

THE NEW TIMES

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

VOL. 60, No. 6.

Registered by Australia Post -Publication PP481667 100259

JUNE 1996.

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

THE CAMPBELL FACTOR IN AUSTRALIAN POLITICS

by Eric D. Butler

C.H. Douglas made the observation that "invincible stupidity" is a major factor in the human drama. The French Bourbons have been charged with having learned nothing and forgotten nothing. Australian Prime Minister John Howard claims that he is a leader for the "long haul". The gun issue is but one of the issues upon which he claims that he is going to show firm leadership. When Federal Treasurer in the Fraser government, John Howard was persuaded that if he went out to central Queensland and talked to workers in the coalmining industry, they would see the necessity for the taxing of their fringe benefits. One result was a major strike, with widespread support for the striking miners, and an irate worker throwing John Howard out of a hotel with a headlock. Those who met John Howard, including several clergymen, in an endeavour to show him the absurdity of his proposed tax on literature, including Church journals, all agreed that rational discussion with John Howard was impossible: that they felt they were talking to a brick wall.

As John Howard has already indicated that he has no understanding of the far reaching practical implications of his proposed gun legislation, his proposal that he go into rural Australia to "explain" his legislation can only be described as yet another example of invincible stupidity. He would be well advised to take strong security forces with him.

What John Howard and his advisers have failed to grasp is that the nationwide explosion concerning gun controls is a type of catalyst for a wide range of issues deeply concerning the Australian people. John Howard was elected on March 2 primarily because of widespread detestation of Paul Keating. The Howard programme is basically a continuation of the Keating programme. *The Australian* foreign editor, Greg Sheridan, took it upon himself early in the Howard government's life to inform a Zionist-Jewish audience that there was no fear of the Howard government deviating from the Keating programme concerning Asia, immigration and multiculturalism. Subsequently Sheridan has written that *"Overall, the new government's foreign policy is about 95 percent continuity with the old government's policy."* Sheridan has confirmed what every political realist knows: that there was no real change of government on March 2, only a change of public relations men for a continuing policy. Needless to say, John Howard has lost no time in assuring the new Israeli government that it has his blessing, expressing the vain hope that the search for peace in the Middle East will continue. Never once has John Howard expressed the view that genuine peace in the Middle East can never be achieved until the genuine grievances of the dispossessed Palestinians are addressed.

Along with National Party Member, Mr. Bob Katter, and several of his National Party colleagues, West Australian Independent Member, Graeme Campbell, is the only prominent

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.

Federal politician to criticise the main thrust of current Australian policies, both domestic and foreign. At two massive anti-gun control rallies, the first in Melbourne when at least 70,000 people packed Burke Street on Saturday June 1, and then at a packed Town Hall in Kingaroy, Queensland, on Thursday, June 6, Graeme Campbell made it clear that his projected new party, tentatively described as "Australia First", would have a much broader agenda than only gun controls. Campbell has stressed that the proposed Howard gun control legislation is extremely bad law because it cannot be enforced, and would in practice intensify the tensions already fragmenting Australian society.

THE ESSENCE OF THE CAMPBELL CHALLENGE

The usual hatchet men like Laurie Oakes have been busy attempting to denigrate Graeme Campbell and his proposed new party. The "right wing extremist" League of Rights gets constant derogatory mention. But apart from the obvious unrest inside the Coalition parties, particularly so inside the National Party where men like north Queenslander Bob Katter are openly calling for a rejection of Coalition policies, public opinion polls are showing increasing electoral support for a new political movement headed by Graeme Campbell. These developments are making it increasingly difficult for John Howard to threaten the Senate with a double dissolution, in which a Campbell-lead movement would almost certainly elect

at least several senators. In a double dissolution the quota required would be less than 8 percent.

Graeme Campbell continues to spell out the major points in his own programme:

- * The regeneration of Australian manufacturing industries, providing adequate protection against a flood of imports produced with what is virtually slave labour. The regeneration of Australia's manufacturing industries would start to move Australia to a position where it was economically sovereign.

- * An immediate reduction in immigration and an end to government financed multicultural programmes.

- * The use of a special Commonwealth Developmental Bank for financing essential primary and secondary production.

- * Australia to pursue as diverse a trading policy as possible, rejecting the dangerous concept of placing the nation at the mercy of only one market, the Asian one.

- * The introduction of a constitutional amendment, which would enable electors to force governments to hold referenda on major issues, the results being binding on governments.

If Graeme Campbell can build a political movement around the above principles, with its Members of Parliament free to debate and vote on issues on their merit, he could pave the way not only for the regeneration of traditional Australia, but for the regeneration of the whole of the Western world. He deserves every chance to demonstrate that regeneration is possible.

