

THE NEW TIMES

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

VOL. 60, No. 8.

Registered by Australia Post -Publication PP481667 100259

AUGUST 1996.

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

SOCIAL CREDIT PRINCIPLES

by C.H. Douglas

The following address was given by the author of Social Credit, C.H. Douglas, at Swanwick, England, in 1924. It is a masterly summary of basic finance-economic principles, which must be studied by anyone wishing to offer any realistic suggestions concerning the problems confronting mankind with increasing intensity:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- (1) That money has no reality in itself. That in itself it is either gold, silver, copper, paper, cowrie shells, or broken tea cups. The thing, which makes it money, no matter of what it is made, is purely psychological, and consequently there is no limit to the amount of money except a psychological limit.
- (2) That economic production is simply a conversion of one thing into another, and is primarily a matter of energy. It seems highly probable that both energy and production are

only limited by our knowledge of how to apply them.

- (3) That in the present world unrest two entirely separate factors are confused. The cry for the democratisation of industry obtains at least 40 per cent of its force from the desire for the democratisation of the *proceeds* of industry, which is, of course, a totally different thing. The confusion is assisted by the objective fact that the chief controllers of industry get rich out of their control.

I do not, myself, believe in the democratic control of industry any more than I should believe in the democratic

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.

control of a cricket team, while actually playing, and I believe that the idea that the average individual demands a share in the administrative control of industry is a pure myth.

I want you to realise that this is a statement of fact, not a theory. More than 95 per cent of the purchasing power actually expended in consumption is wages and salaries.

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

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

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

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

Considered as a mechanism for distributing goods, however, the existing financial system is radically defective. In the first place it does not provide enough purchasing power to buy the goods, which are produced.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ACCORDING TO GEORGE ORWELL

*"Doublethink means the power of holding two contradictory beliefs in one's mind simultaneously, and accepting both of them . . . The process has to be conscious, or it would not be carried out with sufficient precision, but it also has to be unconscious, or it would bring with it a feeling of falsity and hence of guilt . . . To tell deliberate lies while genuinely believing in them, to forget any fact that has become inconvenient, and then, when it becomes necessary again, to draw it back from oblivion for just so long as it is needed, to deny the existence of objective reality and all the while to take account of the reality which one denies - all this is indispensably necessary. Even in using the word *doublethink* it is necessary to exercise *doublethink*. For by using the word one admits that one is tampering with reality; by a fresh act of *doublethink* one erases this knowledge; and so on indefinitely, with the Lie always one leap ahead of the truth."*

("Nineteen Eighty-four", 1949).

50TH LEAGUE ANNIVERSARY WEEKEND

It's later than you think!

THE ORGANISERS of the League of Rights' Fiftieth Anniversary Weekend report that they are feverishly working to ensure that the weekend anniversary event will be worthy of the historic occasion. The display material alone will graphically demonstrate the history and achievements of half a century. Those who have any photographic, personal correspondence or media material which they feel could be of interest, are requested to forward it immediately.

The next issue of "Heritage", the quarterly magazine produced by the Australian Heritage Society, will contain a section of Eric Butler's Memoirs, *THE SPY WHO LOOKED LIKE EVERYONE'S FAVOURITE GRANDMOTHER*, which deals with Eric Butler's twelve year association with Mrs. Anne Neill, the middle-aged Adelaide widow who so successfully penetrated the Communist conspiracy on behalf of ASIO, that she undertook a dangerous assignment behind the Iron Curtain.

Eric Butler related how Anne Neill decided to associate with the Australian League of Rights after consulting with her ASIO contacts. It was at this time that the Federal Attorney General, B.M. Snedden, asked for a report on the League from ASIO, stating in a letter of December 17, 1965, that "*There is no evidence to suggest that the League of Rights is other than a reputable organisation.*"

The issue of "Heritage" containing his Anne Neill story will be available at the Anniversary Weekend.

Also on display will be the sensational headlines of the Adelaide *Sunday Mail* of December 6, 1964, proclaiming that for seven years Anne Neill had operated as a security agent inside the Communist movement. A full size photo of Anne Neill will be on display and an extract from one of her recorded addresses will be played. Here is the stuff of real Australian history and the League's role in that history.

