

THE NEW TIMES

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

VOL. 60, No. 7.

Registered by Australia Post -Publication PP481667 100259

JULY 1996.

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

JOHN HOWARD THE BANKERS' MAN

by Eric D. Butler

Australia's Prime Minister, John Howard, would undoubtedly have made a good suburban lawyer, honest and conservative, rigidly adhering to the letter of the law, reflecting his Methodist upbringing. But John Howard decided to go into politics at an early age, and can now be described - without being offensive - as a professional politician. The story is told of how a senior Federal official told a representative of the car industry that John Howard, at that time Federal Treasurer, was the Minister most highly regarded by the Federal bureaucracy; he could be briefed and programmed on any particular issue and relied upon to go before the media and never deviate from his briefing. I well recall talking to several Christian clergy from Brisbane after they had been to see John Howard concerning the proposal to tax books and magazines. The tax would have had a serious effect on Church magazines. But eventually they were forced to retreat, expressing the opinion that attempting to change John Howard was like talking to a door. John Howard was quite unemotional about a tax, which threatened serious social and cultural consequences.

Long forgotten is one of the most popular strikes in Australian history, that of the miners operating open cut coal mining, mainly in Central Queensland. The industry had created several fringe benefits, including low cost housing, to encourage workers to operate in isolated areas. John Howard was persuaded by the taxation bureaucracy that such fringe benefits should be taxed. The result was a strike, which crippled the open cut coal mining industry for months. With widespread national support for the striking miners, including the trucking in of adequate supplies of food, the strike looked like going on indefinitely. The loss of tax revenue was astronomical. And John Howard felt that if he went and talked to the strikers they would readily agree that they should be taxed on their fringe benefits. The most dramatic result was John Howard being thrown out of a country pub by an irate striker applying a headlock.

John Howard appears to have learned little from this episode, as witnessed by his foolish attempt to address an open-air meeting of irate gun owners and their supporters in Sale, Victoria. Adding insult to injury, he allowed himself to be persuaded to wear a bulletproof vest, the first Australian Prime Minister in history to insult his fellow Australians in this manner.

There is such a thing as invincible stupidity. John Howard's long career testifies to the fact that he is determined to hang on to financial orthodoxy, irrespective of what new current manifestation it is displaying. He was one of the first to accept the deregulation of the financial system along with other

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.

aspects of economic rationalism.

In his long and dogged attempt to become Prime Minister, John Howard has demonstrated that he is prepared to reverse himself on issues, which might otherwise lose him support from those promoting current orthodoxy.

He flirted with the immigration question until it was made clear that he had strayed into *verboten* territory. No doubt he vividly recalled that the flirtation with the ridiculous "Joh For Canberra" campaign probably lost him the chance of becoming Prime Minister. John Howard's subsequent performance on the immigration issue bordered on the obscene, with a man seeking high office not only reversing himself, but virtually groveling with his abject apologies.

The plight of the Liberal Party can be judged by the manner in which it eventually turned back to Howard because of the stupidity and incompetence of Alexander Downer who, as Minister for Foreign Affairs, now staggers from one disaster to the next.

John Howard's background

And needless to say, John Howard has ingratiated himself with the Zionist Jewish lobby, smearing the patriots of the League of Rights, whom he has never even met.

When John Howard's background is assessed, it would be wishful thinking to believe that he is likely to shift Australia off the present dangerous course. His foreign and domestic policies are a continuation of where Paul Keating left off. He has left no doubt that he is prepared to bend the knee to those international financial forces which are increasingly dictating to the nations of the world.

Early in June, representatives of those international forces arrived here to ascertain how Australia was performing. Those who arrived, representatives of the world's 100 largest banks, were the same kind of people who arrived in Australia to order the programme which resulted in the worst features of the Great Depression of the thirties. Sir Otto Niemeyer represented the Bank of England at that time. Niemeyer was accompanied by Professor Gregory, of the notorious London School of Economics, originally founded by the Fabian Socialists with the support of Big Finance. The message then to the Australian people was brutally simple: they had lived beyond their means, and a drastic reduction in their standard of living had to be imposed. Another major demand was that Central Banks modelled on the American Federal Reserve System had to be established.

The establishment of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank towards the end of the Second World War, with Big Finance again co-operating with the Socialists, was the logical extension of a philosophy of centralism in action.

Unlike the arrival of the representatives of the International Bankers in the thirties, the representatives of the 100 largest banks who arrived in June were given relatively little media coverage. Very few people, except those involved with financial investments and associated matters, read *The Financial Review*, whose report by Peter Hartcher on the Sydney conference in its issue of June 7, said that before Australian Prime Minister Howard met the international bankers, they had spent half a day "discussing the price they would demand from countries from around the world for bankrolling them. In an increasingly capital-thirsty world, international financiers, the commissars of capital, have become modern potentates with the power to dictate policy to

states which have long considered themselves sovereign."