HISTORIC FILM FOR CENTENARY CELEBRATIONS

As a result of modern technology, a film of Eric Butler making a presentation of a tanker of petrol to the Ian Smith Rhodesian government in 1966 has been adapted for video presentation, and will be shown at the 50th Anniversary celebrations of the League of Rights in early October. The petrol, donated by Australians and New Zealanders, was presented to Lord Graham, the Duke of Montrose, Minister for Defence and Foreign Affairs, representing the Rhodesian Government. The presentation caused a stir in Australia, with Labor Opposition leader Gough Whitlam raising the question of how this breach of United Nations sanctions had taken place, with the suggestion that Eric Butler be stripped of his Australian passport.

Extracts from a number of other historic films will be a feature of the Anniversary celebrations.

There has been a steady flow of bookings for the *New Times* Dinner, to be held at the prestigious Melbourne Sheraton Hotel on Friday, October 4. The charge is \$35 per person. A first class dinner is guaranteed. Early bookings would be appreciated by the organisers of this function. Seating is not unlimited. The Dinner is open only to League supporters and members of their families. The organisers will do their best to have guests seated with selected friends. They reserve the right to decline any bookings.

SIR ROBERT SPARKES BLAMES THE LEAGUE OF RIGHTS

Sir Robert Sparkes, former President of the Queensland National Party, has joined in the chorus, which claims that the League of Rights is one of the "extremist" groups generating National party opposition to the proposed Howard government's gun control programme. Denouncing the Sparkes allegations as "evil", League of Rights National Director David Thompson has issued a general media release stressing that it was an "evil suggestion" that if Queensland did not support the Howard government's proposals, they would bear the guilt for future killings with firearms.

David Thompson pointed out "Even John Howard admitted that his new gun controls would not prevent the occurrence of tragedies in the future.

"It is quite clear to us that there is massive opposition to the Howard gun controls. It is perfectly acceptable for any Australians who own weapons to attempt to protect their interests with legitimate political action.

"When Aboriginal groups press for land claims or mining royalties, they enjoy legitimate standing in the eyes of the courts and the community. When firearms owners press for recognition of their concerns, they are pilloried as Vocal extremist minorities'. This is absolutely unacceptable, and more suited to a police state than representative government."

David Thompson pointed out that John Howard had no constitutional authority over the states on firearms. "His stand-over tactics should be rejected, and Queenslanders have every right to do so.

WHO CONTROLS HISTORY CONTROLS THE FUTURE

The following perceptive article by the brilliant South African writer Ivor Benson first appeared in the May 1984 issue of his monthly "*Behind The News*". Dramatic developments have taken place since the article was written, including the collapse of the Soviet system and the bringing to office of the Nelson Mandela government in South Africa. But the power factors outlined by Ivor Benson continue to operate. C.H. Douglas said that real history was not a series of disconnected episodes, but crystallised politics. An understanding of what is taking place in the world requires the type of background information provided by Ivor Benson. A wide range of literature is available for those who wish to gain that understanding.

Who controls the past controls the future;

Who controls the present controls the past.

George Orwell, "*Nineteen Eighty-Four*".

One of the best known of modern "revisionist" historians is Dr. Antony Sutton, one-time Research Fellow at the prestigious Hoover Institution for War, Revolution and Peace, Stanford University, California, and author of several books which have circulated widely in conservative circles since the end of World War II, including *National Suicide*, in which he shows that Soviet industrial and military might is almost entirely a creation of Western high finance and big business, *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution*, *Wall Street and the Rise of Hitler*, *Wall Street and FDR Trilaterals Over Washington*.

All of these books were meant to correct what Dr. Sutton describes as "an Establishment version of history" which is "not only inaccurate but designed to hide a pervasive fabric of deceit and immoral behaviour".

It would be hard to fault Dr. Sutton on the copiously documented information he supplies, much of it extracted from US State Department Decimal Files and other sources not readily accessible except to the professional investigator.

Down the years we have drawn heavily and confidently on the detailed information contained in Dr. Sutton's books, especially his conclusive proof that during the Vietnam War it was with weapons from Soviet factories placed there by Western high finance and big business that thousands of Americans and anti-Communist Vietnamese were being killed.

However, the time has come when it is urgently necessary to point out and explain that there is a factor of major importance in human affairs, the absence of which in all Dr. Sutton's writings, especially the *Wall Street* trilogy is conducive to a dangerous misinterpretation of the history of the 20th century.

It was this missing factor in historiography that Benjamin Disraeli pinpointed when he wrote: "*No one must lightly dismiss the question of race. It is the key to world history, and it is precisely for this reason that written history so often lacks clarity - it is written by people who do not understand the race question and what belongs to it.*"

It is hardly necessary to point out that a "written history" that "lacks clarity" is of little or no use to the people for whom, and about whom, it has been written, and can even be dangerously harmful; for, as George Orwell has so succinctly stated, "who controls the past controls the future", meaning that if we do not understand what happened in the past we can hardly expect to be able to understand what is happening now; and if we do not understand what is happening now we have lost all control over our own future.