Most display material will be at the *New Times* Dinner on Friday,

October 4, and the National Seminar on Saturday, October 5, both functions at The Sheraton Hotel, Spring Street, Melbourne. But the complete display will be at "Runnymede" on Sunday, October 6, during the action seminar.

The organisers reserve the right to decline bookings for either the *New Times* Dinner or the Sunday Action Seminar. The Seminar on the Saturday will be open to the public. The media will also be invited to attend.

The most economical fares and budget accommodation in Melbourne can be arranged if adequate notice is given. Dinner bookings should be made as soon as possible. Already there is heavy pressure on seating. Will those who have indicated they wish to attend the Dinner but have not yet forwarded their \$35 per person, do so immediately.

Further details about the Anniversary Weekend will be published as they become available. Dinner tickets are in the process of being forwarded.

USING TED DRANE TO SMEAR GRAEME CAMPBELL

Evidence has been mounting for some time that a third force in Australian politics, centred on the Western Australian Independent Member, was causing alarm in Zionist-Jewish circles. The most striking evidence is provided by an article in *The Australian Jewish News* of July 26, based upon what is described as "an exclusive interview" with David Greason of the *Australia Review*.

The story in *The Australian Jewish News* carries the dramatic, but rather hilarious headline, "How Shooters Averted League of Rights Coup". The essence of the story is that Ted Drane of the Sporting Shooters Association "had discovered that the League of Rights and other extremists were plotting to hijack the shooters' movement." League of Rights supporters will be astonished to learn that a movement which, for fifty years, has been motivated by service, never at any time seeking power, was engaged in a plot to seize political power through control of Ted Drane and his Shooters' Association! Clearly Ted Drane is so naive that Graeme Campbell is fortunate to be freed of any association. If by some miracle Ted Drane were elected to office, it is frightening to think of how he could be exploited.

According to David Greason, Ted Drane told him that he had been concerned for some time that Campbell was working closely with the League. He even went to the trouble of getting private detectives to discover which League members Graeme Campbell might be working with! According to *The Australian Jewish News* report, Drane said that during his short lived

alliance with Campbell, "the pressure was always on to accommodate the League. *I thought that I could work with Campbell, even though I didn't agree with him in some areas like immigration. But when I looked at this League, they work like a secret society. I am not interested in giving them any legitimacy at all.*"

Assuming that Greason is reporting Drane correctly, Drane told him, *'We've got something like 60,000 members. It would have been the first time in their short lives that they've got close to power.'* Presumably Greason did not correct Drane by pointing out that the "short" life of the League consists of half a century. The League was invited to send a representative to a Campbell conference in the Blue Mountains. There was nothing "secret" about the meeting, with all invitees being provided with directions as to how to reach the venue. Graeme Campbell issued a general media release after the conference, this being carried in the League's *On Target*. The League was interested to ascertain if he had some constructive objectives, which the League might support.

While it is probably true (we cannot confirm this) that there are 60,000 members of the Shooters Party, it is certainly not true that they are all members of Ted Drane's Reform Party. We are reliably informed that there is a strong anti-Drane faction among the Shooters Movement. Some have already indicated that they prefer to join Graeme Campbell's Australia First Party.

'CHRISSEY ILEY MEETS DANIEL GOLDHAGEN'

"**RAISING THE HAIR OF THE JEWS**" is the title of a perceptive article by the well-known American Jewish columnist William Zukerman published early in 1950, in which Zukerman exposes techniques employed by the Jewish leadership-in-dispersion "to keep Jews constantly on edge with the scare of anti-Semitism".

Zukerman's writing throws some light on Harvard Professor Daniel Goldhagen's "chillingly cool" book *Hitler's Willing Executioners*, a book which, according to Chrissy Iley in the London *Sunday Times* of 28 April, has "caused explosions in America and is at the top of *The New York Times* bestseller list."