According to the Hartcher *Financial Review* report, Mr. John Corzine, chairman of the well-known US investment bank, Goldman Sachs and Co., and a former central banker, outlined to the Sydney conference the rules, which should govern lending:

"Rule Number One: *'There is no substitute for consistent disciplined, fiscal monetary policies....We should not lose sight of the fact that for individual countries, chronic current account deficits are a symptom of structural imbalance taking the form of over consumption and undersavings.'*"

Bankers' assessment of Howard

Then Corzine outlined *Rule Two:* *"commitment to privatisation, subsidy reduction, progressive tax policies, reduced public payrolls, pension reform . . . will solidify credit-worthiness, enhance competitiveness, and send welcoming signals to investors."*

What Mr. Corzine was saying was that governments, which do not follow the type of policies he and his colleagues are advocating, will not be regarded as "Credit-worthy". Any Australian government could, of course, defy Corzine and his international banking friends -providing that Australia was economically independent. But the degree of economic independence, which Australia still has, is being progressively eroded by the programme of internationalism being imposed.

According to the *Financial Review* report, Prime Minister Howard, who addressed the International Bankers, was regarded as having met the rules outlined by Mr. Corzine. *"Although Mr. Howard did not spell out his full agenda, his Government is indeed moving on virtually all of the specifics nominated by Mr. Corzine - more privatisation, fewer subsidies, and smaller public payrolls . . . Several participants mentioned that all the bankers' assessments of the new Australian leader were strongly positive. He was, in short, pronounced credit-worthy in the great global competition for capital."*

Put bluntly, John Howard has satisfied the International Bankers that he and the government he leads is not going to upset their programme for the creation of a New World Order, a major feature being first to establish an International Economic Order. Australia's future as an independent nation depends upon the Australian people obstructing John Howard's policies in every possible way and laying the foundations for the election of a government pledged to put Australia First.

The Question of History

"Writing differs from memory in being two-dimensional instead of being four dimensional. It is only possible to write about one thing at a time. Genuine history, that is to say, the flow of events, is just as unwritable as a spring morning. You can pick out certain facts about it, which you think are important, but there are infinitely more contemporaneous happenings than you can possibly mention. In other words, written history is five percent fact, and ninety-five percent historian, even at its best."

C.H. Douglas in *The Big Idea*

The Faith and Politics

by Bishop Robert Crawley

The following article appeared in "*The Rock*", which describes itself as "A Journal for Anglican Traditionalists." It is edited by Bishop Robert Crawley, who in 1994 was the guest of honour at *The New Times Annual Dinner*. *The Rock* is published quarterly and may be obtained from 10989 Hilsa Crescent, R.R. 4 Ladysmith, B.C. V0R 2 E0, Canada.

Politics, Economics, and The Rock! Now there's a tricky trio so I usually stay clear of it, not because I am afraid of controversy (as my friends and others will attest) but for fear of diluting our primary message and purpose. In addition, my hackles are raised rigid by prelates and priests who attach their fuzzyheaded faith to some particular secular ideology or financial panacea. The 'silly sixties' produced a revolting crop of pseudo Marxist aficionados whose firm belief in Christ as militant "guerrilla freedom fighter" caused untold misery to millions of completely innocent people. The financial backing by the World Council of Churches of murderous Marxist regimes still stinks in the nostrils, not only of the victims, but their descendants who inherited the large scale economic disasters brought about by the determination to apply so-called "Christian principles" to societies run by one-party regimes. I don't care if the chosen ideology is of the so-called "right", either - it's the *approach* that's skewed. The latest efforts seem to focus on a variety of enthusiasms; Native land claims, the new World Order complete with world government; pantheistic environmentalism, homosexual "equality", all forms of "discrimination", and other stomach churning issues.

About thirty years ago Harry Blamires, an English lay theologian, wrote a valuable book which dealt with this underlying modern malaise, entitled *The Christian Mind*, (SPCK) which he claims has largely disappeared. The Christian worldview no longer forms and directs Christian judgments, rather, the prevailing secular worldview is the one in which the mind has been soaked from kindergarten on through university. Then the attempt is made to apply to it as much Christian doctrine as it will bear. Which isn't much, and accounts for the rapid decline of our society and the fact that political and economic attitudes (either "right" or "left") are merely arguing in a narrow epistemological trench of secularist "reality" which they both share. Tweedledum and Tweedledee.

