punters are all concerned about realities, not slogans.

It is legitimate to talk about Western European people. But only an idiotic academic believes that there are no fundamental differences between, for example, Germans and Spaniards. Basic characteristics can be and are modified over a period of time. While differentiation is a natural law of evolution, the flowering of personality through diversity is only realised when individuals belong to the same stable and secure grouping. There is no evidence to suggest that because different races of people favour living together, separate from other races of people, that they therefore hate other people. In a nation like Australia, where the Christian philosophy still exerts an enormous influence, even if many Australians do not consciously recognise this, those who advocate a restrictive and limited immigration policy do not do so in a spirit of negative and destructive hatred. I detected none of this as I listened to Robyn Spencer last week. The very negativeness that has been charged against the AAFI could produce the most positive results. Douglas has discussed this matter, relating the story of the pig found wandering on the Scottish moors who, when questioned, said he had been one of the Gadarene swine of the Bible story who, as the herd stampeded towards the abyss, decided that there was not much future in this policy and decided to pull out. Although he was loudly abused by his fellow pigs as they thundered past, charging him with "being negative", and he had not achieved a great deal, he was at least still alive! Negative action can often unite people on a policy leading to positive results.

If the AAFI can elect only a handful of Senators at the next Federal elections, perhaps holding the balance of power, they may be the decisive factor in keeping sufficient of traditional Australia alive for a process of regeneration to take place in the future. Every Social Creditor should be able to grasp this potential and to act accordingly.

---

## **THE THREAT OF VIOLENCE**

Desperate people can be misled into engaging in violent activities. All over the world there are manifestations of a breakdown of stable societies. The basic cause of most violence, including even domestic violence, is the centralisation of all power over the individual who, feeling alienated and helpless, can be persuaded that violent destructive activities are the only way to correct the situation. Terrorist activities are morally indefensible, inevitably leading to further terrorist acts. The first knee-jerk reaction to the Oklahoma bombing was that this was an Arab terrorist action. Naked terrorist activities by Zionists were a major feature of the establishment of the Zionist State of Israel. Hundreds of thousands of Palestinians were driven from the homes in which they had lived for over a thousand years. One of the biggest - and generally forgotten - refugee problems of modern times was a fertile breeding

ground for terrorist activities, not only against the Israelis, but against others perceived to be supporting the Israelis. As the USA is correctly seen to be the main Western nation supporting Israel it is not surprising that America is a major target for Islamic terrorists.

But Americans are now faced with the reality that the centralist policies being imposed in their own society is producing a large and growing number of alienated and desperate people who see the Federal government and its agencies as their main enemy. American farmers, driven from their properties by debt, or workers becoming unemployed because of the free-trade policies which result in American industries moving to Mexico or other cheaper labour areas, join the ranks of those who in desperation favour some type of

## VALE JOHN "JOHNNO" RAY JOHNSTONE

After a long and debilitating illness, which tested not only his own courage, but that of his wife and family, one of the greats of the League of Rights, John Ray Johnstone of Melbourne, passed away on May 3. He was buried at Drysdale on May 8, following a moving service at St. James Anglican Church, Drysdale in which members of the family participated. A feature of the service was the music. The son of an extremely talented musical mother and father, John Johnstone loved and appreciated good music, one of his favourite composers being Bach. His grandson, an extremely talented and promising cello player, rendered two of his grandfather's favourite pieces. Everyone was deeply moved by tributes from daughters Vanessa and Pippa.

I first met John Johnstone during the historic 1940 Federal Elections, when his parents campaigned for the Independent candidate for Kooyong, Dr. John Dale, against Robert Menzies. Dr. John Dale was the well-known and popular Melbourne City Health Officer, and a prominent Social Creditor. The Johnstone home at Surrey Hills became the centre for regular meetings of younger Social Crediters where I gave a number of lectures on Social Credit and associated subjects. A movement for the Defence of British Culture emerged. John Johnstone was very active in this ferment of activity. He joined the AIF and quickly rose to the rank of Captain. A close friendship was maintained, although the Pacific war took us to different destinations. We managed to keep in touch through correspondence, most of it concerning Social Credit and political matters.

He was deeply loved by those who came to know him. John Johnstone had an attractive personality, which was generally appealing. The end of Second World War military conflict saw us forging an even closer relationship, one that deepened over a lifetime. He travelled with me to Adelaide, via Mildura, and from Berri in South Australia by plane to Adelaide, for the formal launching of the League of Rights in the Adelaide Town Hall in 1946.