Chrissy Iley refers admiringly to Goldhagen's work as "a profound, analytical and graphic book" - *but as you read on you sense that the pretty journalist has instinctively grasped something of the real nature of the Goldhagen work - that it is yet another contribution to the 20th century's voluminous "literature of Talmudic vengeance"; yet another product of a certain mental attitude, a peculiar twist that "turns truth upside-down", perverse, illogical and hateful.*

Another American writer, a former Jew born in Hungary, whose work in another context also sheds light on this kind of "hate literature" is Professor Thomas Szasz who, in his devastating psychological study, *The Myth of Psychotherapy*, dissects Sigmund Freud's strong "personal sense of Jewishness and anti-Gentilism" and his constant "desire to inflict vengeance on Christianity"; in his important work, Szasz explores at depth themes expressed in the "rhetoric of execration and invalidation."

In this light, Goldhagen's work shows as the kind of project that Szasz in another context describes as "public-relations manoeuvre", a psychologically destructive piece of "science-fiction" - and, in that context Goldhagen's book qualifies "not as a matter of history but of Jewishness."

Interview

During her meeting with Daniel Goldhagen at the Waldorf, where they take coffee latte and cookies, Chrissy Iley finds herself becoming "slightly discomforted".

She writes: "We have spent half an hour in which he has told me what I think before I am thinking it, his speech is sodden with clauses and caveats, with him answering questions with questions - the orchestration of a very Jewish headset. Enough of me is Jewish to know that. So - does he think there is a Jewish psyche?"

"No", is Goldhagen's reply, and Chrissy Iley then asks if he is religious. He answers, "I'm not religious and I don't keep kosher".

She persists, asking if he is "spiritual" - and has to explain what she means by that. Goldhagen replies: "I have no belief in a higher being."

She thinks to herself: "I'm always sad to hear that people don't believe in spirituality. It makes them somehow inhuman . . . But I don't tell him this."

Earlier, Chrissy Iley asked him: "Why did the Germans

hate the Jews?" - To which Goldhagen replies: "They hated the Jews because they hated the Jews."

"So - where does hatred come from?" she persists, and Goldhagen replies: "I'm not qualified to tell you why we hate people."

She is not satisfied, and points out that the Germans did not have a monopoly on anti-Semitism, that "the Poles hated the Jews as well."

Goldhagen says he thinks there is "an important difference", that the Poles hated the Jews for "essentially religious" reasons and that "German anti-Semitism was racial and biological". Chrissy Iley writes: "He is over-defensive here."

To her readers, Chrissy Iley confesses: "I am disappointed by a man whose anger is so measured, whose motive is so blurred and who has been so coddled by academia . . . About himself, he is cagey. About his work, he has tunnel vision - though he calls this 'clear-sided compassion'."

She concludes: "In short, he is a man who recoils from himself. Most Jews like to revel in their Jewishness . . . because they like to recognise themselves. This one likes to hide from himself....."

Explanation

Whether she intended it or not, in her charmingly straightforward account Chrissy Iley has given us a glimpse of the real meaning behind that emotive label "anti-Semitism".

What is called "anti-Semitism" is in fact its exact opposite - namely, "anti-Gentilism", the covert antagonism of a tightly-knit, deliberately inassimilable minority, a "unity-in-dispersion" which produces a *natural* and seemingly "racist" reaction among almost all host populations.

In his book, *The Other Side of the Coin*, the courageous American Jewish writer Alfred M. Lilienthal has put it this way: "The failure of the powerful and wealthy Jewish American community to launch one objective scholarly study of the causes of anti-Semitism is significant. Neither the religious nor the lay leaders of the many Jewish organisations wish to lose this potent weapon. Remove prejudice and lose adherents to the faith . . ."

WHERE IS THE LEAGUE OF RIGHTS?