This opinion is reinforced by a prominent modern American historian, Professor Hannah Arendt, who remarks in her book, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, "*the need for an impartial and truthful treatment of Jewish history has recently become greater than ever before.*" Why Jewish history?

Professor Arendt adds: "*The Jewish question and anti-Semitism . . . became the catalytic agent for the rise of the Nazi movement and the establishment of the organisational structure of the Third Reich . . . then for a world war of unparalleled ferocity . . .*"

"THE CONTROVERSY OF ZION"

But what has the Jewish question to do with the role of race in history? The Jews are a religious community, surely, and not a race? Professor Sir Arthur Keith, a famous anthropologist in his day and one-time President of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, compresses into one sentence the contents of two lengthy chapters about the Jews in his book, *A New Theory of Human Evolution*: "*My deliberate opinion is that racial characters are more strongly developed in the Jews than in any other Caucasian people*".

Those in whom racial characters are strongly developed have a keen sense of kind - like the pigs in George Orwell's *Animal Farm*, sometimes fighting cruelly among themselves but always drawing a clear distinction between themselves and the other "animals"; as Professor Keith puts it, they are then applying "a dual code".

Dr. Carroll Quigley, one-time Professor of International Relations at Georgetown Foreign Service School, Washington DC, in his monumental world history *Tragedy and Hope*, makes no attempt overtly to explore the "catalytic" role of the Jewish people in his history of our century; indeed, in a book of some 1300 pages he has nothing to say about the Jews as such, except when writing about the inauguration of the state of Israel; and the 36-page index does not even contain the word "Zionism". Nevertheless, the publisher, the Macmillan Company, abruptly ceased distributing this book when it was realised in establishment circles that it contained a great deal of information, some of it from confidential sources, from which sound conclusions about the race aspects of 20th century history could be drawn by the perspicacious student.

Dr. Quigley demonstrated, as others had done before him, that there prevails in the West a system of censorship not as obvious as that behind the Iron Curtain but almost as effective. And books of history most rigorously excluded from establishment bookshelves are precisely those in which some attempt has been made to explore and explain that "catalytic" Jewish presence - in other words, the racial factor.

Dr. Sutton admits that there is something missing from his three *Wall Street* books, for in one of them, *Wall Street and the Rise of Hitler*, page 167, he writes: "*Why did the Wall Street elite, the international bankers, want Roosevelt and Hitler in power? That is an aspect we have not explored*". And on page 174 he raises the question whether the New York elitist establishment is "*a subversive force*" deliberately trying to suppress the constitution and a free society, adding that a consideration of that question "*will be a task ahead in the next decade*".

In all three books Dr. Sutton writes as if the Jews, as an

ethnic entity, are of no more historical significance than the Gypsies or Eskimos; and having thus excluded the race factor, he does not feel called on to explain why, after World War II, only Max Warburg was exempted when all the German bankers on the supervisory Board of Directors of the giant I.G. Farben industrial empire were tried as "war criminals" at Nuremberg.

Wall Street and the Rise of Hitler is notable for another most significant omission: there is no mention of the financing of the other "extremist party" in Germany which won spectacular successes in the elections of September 1930, namely the Communists, who had launched the internal revolution that brought World War I to an abrupt end and who subsequently operated on a massive scale as a legitimate political party. It is reasonable to suppose that the identity and motives of those who financed Hitler might have had something to do with the identity and motives of those who were financing the Communists.

Without this information and the inferences to be drawn from it, we are left with a book containing a great deal of painstakingly researched and documented information which leaves uncorrected and unclarified that "establishment version of history . . . designed to hide a pervasive fabric of deceit and immoral conduct" - and which could even have the effect of *deflecting attention* from the main influences and motives at work.

"THE MAMMON OF UNRIGHTEOUSNESS"

Sutton remarks of Quigley's book *Tragedy and Hope*: "*Quigley goes a long way to provide evidence for the existence of the power elite, but does not penetrate the operations of this elite*". That is true, but Sutton evidently failed to notice in Quigley's book a number of hard facts, all of them well documented, which provide a fairly complete answer to the question which he had decided to leave "not explored" ("*Why did the Wall Street elite want Roosevelt and Hitler in power?*"), just the facts needed to give Sutton's three *Wall Street* books the full and rounded meaning required by genuine scholarship.

