

# THE NEW TIMES

\$20 per annum.

Box 1052J, Melbourne.

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

VOL. 61, No. 7.

Registered Australia Post • Publication PP481667 100259

JULY 1997.

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

## THE TRAGEDY OF IAN SMITH OF RHODESIA

*by Eric D. Butler*

The recently published memoirs of Ian Smith, *"The Great Betrayal"*, confirm the fears of those who believed that although he was basically an honest man, the Rhodesian Prime Minister, who electrified the world on November 11, 1965, when he and his Rhodesian government declared that they were completely independent of the British government, lacked an understanding of the real nature of the international forces which eventually defeated him. This is demonstrated by his acceptance of Henry Kissinger as a man who, while allegedly admiring the Rhodesian stand, sadly had to advise them that with the Western world becoming "soft" on the Communist question, they could expect no support from the West. The end result of the Rhodesian surrender was the installation of Communist Mugabe in power in what became known as Zimbabwe.

In a personal discussion with me, Australian-born Rhodesian Foreign Affairs Minister, Air Vice Marshal Harold Hawkins provided a much more realistic assessment of Kissinger, referring to the "meat axe diplomacy" which Kissinger had used to force South Africa to desert Rhodesia, eventually paying the same price as Rhodesia with the installation of former Communist terrorist Nelson Mandela as Prime Minister. There is no evidence that Mandela has ever repudiated the philosophy, which made him the idol of the international Communist conspiracy. Mythology has promoted the lie that Mandela was imprisoned by the South Africans because of his opposition to *apartheid*. As demonstrated at the Rivonia trial, Nelson Mandela was a senior Communist revolutionary with a programme for seizing control of South Africa. At the Rivonia trial, Mandela endorsed one of his own writings, *"How to Become a Good Communist"*.

Not without significance was the fact that the majority of those arrested at Rivonia were Whites, not Blacks, and that most of these were Jews. Marxist influence in the African National Congress, now dominating the South African government, has always been enormous. It was recently announced that Mandela had married the widow of Semora Machel, Communist dictator of the former Portuguese territory of Mozambique. Clearly birds of a feather still flock together! Mandela has been endorsed by the representatives of International Finance, who envisage absorbing the whole of

### OUR POLICY

To promote service to the Christian revelation of God, loyalty to the Australian Constitutional Monarchy, and maximum cooperation 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.

Southern Africa, and its vast mineral wealth, into an emerging New World Order. Nowhere in his memoirs does Ian Smith mention the fact that shortly after Communist Mugabe had been installed in Zimbabwe there was a visit from David Rockefeller, founder of the Trilateral Commission, who said that he was "pleased" with developments and could see no problems concerning Soviet involvement here or in other parts of Africa. This omission seems strange in view of Ian Smith's stress on the dangers of Marxism-Leninism in Africa.

### **STRANGE SUPPORT FOR MANDELA**

Equally strange is the eulogy of Mandela at the end of Ian Smith's memoirs. He welcomes the creation of a Southern African Common Market, followed by the comment that "Moreover, we have in Mandela a leader with the maturity, wisdom, compassion and courage that derives from great experience.... so let us count our blessings. There is ample justification for us to plan and work for a better future. All the necessary essentials are in place. It is clear that as things stand at present, history will record Nelson Mandela as the first black statesman, as opposed by politicians, to be produced by Africa."

This statement reflects the liberal, wishful thinking of Ian Smith, which led him down a pathway, which ended in disaster. This does not mean that Ian Smith was not an honourable man, as he battled with a situation he did not fully understand. He was not a deeply read man, as I discovered during the many interviews I did with him, the first being immediately following the declaration of Independence. The interview was arranged by Lord Graham who, although a senior Cabinet Minister, is not mentioned in Ian Smith's memoirs. Lord Graham became increasingly critical of the direction in which the Smith government was progressively moving. I found Lord Graham the best informed of the Rhodesian Cabinet Ministers, certainly in the field of finance-economics and international affairs. It was during the time of the Field government that he invited Edward Holloway of the Economic Reform Club, with a number of prestigious members like Sir Henry Kelliher of New Zealand, a former Director of the Bank of New Zealand, to present to the Field Cabinet some constructive ideas on credit creation. I met Edward Holloway in London immediately after his return from Rhodesia, and he told me that the main opponent of his proposals was Ian Smith, Minister of Finance in the Field government. Lord Graham subsequently confirmed to me what Edward Holloway had told me. The explanation for Ian Smith's opposition to any credit reform proposals is probably to be found in the fact that he had taken a degree in economics and commerce at a South African University. And there was Ian Smith's notoriously cautious approach to problems. Whatever the explanation, his obvious blind spot concerning finance-economics, helps to explain his failure to grasp the bigger global picture in which his stated main concern, Communism, could be seen as a major feature.