Readers who wish to contact the Australian League of Rights, order books, videos, tapes, book catalogues, subscriptions to journals, etc., should use the nearest of the following addresses:

Heritage Bookshop, G.P.O. Box 1052J,
Melbourne, Vic. 3001. Ph: (03) 9650 9749
Heritage Book Services, P.O. Box 93,
Boronia Park, NSW 2111. Ph: (02) 817 1776 Heritage
Book Mailing Service, P.O. Box 27,
Happy Valley, S.A. 5159. Ph: (08) 322 8665
Heritage Book Mailing Service, P.O. Box 1035,
Midland. WA. 6936. Ph: (09) 574 6042
Conservative Bookshop, 2nd Floor, 460 Ann Street,
Brisbane, Qld. 4000. Ph: (07) 3831 5481

STRATEGY TO ENHANCE THE WELL-BEING OF WORKERS

From Chris Woods, Australian Services Union, 29 Amelia Street, Fortitude Valley 4006.

PRESENT STATE OF EMPLOYEE/EMPLOYER RELATIONS

The state that presently exists is one of opposition. Why is there opposition? Because both parties want their needs and wants satisfied.

THE CAUSE OF EMPLOYEE/EMPLOYER RELATIONS

It would appear that both parties' needs and wants can't be satisfied due to money being scarce. There must be a scarcity, otherwise both parties would be happy.

"Social Credit" enthusiasts say that the shortage of money can be traced to the supply and issue of money by private banks and to their system of credit and interest charges.

"Social Credit" is an economic philosophy, which states that because our society has reached such a high degree of technology, i.e. machines, electronic equipment (computers), that this is a great opportunity for workers to have more leisure time if they desire (it's nice to have the choice) i.e. substituting technological energy for human energy.

SOLUTION

If the present system is not working (this has been glaringly obvious over the past 50 -60 years) then one would think it better to create a new system, rather than patch up the old system which has been done up to now.

It one takes the time to read more about "Social Credit" one becomes consciously aware that it offers much more to "everyone" than our present system. It estimates that we really only need to be working 15 hours reducing, per week, so that human beings can spend more time on what they want, not on repetitive soul-destroying tasks.

It would be advantageous for the Union to take responsibility in spearheading the attack on this present economic system. The advantage in doing this would be that the Union is an organised body offering greater efficiency of action. The employers, corporations and government are highly organised and this is why they have been successful against the worker.

STRATEGIC PLAN

The following is a proposed strategic plan, which the Union may like to consider:

Plan A

Social Credit hinges on the concept that production should equal consumption and that the main reason it doesn't is due to the interest charged by the banks, which are private institutions; their policies ostensibly governed by the board of directors of

the "Federal Reserve" system in the United States. As you are well aware, the Commonwealth Bank has recently been privatised and I have my doubts as to whether the Reserve Bank is government owned.

The Union could present a "Social Credit" proposal to the government, once it was sure that it had a practical application.

Plan B

The Union could be the active catalyst of "Citizen Initiated Referendums". The present staff of the Union could be responsible for providing factual contextual information to the voters and be actively involved in organising the voting and administrative work thereafter.

Plan C

It may be highly desirable for the Union to gain greater impetus in spearheading the movement by stepping out of the existing system by:

1. Possessing more power to change the present system by:
2. Generating more money by:
3. Transforming the Union into a profit-making organisation by:
4. Changing the Union into a "pure contract trust" which is a legal entity.
5. The Union could become managing directors of the "Trust", which would be similar to shareholders of a company but with greater advantages.
6. The members of the Union could receive monetary benefits similar to those of shareholders from the profitable businesses run by the trust (Union). Everyone who joins the Union shares the benefits. This could be used as a motivational tool for potential members.
7. The above radical changes could be put to the members in the form of a referendum (secret ballot).

If you would like to know where to obtain information on the particular trust, do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours faithfully,
Hillary Arnott

UNION DELEGATE

References:

1. "A Licence to Live" D.E. Phelps Price \$6.00
2. "The A + B Theorem - Its Validity and Implications" J.D. Malan Price \$0.30
3. "What is Social Credit?" Geoffrey Dobbs Price \$0.80
4. "The B.B.C. Speech on Social Credit - The Fear of Leisure" A.R. Orage Price Unknown

All of the above references can be obtained from:

THE CONSERVATIVE BOOKSHOP, 460 Ann Street, Brisbane.