So it was with great delight I read a long article in *The Wanderer*, a traditionalist RC weekly, by Charles S. Rice, in the April 18th issue. Problem; it was directly focussed on the American Presidential election, in favour of one particular candidate, and frankly, as a Canadian, I have no intention of getting *The Rock* embroiled in that contest. (Also, I have too many readers in the USA!) I found it very valuable and so I have excised its specific recipient in favour of focusing on real Christian principles from the real Christian worldview. Readers who would like the whole article should write to 201 Ohio St., St. Paul MN 55107.

THE DEFINING CONFLICT

The defining conflict of this century has been, and will continue to be, over the nature of the human person. Over the past three centuries, philosophers and politicians have attempted to organise society as if God did not exist. They put their faith instead in the premise of the Enlightenment, which rejected not only the Church and revealed religion, but also the capacity of reason to know the truth. The Enlightenment view of the person and of the state differed radically from what had gone before in the Christian tradition and the common law.

Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau postulated a mythical state of nature in which autonomous, isolated individuals were milling around. For various reasons, they got together and agreed to form the state. With Hobbes it was because people were hostile in the state of nature and needed the state, or Leviathan, to keep them from killing each other. Locke's state of nature was more pleasant, but men needed a common Judge to settle disputes. And so they formed the state to protect their rights, but in that state the majority would rule. With Rousseau, men formed the state to carry out the general will, which is the will, not of the majority, but of the sovereign.

In the traditional Christian view, the state derives its authority from God (although the people may from time to time decide who exercises that authority) and is subject to the law of God. In the Enlightenment view, however, the state derives its authority horizontally, from the people. It is the people, rather than the law of God, who define in what way, if any, the power of the state will be limited. Moreover, if the people give rights, the people can take them away.

Enlightenment philosophy is characterised by *secularism*, the denial of the relevance of God and His law in human affairs; *relativism*, including skepticism, typified by the many who deny objective morality and by the professors who are absolutely sure that they cannot be sure of anything; and *individualism*, as seen in autonomous man, with no inherent relation to others, who is the creator of his own morality i.e., he is his own god. The Enlightenment looks on the human person, not as social by nature, but as an isolated individual who is merely sociable in that he can be made social by his consent. The isolated, autonomous individual has relation to others only if he so chooses. That is the origin of "pro-choice". Even the mother has a relation to the child she is carrying if she so chooses. Even the husband and wife have a continuing relation to each other only if they continue to consent.

Nineteenth-century utilitarianism added to this mix the idea, as seen in Bentham, Mill, and others, that the purpose of law and society is to achieve the greatest good for the greatest number. The good is the maximisation of pleasure and the minimisation of pain. There is no knowable objective morality and no common good beyond the sum total of individual goods. The family is an aggregation of individuals rather than a society in itself. The person comes to be regarded as merely "economic man".

The Enlightenment philosophy has dominated the 20th century in different forms. It leaves no room for mediating institutions, such as the family and social groups, between the individual and the state. It tends to deteriorate into an extreme, individualist capitalism or a totalitarian collectivism. In Enlightenment jurisprudence, law becomes an exercise of will, unlike Aquinas who affirmed that the essence of law is reason. Enlightenment jurisprudence will be utilitarian and positivist, with no inherent limits on what the state can do. Legal positivism rests on the epistemological premise that, in Hans Kelsen's words, "*Justice is an irrational ideal.*" Since nobody can know what is right or wrong, positivists leave the resolution of those questions to the political process. If that process

turns out an *Auschwitz* or a *Roe v. Wade*, no one can say it is unjust because no one can know what justice is. And the person has no inherent and absolute rights, because he has no knowable and transcendent destiny beyond the interests of the state.

Rice then turns to the abortion issue, and he summarises the conflict among nearly all the professional politicians claiming to be opposed as centering on the concept that "their only option is the lesser of two, three, four, evils" and the premises of the main contenders for the Presidency are based on the nonpersonhood of the unborn child. He points out that "The principle of Roe v Wade, that an innocent human being can be defined as a non-person and subjected to execution at the discretion of another, is precisely the principle that underlay the Nazi extermination of the Jews and other minorities." Rice then turns his attention to Free Trade.

FREE TRADE

One attraction of the "free trade" concept is that it tends in principle, to reduce the control of government over the economy. As Llewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr., put it recently, the free-market conservatives of the "old right" in the 1930s and 1940s "took a strict laissez-faire attitude toward international trade. They loathed tariffs, and saw protectionism as a species of socialist planning." (*The Washington Times*, March 10th 1996, p. B3). However, the "global free trade" at issue today is not the unfettered exchange of goods free of government interference and manipulation. Rather, "global free trade" today is imposed and enforced by regulations of a super-government of international bureaucrats, including the World Trade Organisation, which has authority to supersede United States laws regulating business.