Whether through personal interviews or addressing meetings, his deep sincerity was always most appealing. Although he could be moved to anger, John Johnstone was basically a gentle but passionate man. He was extremely generous, sometimes to his own disadvantage and that of his family. Any cause he took up had his full and undivided attention. He was a major driving force behind the anti-fluoridation movement in Geelong. When he became convinced that the concept of the Citizens' Initiative and Referendum offered a practical mechanism through which electors could control their governments, he threw himself enthusiastically behind the C.I.R. movement, later taking it to New Zealand where, accompanied by his wife, he successfully introduced the C.I.R. concept. It is not too much to say that the vigorous C.I.R. movement in New Zealand owes its genesis to John Johnstone. John Johnstone was never negative, always the optimist.

He was a delightful host, and under the most trying conditions maintained and displayed a deep sense of humour. Even during his last days when conversation with him was practically impossible, his face would light up when I recalled some of the more humorous incidents of our long association.

I felt privileged to have known John Johnstone and his closely-knit family.

As the coffin was carried from the Church, while his daughter Pippa and son-in-law Steve sang "*Swing Low, Sweet Chariot*", my mind sought for some composite picture of my friend, and immediately Shakespeare's words came to mind:

*"His life was gentle, and the elements  
So mixed in him that Nature might stand up  
And say to all the world, This was a man."*

On behalf of all *New Times* readers, I extend our deepest sympathies to his wife Dorothy, and all members of the Johnstone family. May "Johnno's" soul rest in peace. His spirit will live on into the future.

---

direct action. Just as Hitler's National Socialist movement recruited some of the most pathological members of a desperate nation, this is happening in the USA. The multiracial nature of American society intensifies the nature of the basic problem. It can be predicted with complete certainty that any attempt by the American Federal government to concentrate upon any programme of gun controls will further inflame the situation. Tensions can only be reduced by a genuine decentralisation of power.

Generally speaking, Australia is not a violent society. But there are limits to the tolerance of the Australian people. The rural disaster has produced relatively few genuine extremists. In the main the long-suffering rural population has endured the whip of the centralisers with stoical self-control. The most disturbing aspects of rural violence is the growing number of

the young committing suicide. If large scale unemployment is to become a permanent feature of the Australian scene, as it must under present totalitarian financial policies, there will be a growing tendency amongst the young to regard favourably some type of violent activity, even if this means assaulting and robbing those they feel are more privileged than they are.

In spite of the fact that the League of Rights has a long history of support for constitutional government, and has consistently warned against the use of violence, insisting that constructive peaceful activity is possible through the inherited British political and constitutional system, every time there is a terrorist act like the Oklahoma bombing, there appear articles in the media canvassing the possibility that there are "wild men of the right" in Australia who might erupt into violence, thus the alleged necessity for anti-racial vilification legislation.

# SOCIAL CREDIT PRINCIPLES

*An address delivered at Swanwick, November 1924.*  
*by C.H. DOUGLAS*

The financial system, in its control over production, stands to the works or factory system of the world, considered as an economic unit, in the same relation as the planning department of a modern factory does to the factory.

The distribution side of the financial system exercises a function not dissimilar to that of the progress department of a factory.

No discussion of the financial system can serve any useful purpose, which does not recognise: -

(a) *That a works system must have a definite objective.*

(b) *That when that objective has been decided upon it is a technical matter to fit methods of human psychology and physical facts, so that the objective will be most easily obtained.*

In regard to (a) the policy of the world economic system amounts to a philosophy of life. There are really only three alternative policies in respect to a world economic organisation: -

The first is that it is an end in itself for which man exists.

The second is that while not an end in itself, it is the most powerful means of constraining the individual to do things he does not want to do; *eg*, it is a system of Government. This implies a fixed ideal of what the world ought to be.

And the third is that the economic activity is simply a functional activity of men and women in the world; *that the end of man, while unknown, is something towards which most rapid progress is made by the free expansion of individuality, and that, therefore, economic organisation is most efficient when it most easily and rapidly supplies economic wants without encroaching on other functional activities.*

It will therefore be seen that there are two standpoints from which to examine its mechanism. The first considered as a method of achieving its political end of universal work, and the second as a means of achieving some other political end - for instance, the third alternative already mentioned.