AUSTRALIA FIRST PARTY

In response to many supporters who have asked about the Australia First Party, initiated by West Australian Independent Federal Member Graeme Campbell, we have ascertained that full membership is \$50 per annum. Those wishing to contact the National Administrator of the Party may do so through Box 725, Warragul, Victoria 3820. Those requiring further information may also obtain it by writing to the same address. We have no hesitation in saying that we have no problems about recommending membership of the Campbell Australia First Party - a party that is different from any other party.

Once again we must stress that the League is a non-party organisation.

THE CHALLENGE

Deconstructing Judeo-Christianity

by Peter J. Lordon, Canada

Isn't it time we stopped using the term "Judeo-Christianity"? That linkage never made sense, either to Jews or to genuine Christians. It's as much an oxymoron as "military intelligence", because the two faiths it couples together are virtual opposites. Then why have they been joined for so long? Because the shapers of the New Testament sought to legitimise it by founding it on the Old.

But Jesus was his own man! His faith could very well stand on its own as a new beginning, a fresh "revelation". Why should a religion founded in his name have to drag behind it the baggage of one so radically different? He *had* to present himself as of the House of David and akin to the older prophets because the Jews would never have listened to him had he not identified himself with their tradition. But how different from that tradition was his message of love and forgiveness! How different his God, a loving Father of all humanity, from the vengeful and bloodthirsty *tribal* god of Moses! And Jesus differs so much in character from the often murderously intolerant prophets of Israel that many people have wondered whether he could have been Jewish at all. His only vital connection to Judaism is that he tried to *reform* it. Under the aristocratic priesthood of the Sadducees, Judaism had become ossified, enslaved to the letter of the law. And the Sadducees were "collaborators", even their Chief Priest being appointed by the Romans. In denouncing their corruption and rigidity, Jesus naturally became a thorn in their flesh. Even worse, he preached that "the Kingdom of Heaven is within you", which struck at the root of their authority. For if an individual could find God for himself, who needed them?

Worse yet, *who needed Moses?* In proclaiming a God, which Moses would never have recognised, wasn't Jesus rejecting Mosaic theology also? Wasn't he reaching back past the Mosaic aberration to that passionate belief in an afterlife, which had fired the wondrous achievements of the Egyptian Old Kingdom? We need only compare the two men to realise how oxymoronic "Judeo-Christianity" is. When Moses repeatedly tells his followers that Yahweh says they're to go kill all those other people and take their land and "nothing that breathes shall be left alive" - isn't he expressing only the genocidal impulse of many another primitive tribe? When asked what his captains should do with the little boys of the defeated Midianites, he says in effect, "Kill 'em all!" Was this a truly "enlightened" man? And if the Hebrews had been slaves in Egypt, they had now exchanged one slavery for another, because the regime imposed by Moses was truly totalitarian. Every aspect of life was dictated by the priesthood - nothing heard *then* about "a Kingdom of Heaven within you". Can we imagine Jesus approving a theocracy so ruthless that a man should be put to death merely for refusing to listen to a priest?

Nor could he have approved Moses's insistence that the Israelites were a "chosen" people divinely licensed to dispose of all others as they saw fit. Ironically, that myth (since become the longest-running hoax in History) was the prophet's only major innovation. Breasted's *The Dawn of Conscience*

shows that most of what Judaism claims to have derived from some "divine revelation" exclusive to itself was in fact borrowed from the high culture of Egypt, in which Moses had been schooled. Nor could he claim to have introduced the first true monotheism, since merely tribal gods don't merit the big "G". But is monotheism such a great thing, seeing how much monopolistic intolerance it has spawned since Pharaoh Akhnaten first tried to enforce it? Here we have to admit that Christianity itself has been the worst offender. Its record in the suppression of competing faiths has been appalling. The Church of the Inquisition had moved so far from its Founder that one might suspect it of having been taken over by the Devil during the Dark Ages!