If Ian Smith had grasped the bigger global picture, he would have noted that it was Dr. Henry Kissinger who played a major role in shifting the USA attitude towards Communist China under President Richard Nixon, and that it was shortly afterwards that David Rockefeller established the Chase Manhattan Bank in Communist China and eulogised the Communist dictator Mao Tse-tung as one of the greatest

"reformers' in history. The most charitable view could be that Ian Smith's understanding of Marxism-Leninism was derived from the head of his Department of Internal Security, Mr. Ken Flower, whom I found extremely "cold" after I lectured a group of security personnel during an early visit to Rhodesia. Flower was an enigmatic figure who, after serving in the Smith government, continued on in the same Security post under Bishop Muzorewa, and then eventually under Communist Robert Mugabe.

The Smith memoirs tend to confirm the view of Ian Smith's critics, that he was obsessed with the view that by displaying what he felt was goodwill and moderation, an eventual agreement could be reached with the British and Western nations. Perhaps his harshest critic, Ivor Benson, who resigned early as an adviser to the Smith government, made the comment that the road, which Ian Smith had chosen to take, was doomed to failure from the start. The first Rhodesian Front Prime Minister, Winston Field, was removed from office because it was felt that his insistence that Rhodesians should continue trying to negotiate with the British was creating too much uncertainty both among Rhodesians and among their friends abroad. In an interview with Field at his home, the former Prime Minister told me that he agreed basically with what I had written concerning the Rhodesian crisis, and while not directly criticising Ian Smith, pointed out that I was wrong in saying that Ian Smith was not a professional politician, briefly outlining his relatively long experience in politics. I took the point. The Smith memoirs point out that Field was loyal to his successor. But I gained the impression that Field had reservations about Smith's approach.

### **IVOR BENSON SPELLS OUT THE OPTIONS**

In his *"Truth Out Of Africa"*, Ivor Benson who, after all, had been originally engaged by the Rhodesian Front government because of his recognised understanding of psychopolitical warfare, observed that "There were . . . only two courses from which the Rhodesians could choose with any prospect of avoiding the disaster which finally overwhelmed them. 1: A deliberate policy of negotiated surrender on the best terms, which could be wrung from their enemies, 2: A policy of total resistance, offensive as well as defensive.

## **ANOTHER BIG NATIONAL WEEKEND COMING UP**

Friday, October 3, will witness the start of another inspiring League of Rights National weekend. The annual *New Times* Dinner will be held at the Sheraton Hotel, Spring Street, Melbourne. The charge will be \$33. Early bookings can be made from now on. The theme of the National Seminar will be "The Challenge to Practical Christianity in a Dying Civilisation". An outstanding panel of speakers will present stimulating addresses. Details later. Discounted travel for interstate and international visitors can be arranged. Also discounted Melbourne accommodation. But early bookings essential.

## ZIONIST FEAR OF IVOR BENSON

"All White Rhodesians unwilling to live under a Black government could have been bought out on generous terms half-a-dozen times over with the money that had to be spent by the Western powers alone in forcing their will on what was at that time the most prosperous and best governed country in Africa. And we may be sure that total resistance, not limited to passive defence, would have been something quite different from what was seen in Rhodesia over the years following the unilateral declaration of independence (UDI) in November 1965; in fact not even one-tenth of Rhodesia's potential power of resistance was being invoked."

Ivor Benson outlined what could have been done if it had been decided to make a real stand. Through their control of the huge Kariba hydroelectric station on the Zimbabwe River, and the Wankie coal colliery, the Rhodesians had it in their power to collapse the entire Zambia copper mining industry. If the full power of the tribal chiefs had been restored they would have ensured that no terrorists could penetrate the country.

But the greatest potential power available to the Rhodesians has the amazing mushroom growth of Friends of Rhodesia right around the world. I can write with first hand knowledge of how a unique opportunity for constructive and offensive action was wasted. Immediately upon my return from Rhodesia late in 1965, I wrote an assessment of the Rhodesian situation in the context of the struggle for the world. After originally being published in Ron Gostick's *Canadian Intelligence Service* and Australian League of Rights journals, the article spread like wildfire right around the world, being translated into numerous languages. It was estimated that the assessment quickly ran into tens of millions of copies. At a time when it appeared that the whole of the Free World was in constant retreat against the expanding power of International Communism, the Rhodesian Declaration of Independence had an electrifying international effect. The perception of a small nation in Southern Africa taking a stand gripped the imagination of people everywhere. Throughout 1966 and 1967 I addressed hundreds of meetings throughout all parts of the English-speaking world, including South Africa. Meetings were large and enthusiastic. I was unable to meet the demands for the conduct of my Basic Anti-Communism School.