*Considered as a means of making people work (an aim which is common both to the Capitalist and Socialist Party Politics) the existing financial system, as a system, is probably nearly perfect.*

The banking system, methods of taxation and accountancy counter every development of applied science, organisation, and machinery, so that the individual, instead of obtaining the benefit of these advances in the form of a higher civilisation and greater leisure, is merely enabled to do more work. Every other factor in the situation is ultimately sacrificed to this end of providing him with work, and at this moment the world in general, and Europe in particular, is undoubtedly settling down to a policy of intensive production for export, which must quite inevitably result in a world cataclysm, urged thereto by what is known as the Unemployment Problem.

To blame the present financial system for failing to provide employment is most unfair; if left alone it will continue to provide employment in the face of all scientific progress, even at the cost of a universal world-war, in which not only all possible production would be destroyed, but such remnants of the world's population as are left will probably be reduced to the meagre production of the Middle Ages.

*Considered as a mechanism for distributing goods,*

*however, the existing financial system is radically defective. In the first place, it does not provide enough purchasing power to buy the goods, which are produced.*

I do not wish to enter at any great length into the analysis of why this is so, because it is always a matter of some heated controversy. I have, however, no hesitation whatever in asserting, not only that it is so, but that the fact that it is so is the central fact of the existing economic system, and that *unless it is dealt with no other reforms are of any use whatever.*

And the second feature of equal importance is that considerably less than the available number of individuals, working with modern tools and processes, can produce everything that the total population of the world, as individuals, can use and consume, and that this situation is progressive, that is to say, that year by year a smaller number of individuals can usefully be employed in economic production.

To summarise the matter, the principles which must govern any reform of the financial system, which will at one and the same time avoid catastrophe, and re-orientate world economic policy along the lines of the third alternative, are three in number: -

1. *That the cash credits of the population of any country shall at any moment be collectively equal to the collective cash prices for consumable goods for sale in that country, and such cash credits shall be cancelled on the purchase of goods for consumption..*

2. *That the credits required to finance production shall be supplied, not from savings, but be new credits relating to new production.*

3. *That the distribution of cash credits to individuals shall be progressively less dependent upon employment. That is to say, that the dividend shall progressively displace the wage and salary.*

I may conclude by a few remarks on the position of the banks, in respect of this situation. It is becoming fairly well understood that the banks have the control of the issue of purchasing power to a very large extent in their hands. The complaint, which is levelled at the banks, is generally that they pay too large a dividend. Now curiously enough, in my opinion, almost the only thing, which is not open to destructive criticism about the banks, is their dividend. Their dividend goes to shareholders and is purchasing power, but their enormous concealed profits, a small portion of which goes in immensely redundant bank premises, etc., do not provide purchasing power for anyone, and merely aggrandise banks as banks.

You cannot spend too much time in making these issues clear to your minds, because until they are clear you are not in a position to offer an opinion on any economic proposal whatever.

In regard to (b) certain factors require to be taken into consideration.

(1) That money has no reality in itself. That in itself it is either gold, silver, copper, paper, cowrie shells, or broken teacups. The thing, which makes it money, no matter of what it

is made, is purely psychological, and consequently there is no limit to the amount of money except a psychological limit.

(2) That economic production is simply a conversion of one thing into another, and is primarily a matter of energy. It seems highly probable that both energy and production are only limited by our knowledge of how to apply them.

(3) That in the present world unrest two entirely separate factors are confused. The cry for the democratisation of industry obtains at least 90 per cent of its force from the desire for the democratisation of the *proceeds* of industry, which is, of course, a totally different thing. This confusion is assisted by the objective fact that the chief controllers of industry get rich out of their control.

I do not, myself, believe in the democratic control of industry any more than I should believe in the democratic control of a cricket team, while actually playing, and believe that the idea that the average individual demand a share in the *administrative* control of industry is pure myth.

The present world financial system is a Government based on the theory that men should be made to work, and this theory is considerably intermixed with the even stronger contention that the end of man is work. I want you to realise that this is a statement of fact, not a theory. More than 95 percent of the purchasing power actually expended in consumption is wages and salaries.

But the essential point in the position of banks, which it is so hard to explain, and which is grasped by so few people, is that *their true assets are not represented by anything actual at all*, but are represented by the difference between a society functioning under centralised and restricted credit and a free society unfettered by financial restrictions.

To bring that perhaps somewhat vague generalisation into a more concrete form, the true assets of banks collectively consist of the difference between the total amount of legal tender, or Government money, which exists, and the total amount of bank credit money, not only which does exist, but which might exist, and which is kept out of existence by the fiat of the banking executive.