Sutton avoids the race question as such, but it is significant that the Wall Street financiers he mostly frequently names are all unmistakably gentiles, these forming part of a vast constellation of financial and industrial power with J.P. Morgan in the centre of it. And it is this financial elite which he blames both for the success of the Bolshevik Revolution and for the precipitation of World War II, supporting his accusations with much documentation. What he does *not* tell us, and what we *need* to know, is that the major revolutionary changes which have characterised our "century of conflict" can be traced to two financial elites, their separateness hard to detect because they so often operated in unison, which found themselves increasingly in a relationship of fierce antagonism from about 1930, the one a gentile elite and the other Jewish.

Sutton comes close to admitting the existence of two Wall Street elites when he says that Henry Ford divided financiers into two classes, the "constructive" and the "destructive", the first personified by J.P. Morgan, the others "the world's real war-makers". Thereafter, however, he continues to write about Wall Street financiers, as a homogeneous species in which there is no need to draw any distinction between Jew and gentile.

To cut a long story short, we find that there were two financial elites involved in a great struggle before and during World War II, the one with an interest in strengthening the

German people and the other bent on eliminating Germany as a powerful factor in global politics. That is something we *need to know* - for how else are we to be fully informed about the elite that came out on top in that struggle, the elite with which we now have to contend?

The following is a much abridged account of what happened, for which authentication can be found in Quigley's *Tragedy and Hope*.

For several centuries international financial activity was largely monopolised by Jewish banking dynasties, the most powerful and best known of these being the Rothschilds. However, financial capitalism was only *fully consolidated on an international basis* in the early years of the 20th century.

During the second half of last century the unprecedented economic development in the United States of America, nearly all of it under the direct control of pioneering families, including Rockefeller, Carnegie, Ford, Astor, etc, gave rise to a corresponding development of banking under the control of the same kind of people, the most conspicuous of these being J.P. Morgan. Much the same happened in Britain and on the continent, where gentile predominance in private-ownership capitalism and industrial enterprise produced national concentrations of finance-capital, which the Jewish banking families could exploit but not dominate.

So enormous was the new wealth generated that a newly created gentile financial power, in which personalities like J.P. Morgan and Montagu Norman figure most prominently, presently superseded the Jewish financial power, of which the house of Rothschild for many years formed the apex.

A very complex struggle ensued on many different planes. One major setback for the gentile financiers, engineered by their Jewish rivals through their growing influence in the media and their direct involvement in party politics and the trade union movement, was the inheritance tax and graduated income tax, aimed at the powerful gentile families in particular and the middle class in general.

Then, when the gentile elite allowed themselves to be lured into complicity in establishing privately owned central banking systems in all the countries of the West, the tables were decisively turned and the gentile elite began to lose ground at an alarming rate in the competitive rivalry of the two elites. In the United States the instigator of central banking was Paul Warburg, a scion of the powerful German-Jewish banking family.

The Morganites and their counterparts in Britain (personified by Montagu Norman) were never deceived by Marxism; they all recognised it at once as a weapon in the warfare of giant finance, a means of marshalling the masses for the attainment of political ends. Therefore, they quickly realised that their rivals had stolen a march on them in masterminding and financing the Bolshevik Revolution and lost no time in trying to get into the act, at the same time putting money into the counter-revolution in case that might succeed.

In Germany a different situation developed. Although traditionally hostile to any form of German nationalism -hence World War I - the Anglo-American gentile elite saw in the emergence of National Socialism an opportunity to back a winner against their rivals who not only took the initiative by backing the Marxist revolutionaries but were later almost certainly the main source of revenue for the official German Communist party.

Was there no other way in which the Morganites could defend or recover their top-dog position in international

finance-capitalism? The answer is "No!" - the only possible way in which the battle against Jewish predominance could have been fought was closed to them because, as partners in the conduct and exploitation of a fraudulent banking system, they had abandoned *the moral position* from which such a battle could have been fought. The gentile bankers had been drawn too deeply into the dirtiest forms of financial power-politics and had even tried to compete with Jewish rivals in buying their way into the control centres of radical leftist movements, including the Communist party, even in their own country.

Henry Ford, on the other hand, as a self-made and independent industrialist, came right out into the open and attacked those he regarded as his and his country's enemies, and he made no secret of his pro-German sympathies before World War II.

THE ANGLO-AMERICAN AXIS

Now for some scholarly authentication. In *Tragedy and Hope*, Quigley tells us that between 1922 and 1930 there came into existence an integrated international banking system and he tells us how and by whom it was instigated and controlled:

"The apex of the system was to be the Bank of International Settlements in Basle, Switzerland, a private bank owned and controlled by the world's central banks which were themselves private corporations. Each central bank, in the hands of men like Montagu Norman of the Bank of England, Benjamin Strong of the New York Federal Reserve Bank, Charles Rist of the Bank of France, and Hjalmar Schacht of the Reichbank, sought to dominate its government by its ability to control Treasury bonds, to manipulate foreign exchanges, to influence the level of economic activity in the country, and to influence co-operative politicians by subsequent economic rewards in the business world." (p. 324).

