

# 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. 8.

Registered Australia Post - Publication PP481667 100259

AUGUST 1997.

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

## BEYOND THE DEMISE OF THE BRITISH EMPIRE

*by Eric D. Butler*

Only those who are ignorant of real history would dispute that the world was a far better place when Pax Britannica was the major force and influence in international affairs. With the British withdrawal from Hong Kong, it can now be formally declared that the Empire "on which the sun never set" is at an end. It is an appropriate time to consider the significance of some of the comments by the author of Social Credit, C.H. Douglas, concerning the British Empire, which he stressed, was the reflection of a culture which was of far greater importance than the Empire as such. Governor Patten, the last British governor of Hong Kong, made a brave attempt to ensure that features of that culture, a degree of self-government and the rule of law, survived into the future. But he was defeated by the alien culture of Big Money, both in Hong Kong and the United Kingdom. Officials of the British Board of Trade were most concerned that any friction between Patten and the Chinese Communists might jeopardise the prospects of massive British exports into a China being transformed by an unholy alliance between the Communists and the International Bankers.

As all well educated people know, the controversial documents generally known as *The Protocols of Zion* are a forgery created by Imperial Russia's secret police. The problem with this explanation is that the essence of the documents can be traced back to earlier documents, which existed before the French Revolution. The matter is mentioned here, not to discuss the authorship of the documents, but to draw attention to the problem associated with understanding real history, which Douglas described as "crystallised politics". The anonymous author of *The Protocols* suggests that the abolition of a study of classical literature would make it difficult for a people to understand their past. George Orwell graphically referred to history being thrown down the memory hole. Classical literature generally is a reflection of the wisdom of the past. A people deprived of access to classical literature are a people without roots.

### LEARNING FROM HISTORY

Which brings us to the question of what of any value is to be learned from a study of a real history of the British Empire. The products of the modern universities will have no hesitation in expressing the view, inculcated into them by their lecturers that the British Empire was established and retained by "gun boat diplomacy" and that its passing is a good thing. Which can only mean that in "liberated" Africa, a return to even worse chanel house conditions than those described by British explorer-missionary David Livingstone, is preferable to the generally benign rule of the British colonialists. The alleged

### 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.

exploitation of British colonies for the benefit of the British people is a myth of history resulting from the orthodox economic view that a nation can only become wealthy through obtaining a "favourable balance of trade" - that is, by exporting more than it imports.

The reality was that the British used their major source of energy, coal, to manufacture goods, which were exported to the colonies. Consider briefly the history of India, which only became a political entity under British supervision. The development of India started late in the sixteenth century, when Queen Elizabeth I granted a charter to a London Company trading with the East Indies. Eventually the British established a common administration for the whole of the sub-continent with English the language of the educated classes. There were previously at least 200 languages. The British poured millions of pounds of development into the sub-continent, created thousands of miles of railways and vast irrigation systems. When the British withdrew after the Second World War, they were in debt to India, which after the withdrawal partitioned into "India" and "Pakistan" with mass loss in the communal rioting which followed. There has been on-going conflict with Kashmir. Both India and Pakistan have continued to disintegrate as stable societies since the British left.

One of the few influences of British culture left is cricket. At a Washington Anti-Communist conference the Americans present were astonished when an Indian said that large numbers of the Indian people wished that the British Raj would return. In response to questioning the Indian stressed what the British rule of law had meant for the ordinary Indians. "The British protected us against the unscrupulous money-lenders. They ensured that there was justice." He pointed out that the British had eliminated the equivalent of the Italian Mafia, the Thuggees. Since the British left, the practice of suttee - with wives being burned alive on funeral fires with their dead husbands - had started to return.

### **BRITISH CHARACTER AND CULTURE**

Enterprising and resourceful, the British had established themselves, first in North America, and later in Australia and New Zealand. The famous Captain Cook, with his little boat the *Endeavour*, was the symbol of the spirit of the British people. There was such a thing as British character and culture. Wherever they went and settled, the British took their culture and their institutions with them.

The zenith of British power and influence was reached before the end of last century. Writing in *Social Credit*, 1924, C.H. Douglas said, "Making all due allowances for the defects in it which are only too obvious, the Anglo-Saxon character probably remains the greatest bulwark against tyranny that exists in the world today. That is a thesis on which a large number of volumes have been written, and it does not seem necessary to expound it further. But if it be granted, it will be agreed that any attempt, either conscious or unconscious, to establish an effective hegemony over the whole world would be likely to concentrate on such methods as would paralyse the Anglo-Saxon."