---

## MCNAMARA SHOULD BE CRYING FOR US, NOT FOR HIMSELF

**From *The Phyllis Schlafly May Report*, Box 618 Alton, Illinois, USA 62002.**

Robert Strange McNamara belongs on the daytime soap operas. Better yet, his histrionics belong on Donahue or Geraldo or Sally Jessy Raphael. We are not impressed that he would "cry easily" about Vietnam, that he "sweated blood at night about it", or that he suffered from "anguish" and "stress".

What about the tears, blood and anguish he caused to others? They are the ones who deserve our sympathy. Even in this era of public confessions and self-deprecating autobiographies, McNamara's book *In Retrospect* comes across as shallow and self-serving.

In his prime years, McNamara said it was all right with him to call Vietnam "McNamara's War". We accept his invitation. He bears the number-one responsibility for the Vietnam tragedy and, as the *New York Times* said so well, "McNamara must not escape the lasting moral condemnation of his countrymen."

McNamara says he wrote his book because he is "sick at heart" about the cynicism with which Americans view their political leaders. His book proves that our cynicism was and is justified.

McNamara tries to excuse himself and earn our sympathy by asserting that, even though he was "wrong, terribly wrong" about Vietnam, it was just an "honest mistake". But the old refrain "everybody makes mistakes" won't wash for McNamara.

He sets a new record of public immorality when he asserts that, although he knew that the Vietnam War was a mistake all those bloody years, knew he was sending thousands of men to a useless death, he did it anyway. This confession indicts not only himself but the man where the buck stops, President Lyndon B. Johnson. This revelation will promote even more cynicism.

McNamara tries to excuse himself on the ground that he lacked accurate information about Vietnam. "We had no senior group working exclusively on Vietnam, so the crisis there became just one of many items on each person's plate." That argument makes him guiltier still because it was culpable

ignorance; he had plenty of resources to get all the information he needed. Indeed, he was the one responsible for preventing accurate information from coming to light.

McNamara complains that our government "lacked experts" on Southeast Asia because the State Department's China experts "had been purged during the McCarthy hysteria of the 1950s". How far fetched can you get! McNamara cannot evade responsibility for the Vietnam disaster by blaming poor old Joe McCarthy, who died many years earlier.

The chief tactic that McNamara and Johnson used to prevent law-abiding Americans from attacking government policies was the fiction that the President and Secretary of Defense were privy to superior knowledge not available to the general public, and therefore we should trust them to prosecute the war as they saw fit. Now McNamara admits it was all a lie; they didn't have any inside information to justify their actions.

McNamara's explanations of "why" the wrong Vietnam decisions were made include the fact that LBJ was eager to safeguard political spending on the Great Society, "the weakness of his decision-making approach", and idiosyncrasies in his style.

In the 1962 presidential campaign, the Democrats' principal theme was that Barry Goldwater was a trigger-happy warmonger. It is now obvious that Lyndon Johnson and Robert McNamara were the trigger-happy warmongers who used the pitiful Gulf of Tonkin incident as an excuse to take America into a no-win war.

After President Johnson kicked McNamara upstairs to the World Bank, McNamara wrote a book in 1968 called *The Essence of Security*. It was designed to camouflage his mistakes during his seven years as Secretary of Defense.

The book was full of worn-out liberal clichés such as "collective security", "accommodation with the Soviet Union," the end of "monolithic" Communism, "building bridges", "peaceful competition" with the Communists, and the hope for "agreements" with the Soviets. He expounded on his Whiz Kid



theory that "The real threat to democracy comes not from over-management but from under management."

He's got that 100 per cent wrong. McNamara exercised more power and produced more disastrous results from his management decisions than any American in our history. He spent more than \$400,000,000,000, yet managed to lose a war and reduce the strategic military power of the United States by 50 percent. McNamara said he was "upset" when demonstrators shouted "murderer" at him. His book gives the American people the chance to shout condemnations at him for

being the mastermind of decisions that destroyed so many young people, not only those who lost their lives on the battlefields of Southeast Asia, but also those whose lives were shattered here at home. These words of Joseph Addison can be appropriately applied to Robert McNamara:

*"Is there not some chosen curse,  
Some hidden thunder in the stores of heaven,  
Red with uncommon wrath, to blast the man  
Who owes his greatness to his country's ruin?"*

---

## POLITICAL ZIONISM AND THE NEW CONSERVATIVES

Well known American Roman Catholic conservative Patrick Buchanan, who caused a stir when he initially polled well in the last American primaries as a Republican Party candidate, has decided to campaign again for the Republican nomination. The first reaction has been a massive anti-Buchanan campaign by the Zionist lobby. One of the most violent of the Zionist groups, the Jewish Defence League, has even threatened physical violence. It was thugs from the JDL who attempted to break up a Toronto, Canada, seminar being conducted by Eric Butler, and who beat up the late Patrick Walsh, former Royal Canadian Mounted Police undercover agent, at the time Research Director for the Canadian League of Rights.

