

THE NEW TIMES

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

VOL. 59, No. 9.

Registered by Australia Post -Publication PP481667 100259

SEPTEMBER 1995.

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

THE CONSPIRACY AGAINST THE LEAGUE OF RIGHTS

by Eric D. Butler

With the major anti-League of Rights media outburst in the South Australian mass media, and the proposal by the South Australian State government to introduce a racial vilification bill, allegedly more draconian than even the proposed legislation by the Federal Labor government, a nation-wide campaign against the League is now operating in top gear. The campaign is unprecedented in Australian history. It has reached the stage where the three major political parties at Canberra have united in the campaign. While many shallow journalists have demonstrated that they readily become victims of their own delusions, the campaign reminds one of Lord Acton's famous comment about the French revolution: that behind all the smoke and confusion it was obvious that there was calculated design.

What is the purpose and the design behind a national campaign which results in large numbers of otherwise commonsense Australians acting like Pavlov's famous dogs when the League of Rights is even mentioned? In a world increasingly dominated by evil, an organisation dedicated to the preservation of the Christian value system, is depicted as the Devil Incarnate. It is a national phenomenon, which awaits the study of some competent social psychologist. Following a radio interview with West Australian State Director, Robert Nixon, in which the objectives of the League of Rights were outlined, with stress on the Christian roots of the League, Zionist leader Isi Leibler was immediately brought on to comment. Leibler said that what listeners had heard was the plausible facade behind which the League advanced its real agenda. This accusation has often been made by the League smearers, but little or no attempt is ever made to outline what the League's "secret agenda" might be.

ZIONIST OPPOSITION TO LEAGUE

While it is true that many Zionist leaders suffer from a form of paranoia, they know perfectly well that the League of Rights is not in the power business, is not attempting to have a political party elected, does not have a mass membership, and is not engaged in training any type of a clandestine military force to stage a coup. Why then are they constantly expressing such fear about the League? From the earliest days of the League, Zionist leaders have run an unrelenting campaign against it. On more than one occasion Mr. Isi Leibler has said that the League must be denied access to the mainstream of Australian politics. A long list of businessmen could be given who were subjected to Zionist intimidation when it was felt that they might be supporting the League. Politicians who associated in any way with the League were personally called upon. Others were warned against appearing on League platforms.

Back in 1984 when the Australian League of Rights was leading the nationwide campaign against so-called "land rights" for Aborigines, the Federal Labor government allocated

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.

\$55,000 to engage the services of the late K.D. Gott to "investigate" and to prepare a report on the League. Even to this day Gott's little hate booklet on the League, *Voices of Hate*, is extolled by Zionist leaders as an outstanding study of the League. When the League of Rights spearheaded a campaign of opposition to the Victorian Cain Labor government's proposal to "acquire" the property of a Western Victorian farmer for an Aboriginal cultural project, the campaign concluding with a mass rally in the Victorian Provincial City of Warrnambool, within hours of the Cain government backing away from its original proposal, Zionist leader Isi Leibler and colleagues were calling upon the leader of the Liberal Party Opposition, Mr. Jeff Kennett, demanding that he join the Labor party in "proscribing" the League of Rights, and directing that no Liberal ever appear on a public platform in association with a League of Rights speaker. The same demand was made on the National Party. Every attempt was made to intimidate Queensland Premier Sir Joh Bjelke Petersen when it was perceived that he was sympathetic to some of the League's objectives.

THE LEAGUE'S RECORD

The League's record has been one of consistently opposing all policies of centralisation, including the compulsory amalgamation of Municipal Councils. Zionist leaders have charged the League with "racism" and much else because the League has opposed an immigration policy, which, unless checked, will fragment Australia into a nation of warring tribes. Zionist leaders have been in the forefront of the campaign to create a multicultural Australia. It is legitimate to ask why Zionist strategists, who oppose the establishment of a multicultural Zionist Israel, campaign in favour of a multicultural Australia? Zionists generally are practitioners of a policy of double standards.

As the League of Rights supports no policies, which threaten the natural rights of any people, but does advocate policies, which would enable a more stable and secure Australia to develop, we are left with the question of what is the real reason for the mounting anti-League of Rights campaign being driven by Zionist zealots? Why the fury because Labor backbench Member Graeme Campbell makes it clear that he will address the League of Rights whenever he pleases? Graeme Campbell is not merely a maverick, as sometimes claimed, but a man with well thought out views on a number of important issues, ranging from immigration to economic rationalism. In his book, *The Betrayal of Australia*, Campbell presents a coherent philosophy in favour of economic nationalism as opposed to internationalism. He rejects the present immigration policy and the programme to foster multiculturalism. In a referendum, the great majority of Australians would support what Campbell is saying. He is an advocate of the retention of the Constitutional Monarchy.