Sir James Goldsmith, a successful businessman and a member of the European parliament, aptly described the World Trade Organisation: "That is the organisation which is supposed to replace GATT, regulate international trade, and lead us to global economic integration. It is yet another international bureaucracy whose functionaries will be largely autonomous. They report to over 120 nations and therefore, in practice, to nobody. Each nation will have one vote out of 120. Thus, America and every European nation will be handing over ultimate control of its economy to an unelected, uncontrolled group of international bureaucrats." (Sir James Goldsmith, *The Trap*, (1994) pp.37-38).

Sir James argues for regional free trade areas among "nations with economies which are reasonably similar" (*The Trap*, p.40). And his comments about "global free trade" and the impact of technology on social stability are worth quoting at length.

"During the past few years, four billion people have suddenly entered the world economy. They include the populations of nations such as China, India, Vietnam, Bangladesh, and the countries that were part of the Soviet empire among others. These populations are growing fast . . . These new entrants into the world economy are in direct competition with the work forces of developed countries." (The Trap, pp. 26-28)."

"One of the big mistakes that we make is that when we talk about balancing trade we think exclusively in monetary terms. If we export \$1 billion worth of goods and import products of the same value we conclude that our overseas trade is in balance . . . But . . . the products that we export

must necessarily be those which use only a minor amount of labour. If not, they would be unable to compete with products manufactured in low-labour-cost countries. The number of people employed annually to produce \$1 billion worth of high-tech products in the developed nations could be under 1,000. But the number of people employed in the low-cost areas to manufacture the goods that we import would amount to tens of thousands of people because these are not high-tech products but ones produced with traditional levels of employment. So, our trade might be in balance in monetary terms, but if we look beyond the monetary figures we find that there is a terrible imbalance in terms of employment." (The Trap, p.30).

"Consumers are not just people who buy products, they are also the same people who earn a living by working, and who pay taxes. As consumers they may be able to buy certain products more cheaply, although when Nike moved its manufacturing from the U.S. to Asia, shoe prices did not drop. Instead profit margins rose. But the real cost to consumers of cheaper goods will be that they will lose their jobs, get paid less for their work, and have to face higher taxes to cover the social cost of increased unemployment . . . As unemployment rises and poverty increases, the towns will grow even more unstable. So the benefits of cheap imported products will be heavily outweighed by the consequent social and economic costs they bring with them." (The Trap, pp. 33-34).

"The winners will be . . . the companies, who move their production offshore to low-cost areas; the companies who can pay lower salaries at home; and those who have capital to invest where labour is cheapest, and who, as a result, will receive large dividends. But they will be like the winners of a poker game on the Titanic. The wounds inflicted on their societies will be too deep, and brutal consequences will follow." (The Trap, p.36).

"You must remember that one of the characteristics of developing countries is that a small handful of people control the overwhelming majority of the nation's resources. It is these people who own most of their nation's industrial, commercial, and financial enterprises and who assemble the cheap labour which is used to manufacture products for the developed world. Thus, it is the poor in the rich countries who will subsidise the rich in the poor countries. Thus will have a deep impact on the social cohesion of nations." (The Trap, p.37). Sir James' comments on specialisation and diversification are provocative and worthy of serious consideration: "I totally reject the concept of specialisation" . . . "One of the most valuable elements of our national patrimony is the existing complex of small and medium-sized businesses and craftsmen covering a wide range of activities. A healthy economy must be built like a pyramid. At the peak are the large corporations. At the base is the diversity of small enterprises. An economy founded on a few specialised corporations can produce large profits, but because the purpose of specialisation is to streamline production, it cannot supply the employment, which naturally results from a broadly diversified economy. Only a diversified economy is able to supply the jobs, which can allow people to participate fully in society. It is extraordinary to read economists (who) believe that the profits of large corporations and the level of the stock markets are a reliable guide to the health of society and the economy. A healthy economy does not exclude from active life a substantial proportion of its citizens." (The Trap, pp. 45-46).

"In the great days of the U.S.A., Henry Ford stated that he wanted to pay high wages to his employees so that they could

become his customers and buy his cars. . . We have forgotten that the economy is a tool to serve the needs of society, and not the reverse. The ultimate purpose of the economy is to create prosperity with stability." (The Trap pp. 49-50).

In short, a healthy economy, in support of the common good, requires diversification rather than a specialisation determined by cost alone.

The common good is not determined by economic calculations. Nor is the sum total of the individual goods. The human person is not an isolated individual. Persons cannot even exist except in relation to others. The person is central to the common good, as summarised by *The Catechism of the Catholic Church*:

(1905): "In conformity to the social nature of man, the good of each individual is necessarily in relation to the common good. This common good cannot be defined except in reference to the human person.

(1906): "By the common good must be understood 'the sum of those conditions of social life which allow social groups and their individual members relatively thorough and ready access to their own fulfilment' . . . The common good . . . includes three essential elements."