One of the few Christian journals prepared to publish anti-Zionist columnists, *The Wanderer*, conservative American Roman Catholic journal, has run material by Patrick Buchanan and well-known columnist Joseph Sobran. Sobran was originally closely associated with Bill Buckley of *National Review*, who has managed to make his conservative publication "respectable" by never being too critical of Zionist Israel. Buckley is typical of the neo-conservatives whom Sobran writes about in *The Wanderer* of April 6: -

"Many conservatives play along with the Zionist elements. Some intimidated; some kid themselves that they are merely participating in the 'Judeo-Christian tradition'; some sincerely believe that Israel is a valuable ally of the United States; some get money and other rewards from Zionist sources; and no doubt there are other reasons.

"Then there are a large number of conservatives who fully understand the real forces at work, but feel that by trying to resist they would only endanger their own livelihoods. I can't blame anyone with a family to support for keeping a prudent silence, providing he does nothing dishonourable.

"And we mustn't overlook a rather forgivable and amiable reason: a lot of Christian conservatives simply have lots of good Jewish friends, whom they don't want to offend -the sort of Jews who are decent and even lovable people; but have become irrationally convinced that they have a sacred duty to support Israel in every way, and that even the mildest criticism of it is a step towards another holocaust. Such Christians rarely have Palestinian friends who might temper this one-sided view, so they go along with their Jewish friends on Israel.

"I happen to be one of the few who tested the limits, the unwritten and indeed unacknowledged rule against applying conservative principles to Israel. To this day I hear tales of backbiting by people I used to think were friends. But I have the great consolation of having found new friends, Christian and Jewish, who look askance at Israel and in some cases has paid a more painful price than I have for their principles. However it has happened, the conservative movement has virtually incorporated Zionism as a tent, without discussion, debate, or formal announcement. It might be called this

generation's 'gentleman's agreement' . . .

"Bill Buckley, you'll recall, wrote a whole book entitled *In Search of Anti-Semitism*, though there is hardly any anti-Semitism in America. (That is why it has to be 'searched' for. Some Jewish leaders note almost plaintively that Jews are so safe and powerful in this country that they are losing the cohesion they have when they feel threatened). It's hard to imagine him writing a book about the evil of abortion, though you don't have to 'search' for abortion mills. But then a book lamenting abortion wouldn't be quoted approvingly in the *New York Times*' lead editorial and given the front page in its Sunday book review section.

"I, of course, was one of Bill's targets; he was very upset with my column's criticism of Israel, for which often he scolded me in private notes (though without trying to refute my arguments). But his chief target was Pat Buchanan, who was badly damaged by his attack. I was struck by a telling disparity of indignation: Jeff Hart, another senior editor of *National Review*, had for years written articles in favour of legal abortion. Bill never objected to that in the least, never Jeff, never worried about scandal. I say this not in criticism of either side, but as an illustration of how the world of politics and journalism really works, and where the power is.

"Merely *verbal* opposition to abortion is easy to find among conservatives. It means little. And it's an optional position anyway. Israel is another matter.

"On Israel there are, so to speak, no exceptions for rape and incest. Because these unwritten rules are rarely mentioned in public, you could get the impression that they hardly matter. But we now have, for example, a speaker of the House, though verbally anti-abortion, who is in thrall to Zionist interests. Not only does he have his own strong ties to the Israel lobby, especially the American-Israel Public Affairs Committee, it has recently transpired that his wife works for an Israeli firm.

"Now Pat Buchanan is running for President again. He is making a strong appeal to the pro-life movement, in contrast to such verbal pro-lifers, as Phil Gramm and Bob Dole, who have been sending out signals that they wish the abortion issue, would go away . . .

"Pat Buchanan isn't the only pro-lifer in the race; and thereby hangs a tale. Alan Keyes and Cong Bob Dorman have thrown their hats into the ring too. Keyes stresses abortion above all other issues, and is a superb orator who can bring pro-life groups to their feet. But he is said to be tight with the neo conservatives . . . He has even defended the National Holocaust film blaming Christianity for anti-Semitism. There is some speculation that he has been encouraged and funded by neoconservatives to take votes from Buchanan. As for Dorman, according to Tom Droleskey, he attacked Buchanan on New York's *Bob Grant Show*, for his position on Israel!"