Quigley says elsewhere that the Rothschilds had been pre-eminent during much of the 19th century, *"but at the end of that century they were being replaced by J.P. Morgan whose central office was in New York although it always operated as if it were in London, where it had, indeed, originated as George Peabody and Company in 2838"*.

The power of the Morgan-Norman elite *"reached its peak during the last decade of their supremacy, 1919-1931, when Montagu Norman and J.P. Morgan dominated not only the financial world but international relations and other matters as well"*; Quigley adds that on November 11, 1927, the *Wall Street Journal* described Montagu Norman as *"the currency dictator of Europe"*. Biographer Andrew Boyle says that Norman was *"instinctively pro-German"*, and he quotes Norman's devoted private secretary, Ernest Skinner, as saying that Norman *"had some fundamental dislikes . . . the French, Roman Catholics and Jews"*. Morgan was also known to be hostile to Jews in general.

Quigley says of the American end of the Anglo-American financial axis, completely dominated from the 1920s to 1930 by J.P. Morgan and Company, that it was *"cosmopolitan, internationalist, Ivy League, Anglophile, Eastern seaboard, high Episcopalian and European-culture-conscious"*, with a significant influence over policy-making in the principal American universities. This was then the American *"establishment"*, closely associated with a similarly oriented British *"establishment"*.

It was this *"European-culture-conscious"* Anglo-American *"establishment"* which, from reasons and motives springing from instincts of race identity, sought first to prevent war with Germany, then did what it could to strengthen the National Socialist movement as a bulwark against a Jewish-sponsored Communist take-over bid in Germany, and even helped to arm Germany. It is all in Quigley's massive *"history of the world in our time"* for those not blinded and stupefied by an egalitarian *"idealism"* that *needs* to believe that all men are equal - as in *Animal Farm* it is an article of faith that all animals are equal.

The activities at the British end of the gentile Anglo-American axis, inheritors of the Cecil Rhodes vision of a new world order to be set up and managed by the Anglo-Saxons and their German cousins, are also chronicled at some length by Quigley. He names most of the principal personalities and organisations involved, and goes on: *"The anti-Bolsheviks, including D'Abernon, Smuts, Sir John Simon and H.A.L. Fisher (Warden of All Souls College), were willing to go to any extreme to tear down France and build up Germany."*

A more moderate group, including Lionel Curtis, Leopold Amery (described as the *"shadow of Lord Milner"*) and Lord Astor, according to Quigley, *"sought to weaken the League of Nations and destroy all possibility of collective security in order to strengthen Germany in respect to both France and the Soviet Union, and, above all, to free Britain in order to build up an 'Atlantic bloc' of Great Britain, the British dominions and the United States."* (p.581).

Armed in our minds with a comprehensive picture provided by Quigley, we can give to Sutton's three *Wall Street* books an interpretation quite different from that intended by Sutton himself.

THE OPINION MAKERS'

It is hard to believe that Quigley was not deliberately exposing what he knew to be a new and very different financial imperialism when he wrote as follows:

"The shift occurred on all levels, from changing tastes in newspaper comic strips (from Mutt and Jeff or Bringing Up Father to Steve Canyon or Little Annie) to profound changes in the power nexus of the 'American Establishment'. It was evident in the decline of J.P. Morgan itself, from its deeply anonymous status as a partnership (founded in 1861) to its transformation into an incorporated public company in 1940 and its final disappearance by absorption into its chief banking subsidiary Guaranty Trust Company in 1959" (p.980).

One of the major cultural and sociological consequences of the shift of the nexus of power in Wall Street, if not the most important of all, was the stripping from that *"Ivy League, Anglophile, high Episcopalian, European-culture-conscious"* elite of the power to nominate the presidents of America's great universities (p.937).

Quigley's elliptical references to *"changing tastes in newspaper comic strips"* and Morgan's inability to nominate a replacement for Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler as President of Columbia University can only mean that he was drawing attention to radical policy changes in American higher education and in the media which followed as a direct consequence of the shift in Wall Street. And an extra dimension of meaning is thus given to Dr. Butler's oft-quoted remark, made at that time: *"The world is divided into three classes of people: a very small group that makes things*

happen, a somewhat larger group that watches things happen, and the great multitude that never knows what happened."