(1907): "It supposes, first of all, the *respect for the person* as such. In the name of the common good, the public authorities are bound to respect the fundamental and inalienable rights of the human person. Society must allow all of its members to realise their vocations . . ."

(1908): "Secondly, the common good demands *social well-being* and the *progress* of the group as a whole. Progress is the common denominator of all social obligations. Certainly, it is up to the authorities to decide, in the name of the welfare of the community, between the differing particular interests. But they must render accessible to each person what each needs to lead a truly human life: food, clothing, health, work, education and culture, useful information, the right to establish a family," etc.

(1909): "The common good, finally, requires *peace*, that is to say, the lasting security of a just order. It supposes therefore that the authorities assure, by honest means, the *security* of the society and of its individual members. . . ."

(1929): "Social justice can only be obtained through respect for the transcendent dignity of man. The person represents the ultimate end of society, which is ordered to this purpose."

The utilitarian individualism of the Enlightenment, on the contrary, tends to treat the human person as merely "economic man", for whom the monetary bottom line is the only line. "Positivism", said Pope John Paul II, "results in agnosticism in theory and in utilitarianism in practice and in ethics . . . Utilitarianism is a civilisation of production and of use, a civilisation of things and not of persons, a civilisation in which persons are used in the same way as things are used. In. . . a civilisation of use, woman can become an object for man, children a hindrance for parents, the family an institution obstructing the freedom of its members" (*Letter to Families*, n. 13).

"This view of freedom *leads to a serious distortion of life in society*. If the promotion of the self is understood in terms of absolute autonomy, people inevitably reach the point of rejecting one another.

Everyone else is considered an enemy from whom one has to defend oneself. Thus society becomes a mass of individuals placed side by side, but without any mutual bonds. Each one

wishes to assert himself independently of the other and in fact intends to make his own interests prevail. Still, in the face of other people's analogous interests, some kind of compromise must be found, if one wants a society in which the maximum possible freedom is guaranteed to each individual. In this way, any reference to common values and to a truth absolutely binding on everyone is lost, and social life ventures onto the shifting sands of complete relativism. At that point, *everything is negotiable, everything is open to bargaining*: even the first of the fundamental rights, the right to life." (*Evangelium Vitae*, n. 20).

The people with the green eyeshades and the sharp pencils, however, believe that all that counts is efficiency, which must be sought whatever its effect on families and communities. Rice's ideal candidate here reminds us that the "bottom line" of the utilitarian is not really the bottom line at all. He reminds us that the common good of a nation depends on solidarity and subsidiarity, that it requires policies to foster the family and local communities. In contrast, the abstractions of global free trade operate today to enhance the arbitrary power of international bureaucracies for whom the human person is merely an interchangeable economic unit.

Perhaps we are living out the prophetic warning of Pope Pius XI, in *Quadragesima Anno* (1931), that "an immense power and despotic economic domination is concentrated in the hands of a few, and that those few are frequently not the owners, but only the trustees and directors of invested funds, who administer them at their good pleasure . . . This power becomes particularly irresistible when exercised by those who, because they hold and control money, are able also to govern credit and determine its allotment . . . This accumulation of power, the characteristic note of the modern economic order, is a natural result of limitless free competition which permits the survival of those only who are the strongest, which often means those who fight most relentlessly, who pay least heed to the dictates of conscience . . . Unbridled ambition for domination has succeeded the desire for gain, the whole economic life has become hard, cruel, and relentless in a ghastly measure. . . As regards the relations of people among themselves, a double-stream has issued forth from this one fountainhead: on the one hand, economic nationalism or even economic imperialism - on the other hand, a not less noxious and detestable internationalism or international imperialism in financial affairs, which holds that where a man's fortune is, there is his country." (nn. 105-109).

If for no other reason than the right-to-life and free trade issues, (a truly Christian candidate) would insist . . . that each human being is inherently entitled to be regarded by the law as a person endowed by God with the right to life. And he would insist that the human person cannot live by bread alone and cannot be reduced to "economic man".

Rice then turns his sights on the vexed immigration question, applies the words of Pope John Paul II in "Pacem in Terris" n. 98, and then moves to his conclusion, based on this Christian understanding of the nature of man. His ideal candidate is a man who takes proper account of the nature of man as a blessed creature of God. "He must not be afraid to affirm the dignity of that person as created in that image and likeness of God and with an immortal destiny that transcends the interests of the state. Each human being is entitled by his nature, and not by sufferance of the state, to the rights of a person. And he must reflect the nature of the Trinity in his intrinsic relation to other human persons. For that reason it

wholly misreads his nature to regard him as merely one among many interchangeable individuals or as "economic man" for whom monetary profit and loss is the ultimate criterion."