Yet, isn't it also true that most social advances since that time have been due to Christian reformers? That the glories of Christian art, music, and literature remain unsurpassed? Hasn't whatever civilisation the world enjoys today (granting its Graeco-Roman roots) been created mostly under Christian influence? Neither Judaism nor any other faith had much to do with it. From the Renaissance to the Industrial Revolution and until about 1900 - when secular Jewish contributions began having great impact - the civilisation now becoming global has been overwhelmingly the creation of white Europeans of Christian belief. (If the fabled "Wisdom of the East" had anything better to offer, why are those peoples now copying our ways as fast as they can?) And isn't it ironic that our dominant Anglo-Christian ethos is now being attacked on all sides by its beneficiaries - often by those coming from countries where the only effective law is still the law of the jungle? The very principles we gave them are being turned against us by alleged "victims" of our society, some even seeking to force their views on us by denying us that freedom of expression, which is basic to any true democracy.

Some of those people will never admit that Christianity was a significant advance on Judaism. "Moses lived in more primitive times," they will say, "doing what he must to hold his people together! And hasn't Judaism evolved since then?" Indeed it has, yielding a great literature. *But the old dynamic still operates!* Jewish children are still taught to identify with it. Anyone doubting whether the Mosaic tradition is racist need only recall the decades-long treatment of the Palestinian Arabs as *Untermenschen*, their appeals for a measure of autonomy met with a policy of "might, force and beatings." Who cannot see the genocidal cast of that teaching in the cold-blooded slaughter of over 800 innocents in the refugee camps of Beirut during Begin's invasion of Lebanon? And when Dr. Goldstein murdered 29 Arabs at prayer in Hebron, many young Israelis hailed him as a hero. Asked to explain this, Cabinet Minister Shunamit Aloni said it was because they had "*emerged from a system of religious belief which teaches that we are a supreme People with the right to kill Arabs and take their property.*" The rabbi at Goldstein's funeral said, "Five thousand Arabs are not worth a Jew's fingernail." It took the assassination of Prime Minister Rabin to make another rabbi admit, "We are guilty of

educating an entire generation in primitive thought." That thought has been opposed for many years by the courageous Dr. Israel Shahak of Jerusalem's Hebrew University, who suspects that most of his fellow-Jews still consider the rest of us to be somewhat less than human. Yet Jewish spokesmen in the West do not hesitate to accuse *others* of racism. And to any criticism of this "double standard" they will react with cries of "anti-Semitism!" as automatically as Pavlov's dog reacted to the sound of the bell. Have those people become so steeped in their own propaganda that they cannot *see* how hypocritical they are?

Apart from this tribalism, the greatest difference between Mosaic and Christian teaching is the insistence of Jesus on the reality of another world and a life hereafter. Despite his Egyptian upbringing, Moses is virtually silent on this. Granted, all we "know" of either man is from Scripture. We cannot tell what they may have taught privately to their initiates. Yet publicly to ignore the hereafter, as Moses did, is to ignore man's "spiritual nature" altogether. His god then becomes a kind of bullying overseer concerned only with the conduct of his subjects in *this* world, as though they had no destiny beyond it.

This focus on worldly success, coupled with obsessive concern for the physical details of ritual, typifies the teaching of Moses. The welfare of his Israelites depended entirely on their obedience to the wrathful god who had "bought" them by bringing them out of Egypt. Obey him, and they should live on the fat of the land, enslaving all others; disobey, and others would enslave *them*. Would it be unfair to summarise by saying that while both men were taken up "to a mountain top and offered dominion over the world, Moses took the deal and Jesus turned it down? Should we then simple-mindedly label one faith as "bad" and the other "good"?

Not so fast! There is another side to all of this, another voice to be heard. A spokesman for Judaism might very well say that when two faiths conflict, they must appeal their difference to a higher court. *'We appeal to the Law of Nature!'* he might say. "And its first commandment is to *survive*. That we have certainly done. Tribal though our faith may be, it has kept us together through nineteen centuries of the Diaspora and countless persecutions. Even after Hitler's Holocaust, we are stronger than ever before. Our accomplishments in science and the arts, our strength in the media and international finance, are out of all proportion to our numbers. What other 'tribe' can claim as much? And nobody gave it to us! By study and craft and a strict self-reliance we have worked hard for our success; you will not find *our* people on welfare. Could we have done all this without the faith, which binds us in the world's oldest collective? *Look* how the State of Israel is restored! And in the capital of the world's most powerful country, we are running President Clinton's court even more than we ran Stalin's!"