# REVISITING "THE PROTOCOLS"

When an international mass circulation magazine like *The Reader's Digest* decides to run an article on the documents generally known as The Protocols, in which Eric Butler and The League of Rights are critically mentioned, there must be a purpose. About the same time as *The Reader's Digest* article, which basically regurgitates the view that these documents are either a forgery or a fabrication, the Oxford University Press released a publication, *The Right Road*, by Dr. Andrew Moore, senior lecturer in Australian history at the University of Western Sydney.

Moore's work is subtitled "A History of Right-wing Politics in Australia", but its clear purpose is to suggest that it is "The Australian League of Rights" which is the main threat to what is termed "liberal democracy". Eric Butler receives special attention, it being claimed that he exercises considerable international influence. Blatant misrepresentations of the Social Credit movement and historical events are masked by what purports to be a carefully documented academic study.

We will not at this time attempt to analyse either *The Reader's Digest* article on The Protocols or Moore's work, *The Right Road*. But by coincidence we have recently received an article from a Canadian, Peter L. Lorden of Calgary, who offers some comments on The Protocols, which are appropriate:

It has been generally asserted for many years past that a document called *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion* is a forgery. Supposedly a report of speeches given at the 1897 First Zionist Congress in Basle, it pictures an international Jewish conspiracy to undermine Christian institutions and pave the way for world domination. Gerald Krefetz remarked in his 1982 *Jews and Money; the Myths and the Reality* that the Protocols - "apparently the plagiarized concoction of a Russian religious mystic" - had long since been discredited as propaganda promoted by the Czarist secret police to justify their own anti-Semitism.

Yet if so long discredited, why have they become what he calls the most successful piece of propaganda in the twentieth century? "For a spurious document", says Krefetz, "it has had a remarkably long and influential life." Could this be due simply to continuing anti-Semitism? Indeed, it is hard to see how this document *could* have been a genuine record of speeches at the Congress. Would people clever enough to engineer such a global conspiracy as the Protocols reflect have been dumb enough to let an outsider take notes of their proceedings, let alone live to publish them? And is such a plot any more credible now than it was then? The recent decline of some big Jewish houses, coupled with the emergence of wealthy Asian conglomerates, seems rather to spoil the picture for those inclined to fantasize about an unstoppable international conspiracy guided only by Jewish financiers!

And if any such conspiracy exists, Jews are certainly not the only participants. A book which became a bestseller in 1972 - *None Dare Call It Conspiracy*, by Gary Allen with Larry Abraham - convinced many people that there was indeed a coalition of "insiders" largely dedicated to orchestrating wars and boom-bust economic cycles in order to increase their own power and profit. It shows in some detail how they had simultaneously financed *both* the Soviet Union (page 71) and the Third Reich (page 85), like people fattening birds for a cock-fight. The book is quite even-handed. While it indicts such Jewish luminaries as Rothschild, Warburg and Schiff's Kuhn Loeb and Company, it also assigns prominent roles to many Gentile houses, Morgan's and Rockefeller's chief among them.

David Rockefeller seems to have had a finger in everything. Many famous names in business and politics, such as Nixon and Kissinger, were alumni of his system, whose imperial reach was by no means confined to the United States. (Apparently the surest way to wealth and power is on the coat tails of a man who already has these things and will "look after" you so long as you do his bidding. Khrushchev's downfall seems to have come about when he stopped doing it). How closely Jewish and Gentile "insiders" worked together is shown throughout the book. Chase Manhattan Bank, for instance, was formed by merging Warburg and Rockefeller units. And a roster of blue-chip American corporations, along with prominent politicians of both parties, joined the "insiders" in the immensely influential Council for Foreign Relations (page 88).

Though Allen's *predictions* have failed so far, his book makes a compelling case for the existence of a conspiracy - or at least a close working relationship - between financiers of international clout and it seems likely that an even greater centralisation of money-power in the Western world has occurred since 1972. But isn't that inevitable given the current globalisation? As to his thesis that the ultimate aim of the "insiders" was to create a totalitarian World Government in which they would control everything as a spider sitting in the centre controls his web, we should note that co-operation between inter-

national financiers today - whatever it may have been in the past - is not necessarily of evil intent. And that a great many other people have long since come to see some kind of world government as a necessary goal. (The next big war may be about who gets to control it!)