However, as time went on, I began to notice what was clearly a cooling or ardour in official government circles in Rhodesia. In order to understand what was happening, it was necessary to study how the forces of internationalism were reacting to what was happening in Rhodesia. A Zionist-Jewish book by B.A. Kosmin, published in Zimbabwe, 1980, sheds some most revealing light on the role of International Zionists. Zionist leaders had over the years paid close attention to developments in Rhodesia. A number of Zionist leaders had visited the country. Dr. Kosmin provides a picture of a highly organised Zionist community, which virtually dominated the economic life of the country. The Zionists were totally opposed to the move towards Independence as proposed by the Rhodesian Front government. The 1962 White backlash which produced the Rhodesian Front government led by Winston Field, left the Zionists with only one representative in the parliament, Mr. A.E. Abrahamsen, President of the Jewish Board of Deputies and a member of the executive of the World Zionist Organisation.

Dr. Kosmin writes that the Zionists were most disturbed by the importing to Rhodesia in 1964 of the "far rightwing political theorist" Ivor Benson, as Government Information Adviser. Ivor Benson had given the Rhodesian Front a coherent policy "which would suit both their internal and external policies." Then there was a stream of "right wing" propagandists from around the world, with reference to me and the Australian League of Rights. During 1966 I had covered the whole of Rhodesia in a series of meetings, which had me speaking to packed halls night after night. Rhodesians were learning for the first time why they were the target for such a vicious international attack. I was also being presented nationally on television. However, reports Dr. Kosmin, I "studiously refrained from open anti-Semitism".

Dr. Kosmin presents a picture of Rhodesia's Zionist Jews moving into the Rhodesian Front Party and with their international connections making themselves increasingly useful to the Smith government in the business of sanction busting. And in the process, their grip on the local economy was being strengthened. With his policy of making "settlement" his major objective, it is not surprising that Ian Smith was easily influenced, perhaps even without realising it, to adopt a softer propaganda line internationally. I saw all this happening first hand. Friends of Rhodesia groups around the world started to lose enthusiasm. They could organise material aid, if they liked, but not hard line political support. Dr. Kosmin frankly explains how the relatively small Zionist Jewish group exploited the Rhodesian crisis. They were delighted when the "odious" Ivor Benson left the scene. They worked on eroding the "right wing extremist" influence inside the Rhodesian government. The Rhodesian Information Department concentrated upon presenting a more moderate picture to the outside world. My visits were less welcomed by those surrounding the Prime Minister, particularly in the Department of Information.

What happened in Rhodesia was subsequently repeated in a South Africa, which was also starting to capitulate to the pressures of International Finance. It reached the stage where eventually my many friends in South Africa were stunned when I could no longer obtain a visa to visit the country. It was no secret that Zionist Jewish influence was responsible for the ban.

## A TRAGIC ENDING

With all its limitations, Ian Smith's memoirs make a valuable contribution to an understanding of how the British Empire was progressively dismantled. The manner in which the British left Hong Kong was pathetic. But the betrayal of the Rhodesians was a disgrace, a betrayal of traditional British values. Ian Smith emerges as a tragic figure in a global drama he never understood. Within the limits of his background and understanding, I believe that Ian Smith was an honourable man. I liked him as a man. It is not surprising that he created a favourable impression amongst conservative people right around the world. His memoirs recount the history of a man who was an excellent athlete when young, who loved country life, with a war record which demonstrated that he was not lacking in physical courage and resourcefulness. But in the end, I believe, he failed himself and his country. By taking the wrong road, he put his country through an ordeal, which left many wrecked lives. The ordeal has clearly taken a heavy toll on Ian

Smith himself. But to his great credit, he has, unlike many of his former colleagues, continued to stay in what is now known as Zimbabwe, acting as a symbol of inspiration for the dwindling number of whites who, for different reasons, have continued to stay in Zimbabwe.

Having been closely associated with the Rhodesian drama during its most critical time, I feel deeply about what happened, and pray that my own country, Australia, will be spared the same ordeal. It is threatened by the same international forces, which destroyed Rhodesia, the preliminary to destroying South Africa. The Rhodesians were in many ways an elite people, outstanding products of the very best that people of British stock and background have to offer to the world. The many Smiths who developed Rhodesia were evidence of the strong Scottish influence. Not surprisingly, Scotland's senior Duke, Lord Graham, Duke of Montrose, was highly regarded throughout Rhodesia. He lamented Ian Smith's failure to come to grips with the realities of the Rhodesian drama. I was proud to have been closely associated with him. My last discussion with Angus Graham was by phone from Sydney, when we discussed the perceptive writings of our mutual friend Ivor Benson and the looming disaster in South Africa. It would have been interesting to have had his views on Ian Smith's description of the Rhodesian disaster.