Zionist strategists have consistently taken the long view of history. All the evidence indicates that they would prefer the continuation in office of the Keating-led Labor government, which is firmly committed to an internationalist programme, which they endorse. But the possibility of a Coalition victory at the next Federal elections cannot be discounted. With a Liberal government in South Australia proposing to implement legislation even more draconian than that proposed in the Federal Labor legislation, events may well result in John Howard attempting to reverse himself once elected to office.

Anything is possible in the game of party power politics, as witnessed in Victoria where the same Jeff Kennett who insisted that his party would never tolerate forced amalgamation of Municipal government, is imposing a programme even more revolutionary than that attempted by the Labor socialists.

A DECISIVE ROLE

Irrespective of who wins the next Federal elections, Australia will continue on a course, which must result in growing convulsions and tensions. In this situation a man like Graeme Campbell could emerge as a type of catalyst for a coherent new grass roots political movement. The League of Rights continues to develop the only coherent and influential non-party political movement. Zionist strategists fear that so far from being eliminated from the Australian political scene, the League's *influence* could result in a major setback to the whole international programme. Australia is entering a new political situation, one that confirms League predictions. Zionist strategy is designed to isolate and, if possible, to destroy the League before the type of developments which could follow the coming Federal elections. The next few years may well decide whether traditional Australia can survive. The League's role will be decisive.

ZIONIST-JEWISH BLACKMAIL

The Zionist-Jewish lobby is now openly showing its naked totalitarianism. *The Australian Jewish News* of September 8 carries a story with the headline: LIBS WARNED OF JEWISH BACKLASH OVER RACE BILL. The story relates to an ABC interview with a Mr. Jeremy Rapke, described as a leader of "the Jewish electoral lobby".

Rapke said that the Liberal Party risked a Jewish backlash because of its failure to endorse the criminal sanctions included in the Labor Party's racial hatred legislation. The ABC interview with Rapke followed a meeting of the Jewish electoral Lobby, which was originally to have been addressed by Deputy Federal Labor leader Beazley, but who was subsequently replaced by Senator Peter Cook. Senator Cook reported on the action taken by the Labor party to "proscribe" the League of Rights and to curb the activities of Labor Member Graeme Campbell.

Mr. Rapke is quoted as saying that in relation to the League of Rights neither of the political parties "had covered itself in much glory".

As the Jewish vote in Australia is not a big one, and it is difficult to pinpoint any electorate in which it might be decisive, any Jewish backlash against the Liberal Party can only be effective in the financial field. Graeme Campbell has publicly charged that substantial Zionist finance is provided for both the Labor Party and the Liberal Party.

REALISM FROM AN ARCHBISHOP

The Anglican Archbishop of Adelaide, Dr. Ian George, has recently put forward the concept of every individual being paid a guaranteed wage to replace all present benefits and allowances. Dr. George argues that a subsistence income would allow many people to work part-time instead of full time, freeing up employment for others and easing social pressures. This concept has considerable merit if financed out of new financial credits.

JEWISH GUIDELINES FOR CHRISTIANITY

by David Thompson

In the hands of what have increasingly become known as "ethnic minorities", the dogma of multiculturalism as applied in Australia, has quickly assumed the philosophy of the "one-way street". That is, the interests of the majority groups, those of traditional British or Anglo Saxon background, who would have broadly called themselves "Christian" in character, have been submerged by the interests of dozens of separately identifiable racial, national or religious groups. The Commonwealth has even provided substantial funds for minority groups to give expression to their own exclusive perspective.

It has generally gone unnoticed that this process has gradually filtered through to what might be described as the "bedrock" of western culture -Christianity itself. If Christianity can be summarised in a phrase, perhaps this phrase would be "the law of love". But when Christ was instructing His disciples before sending them out among "the lost sheep of Israel" he warned them of persecution for His sake. Matthew later records that Jesus specifically warned them not to "suppose that I come to bring peace to the earth. I did not come to bring peace, but a sword . . ."

PEACE OR CONFLICT?

Now what can this mean, when Christ is worshipped as the Prince of Peace, and John records him as saying "Peace I leave with you...." Of course Christ came to bring peace; peace between God and those who accept him as their Father, peace between men who obey his laws - principally the law of love. But the inevitable result of the application of the law of love itself is conflict. Conflict "between Christ and the anti-Christ, between light and darkness, between Christ's children and the devil's children."¹ There are plenty of passages in the Gospels where Jesus teaches specifically about the very foundation of this conflict, and Matthew records where Christ names the Pharisees as the sons of hell.