WALL STREET AND THE BOLSHEVIK REVOLUTION

In *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution* Sutton presents an accurate picture of the American financial and industrial power structure early in the century, "dominated by two conglomerates: Standard Oil or the Rockefeller enterprise, and the Morgan complex". In Sutton's three *Wall Street* books criticism is concentrated almost entirely on these two power conglomerates, which included Guaranty Trust, the US end of the giant German I.G. Farben Company, International Telephone and Telegraph (ITT), Standard Oil of New Jersey, and Chase Bank. As in *Wall Street and the Rise of Hitler* he leaves unexplored the funding of the Communist party and its revolutionaries, so in *Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution* he ascribes no significance to the identity of those who financed the revolution and were afterwards instrumental in setting up Rustombank, the Soviet Union's national bank. In the forefront of these, as we are told, as Olof Aschberg, of the Swedish Nya Banken, who channelled funds from "German" bankers and the then war-pressed German Government to the revolutionaries in Russia; there was also Alexander Israelovitch Helphand (Communist party *nom -de -guerre* Parvus) who acted on behalf of the "German" bankers and was later instrumental in arranging the transit of Lenin and his band of Jewish revolutionaries through Germany in a sealed railway carriage. Parvus was a rabid revolutionary from Odessa who launched the Communist paper *Iskra* and also managed to become a multi-millionaire financier, as Solzhenitsyn tells us in his book *Lenin in Zurich*. Aschberg became head of the Soviet Rustombank, which included among its director the heads of the former "tsarist banks", privileged "capitalists" who escaped "liquidation" and were drawn into the new socialist power structure.

Sutton remarks of all the financiers, the Russian and the foreign, who helped to launch the Bolshevik Revolution and later supported the Soviet Union, that "their common objective was profit, not ideology" (p. 123). This wholly unwarranted remark, excluding politics as a primary source of motivation for any of those involved, helps to explain the misleading incompleteness of all three *Wall Street* books.

With his mind securely insulated against disturbing considerations of race or other ethnic identity as a source of political motivation, Sutton summarily dismisses the hypothesis that the Bolshevik Revolution was essentially a Jewish enterprise (p.185 *et seq*). On this subject we are asked to support Sutton's unsubstantiated opinion rather than that of Winston Churchill who, as Britain's Secretary for War and Air at the time of the Bolshevik Revolution, had access to confidential information made available by the secret services and the diplomatic services of several countries. Sutton quotes some most damning statements from a State Department document but attaches no value to these because "not supported with empirical evidence"; he seems to have required no "empirical evidence" to support his own emphatic conclusion that all the stories of Jewish predominance in the Bolshevik Revolution were "spurious", as he describes them.

It was hardly to be expected that Churchill and the other authorities involved would be in a position to make a complete public disclosure of all the top-secret information in their

possession and its sources.

'BEHIND THE SCENES'

Fitting perfectly into the pattern of what was basically a racial struggle in the realm of American high finance is another political drama which Sutton has chronicled at some length in his *Wall Street and FDR*, but failed to understand: a plot to install a fascist-style dictator in the White House. Again it is exclusively the gentile power-wielders of high finance and big business who are named as the offenders, all linked in one way or another with J.P. Morgan: Grayson Murphy, a director of the Morgan-controlled Guaranty Trust Company; Jackson Martindell, associated with Stone and Webster, allied to the Morgans; the Du Pont Company; the Remington Arms Company, controlled by Du Pont; the Morgan-Harriman financial interests. And, again, the motives are left unexplored.

News of the plot was given brief front-page treatment by the *New York Times* of November 21, 1934; a Congressional committee was set up to investigate the allegations; then news of the plot faded out of the press, and a subject of enormous possible national interest was buried in oblivion. Others involved - since bankers alone cannot stage a coup - were a few men holding important positions in the American Legion, the ex-servicemen's organisation, and another organisation known as Liberty League, which together seem to have undertaken to make a fighting force of some 500,000 men available. Leadership of the military operations was offered to Major-General Smedley D. Butler, a much decorated military hero, but there is no evidence that he actually agreed to go along with the plotters; he would have needed a good deal of persuasion because his distrust of bankers in general as "war-makers" was well known; what is certain is that the General discussed the matter with a journalist who blew the whistle on the whole exercise. Contact between the Morganite bankers and the soldiers and ex-soldiers was established by two members of the American Legion, Gerald MacGuire who worked for Grayson Murphy, and Bill Doyle. Also directly involved was Captain Samuel Glazier, Commander-in-Chief of CCC Camp at Elkridge, Maryland, who afterwards testified that he had had talks with Jackson Martindell at the latter's luxurious home in New Jersey and that these had "anti-Semitic overtones".

The most reasonable explanation that fits all the known facts is that the Morganite financiers and the industrialists, with whom they were linked, finding their hegemony and independence heavily threatened in Wall Street, had been tempted to try to turn the tables on their Jewish rivals with a rash attempt to achieve a military coup.

Why, then, the clamp down on news of the plot once it had been brought to light? Why the White House silence? Why the abrupt curtailment of the Congressional committee investigation? Why no backlash from the Jewish sector of the Wall Street elite and the powerful news media with which they were already aligned?