## A SPURIOUS DOCUMENT?

What light does Allen's book throw on the Protocols? A negative one, it would seem, inasmuch as he shows Gentile interests to have as much clout as the Jewish. Yet the Protocols are not to be dismissed so easily. For if they are false in one sense, a reader cannot help feeling that they are genuine in another! What makes them *seem* genuine is that they are not at all what one would expect from "a Russian religious mystic". They show too deep an understanding both of Gentile weaknesses familiar to us all and of the sort of mindset, which might ruthlessly exploit them for sectarian gain. Fictional or not, they were written by somebody who knew very well the kind of men whose utterances they supposedly report. They express a wealth of hard-headed insight in a tone of arrogant superiority which is not unfamiliar to us either. We cannot quarrel with the comment of Henry Ford's *Dearborn Independent* - which publicized the Protocols in America around 1921 - that the work was "too terribly real for fiction, too well-sustained for speculation, too deep in its knowledge of the secret springs of life for forgery".

Then who *did* write the Protocols? We may never know that, but it seems improbable that either a mystic or a bigoted Russian policeman could have come up with an analysis so penetrating, and so unfailingly *prophetic*. "Spurious" the document may be, historically speaking. But as anyone familiar with current events will instantly recognise, many passages in it show a remarkable prescience.

That a document first published in 1905 should have prefigured the collapse of European monarchies, the Bolshevik Revolution and World Wars yielding little change in territory but a big one in the map of international finance is surprising enough. That it should also have anticipated a Great Depression caused by the arbitrary cutting-off of credit, the resurgence of Israel, the current squeeze on countries with large external debt - and even hinted at today's explosion in "derivatives" trading - has to impress any thoughtful reader. ("That's some mystic!" he'll say. Or he might well echo the comment made in 1921 by Ford himself: "The only statement I have to make about the Protocols is that they fit what has gone on in the world situation these sixteen years. They fit it now.")

## THE PROTOCOLS DIGEST-ED

Since discourse in the Protocols is often disjointed, we have taken the liberty of grouping quotations (from Victor Marsden's 1934 edition) in what seems a logical order of subject. We have also tried to minimise the more offensive ones. Contemptuous references to *goyyim* (the unfortunate Talmudic term for Gentiles, meaning "cattle") are scattered throughout the work, as indeed one might expect if the author were a propagandist determined to present a malign image of Jewry. One might have preferred to omit such racism altogether, along with utterances more interesting to students of religious pathology than to the general reader. But the purported speaker's ultimate aim - to see "the King-Despot of Zion as Patriarch of the World" - is so central to the work that excluding it would give a wholly false impression. For those who ignore that side (*as one can easily do by substituting Untermenschen for goyyim and some other ideology for the Mosaic*), the fascination of the document lies in its Machiavellian

practicality, (its being virtually a manual for would-be dictators is probably why Adolf Hitler knew it so well.)

The document opens with a flat statement that all "rights" other than that of "might" are vacuous; that "freedom" is an empty word, and absolute despotism the only sensible form of government.

### ON POLITICS

The political has nothing in common with the moral . . . Our right lies in force . . . Violence must be the principle and a cunning make-believe the rule if we are to bring all governments into subjection to our super government."

"The French Revolution was wholly the work of our hands.. We were the first to cry among the masses the words 'Liberty, Equality, Fraternity', since many times repeated by stupid poll-parrots. This helped us to destroy the natural aristocracy of the *goyyim*, on whose ruins we have set up the aristocracy of our educated class headed by the aristocracy of money . . . Our subordinate agents are boring away at the last remnants of *goy* authority, striving to overthrow all established forms of order . . ."

"We have advertised sedition-mongers as martyrs for the common good, though none will be permitted under *our* rule. This has brought many liberals into the ranks of our 'cattle' . . ."

"Having *used* this freedom-shibboleth, we shall erase that word from the lexicon when we come into our kingdom . . . Freedom of the Press, of speech, of association and *conscience* must disappear forever...We define freedom as the right to do that which the law allows; *this serves our aim very well, for we shall make the laws!*"

"For our purpose, wars must not result in territorial gain, the true battlefield will be the economic. Our international rights will then wipe out national rights."

"We need an intensified centralization of government to facilitate our control . . . We must so ferment things that the peoples of the world will eventually cry out for one global government . . . Useless changes of government to which we instigated the *goyyim* in undermining their state structures will have so disheartened the people that they will suffer serfdom under us rather than go backward . . . One-third of our subjects will keep the rest under observation from a sense of duty . . . The *goyyim* are a flock of sheep and we are their wolves."