This massive cleavage between Christ and Pharisee has traditionally been the primary reason why the Pharisees and their antecedents (which in general terms, means modern-day Judaism) have rejected Christ as the Messiah, and therefore the validity of Christianity. Wherever Christianity has been faithfully taught, this conflict has followed, as Christ warned that it would. But as we move into a multicultural society, where it becomes illegal to place a greater weight or worth upon one religion, race or culture than another; to "discriminate" between what is truth and what is not, how is the philosophical cleavage between Christianity and Judaism to be handled?

In 1995, this question was addressed by the formation of the Council of Christians and Jews, formed to attempt to find a way of eliminating the conflict about which Christ warned. Needless to say, the Council includes Jewish representatives as well as those from the major Christian denominations. In 1982, the president of the Victorian Council of Christians and Jews was Rabbi John Levi, who summed up the position:

*"Being part of a multicultural open society requires sincerity and serious commitment from Jews and Christians. Centuries of hostility, triumphalism and persecution have left deep scars (within Jews) that Christians need to understand."*²

ACHIEVING THE IMPOSSIBLE

In order to achieve the impossible, the Council has concentrated on the presentation of the Christian Gospels in

such a way that Judaism will not be offended. There is no suggestion that any Jewish teaching should be modified in any way. From the evidence so far available, it is *Christian teaching, which must be modified to meet Jewish standards*, and presumably, the standards of the Human Rights Commission. If Christ were to appear before the Human Rights Commission and utter the remarks, which the Apostles record him making of the Pharisees, he would be condemned in even more robust terms than the League of Rights has been, if this is possible.

According to recent reports in *The Australian Jewish News* (18/8/95), the Victorian Council for Christians and Jews has now produced the promised guidelines, called *Rightly Explaining the Word of Truth*. The *AJN* article explains: "They are intended to help Christian teachers and preachers deal more sensitively with those passages in the Christian Testament which have traditionally been used against Jews and Judaism. Certain texts of the New Testament 'require very careful handling . . . to promote sensitivity both to past Jewish sufferings and present Jewish concerns' the guidelines say. The particular areas of New Testament which form the subject of the guidelines are the trial and death of Jesus, the depiction of the Pharisees, the expression "the Jews" in the fourth Gospel, the Gospel of John, the relationship between Jesus, Judaism and the Torah . . ." (emphasis added).

We should note that the guidelines are intended to modify Christian teaching, not Jewish teaching. This is a manifestation of the philosophy of the "one-way street". *The Australian Jewish News* in September of 1991 carried the remark that dialogue between Jews and Christians is supported, and emphasised the need for canonical Christian texts to be taught in the light of modern historical and textual understanding, *especially after the holocaust*.

"CAN WE SURVIVE LOVE . . .?"

The ultimate objective of this process, of course, is to emasculate Christianity, and eliminate it as the threat to Judaism that it clearly is. In the Christian light, Judaism cannot survive. One of the founders of Zionism, Theodore Herzl, predicted in 1896 that if the Christian communities "would leave us in peace for two generations", then Jews would assimilate, destroying Judaism. Herzl's challenge for Judaism was, "can we survive Christian love?" The answer to Herzl's question is "no". Professor Alan Dershowitz, the O.J. Simpson trial legal consultant, visited Australia in June, and addressed this question. He told Australian Jews that he has taken up Herzl's challenge³ "where he says the only reason for Judaism and Zionism is to fight our enemies. We have to consider how to deal with a generation that has no enemies . . ."

This, of course, is the ultimate in dialectics, of which Dershowitz is clearly a skilled exponent. If Christian love leads to assimilation, and therefore the undermining of Judaism within two generations, then this clearly is "the enemy". But

how is an enemy armed with *love* to be first, branded as an enemy, and then dispatched?

The answer is to use the letter of the law in the same way that the Pharisees used the letter of the law to imprison the Israelites, and that is today used to imprison modern-day Jews within Judaism. The Mosaic Law, contained in the Pentateuch (the first five books of the Old Testament) had to be interpreted, and those who failed to keep it, to be judged. The interpretation of the Law, and the myriad of judgments make up a vast web of secondary laws, judgments and directives, known as the Talmud. The Talmud is otherwise known as "*the fence around the Law*", and it is this vastly complex legalistic web that imprisons modern-day Judaism.

"A CHRISTIAN TALMUD"

What is proposed to defeat the Christian law of love as a threat to Judaism, was revealed in the final paragraph of Susan Bures' article in *The Australian Jewish News* (20/9/91), when she wrote:

"And finally, Orthodox feminist writer Blu Greenberg argues for a Christian Talmud and Midrash to deal with its fundamental documents of faith so that no Christian text is ever taught without a quasi-canonical exegesis based on Christian and Jewish scholarship and a sense of history. 'Only the Gospels can undo what the Gospels have done. Only through the process of quasi-canonisation of the new and positive teachings can the negative ones be banished from consciousness. The Gospels must be bound to an Oral Gospel', a definitive tradition whose interpretation must shape the actual reading of the Gospels."