Editor's conclusion

The main flaw I see in the above is the absence of a critique on the *nature* of money, its centralised *power*, its manipulators and their *grand purpose*. But that's for another time. Those interested could make a start by reading Fr. Malachi Martin's novel *The Struggle for World Domination*.

I would ask the reader not to waste energy trying to figure out the candidate whom Rice has in mind, but to concentrate on the Christian world view upon which his arguments rest, the main one being the dignity and purpose of man endowed by his Creator in love, with free will to respond to that love. These "inalienable rights" are not bestowed by the state. The modern Christian must clear his mind on this in order to get his political priorities firmly fixed. A study of how the early church dealt with the enormous power of the Roman Empire -and overcame it - is invaluable.

FIFTIETH LEAGUE OF RIGHTS ANNIVERSARY

A feature of the 50th Anniversary of the Australian League of Rights, starting with *The New Times* Dinner on Friday, October 4, at the Sheraton Hotel, Melbourne, will be the wide display of material covering the fifty years of this unique movement.

Enormous research is well under way to make the anniversary an event of a lifetime. Will all dinner guests please note that they will be forwarded tickets for the Dinner. They may arrive from 6 p.m. onwards for pre-dinner refreshments, but must be seated by 7 p.m. unlike previous years; all dinner guests will be escorted to their tables by dinner hosts and hostesses.

Apart from the usual high quality toasts and special addresses, several unique features will be included.

Bookings have been heavy, but a large number of regular guests have not as yet booked. The organisers have made a list of these and seats are being held for them. But firm bookings -which means \$35 per person, must be made at least two weeks before the dinner.

Much of the display material will be at the Dinner on the Friday evening, and at the Seminar on the Saturday - the Seminar also at the Sheraton - but the major displays, including the screening of historical events, will be at "Runnymede" on Sunday, October 6. Arrangements have been made for guests staying at Melbourne Hotels to be transported to and back to Melbourne from Runnymede. Details later. With the large number of guests attending, the organisers appeal for the full cooperation of those attending.

Organisers can arrange for the cheapest transport - air, bus and rail - from interstate to Melbourne. Also economy accommodation can be arranged. But early booking is a must. All private hospitality has now been allocated.

GRAEME CAMPBELL'S AUSTRALIA FIRST PARTY

According to media reports, Mr. Ted Drane of the Reform Party has decided that he cannot work with Independent Member from Kalgoorlie, Mr. Graeme Campbell, because Campbell is associated with "extremists" who he cannot tolerate. League of Rights supporters have been mentioned. We find this attitude by Ted Drane rather surprising as he has let it be known to a number of people that he has a high regard for former League National Director Mr. Eric Butler. Our view is that while there is no doubt that the Howard government's draconian firearms legislation is a major issue with implications far beyond those relating to gun control, no successful new political movement can be built upon a single issue like gun controls. Graeme Campbell has put the gun control issue in a much wider perspective with his Australia First programme. Graeme Campbell does not have the complete answer to Australia's problems, but he has provided the catalyst for the development of a new political force, which can shift Australia off its present disaster course. The limited but basic programme outlined by Campbell has the capacity to unite the big cross section of the Australian people.

The League of Rights is a non-party political service movement, with no interest in any form of party politics except where they coincide with League objectives. For example, the League has long been in the forefront of opposition to the philosophy underlying economic rationalism. It has advocated the adoption of constitutional changes, which would give the electors more effective control over their Members of Parliament. The League has been a persistent critic of an immigration policy, which results in the disintegration of a cohesive Australian community. Graeme Campbell is the first Federal Parliamentarian who has provided some realistic leadership on these issues. For this reason, the League of Rights believes that he and his movement deserve support.

We believe that Mr. Ted Drane has made a major mistake in dissociating himself from Graeme Campbell, whose electoral successes will be more likely to bring some sanity into the gun control legislation than the narrow approach being adopted by Ted Drane. We predict that there will be the usual smear tactics as the Campbell movement grows. Graeme Campbell will not even need to win many seats in Parliament to make a vital contribution to the regeneration of Australia. The electoral threat from the Australia First movement will be sufficient to shift the attitude of some Members of the present major parties.

We can only wish Graeme Campbell well in his endeavours. Freed from any restrictions imposed by a nervous Ted Drane, he can now move forward with every confidence.

THE BASIC FUND

We wish to thank those who have made early contributions to the League of Rights' Annual Basic Fund. This forward thinking is greatly appreciated. The formal launching of the Basic Fund will, as usual, be late in September. We are pleased to announce by careful management and the co-operation of the League's team of volunteers, that we are managing to continue operating without debt. We also thank all those who pay their subscriptions promptly when they receive reminders. Prompt payment of journal subscriptions is a valuable contribution towards the smooth running of the League, easing the pressure on those responsible for administration.