"Though we have sacrificed many of our people in pursuit of the goal of world-government, it has paid us. Each victim on our side is worth in the sight of God a thousand *goyyim*".

### ON PROPAGANDA

"Our aim must be to debilitate the public mind by continually fomenting contradictory opinions and thus distract it from serious reflections which might cause resistance to our aims . . . Let the *goyyim* be bewildered, for there is nothing so dangerous as personal initiative!"

"So that the true meaning of things shall not strike the *goyyim* until the proper time, we shall mask it under an alleged ardent desire to serve the working classes.. If any States raise a protest against us, it is only pro forma and by our direction, *for their anti-Semitism is indispensable to us for the management of our lesser brethren.*"

"The Press is already in our hands. Not a single announcement will reach the public without our control. This we have already attained in large part through our control of those agencies by which all news items must pass . . . We shall put out our own journals, disguised as coming from elsewhere so that readers will in effect be following the flag we hang out for them; these will even be allowed to feign attacks on us, to convince people they are reading a free press . . . Let them discuss themselves silly!"

"*Distraction* is one of our principal aims -through amusements, gambling and games of all kinds . . . have we not very successfully turned the brainless heads of the *goyyim* with 'progress' - a fallacious idea except in terms of material invention, for truth is one and there can be no place in it for progress? 'Progress' serves to obscure the truth so that none may know it except ourselves, the Chosen of God, its guardians."

"When we come into our kingdom, it will be undesirable that there should exist any religion other than ours. We must therefore

sweep away all other forms of belief . . . We have long taken care to discredit the priesthood of the *goyyim*, whose influence falls lower day by day. But no one will ever bring *our* faith under discussion from its true point of view, since only we shall know that"

### ON EDUCATION

"We have bemused and corrupted the youth of the *goyyim* by rearing them in principles and theories we know to be false.

"To destroy every collectivism except ours, we shall emasculate the universities . . . banning classical history and erasing from the memory of the *goyyim* all historical facts unfavourable to us."

"To discourage independent thinking, our subjects will be schooled only for the occupations allotted to them . . . Students shall not busy themselves with questions of polity in which even their own fathers never had any power of thought."

"We shall choose *goy* administrators on their capacity for servile obedience."

### ON FREEMASONRY

"Ours is an invisible force, for which Gentile freemasonry unknowingly serves as a screen . . . The aims of our organisation of secret masonry are not even suspected by these *goy* cattle attracted to it."

"We shall multiply Masonic lodges as a means of gathering under our eye all those *goyyim* who (promise to become prominent in public activity), particularly all agents of international police, for these are useful both to enforce and to screen our activities. We puff up their foolish egotism, their need for any little success, in order to keep them in line, for these tigers in appearance have the souls of sheep . . . They are incapable of the analysis and observation required for *foresight*, hence the inevitable subjection to ours of the brute mind of the *goyyim*".

"Who will ever suspect that all these people have been stage-managed by us according to a political plan which no one has guessed at these many centuries?"

### ON ECONOMICS

"Capital must be free to establish monopolies so that its leaders shall have political force."

"By centralising in our own hands the money-power of the world, we can throw all *goyyim* into the ranks of the proletariat . . . The *goy* aristocracy benefited by having their people healthy and strong; we are interested in just the opposite."

"Hunger creates the right of capital to rule the worker. By want and envy and the hatred it engenders we shall move the mob . . . This hatred will be further magnified by the effect of an *economic crisis*, which will stop dealings on the exchanges and bring industry to a standstill. By creating this crisis we shall throw upon the street whole mobs of workers simultaneously in all the countries of Europe."

"We shall surround our government with a whole world of economists, bankers and millionaires, because in substance everything will be settled on the basis of figures."

"We must tear out of *goyyim* heads the very principle of Godhead, replacing it with arithmetical calculation and material needs . . . We must put industry on a *speculative* basis, for in that is our strength."

*Economic crises* have been produced by us through the *goyyim* by no other means than the withdrawal of money from circulation. Huge pools of capital have stagnated, forcing States to borrow from them and thus become their bond-slaves. . in twenty years, a State which has borrowed money at 5% has paid the whole sum in interest without reducing the debt. . . The State is thus forced to impoverish its masses in order to pay off rich foreigners. Why could those stupid *goyyim* not have taken the money they needed from their own people . . .?"

"*Goy* governments could play tricks with internal loans but not the *external*, for they know that we shall demand all our monies back."

(Wow! If a "Russian religious mystic" so long ago could show this good a grasp of money matters, maybe we should try to get one for our next Minister of Finance!)