The significance of this cannot be underestimated. This is the most revolutionary and deadly challenge available to Christianity, and in fact encapsulates the negation of the central message of Christianity itself. "*Ye shall know the Truth, and the Truth (Christ) shall make ye free*" is to be "interpreted" by a new text, produced with the help of the Pharisees! The very words of Christ, only recorded by the Apostles who witnessed His deeds in the Christian Gospels, are to be re-interpreted and taught by the Pharisees, whom Christ condemned. The Light is to be filtered through Darkness. And the greatest tragedy of this process is that the Churches have not only conceded to it, but have actively assisted in its execution. Thus is the Body of Christ betrayed, not by its avowed enemies, but by its own household. Perhaps this fulfils the prophecy of Christ, where Matthew records him as continuing, after saying "I did not come to bring peace, but a sword": "*For I have come to turn a man against his father, a daughter against her mother, a daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law - a man's enemies will be the members of his own household . . .*"⁴

It now remains to be seen whether the Churches will use

the new Christian Talmud "Rightly Explaining the Word of Truth", or not. Will they acquiesce in the sacrifice of the law of love, thus permitting what amounts to a second crucifixion of Christ?

1. *NIV Study Bible footnotes.*
2. *Australian Jewish News*, 14/9/91.
3. *Australian Jewish News*, 23/6/95.
4. *Matthew*, Chapter 10 vs. 35-36.

"SEMANTIC REACTIONARIES"

In a recent letter our greatly respected Social Credit colleague of the United Kingdom, Dr. Geoffrey Dobbs, suggests the formation of a movement dedicated to the preservation of the original meaning of all those terms, which have been hi-jacked by those who preach the gospel of political correctness. For example, the term "gay" should be used as it was originally. People should boldly say they not only believe in "discrimination", but practise it whenever necessary.

A recent featured letter in *The West Australian* provides an inspiring example of what is needed. Under the title FOR GOD'S SAKE, LEAVE THE BIBLE ALONE, Peter Jeans writes:

"It was only a matter of time before the polcorites (politically correct zealots) got their hands on the Bible.

"Not that I'm a rabid Christian or even a mild one; it's just that I treasure the resonance and the colourful metaphors and sonorous invocations in ancient authority that the Church Fathers saw fit to indulge in whenever they wrote up their journals.

"Now, if I am to believe my eyes, the Oxford University Press mob has been persuaded that God should be '*Our Father-Mother in Heaven*', and the Son of Man (Christ, whom I have always presumed to be male) should transmogrify into '*the human one*'. It's called 'the new climate of language'.

"If you ask me, it's the new climate of linguistic madness. It's another way of saying that people haven't the intelligence to read between the lines, that metaphors such as darkness-evil have to be read as racial slurs, that although historically the Jewish community of 2000 years ago did crucify Christ with the help of the Roman authorities, this fact must now be expunged from our collective consciousness. Well, a pox on polcorism.

"And if Mark Tauber of Oxford's marketing department is anything to go by there is more to fear. He is reported as saying: '*. . . it is a scholarly adaption responding to need.*'

"I've got news for Mr. Tauber - there is no such word as 'adaption', never has been. This being the case, it makes me wonder what other lexical nonsense he and his dubious band of semantic reactionaries at Oxford intend inflicting on us."

BRUCE RUXTON, O.B.E.,

FOR NATIONAL SEMINAR

RSL leader Mr. Bruce Ruxton, will present the first paper at the 1995 Annual National Seminar of The League of Rights, at The Victoria, Little Collins Street, at 2 p.m. on Saturday, October 7th.

The identity of the second speaker will be revealed later. The 1995 National Seminar of the League promises to be the most dramatic in the history of the League. All readers are urged to publicise the Seminar widely.

GATT: A CON JOB ON THE MASSES?

This article originally appeared in *The Guardian Weekly* (U.K.)

It is extraordinary that the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), the instrument of global free trade, could have been negotiated by successive US administrations without a full public and national debate.

By contrast, the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) was the subject of substantial and reasonably well-informed debate in Congress - yet NAFTA is insignificant compared to the so-called Uruguay Round of GATT. If fully successful, GATT - and its successor, the World Trade Organisation, to be established by the Uruguay Round agreement - will ultimately create a free trade area not just with America's neighbours, Mexico and Canada, but with China, India, Vietnam, Bangladesh, indeed with the whole world. It is impossible to conceive of an international agreement with deeper social consequences. The American public cannot afford to let its collective eyes glaze over at the mention of GATT.