SMEARING DAVID IRVING

Whether or not British writer David Irving is an outstanding historian depends upon how the term "historian" is defined. Our view is that while from the conventional viewpoint Irving must be rated an outstanding, and courageous historian, his greatest contribution to the eventual writing of true history, as far as this is possible, is his amazing capacity for research. Irving has provided the documentation of developments of the greatest significance, which fit into a pattern of events over a period of time. Douglas writes of how the demagogue Hitler was helped to power by Jewish international financiers. Irving has documented how the biggest Zionist Jewish bank in Germany helped to finance Hitler. But Irving does not raise the question of why Hitler was supported in this manner.

No statement produces more outrage from the Zionist Jews and their numerous dupes than that which stresses that Hitler's basic policies were Jewish policies. The distinguished and courageous anti-Zionist Jew, Dr. Oscar Levy, pointed out in his little classic, *The Idiocy of Idealism*, that Hitler's chosen race concept was similar to that of the Zionist Jews. In his great historic work, *The Controversy of Zion*, British writer Douglas Reed deals with the close relationship between Hitler's National Socialists and the Zionists. This has been subsequently documented in some detail by several Jewish writers. In his *Programme For The Third World War*, C.H. Douglas commented, "There is not a single feature of National Socialism which is not Judaic, from the Herrenvolk idea to the Sacred State under the Hitlerian Messiah." In a desperate attempt to try to help avoid the Second World War, Douglas wrote a personal letter to Hitler stressing that the philosophical basis of this economic policy - the maintenance of Full Employment accompanied by Export Drives - was Judaic and could only lead to a Second World War which could end in a victory for the very Judaism Hitler claimed to be fighting.

One of the major results of the Second World War was the establishment of the State of Israel, with its continuing impact on international politics.

Why is Israel excluded from any criticism of the danger of bigger nations like China, Pakistan and India developing nuclear weapons? Why the rush by Western politicians of all labels to attend the funeral of the assassinated Israeli Prime Minister Rabin? These and other questions must be examined by any one desirous of trying to understand why the world has become an increasingly dangerous place since the beginning of this century. David Irving has not directed his investigatory talents to these questions. But he has helped others to investigate them by his massive research projects. And he continues to be smeared because he does not discover anything, which supports the Zionist-Jewish version of history. An article on Irving in *The Sydney Morning Herald* of June 22, which purports to be objective, rehashes what can only be described as anti-Irving smears. The article is by Peter Ekkingen, who recently interviewed Irving.

Historian Trevor Roper is quoted as saying that "Irving is bewitched by the Fuhrer and intent on clearing Hitler of 'the Final Solution'." A careful study of Irving's *Hitler's War* reveals no evidence of any pro-Hitler bias.

Irving's introduction to *Hitler's War* states that the real nature of Hitler remains an enigma. So why does British writer Christopher Hitchens state that, while St. Martins has "disgraced the business of publishing and degraded the principle of debate" by dropping the publication of *Goebbels' Diaries*, he deplores Irving's "depraved ideas about Hitler"? What are these "depraved ideas"? Presumably they relate to Irving's statements to the effect that he has been unable to find any documents, which confirm the generally promoted view that Hitler masterminded the "final solution".

There is no evidence to support the carefully promoted view that Irving is, or has been, "pro-nazi". A study of Irving indicates that he is by temperament a conservative. Both in lectures and in his writings, Irving has let his deep feelings concerning Churchill carry him away into some unwise statements. But these statements provide strong evidence of Irving's strongly held views concerning the benefits of the old British Empire. He felt that Churchill was primarily responsible for the destruction of that Empire. But a study of real history suggests that Churchill allowed himself to become the victim of a long-term strategy, which sought to destroy the British Empire as a major obstacle to the establishment of some type of a New World Order.

Irving has, of course, never written a work on "The Holocaust". What he has done is to state that all the evidence available casts serious doubts on the validity of much of "the Holocaust" story. His greatest sin is, beyond doubt, to express doubts about the alleged systematic gassing of millions of Jews.

PROFESSOR JOHN HOTSON

The Canadian Professor of Economics, John Hotson, died while undergoing heart surgery early this year. While Professor Hotson did on occasions - generally in private - admit that events had proved C.H. Douglas right; he did not endorse Douglas personally. This would not have offended Douglas, who once said that he did not care if what he was advocating never mentioned Social Credit. Hotson's thinking has had an international impact.

In a statement made in November 1995, Hotson virtually confirmed the Douglas analysis of the defects in the orthodox finance economic system:

"The root cause of this depression is our defective financial system, which causes debt and interest on debt to grow faster than income and output. The economics profession is especially at fault. Instead of championing the reforms necessary to make the world work for everyone with no one left out, they chant the mindless mantra, 'Trust the magic of the market and all will be well'. The 'powers that be' are making the age-old mistake of attempting to defend the indefensible and contemptible instead of aiding humane adjustment. They may end up the biggest losers because of their folly."