The most likely answer is that it would have suited neither side to flush the plot right out into the open, thereby possibly precipitating a massive polarisation of popular opinion and sentiment on racial lines and it would have been impossible to breach the secrecy surrounding the Morganites without serious risk of exposing the political significance of the rapidly increasing power of their Jewish opponents in all spheres.

Thus, in the three books forming Antony Sutton's *Wall Street* trilogy we find an almost complete avoidance of the

factor of "race and what belongs to it", and a quite misleading concentration of attention on the misdemeanours of that Wall Street elite which Quigley has identified as "high Episcopalian, European-culture-conscious" etc., these being exhibited

throughout as the "destructive financiers, the world's real war makers", while those so described by Henry Ford are presumably exculpated.

BUY AUSTRALIAN - IF YOU ARE ABLE

Like a ray of light, the following article by Michael Barnard appeared in the *Sunday Herald Sun*, Melbourne, of June 9. Some will recall the many brilliant articles written by Michael Barnard for *The Age*. It is encouraging that his conservative viewpoint is being publicised by *The Herald Sun*.

Strange indeed, but in Australia today we can go from the cradle to the grave with almost all our major purchases and daily necessities of life coming through industries dominated by or controlled through multinationals and other foreign investment.

In fact, if for some bizarre reason you wanted to start a "Don't Buy Australian" movement, you would survive very nicely, thank you, with a mind-boggling range of options from baby food through to funeral parlors.

"Selling the farm" has truly come of age -and continues apace, with Sheridan sheets and Kambrook electrical appliances among the latest enterprises likely to slip into foreign hands.

All this hails from modern economic theory that requires a greater leap of faith than religious belief and which glows with such disarming terms as "globalisation", "free market" (read *unfettered*) and "level playing fields".

The level playing field is the device by which Australia rolls back tariffs to expose its industries to competition from countries that have few qualms about their protective devices and which in many cases can produce competing consumer goods at slave-labour costs.

That the overall process is that thousands of Australian jobs are being lost, that Australia progressively is surrendering control even of strategic industries, and that more and more profits are flowing overseas, appears to be lost in the glow of future salvation under the new Cross, globalisation.

Yes, of course, the situation is more complex than this.

But the surrender of so much industry and enterprise to foreign influence - to pursue the single part of the equation with which I begin -tests credulity.

In spirit, it flies in the face of the time-honored Australian dream of owning your home, controlling your destiny. It invites a status of economic colonialism at the very time a significant section of the community is clamoring for a Republic.

Four months ago, the Australian Owned Companies Association ran a table showing estimated percentages of foreign ownership or control over a wide range of "Australian" industry, 30 categories in all.

The table was widely circulated and most recently was republished in the lively BA. Santamaria journal *News Weekly*.

Last week, I contacted Mr. Harry Wallace, AOCA president, to see if anyone had challenged the figures. All he could do was add to the list.

I write "estimated percentage" because the Foreign Investment Review Board, an arm of Treasury, does not keep detailed records of foreign investment, in specific industries. Here is a sample of the AOCA figures:

Abattoirs - 80 percent; baby food 100; baked beans 80; beef processing 75; beer 50; biscuits 90; bread (major) 50; breakfast cereals 65; canned soups 95; car manufacture 98; cheese 50; confectionary 80; computers 98; cosmetics 90; feminine hygiene 96; frozen desserts 95; frozen vegetables 85; heavy construction 65; heavy engineering 70; house building 40.

House building? Yes, even the Great Australian Dream can be conjured from overseas, as evidenced by the takeover of A.V. Jennings. More? Try ice cream, 75 percent; insurance brokers 80; jams 80; jellies 85; meat pies 40; mining 50; paint 70; pet food 85; petrol 80; pharmaceuticals 80; soft drinks 85; soap and detergents 90; software providers 85.

Even the funeral industry has been brought into the act, with two big US companies buying into major Australian centres. As Mr. Wallace points out, the criteria generally offered to justify foreign investment - that it brings hi-tech skills and helps generate export earnings -can hardly apply to the funeral industry.

Lists such as AOCA's become more meaningful when fleshed out with names. There's been plenty of them, including Pacific Dunlop's sale of its food division, with such well-known brands as Birds Eye and Peters ice cream, to Swiss and US interests.

Illustrative of potential pitfalls has been the Campbells Soup takeover of Arnotts Biscuits. When Campbells first moved, it told the FIRB jobs would rise by 20 percent. In fact, jobs fell from 7,500 to 4,300, a drop of more than 40 percent (*News Weekly* June 1).

Australian Meat Holdings, 91 percent owned by the US conglomerate Conagra, closed three meat export plants here while the US parent company, however coincidentally, boosted exports to Japan. In effect, the critics say, Australian meat workers' jobs were exported to the US.