In no sector will the social and economic consequences be more far-reaching than in agriculture in the name of efficiency and increased agricultural "productivity". Modern economists, more particularly those in favour of global free trade, claim that the best agricultural system is one that produces the maximum amount of food for the minimum price and employs the fewest people. But even in economic terms, that calculation is incomplete.

Redundant rural people

When you reduce the number of people employed on the land, those who become redundant are forced into cities. Therefore, you must add to the direct cost of producing food by intensive methods the indirect costs of those who have been uprooted. As there are insufficient non-agricultural jobs throughout the world, there will be increased unemployment, with the consequent costs of welfare. As there is insufficient urban infrastructure, such as schools, hospitals and housing, there will be a need for substantial new capital expenditure.

Yet there is a deeper price. In a stable society when, as a result of changes in technology, some jobs are lost in a particular industry, the fundamental balance of society is not altered. Some declining enterprises necessarily suffer while other, more competitive, entities emerge. But loss of rural employment and migration from the countryside to the cities causes a fundamental and irreversible change. It has contributed to the destabilisation of rural society and to the growth of vast urban concentrations from the First World to the Third. Within these huge urban groupings reside an alienated underclass whose cultural traditions have been extinguished and whose families are dependent on public and private charity.

Rural dislocations

The cost of contributing to such social breakdown cannot be measured. As Jose Lutzenberger, the far-sighted former minister of the environment of Brazil, reminds us, the notorious slums of Brazil, known as *favelas*, were the direct result of the rural dislocations caused by the "green revolution" of the 1950s, which, through intensive farming, was supposed to end for all time famine throughout the world.

Maximising agricultural output per person might have been an important consideration in the highly developed Western

nations in which the cost of labour was great and standards of living were high. But we are entering a new world. Four billion people suddenly are joining the world economy. Until recently they had been held separate by their political systems, usually communist or socialist. They include the populations of China, India, Vietnam, Bangladesh and countries of the ex-Soviet Union among others. Their populations are growing fast and it is forecast that they will reach 6.5 billion in 35 years.

It is estimated that there are still 3.1 billion people throughout the world living in the countryside. If GATT succeeds in imposing worldwide the sort of productivity achieved by the intensive agriculture of Canada and Australia, then it is easy to calculate that approximately 2 billion of these people will lose their livelihood. Rural communities will be uprooted and swept into urban slums. If many cannot find jobs in an expanded industrial sector, mass migrations of displaced and tragic peoples will follow. They will be the GATT refugees.

Local effect

If global change is too vast to contemplate, consider the effects of GATT on one country. Vietnam is typical of the many nations making their first faltering steps toward joining the free world and the global economy. It has a population of 67 million, of which 78% live in the countryside (compared to 14.8% in Australia, a major agricultural country). The current version of GATT would drive millions of poor Vietnamese from the fields into urban slums and create deep and long-lasting devastation.

But GATT is not only a concern to landless Third World peasants. The developed world will suffer GATT-induced stresses of its own, in addition to the need to cope with refugee movements. The principle of global free trade is that anything can be manufactured anywhere in the world to be sold anywhere else.

That means that the 4 billion new entrants into the world economy will be in direct competition with the work forces of the developed countries. This massive increase in the supply of extremely cheap labour is taking place at a time when technology can be transferred instantly anywhere in the world on the back of a microchip, and capital is free to be invested worldwide wherever the anticipated yields are highest.

People become dispensable

Some high-tech industries can survive under these circumstances because they are highly automated. For them, labour is a minor item in the overall cost of their products. But as soon as they need to increase employment, they are forced to move offshore. For example, IBM is moving its disk-drive business from America and Western Europe to low-labour-cost countries. According to the *Wall Street Journal*, "IBM plans to establish this new site as a joint venture with an undetermined Asian partner and use non-IBM employees so that it will be easier . . . to move to an even lower-cost region when warranted . . . Moving from higher-cost regions to Asia cuts in half the cost of assembly."

Supporters of global free trade argue that jobs in the service industries will replace lost employment to low-cost areas. Today through satellites you can remain in constant

contact with offices in distant lands. Swissair, for example, has recently transferred a significant part of its accounts department to India.

Developed countries need to begin thinking about their balances of trade in terms of employment as well as money. If we export \$1 billion of goods and import products of the same value, we now conclude that our overseas trade is in balance. But if our exports are heavily weighted toward high-tech products, while our imports are labour intensive, we are importing unemployment - with large social costs not counted in the balance.