When, or if, the true story of the contribution of the British Empire to the development of Western Civilisation is written, and how that Empire was destroyed, the Rhodesian tragedy will provide evidence of all the elements, which led to that destruction. But perhaps C.H. Douglas has made the most perceptive comment of all: The passing of the British Empire as such was of little importance compared with the attempted subversion of British culture. The passing of the great Roman Empire left a permanent legacy, which played a decisive role in the development of Western Christian Civilisation. The legacy left by the British could be the major factor in the next development of Civilisation.

One of my most haunting memories of the Rhodesian tragedy was the young New Zealander, limping into one of my meetings on a walking stick, to tell me that he had been one of the many volunteers wounded by terrorists in Rhodesia. Of Scottish background, he had volunteered to serve in Rhodesia because he believed they were setting an example to the rest of the British world. But he had become bitterly anti British because of what he saw as the treachery of the British Government. His efforts had been in vain, and he was left with a permanent limp.

Regretfully, I said I understood how he felt, but pointed out that the treachery was not that of the British people, but of the politicians who were serving the agenda of international power groups with their vision of some type of a New World Order. Failure to make this point is the major deficiency in the memoirs of Ian Smith. He tells of his first hand experience of the treachery of Lord Carrington, but makes no reference to Carrington's close links with International Finance. He is rightly critical of Lord Soames, who presided over the UN-supervised general election, which brought Marxist Mugabe to power, but fails to mention that Soames was a member of the board of governors of international bankers N.M. Rothschild

and Son. The most charitable comment one can make is that, because of his lack of understanding of the close link between Big Finance and Marxist Revolution, he did not feel it important to mention the backgrounds of the political traitors he had to deal with. Or did he feel that if he mentioned such matters, he would have even greater problems concerning the finding of a mainstream publisher for his memoirs? Media reports said that the publication of the memoirs was held up because potential publishers objected to his references to Mugabe as a Communist terrorist.

However, with all their limitations, Ian Smith's memoirs are essential reading for the student of modern history. But they should be read in conjunction with Ivor Benson's *"Truth Out Of Africa"*, which provides an excellent summary of the disastrous aspects of Ian Smith's agreement with British Conservative Foreign Minister Sir Alex Douglas Home, as outlined by Australian Constitutional authority Dr. Walter Henderson. Neither at the time, nor in his memoirs, does Ian Smith offer a convincing explanation of why he appeared to have retreated from the original stand by the Rhodesian Front government when it declared independence in 1965. This agreement, paving the way for the establishment of "majority rule" in Rhodesia, was signed on November 21, 1971. Ian Smith writes that he realised the agreement would not receive the support of the "extreme right wing of the Rhodesian Front." Lord Graham was one of the "right wing extremists" who had deep reservations about what was proposed.

The real explanation for Ian Smith's apparent retreat from the original policy of the Rhodesia Front government of 1965 and the succeeding years may be found in his address to the Rhodesian parliament on November 25 1969, in which, as pointed out by Dr. Henderson, Ian Smith "sheltered himself behind the statement, 'If only Rhodesians could be appraised of the facts, and predictions available to Government, our economic requirements and anticipated development difficulties, the security problems . . . then they would more readily understand our position . . . . Regrettably, it would be irresponsible for me to divulge any of this information, as by so doing, it would become available to our enemies'." But, as Dr. Henderson observed, all relevant information was already known to the British government and other interested parties. Ian Smith's failure to see the far-reaching significance of the British proposals, left him open to the charge by some of his critics that he was misleading the Rhodesian people deliberately, failing to explain that the proposals meant a rapid advance to Black majority rule and a loss of independence by any Rhodesian government.

Whether intentional or not, Ian Smith was taking major steps in retreat which would end with the ultimate disaster, the surrender of Rhodesia to a Communist government. As I have said, it was Ian Smith's failure to grasp the realities of finance-economics, which left him vulnerable to the pressures of revolutionary forces. Financial ignorance has been the Achilles Heel of numerous so-called conservative governments of the western world over a long period of time. A constructive revolt against debt finance is the only hope for a regeneration of Christian civilisation.

# Cultural Diversity versus Multi-culturalism

by Mrs. Rona Joyner

**Racism, Multi-racial, Culture, Multi-culturalism, etc., are words that cause confusion and division among Christians, because of the way the media use them interchangeably, without any definition of meaning. The media thrives on confusion over word meanings, on distorted reporting, unresearched articles and emotionalism. It delights in stirring up controversy over cultural issues, so in the interests of unity, and to avoid misunderstanding, I will clarify the terms I use. "Professional multi-culturelists" is a very apt name coined by Pauline Hanson, M.P., and their agenda needs careful scrutiny, judging by the false and misleading History being taught to Year 9 and 10 classes.**

Race: Race is genetic. It divides human beings according to their common origins and physical traits. It may or may not influence a man's cultural orientation, i.e. his relationship with god(s) and men. He may or may not be Christian. Either way he cannot change his race, his genes (*Jer. 13:23*).