Much the same argument over the effective export of Australian jobs is put by AOCA in the case of China, which exports to Australia many consumer products of high-work content while importing mainly low-work content raw materials.

In Australian tourism and real estate, Singapore has replaced Japan as the major Asian investor.

According to the Queensland Foreign Land Register, by March this year in Queensland alone Singaporean interests owned 6116 properties worth \$501 million. Recent acquisitions include Dreamworld.

And so it goes on. That's a point with this topic. As with dole queues, there's never a shortage of figures.

THE HOWARD GOVERNMENT'S INDUSTRIAL "REFORMS"

Ever since the start of the Industrial Revolution, there has been a constant endeavour to produce with lower labour costs. Initially this resulted in stable rural communities being stripped of their manpower, who were herded into human ant heaps to provide the labour to operate the expanding industrial machine. In the United Kingdom, where coal was the main source of energy, child slavery in the coalmines was a blot on a nation, which had led the world with the development of constitutional government and civilised standards. The development of the Trade Union movement was a natural consequence of a revolt against the worst features of the industrial revolution. Many of the earlier Socialists, like the famous Kier Hardy, were emancipationists. Initially some trade unionists expressed interest in Social Credit and the Douglas concept of a social dividend, which would free the individual from the worst excesses of the industrial system. But the emancipationists were replaced by the Fabian Socialists and the philosophy of centralised planning.

The Industrial Revolution has now reached the stage where human labour is of diminishing importance in a semi-automatic production system, now under the control of a growing number of multinational organisations. Massive unemployment in every industrialised nation is now a fact, which cannot be disputed. The power of organised labour to defend itself and its members has been badly weakened. While the organisation of super-unions provides the union bosses with some power and privileges for themselves, the result is that the position of the average worker has been weakened. Except in a few industries, the worker is defenceless against the effects of the progressive centralisation of power.

No one will dispute that it is possible to operate the industrial system more harmoniously than it is being operated at present. But the Howard Government's much publicised

industrial reforms start from the false premise that such reforms are necessary to obtain greater productivity. With all its imperfections, the present system is producing a glut of production. But, says the Howard government supporters, "we must produce much more efficiently in order that we can become internationally competitive." "Flexibility" is a new buzzword used to describe what in reality is a proposal that each individual worker should be left to bargain as best he can with his employer. The Howard government makes the absurd claim that by "freeing up" the labour market, hundreds of thousands of new jobs will materialise. If the Australian worker is to be forced to compete on the famous "international level playing field", he will progressively be driven to accept the type of coolie wages paid to large numbers of Asian workers.

As a result of their failure to tackle the financial issue and the debt problem, today's trade union leaders can only fight some type of a defensive battle against the programme of the Howard government.

Graeme Campbell appears to be one of the few Federal politicians who have grasped the danger of "economic rationalism" to the very existence of Australia as a free nation.

"APOCALYPSE 1945 - The Destruction of Dresden by David Irving

The work which first propelled British author David Irving into the international spotlight is now available in its revised form. This is a completely new edition, with previously unpublished photographs and considerable additional material. This is one of the major historical works of the century, and set the background for David Irving's career as an independent historian, relying almost exclusively on original research and not being afraid to publish politically 'unpopular' points of view. The key to Irving is that *he has done his research*. He has evidence, which he places before his readers in an attractive style. *Apocalypse 1945* is a prime example of Irving at his best. \$35.00 from all League book services. Those who wish to obtain the book by mail order please note: \$35.00 from your State book service. Interstate postage is diabolical.

1996 promises to be a big publishing year for David Irving. *The Goebbels Diaries* is now fresh off the press, and the second volume of *Churchill's War* is anticipated. We are informed by Irving's Australian publishing representatives that he will be applying for a visa to visit Australia to promote his books. How Irving's visa application will be treated by the Howard government will test the will of John Howard and his Immigration Minister Philip Ruddock. Will they defy the Zionist Jewish lobby, which was the driving force behind the Racial Hatred Act, and lift the ban on David Irving?

DOES DR. JIM CAIRNS REMEMBER?

Dr. Jim Cairns, former Federal Treasurer in the Whitlam government, has joined the ranks of those stressing the fallacies associated with "economic rationalism". But the son of the late Rex O'Connor, a senior Minister in the Whitlam government, has claimed that his father had told him that when the Whitlam government first adopted the philosophy of economic rationalism, Dr. Jim Cairns was a supporter. Rex O'Connor was one of those who warned against the dangers. We wait with interest to hear from Dr. Cairns about this important matter. If he did initially support economic rationalism, perhaps he would now like to apologise to the Australian people for having betrayed them? Needless to say, we do not anticipate any apology from Gough Whitlam, a man who was an economic illiterate.

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