And global trade will not only increase unemployment in the developed world but exert downward pressure on wages because the value of labour will decline. Value-added is the increase of value obtained when you convert raw materials into manufactured product. In a mature society such as our own, we have been able to develop - through generations of political debate, elections, strikes, lockouts and other conflicts - a general agreement as to how it should be shared between labour and capital. Global free trade will brutally shatter that agreement.

Of course, there will be those who will benefit from these extraordinary changes - principally, companies with access to an almost inexhaustible supply of very cheap labour. But they will be like the winners *in* a poker game on the Titanic. The wounds inflicted on their nation will be too deep to be acceptable without brutal consequences.

Replace free trade

Until wage levels and standards of living in the developing world can be brought into close alignment with those of the West, we must replace the concept of global free trade by free and vigorously competitive regional markets. NAFTA and Europe are the two largest free trade areas ever created. Obviously both are more than big enough to ensure highly competitive internal markets. They would not cut themselves off from the world, but would welcome innovation from anywhere. Foreign corporations wishing to sell their products would build factories in America, employ Americans and bring with them their technology and capital. The same, of course, is true for the European economy. What is more, each region would be free to decide how it wishes to trade with other regions including developing countries, entering into bilateral agreements to the mutual advantage of each party.

Developing nations should also form free trade areas, as is currently the case in Latin America. These areas should consist of nations with economies reasonably similar in terms of development and wage structures. Of course, freedom of transfer of technology and capital would be maintained. Thus, corporations wishing to sell products in these regions would produce locally, importing capital and technology and creating local employment. That is the way to create prosperity and stability in the developing world without destroying our own.

By Sir James Goldsmith. He is an international financier who has recently been elected to the European Parliament from France.

RETRAINING FOR SERVITUDE

Almost forgotten now, in March 1994 U.S. President Clinton called for a 'world summit on Unemployment'. It did more than acknowledge the millions of out-of-work human beings in industrial nations; it reinforced the supposition that the globalisation of opportunity was the way forward, and that the disposing of personal freedom is a fundamental for the future.

The grandiosity of a "world summit" about the future activities of the world's peoples is, in truth, Grand Guignol farce. Those meeting came from nations whose social fabric is unravelling.

Four months after Clinton's grandiloquence, Paul Sheehan, writing from New York (*Financial Review* 20/7/94) described the President's home turf:

"While corporate profits rose about 45 percent, year on year (a 7-year period) in the second quarter for Standard and Poor's 500 companies - a fantastic result - it is also an unsustainable one, and much of it is the product of "restructuring", "downsizing", "re-engineering", "partnering", "outsourcing" and "resource leveraging".

What all these deathly euphemisms actually mean is "cutting staff".

Some companies have carried this low-cost mania so far that a new term has been invented - "corporate anorexia" - to describe companies, which cut to the point of creating debilitating morale and productivity problems. Behind this evolution in the culture of corporate America is a whole set of big numbers which should cause concern for the intangibles of social cohesion. During the past decade of stock market boom:

- * Average family income has stagnated in inflation-adjusted terms.
- * The 500 largest companies in America have collectively shed almost 3 million workers.
- * The ratio of home mortgage equity to household debt has shrunk from 74 percent to 54 percent, which

means the average American household has taken on more debt to compensate for average income. . .

* The minimum wage has remained unchanged at \$US1.25 an hour since April 1, 1991, representing a weekly income of \$US170 for a 40-hour week, and an annual wage of \$US8,840 with no holidays and no medical benefits. . .

. . . So many high-wage jobs have been replaced by low-wage or part-time or temporary jobs that cultural assumptions about job security have been eroded, and the very definition of what constitutes a "job" has been challenged.

"Anyone can get a job in America, it just depends on what you call a job," says Nancy Mudd, who was laid off from her \$US40, 000-a-year job as ticket agent at American Airlines, and then offered the same work at \$US 16,000 a year.

Employment growth in US manufacturing has become so moribund that last week's *Barron's* called this once crucial employment sector a "growing job sinkhole".

Union membership has shrunk to about 14 percent of the private workforce, a rout that has been caused by a combination of automation, free trade, new technologies and self-destruction. No countervailing social force has emerged to counter an increase in the exploitation of the millions of Nancy Mudds in America.

And with a high-tech job and income boom under way for America's most skilled people, a yawning income gap is emerging between America's highest and lowest skilled workers, leaving a beleaguered rump in the middle, worried

about crime and whether the job they have today will still exist tomorrow. . . ' (End of quote)

It was against this background that the international summit met in Detroit in March 1994 to consider the proposition that investment in retraining would deliver a "high skills, high wage economy".

The Economist (syndicated in *The Australian*, March 16, 1994) synthesised the argument:

. . . The argument behind the incantation goes roughly like this: Low skilled jobs are being destroyed remorselessly in the rich world by the forces of automation and globalisation. But the traditional recipes for maintaining employment -saving old jobs through protectionism and subsidies, creating new ones through reflation and public works -have failed.