Culture: Culture is the opposite to race - it is not genetically-based, and can change depending on one's, current beliefs about god(s), this life and the next. It is often determined by family or social or geographical environment imprinting traditional religion, laws and lifestyle. In some countries we see one or more narrow "racial cultures" existing in friction with each other and with the "national culture", causing war, torture and bloodshed. Culture may be Christian or otherwise, and at its best it refines the people being influenced by it.

Cultural Diversity: By God's Grace, the Gospel allows us Personal Choices. Certain activities are neither enforced nor forbidden by law in Christian countries, e.g. visiting ancestors' graves is compulsory in some pagan cultures. The freedom of choice that Christians enjoy accounts for the differences in behaviour within the Christian culture, but that is cultural diversity, not multi-culturalism. Laws can call Sundays, Christmas and Easter holidays, but in Christian Australia what we do on those days is left to personal choice, being for individual conscience to decide.

Also in Australia, our culture being Christian, not Jewish, we do not have laws enforcing the observance of the seventh day Sabbath, because Christianity teaches that we are free to exercise personal choice in that matter also (*Romans 14:5*).

Likewise the Christian culture allows personal choices regarding "clean" or "unclean" food, circumcision, etc., without the imposition of laws such as the Jewish culture has. God has given far more personal choices to people living under a national Christian culture, than He gave the Jews under their national Jewish culture, or that Moslems have under their Islamic culture. God still retains certain Biblical absolutes ("*You shall do no murder, you shall not steal*" etc), which Australia originally put into law, but too many have recently been unlawfully decriminalised.

We in Australia are the very fortunate recipients of a guaranteed British Christian heritage, which is ours for as long as we as a people cherish God's wonderful gift to us of a national Christian culture. This blessing is free to us, but it cost the lives of many heroic Christians over hundreds of years.

Cultural Change through the Gospel is the only hope for our hurting world. Christians are God's servants IN the world, but not OF the world. He expects His Church to "turn the world upside down" be refining the culture of nations through

the application of the Gospel to their gods, their ancestor-worship, their laws and their rulers, so all nations will acknowledge Christ as their King.

Civic affairs is an area in which Christians need to be involved since it is God's will that we serve Him in every sphere of life. He wants us to pray and work (*1 Timothy 2:1-3*) in areas of government everywhere, because He ordained all governments to do their citizens good and not evil (*Romans 73:7-7*). We need to take a keen interest in political issues in order to pray and act intelligently.

The Belgic Confession of Faith puts the Church's duty in regard to civic affairs very clearly when it says that God has ordained kings, and civil officers, and wants the world to be governed by laws and policies so that human lawlessness may be restrained. (God has given us this mandate to bring all governments under the power of the Gospel). The Confession also says we are to honour and respect all members of Parliament and obey them in all things that are not in conflict with *God's Word*. We are also to pray that the Lord may lead them in all their ways and that we may live a peaceful and quiet life in all piety and decency.

"*Righteousness exalts a nation*". However, national righteousness would appear to be beyond possibility unless we foster a national Christian culture. Not to do so plays right into the hands of the devil who delights in deceiving the nations (*Rev. 18:23*) so they will not give allegiance and loyalty to Christ.

Christ's Temptation (*Matt. 4:1*) is significant to me, in that Satan's bartering with Christ on the mountain was not about Satan surrendering individuals to Christ in return for His worship, but rather it was about Satan surrendering kingdoms, and power to Him. Christ chose to inherit these by the cross and confirmed He had when He told us to teach all nations to observe His Laws (*Matt. 28:18-20*). We are to take the Gospel into all the world, including governments, so as to increase the influence of Christianity in every nation and to reduce the influence of paganism over people.

Multi-racial: This refers to various races living as one mono-cultural people, obeying one set of laws and values, by having freedom of conscience as to their private unobtrusive beliefs, etc.

Multi-cultural: This refers to the very foolish experiment with people's lives, being carried out on us by many unthinking party politicians, forcing us to take in people from different cultures, with different values and laws, to see if we can do the impossible - make one homogenous society, by legislating new and conflicting laws to take precedence over Christian laws.

They hope to end up with a man-made Utopia that will rival Heaven.

History shows that this is another of Satan's deceptions. It cannot and will not work. History records that no society has ever survived for more than a few generations after its basic religion and laws (whether Christian or not) have been fragmented or superseded by different beliefs and alien laws. Pauline Hanson is one Parliamentarian who has learnt the lessons of history and is trying to save us from a repeat disaster.