"It would be absurd," he might go on, "to maintain that Judaism has no spiritual side. But why should we not seek success in this world when we've no more *evidence* of another than the Old Kingdom had? People hoping for a reward 'hereafter' have simply taken their eye off the ball! Some have even blamed us for inventing Christianity; they say that by persuading you to look to another world while scooping up the goodies in this one, we 'psyched you out'. That's obviously

false. No prominent Jew since Paul has ever promoted Christianity. Haven't we rather seen your faith as the enemy of ours? *And hasn't it been your enemy also?* By cherishing foolish hopes of Heaven and fears of Hell - with all that sexual repression - haven't you done great damage to yourselves? The therapists' notebooks are full of it! And isn't your faith declining everywhere? While nobody else dares attack ours, haven't Christian scribes been meekly amending your New Testament to remove any reference offensive to us? We reject Judeo-Christianity just as you do, but on opposite grounds! Jesus to us was merely an apostate, an errant rabbinical student whose charismatic leadership posed a threat to our faith. Its survival mattered more than his."

"Set your complaints in this light," he continues, "and see how empty they are! You imply that we lack 'principle'? A principle has value only as it serves to advance our interest - or to block another's. Thus we may argue for it on one occasion and against on another, as any good lawyer should. When we were powerless, we embraced Communism as a means to empowerment, but it would be foolish to think we have any time for it now. (Though we may use it for our own ends, as when we used the Young Spartacists to help us trash that California YMCA where David Irving spoke.) The same logic applies to your vaunted 'freedom of speech'. Naturally we demand it for ourselves, but why allow it to people speaking against us? And why shouldn't we use the handy label of 'anti-Semitism' to deter them? Whether or not it is 'fair' - that foolish Anglo-Saxonism! - it *works*. To quote that sagacious goy, Dr. Sam Johnson, 'Clear your mind of *cant*, Sir!'. Then you will see the Law of Nature stand supreme. The people of Melos, you'll remember, saw it too late. When the Athenians demanded they surrender their little island to the Empire, they appealed to 'principle' and 'the gods' - all in vain! The Athenians answered, 'Our opinion of the gods and our knowledge of men lead us to conclude that it is a general and necessary law of nature to rule whatever one can.' *That's it exactly!* That is the lesson the Jews have learned the hard way - not to seek first the Kingdom of Heaven, but *power*. And we are winning it. Having survived everything your Christian 'love' has thrown at us, from the Templars burning our people in Jerusalem to Hitler burning them in Auschwitz, we are resolved never to be vulnerable again. And that means *being in charge*."

"If you do not relish a subordinate position," he concludes, "you must fight us with our own weapons - not the cowardly tactics of spraying our synagogues and toppling our tombstones! Jealousy will get you nowhere. You must *compete* with us. And even if you should succeed in beating us at our own game, then in a sense we shall have won anyway - *for we shall have made you become like us!*"

Granted, a real spokesman for Judaism would never be as frank as ours has been. But who will deny that his statement reflects reality? Here is the "challenge" of our title. How should Christians answer it? Not being one of them, this writer cannot say. But the challenge is clearly issued to *all* Gentiles. And those of us not willing to live under any "master-race" had better sit up and take notice.

U.S. RULE OF THE GUN LOWERS CRIME

Reprinted from *The Cairns Post*, July 2, 1996.

Radical law changes in most U.S. states have made it easier for people to possess handguns. Has the law made the country more dangerous? DAVID KOPEL of Knight-Ridder/Tribune helped compile a survey on the question.

WASHINGTON: A quiet revolution in gun policy is spreading throughout America.

Ten years ago, only a half-dozen states routinely issued permits for trained citizens to carry concealed handguns for personal protection.