So the intelligent strategy is to turn instead to the supply side of the economy and concentrate on improving the skills of the workforce. As long as rich countries provide their workers with the skills to compete at the upper end of the market, it hardly matters that jobs are being destroyed by technology or exported to poorer countries. Indeed, it is a good thing, since it frees all economies to exploit their comparative advantages in brains and brawn.

This position has a powerful coalition of interest groups behind it. . .

The architect of Clinton's training policy is his Labour Secretary, Robert Reich, a former Harvard Professor . . ."

(End of quote)

Now this scenario, linked to other global policies for which President Clinton and his advisers are such keen proponents, raises some awkward questions. We are on the edge, so we are told, of a global free market, to be managed by the third leg of an unholy trinity, the World Trade Organisation. The other two are the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund.

Describing this threesome, Dr. Susan George of the Transnational Institute, told the ABC listeners in 1992:

"All these institutions are centralised, hierarchical, completely undemocratic and working with a lot of money contributed by their members, mostly their richer members. What do they do with the money? Well, in many ways they are helping to subjugate all the economies of the world and making them satellites of 'free enterprise' so to speak. These are all places where capital is free to go, where the market will reign supreme and that means the market without necessarily any social safety nets. The World Bank is in charge of imposing this economic doctrine, the International Monetary Fund is in charge of imposing structural adjustment, in other words austerity programmes in the Third World, and GATT (*now headed by the WTO - Ed.*) is involved with indeed reducing not only barriers to trade, but any standards - environmental standards, health standards, high wages - that could be considered impediments to trade. I feel very much that the undemocratic nature of these institutions will mean that a whole new world order is put into place and that it is an anti democratic, authoritarian order run by the elites of the rich world on their own behalf . . . " (End of quote)

Even as those words were spoken, the "elites of the rich world" were maneuvering into position. Over half the world's production is in the hands of well under 400 companies. These in turn are dependent, and in many cases directed by those who now have a global monopoly of credit.

In the world they are attempting to mould for tomorrow,

their oyster spurns national boundaries or state laws. Humanity, if it is considered at all, is merely one of several statistical factors. It is being divided into two groups - an elite, trained and retrained for the global managerial revolution. Competition for entry into this elite will be intense. Amongst criteria for acceptance, the main one will be obedience - which includes political correctness.

The majority will drift in and out of an international non-skilled workforce whose identifying hallmark will be the lowest common denominator. Third World wages and conditions will become an increasing norm in First World economies.

The general situation was aptly described by Trotsky, in his *The Revolution Betrayed*:

"In a country where the sole employer is the state, opposition means death by slow starvation. The old principle 'Who does not work shall not eat' has been replaced by a new one: 'Who does not obey shall not eat'"

It is not true to say that all those involved in implementing this order understand where it is heading. Some still vainly imagine that a return to full employment is possible. Others are not so sure.

Former Labor Minister Barry Jones, in his *Sleepers Awake*, clearly understood where a technological world was heading -but declined to offer the solution, which he hinted he understood.

But truth will out.

The Weekend Australian (August 26, 27, 1995) reported a recent conference in these words:

"Federal Government policies are keeping Australia's young adults in a "limbo land" of education and training in the mythical expectation that their employment future is secure, a major conference on youth unemployment will hear next week. Associate Professor of Education at Melbourne University, Professor Peter Dwyer, claims that a series of myths are being perpetuated about the Government's big training and education programmes to take the political heat out of high youth unemployment levels.

While not disagreeing with the push for greater skills in the workplace, Professor Dwyer says there is no evidence that there will be jobs in return for these skills, and he challenges the Government to produce its forecasts for youth employment in 2001, when the policy is fully in place . . . "

(End of quote)

"Working Nation" and "Job-Start" are monuments to futility -a highly expensive form of "whistling in the dark".

Judith Sloan, writing in July 13's *Australian*, mercifully pointed out the truth:

" . . . Recall that the Working Nation White Paper, released in May 1994, committed the Government to expenditure of more than \$6 billion between 1994-95 and 1997-98, directed mainly at assisting the long-term unemployed.

The Government recently released a nine-month report card on Working Nation. . . . In the document, it is noted that 133,000 Job Compact clients (out of a stock of 290,000) had achieved an 'outcome' that ended their Commonwealth Employment Services registration and Newstart Allowance in the nine-month period.