Multi-culturalism is so against God's civil order and so generally unacceptable that it has to be enforced by legislation and punishment that is repugnant to God's word (such as many forms of Anti-Discrimination Laws, Affirmative Action Legislation, etc. that have followed closely on the heels of the legalisation of many sinful practices that God condemns, that used to be forbidden in our Criminal Code and Crimes Acts). The strange thing is that these same politicians who so wrongly proclaim that a government cannot legislate for morality, are very eager to legislate for immorality - homosexuality, abortion, etc. - despite our ruling Christian culture.

Multi-culturalism is not to be tolerated. It teaches that all beliefs are valid to those who believe. Christ said that He is the ONLY way. The New Testament has warnings against the watering down of our Christian culture (Gospel beliefs and behaviour etc.) by the deliberate acceptance of, and tolerance for, people spreading heathen beliefs and lifestyles. There is ONE faith, ONE Lord, (*Ephesians 4:4-6*), ONE gospel (*Galatians Ch. 1*) and only ONE culture to take to all the world. Christians must exhibit righteous indignation against and disapproval of all false religious beliefs that oppose the Gospel of Christ. We must not pussyfoot around when God's absolutes are at stake.

Professional Multi-culturalists; These are wittingly or unwittingly aiding the devil's programme through being in positions of influence in various fields of power, where they have the opportunity to sway people into thinking all beliefs have equal relevance, forgetting God's absolutes. God's absolute command to prevent our being swamped with contradictory beliefs is that we are NOT to take in, nor even welcome, anyone who wants to come to us holding beliefs that differ from the Gospel that Paul preached. Otherwise we are partakers of his wicked work (*2 John 10:11*).

What God forbids, we must actively oppose. God forbids tolerance for other religions (*Galatians ch.1* twice says "*Let him be accursed*", referring to whoever brings another gospel). God therefore curses any "professional multi-culturalists" in the education system who are forcing our children to become tolerant of other religious beliefs. I quote from a Queensland History Unit on "*Motives for Imperialism*" for Year 9 and 10 students:

"Western Europeans firmly believed in the superiority of their culture, especially their Christian religion. They saw it as their duty to convert the native races to Christianity and to enlighten the "darkness" of their existence by showing them European "know-how". (You should note that such ignorant lines of thought are not held by educated people today. Better understanding of other cultures has brought a realisation that each has its unique contribution to the richness of human existence.)"

*The King James Bible in Romans 2:4 uses "forbear" meaning "to refrain from action". It does not contain the word*

*'tolerant' such as some new versions use instead of 'forbear'. God cannot command anyone to be tolerant, meaning "to tolerate different beliefs and views" because He cannot contradict Himself, after having told us through both John and Paul not to be tolerant*

Mono-cultural: This describes a country wisely governed under laws that do not conflict with the religion on which that country was founded. The Coronation Oath keeps Australia mono-cultural.

Democracy; The saying "Of the people, for the people, by the people" sums up the weakness of a democracy because unrestrained majority rule eventually ends up as mob rule, and the will of man inevitably multiplies wickedness when the majority discovers there is no compulsion to submit to a Higher Authority. Unlike Monarchies, democracies are unstable and self-destructing

Christian Constitutional Monarchy: "Long Live the King!" is prophetic of Monarchies, their stability and their continuity through God's selection, normally through inheritance, rather than by human election. Our regal Head of State represents God to us, for she is God's choice, not ours. Australia is NOT a democracy, except perhaps in the way we elect Parliamentary representatives.

Swearing allegiance to our Monarch (the Queen of Queensland and of Australia) by all Members of Parliament after election is compulsory. The Monarch is God's anointed servant, made supreme over Parliament by the Constitution.

God's Laws are Enshrined over Man's Laws: At Her Christian Coronation Queen Elizabeth bowed on her knees before God and acknowledged Him to be the Supreme Authority over her. She swore allegiance to God and promised to promote the true Gospel of Jesus Christ as our culture.

The Monarchy is what makes Australia different. Because of the Monarchy, we are a nation where Christ is officially acknowledged by our Queen to be the enthroned King of Australia, supreme over every human Monarch.

The Ten Commandments were ruled by the ancient English King, Alfred the Great, to be the basis of all the Laws of England (and also the laws of all countries whose Parliamentarians swear allegiance to the Monarch). It is therefore the law in Australia that no Bill should be assented to if it is repugnant to English Law, i.e. the Ten Commandments as magnified by Christ. Certain listed laws are the Law of this Land, which every Monarch swears at His Coronation to uphold forever.

As constituted, Australia is a multi-racial, mono-cultural country, with Christian Parliamentary Prayers, both State and Federal. God's Laws and the Christian calendar system, including "In the Year of Our Lord", overriding all else. Swearing on a Bible and saying, "So Help me God" also confirm Australia's official status as a Christian country.