THERE'S NONE SO BLIND.

The Liberal-National Coalition made a virtue of its pre-election, "cross-our-hearts" promise there would be no new taxes.

Until, of course, the horror-discovery of the "black hole"; Labor's alleged "hidden" deficit of \$8 billion. And everyone knows, don't they, that budget deficits are a completely justifiable excuse to break promises?

Mr. Costello, with the obvious backing of Mr. Howard, had no intention of going beyond cuts in the public service. It would be far better, they reasoned, to simply pass the necessary tax extortions to the States, who could in turn pass them on to our almost bankrupt Local Authorities.

It has been left to Fred Argy, the man credited with setting the whole de-regulation process in motion, to question the need for putting Australia into another recession to appease the Deficit-god. Writing in *The Financial Review* on June 3, Mr. Argy wrote:

"The firm aim of the Government is to achieve an 'underlying Budget balance' over the next two years. This is courageous, but is it wise. . . .?"

His article questioned whether such a move would achieve any of the objectives the Government was aiming for. He made it clear he thought not. He concluded:

"There is little economic rationale for a crash-through attempt to achieve Budget balance over two years irrespective of economic conditions. Nor is there any welfare justification for relying exclusively on cuts in government spending to achieve the desired outcome. . . ."

The Queensland economist, H.W. Herbert, clarified some confusion about Budget deficits in a 1987 article in the *Courier Mail*:

"It is clear many people, including many politicians, confuse the Budget deficit with the balance of payments deficit. . . . The two deficits are quite different animals. The balance of payments deficit is the amount by which our exports of goods and services fail to pay for our imports. . . . The Budget deficit is an internal matter - the amount by which government spending exceeds revenue. . . ."

Mr. Herbert pointed out in numerous articles that Budget deficits are financed by Reserve Bank credit-creation, the book-debt being subsequently sold to commercial money-lenders.

The convention that such sales were necessary was, and is not necessary. There is nothing to prevent the Reserve Bank continuing with the bookkeeping necessary for this money-creation, charging no more than cost-of-service for doing so.

The Deficit could thus be used as an additional tool to stimulate the economy in weak periods. It could be used to reduce taxes, or undertake necessary capital works.

Mr. Herbert dealt with this issue in a *Courier Mail* article on December 19, 1976, at a time the then Prime Minister, Malcolm Fraser, was facing the same dilemma now facing Messrs. Howard and Costello twenty years later:

"If the economy is to expand from an increasing workforce and higher productivity, it must have more money. It cannot get this by borrowing money already in the community. It must create more.

"Mr. Fraser sometimes talks as though money creation did not exist. At other times he talks as though it exists, but is evil and inflationary - 'Printing Money' a vice of Labor. Mr. Fraser, who studied economics at Oxford, should not promote these primitive economic errors, pandering to the ignorant section of the community that believes the quantity of money is fixed. . . ."

Mr. Herbert pointed out Australia's money supply more than doubled between 1962 and 1971.

It is now doubling in about 7 years. In June 1988 the Money Supply (M3) was approximately \$130 billion. In June 1995 it was \$264 billion. The "Printing Presses", which politicians in their ignorance pretend cannot be used, were hard at work. (Computers now take the place of printing, but the principle is the same).

Somewhere between \$15 billion and \$30 billion new money is now created annually - at least twice to three times enough to fill the "black hole". A sensible government that understood the facts - or was not terrorised by the grandiloquence of international bankers - would use this money increase to set Australia back on its feet; restoring the few remaining farmers and small businesses to profit, making sure the \$130 billion backlog of Local Government infrastructure maintenance was dealt with, buying back the farm, restoring the nation's defences.

Howard's blindness is really the result of refusing to see. It will be Australia, which stumbles into darkness.

IS GUN CONTROL A NAZI SCHEME?

A statement attributed to Hitler has been widely quoted during the Australian debate on gun control. Feeling that this statement was almost "too good to be true", we have carefully researched the question and can only conclude that there is no evidence to support the statement, which appears to have been promoted by an American Jewish group which allegedly opposes gun controls. The motives for circulating this false statement can only be guessed at. We are satisfied that while German law under the Hitler regime required a strict

registration of firearms, the 1938 law, which we have studied, specifically provided for the ownership and carrying of firearms by German citizens. Jews were not, of course, listed as German citizens. Many of the restrictions could be listed as being similar to those of the Howard government. But overall, the gun laws under Hitler were much more liberal than those proposed by the Howard government. It was not until after 1945 and the end of the Second World War that the Germans were denied the right to armed self-defence.