"What is an 'outcome'? It is actually a variety of results, including a subsidised job, full-time employment, further education, withdrawal from the labour market or transfer to another kind of pension . . . The published figures only allow us the insight that 27 percent of the Job Compact individuals assisted by the CES were in subsidised jobs. A further 91,000,

or 69 percent of the total, had achieved the other types of 'outcomes' - full-time employment, further education, withdrawal from the labour force or transferal to another benefit. We are given no breakdown of the relative numbers in the four categories . . . Suspicious types like me . . . wonder whether the figures are deliberately fudged . . . Here is . . . evidence of the on-going fiasco of the trainee-ship system, a system that has limped on for nearly a decade without achieving any degree of market acceptance or penetration . . . "

(End of quote)

The most convincing evidence, though, is the total lack of enthusiasm or faith in the programme amongst young people.

In another *Australian* article, (September 2,3, 1995), Roy Eccleston wrote:

" . . . In the past 20 years, more than 350,000 full-time teenage jobs have been lost as Australia has gradually pulled down its protectionist walls and opened itself to the global economy, embracing economic rationalism, privatisation, technological change and increased competition. The result has been an increasing demand for better-qualified young workers. But there are not enough jobs for them all..."

(End of quote)

"A fault confessed is half addressed," it was once said. But the chances of Government (or Opposition) confessing to any mistake is beyond the bounds of possibility!

Dr. David Clark, under the heading "*Our Kids Deserve Some Truth*", *Financial Review*, (June 20, 1994), came a little closer than most:

"Why are we telling such whopping lies to our teenagers? Surely the worst thing one can do to such persons is to raise their hopes of exciting and interesting careers, only to have them dashed a few years later by the realities of our labour market? But this is exactly what most school career advisers, DEET publications, large sections of the media and representatives of universities at career days are doing . . ."

(End of quote)

"TRUTH OUT OF AFRICA"

by Ivor Benson

In this new updated edition of one of his most important works, the famous South African writer and political analyst, the late Ivor Benson, provides a brilliant picture of the emerging events in Africa, and how they relate to the bigger picture of the struggle for the world. There is an illuminating chapter on the role played by the Zionists in the destruction of Rhodesia. For those who wish to understand the real significance of what is happening in Africa, including South Africa, this is an essential work.

Available from League bookshops: \$14 posted.

But even Dr. Clark appeared to flinch from the obvious - that we are never going to have full employment (as presently defined) again; that technology is lifting the "curse of Adam"; and that this offers the possibility of a marvelously creative future, if we can just unlock the dead hand of the past.

THE HIGH COURT AND MABO

In his introduction to the book, *The High Court of Australia in Mabo*, containing two Papers presented to the Samuel Griffith Society, including two critical addresses of the role of the present High Court in the Mabo case, Mr. GA. Savell, Chief Executive of the Association of Mining and Exploration Companies (Inc.), Perth, writes as follows:

"The High Court brought down its decision on Mabo on 3rd June, 1992. Since then, Mabo and its consequences have become a major political, economic and constitutional issue and have embroiled the High Court in a political debate, which is unprecedented in Australia's history.

"In particular, Australia's mining and exploration industries, upon which Australia is crucially dependent for its international credit-worthiness and solvency, are now faced with agonising decisions which could, if current uncertainties prevail, lead to the rapid drying up of international investments.

BASIC FUND SET AT \$60,000 Shaping up for the Decisive Round

Events are moving with such rapidity, with the League of Rights now at the centre of Australian political stage, that the League's Annual Basic Fund has been launched a little earlier than usual, with the Basic Fund increased slightly over last year. The minimum required is \$60,000.

Already a number of veteran supporters have started the fund off to an inspiring start. As outlined in our front-page article in this issue, the enemies of traditional Australia are attempting to move in for what they hope will be a knock out blow against the League.

They are well aware that the next few years are going to be the deciding ones for Australia. If the League can come through the next five years, and is still holding the line by the end of the century, the future may be assured, in the most trying circumstances for many League supporters, we have no alternative but to ask readers to make yet another major effort to help financially to sustain the League. All donations to The Australian League of Rights, Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne 3001.

BOOK NOW FOR ANNUAL "NEW TIMES" DINNER

Time is running out for those readers who wish to attend the Annual *New Times* Dinner at The Victoria, Little Collins Street, Melbourne, on Friday, October 6. With the British-born Canadian journalist, author and TV and radio commentator, Mr. Doug Collins, as guest of honour, guests are guaranteed an evening that will long live in their memories. Once again the toasts at the Dinner will demonstrate the growth of the League of Rights.

The *New Times* Dinner is a family affair and is not open to the general public. Bookings must be accompanied with payment of \$30 per person. Guests may arrive from 6.00 p.m. onwards for pre-dinner refreshments and be ready to be seated at 7 p.m. sharp. Some of the news at this year's Dinner will be highly exciting.

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