However, since World War 2, the many party political attempts to undermine the supremacy of Christianity in Australia, are heading us for disaster, especially Christians, no matter what their race. John Zylstra (*Trowell and Sword, Jan/Feb 1997*) rightly pointed this fact out in regard to Christian Aborigines and their worry of a pagan revival of ancient Animistic beliefs among Aborigines. So far Australia's

Christian religion and laws have survived many attacks and much battering by the devil, but for how much longer?

Christ's Church to the Rescue! The church in Australia has generally become so apathetic and lacking in knowledge that it has turned a blind eye to the many unlawful laws that have been assented to in recent years. Such laws are null and void forever, and the church has the urgent duty to challenge and overthrow them on behalf of Jesus Christ, the acknowledged King of Australia.

Where are our church leaders today who are working to have rulers everywhere submit to the Kingship of Christ? Leaders like Anglican Archbishop Vaughan who led the successful campaign at the turn of the century to restore the Bible and Christian Philosophy of Education to the then Department of Public Instruction in Queensland? Leaders like English Archbishop Stephen Langton, who was one of the heroes of the Magna Carta which 700 years ago established the supremacy of God's Laws over the will of every English Monarch? In 1996 Prime Minister Howard unlawfully made his will supreme over Magna Carta (which is legally still in force to guarantee our right to keep our private property, e.g. guns). Lincoln and Wilberforce also served God politically to abolish slavery, etc., in the USA and the UK. History is full of examples of the Gospel in action.

The early church did what Christ wanted, as the history of the church in Great Britain from the earliest times shows. The history of the church and the history of our Monarchy are so intertwined as to be inseparable. Our modern education system denies our children any knowledge of this history, which is "His Story", the Story of God at work over the centuries to give us the chance in Australia today to live in peace and godliness, in a Christian culture

Pauline Hanson is one of only a small handful of Parliamentarians who are truly representing their electorates, without any unlawful coercion or pressure by any political party. Liz Cunningham is another. The Constitutions (State and Federal) as drawn up provide for totally independent representation of electors - with no coercion by political parties or anyone else.

The voice of independents is extremely important today for

they alone truly represent the people who voted for them, in a way that representatives of political parties never can. The allegiance of an independent is to God and the Queen first and to the electorate second, which is the way it should be according to both State and Federal Constitutions. The party hacks must put their allegiance to the party first, second and third, otherwise they will lose their party endorsement.

Pauline Hanson said in her Parliamentary speeches exactly what her electorate voted her in to say. If you remember, she was disendorsed by the Liberal Party because of her pre-election policies against further immigration and in favour of 'one people for Australia'. It was because of these same policies that she was elected - in an ALP stronghold, what's more! The people of Oxley have a right to an M.P. who can exercise freedom of speech on their behalf, and not be answerable to anyone else but them.

Under the Law of the Land, there is a sound and unchangeable Christian Code of Morals, Ethics and Conduct, as well as an on going unchangeable Parliamentary Privilege granted in the Bill of Rights of 1688. This protects forever the right of free speech in Parliament, which Pauline Hanson must not be denied, and Christians must uphold and defend this right for her or else they will lose it for themselves and the Gospel.

This right flows on from the State and Federal Constitutions, being included in the inherited Christian Laws, which every Monarch swears to uphold during the Coronation Service. Likewise every minister and Member of Parliament also swears by his/her Oaths of Allegiance and of Office to uphold the same Biblical Law that the Queen upholds.

Pauline Hanson is God's servant in Parliament and to Him she is accountable (*Romans 14:4-13*). We are not to judge her heart nor her motives, only her actions if there is proven evidence of unlawfulness or the breaking of her Oath of Allegiance. Christ said, "Whoever is without sin, let him cast the first stone."

Rom.2:21 is a warning to those "who preach that a man should not steal (or bear false witness)" to be sure they don't steal (taking Pauline Hanson's reputation from her by bearing false witness against her). If "you who make your boast of the law, break the law, you dishonour God".

## ORAGE ON WORK

From *The Social Crediter*, July/August 1997.

In the first three decades of this century, A.R. Orage was, undoubtedly, the brightest star in the journalistic firmament.

When he began editing *The New Age* - a Weekly Review of Politics, Literature and Art in 1907, it was anticipated in Socialist circles that, as an advocate of Guild Socialism, his journal would become the mouthpiece of the Fabian Society. But Orage's penetrating intellect had begun to question the adequacy of Socialist theory. When, in 1917, the Anglo-Scottish political and economic realist, C.H. Douglas, brought his analysis and proposals to Orage's attention, he readily embraced and advanced them, to become recognised as the midwife of the Social Credit movement.

Far from winning converts from erstwhile colleagues,

Socialists, especially the Trade Union element, closed ranks against him. Judging by the policies being currently advanced by New Labour, the situation would be unchanged today.

To illustrate the point, contrast these two opinions. A New Labour Parliamentary Candidate opined: "Unemployment is a curse. Not only does it blight the lives of those affected and their families, but it also spells higher taxes for us all - to pay the social security bill."