Today, however, 31 states comprising more than half the nation's population grant concealed-carry permits to law-abiding citizens.

In 1987, Florida Governor Bob Martinez signed a Bill entitling any citizen who clears a fingerprint-based background check and passes gun-safety classes to receive a permit to carry a concealed handgun for protection. Since then, a steady progression of states has adopted concealed-carry laws modeled on Florida's. Has this movement made America safer or more dangerous?

In research conducted for an article in the *Tennessee Law Review*, historian Clayton Cramer and I found that in Florida, following adoption of its concealed-carry law, the murder rate started a steady decline.

Before the law, Floridians were about 36 per cent more likely to be murdered than other Americans. After a few years, the Florida rate was equal to or slightly less than the national rate.

As for other violent crimes, Florida was the worst state in the nation both before and after the new law. Florida's overall violent-crime rate, however, rose much more slowly since 1987 than did the national violent-crime rate.

When we examined violent-crime data in California, where permit policies vary widely by county, we found counties that issue concealed-carry permits liberally had lower violent-crime rates than counties with restrictive policies; restrictive counties had lower rates than counties with prohibitive policies.

A comprehensive study by University of Chicago law professor John Lott and graduate student David Mustard examining crime data for 3054 counties found while concealed-carry reform had little effect in rural counties, in urban counties it was followed by a substantial reduction in homicide and other violent crimes.

At the same time, there was a statistically significant rise in non-confrontational property crimes, such as larceny and car theft. Apparently many criminals concluded the risks of encountering a victim who could fight back had become too high.

Dr. Lott and Mr. Mustard estimate that if all states that did not have concealed-carry laws in 1992 adopted such laws, there would be approximately 1800 fewer murders and 3000 fewer rapes annually. Thus the adoption or improvement of concealed-carry laws in more than a dozen states since 1992 may be one reason for the current decline in murder rates.

In some respects, the concealed-carry movement has become a women's issue. In fact, about a quarter of those who apply for and receive concealed-carry permits are women.

When Alaska Governor Walter Hickel signed concealed-

carry legislation in 1993, he explained the constituents he found most compelling were "the women who called and said they worked late and had to cross dark parking lots and asked why couldn't they carry a concealed gun."

Typically, when state legislatures first consider concealed-carry Bills, opponents warn of horrible consequences: permit holders will slaughter each other in traffic disputes, while would-be Rambos shoot bystanders in incompetent attempts to thwart crime. But within a year of passage, the issue usually drops off the media radar screen.

Why? Because everyone is a potential beneficiary of concealed-carry reform. Since criminals don't know which of their potential victims may be armed, even persons without concealed-carry permits would enjoy increased safety from any deterrent effect.

Moreover, a *Psychology Today* study of "Good Samaritans" who came to the aid of violent-crime victims found 81 per cent were gun owners, and many of them carried guns in their cars or on their persons.

Concealed-carry permits are no panacea for high crime rates. But they will be an important component of an anti-crime strategy based on the right and duty of good citizens to take responsibility for public safety.

EARLY LAUNCH OF BASIC FUND

Because of fast moving events, and the determination of the League to prepare immediately a far reaching strategy to handle what we anticipate as a period of convulsions such as we have never previously seen in Australia, the Basic Fund for 1996-97 is being launched two weeks earlier than normal. Already several stalwarts have contributed. Once again the League has been able to operate without incurring any debts. Unlike the major political parties, all of whom operate on loans from the banking system, the League operates as a genuine grass roots movement, paying its way as it operates. We will not report on them at this time, but the achievements of last year were far reaching, with the full benefits yet to be felt in the future. Bearing in mind the state of the economy, the target for 1996-97 has been set at \$65,000. This is a slight increase on last year's Basic Fund, but the League has been challenged with increasing costs, including preparations for the 50th Anniversary celebrations - although we must stress that most of the organisational work has been undertaken by volunteers.

The League's assets - in the shape of increased literature stocks - were increased over the past year. Once again we appeal to veteran supporters to give a lead by contributing as generously as possible, or promising what they can do in the coming twelve months.