A.R. Orage, examining this question sixty-four years ago, stated:

*"So long as the creation of the means of Leisure which we owe to Science is regarded as a symptom of disease and subjected to prescriptions of cure, so long, we may be certain,*

all the proposed "remedies" prove to be impractical or useless. There literally is no cure for unemployment that is compatible with the continued existence and development of Applied Science . . .

"By taking it for granted that unemployment must be treated as a disease to be cured, the House of Commons, all unwittingly we hope, played perfectly, as they have so many times before, into the hands of the financial villains of the social peace . . .

"The message of technocracy was that not only is unemployment (defined as the substitution of natural for human energy) an inevitable concomitant of progress, but its rate of

increase is directly proportional to the pace of technological development. . . labour-saving devices have paved the road of human progress; and it is nothing less than black ingratitude to human reason to consider as a social disease what, in fact, is a social triumph."

Our present painful predicament is apparent when one considers that the New Labour man's deeply flawed attitude is shared by purblind individuals who approve of policies hatched in Brussels on behalf of the fifteen sober suited men of the Europäische Währungsinstitut (European Monetary Institute), who presently meet monthly on four heavily guarded floors at 29, Kaiserstrasse, Frankfurt.

Jack Hornsby.

---

## THE TRIUMPH OF THE LIE

by Peter L. Lorden

40-43, 8th Ave, S.E., Calgary, AB T2G 067,

Anyone who still credits the infamous "6 million" figure should consider its origin. It came from the Soviet Union! it was cooked up and presented to the world at Nuremberg by the same people who claimed that 15,000 Polish officers had been slaughtered in the Katyn Forest by the Nazis, when in fact the Soviets had done it themselves.

It must also be remembered that Bolshevik propagandists were the only ones with access to the so-called "extermination camps", these being all in the Soviet Zone. And they had every reason to inflate the Nazi Holocaust as a means of diverting attention from their own far greater crimes, including the systematic murder by starvation of some 8 millions in the Ukrainian Holocaust of 1932-33. It was they who put out the monstrous lie that 4 million Jews had been killed at Auschwitz - where the *total* of deaths is now seen to have been less than 100,000. (Since this became known, we have suddenly been presented with vastly increased death tolls for the *other* Polish camps. Why? Because "Holocaustamaniacs" have so long profited from the 6 million myth that they cannot bear to give it up!)

There is actually no more *proof* of that figure than there is of the alleged gas-chamber killings. (All "evidence" of *those* has since turned out to be a case of somebody hearing about them from some "witness" no longer available to testify!) So to those Nuremberg "confessions" on which Jewish historians like Lucy Davidowicz and Raoul Hilberg have relied so heavily, these were all obtained by torture at the hands of vengeful European

Jews hastily naturalised into Americans for PR purposes. Such confessions are no more reliable than the Eichmann "memoirs" which miraculously turned up for the start of his trial in Jerusalem - or survivor accounts so fantastic that even Yad Vashem shrink from using them. Even a senior American judge on the Tribunal described Nuremberg as a "lynching party" - he would never have attended if he had known how little chance of justice the defendants would be given.

None of this should be taken to mean that the Nazi Holocaust didn't happen. But 6 million? How could the Nazis have killed 6 million Jews when - after numerous emigrations and flights into Russia - they didn't have more than 3 million available to them? And when Germany has since paid compensation to over 3½ million alleged "survivors"? The 6 - myth was, in fact, conclusively disproved 50 years ago! And this by Jewish authorities themselves, whose census of worldwide Jewry taken just before the War counted some 16 million, while another taken just after it showed about 17 million. There is simply *no room* for an intervening drop of 6 million. Of course, this has never stopped their propagandists from labelling anyone who questions the 6- myth as a rotten anti-Semite.

In sum, Jewish propaganda here has been as great triumph of "the Big Lie" as their claim to be a "Chosen People". In both cases, they have contrived to foist upon countless millions of "the stupid Goyim" a self-serving fabrication extremely profitable to themselves. Compared to these people, Goebbels was an amateur!

## HOW FAR SHOULD WE GO ON FREE TRADE?

The following item appeared in the *Australian Financial Review* of 10th June 1997:

If you really want to hit people where it hurts, between the legs is an obvious target and Pauline Hanson, having been accused of putting the metaphorical knee into the interests of exporters, multiculturalists, Aborigines and foreign investors, has now done it to the sex industry. Industry lobby group Eros Foundation fears her approach to immigration could be detrimental to the industry.

"A wide and varied immigration policy has served the sex

industry very well," according to an article in the Foundation's newsletter, *Sex Files*, "Brothels that specialise exclusively in Asian, South American and black African workers do well in almost every capital city."

The article said cultural differences are heightened in sexual situations, making these workers a vital component of the industry.