The development of Pax Britannica saw the diffusion of the Anglo-Saxon character and the institutions, which the British had evolved over a thousand years. Dr. Bryan Monahan wrote in 1967: "... within the framework of Pax Britannica the Anglo-Saxon character expressed itself in increasing self-determinism,

culminating in one way or another in 'independence', which is simply the formal recognition of self-determination, just as a child gains legal independence on the attainment of its majority." The development of the British Empire as an association of independent nations sharing the same basic institutions and value systems was organic and not centrally planned. This association of nations was economically self-sufficient. When it was proposed during the Great Depression that British Empire nations should establish a system of Empire trade preferences, every form of international pressure was brought to bear to prevent this policy being implemented. This was a clear indication that the forces of Internationalism were not prepared to tolerate any steps towards economic independence for the British world.

### **THE CHALLENGE OF THE FUTURE**

The Achilles heel of the Anglo-Saxon world was that wherever the British had gone, they had attracted the system of debt finance which had been first established in England with the establishment of the Bank of England in 1694. Director Paterson made the frank admission that the bank would have the benefit of the money it had "created out of nothing. Courageous patriots like the self-taught Ploughman's son, William Cobbett, challenged what he correctly described as an evil force destroying the very heart of British society. But along with the evil the traditional British character and culture manifests itself in many ways. It is not without significance that Social Credit, the policy of a philosophy, as described by Douglas, took firm root only within the British nations.

The enemies of the British Empire have achieved their objective of destroying that Empire. But has the culture, which produced that Empire, been so subverted that it lacks the capacity for regeneration? That is now the challenge, which faces the Anglo-Saxon-Celtic peoples everywhere.

---

## **WHY NOT SUBSCRIBE TO *HERITAGE?***

The enlarged quarterly magazine of the Australian Heritage Society, now in colour with outstanding photographs, should be supported by every Australian patriot. The latest issue carries a beautiful photograph of Mayor Peter Davis of Port Lincoln, S.A., enjoying a laugh with Aboriginal singer, Mandurrwy Yanupingu, of the Yothu Yindi Band. Tom Fielder writes of his prisoner of war experiences. Another section of Eric Butler's memoirs recalls the dramatic public meetings, one in Christchurch, New Zealand, when a gun was pointed at him, and the other in Moose Jaw, Saskatchewan, Canada, where he and former RCMP undercover agent Patrick Walsh battled with an organised student riot. A fascinating story on the famous Daisy Bates, who lived with Aborigines for years. And many more absorbing items. Single copy: \$8 posted. But why not take out an annual subscription of \$30? Every issue contains excellent source material for young students. Order direct from *Heritage*, P.O. Box 1035 Midland, Western Australia 6936.

---

# THE MASTERS OF THE NEW RUSSIA

Writing in the May-June 1997 issue of *"The Journal of Historical Review"*, Daniel W. Michaels, a retired American Defence analyst, provides a brilliant assessment of what is happening in the former Soviet Union. After graduating in 1954 from Columbia University, Michaels studied in Germany (1957) with a Fulbright Scholarship. *"The Journal of Historical Review"*, which has been praised by historians of the calibre of David Irving is, beyond doubt, the most prestigious journal of its kind in the world today. It is published by "The Institute for Historical Review", P.O. Box 2739, Newport Beach, C.A. 92659, U.S.A.:

The following is an edited copy of the Michaels article, which shows how Internationalism and Nationalism are locked in combat in the New Russia:

Personifying Russia's new ruling class is Boris Abramovich Berensky, a Jewish business magnate, media mogul and high-ranking government official whom US NEWS & WORLD REPORT calls (Jan. 13, 1997) "the most influential new capitalist tycoon in Russia." His business empire includes a bank, one of the few national television channels, oil concerns and automobile dealerships. (*Forward* [New York] Nov. 22, 1996). After taking advantage of high-level political connections to quickly amass enormous wealth, Berensky provided large sums and favorable media coverage to insure the re-election of President Yeltsin, who then appointed him to the country's National Security Council.

An important step in Berensky's ambitious upward climb was his acquisition of Sibneft, Russia's sixth-largest oil company. He gained this immensely important asset not through honest business practices or competitive bidding, but as a gift of the State Committee for the Management of State Property. Committee head Kokh simply appointed Berensky to take over Sibneft, and President Yeltsin signed the papers to approve the transfer. (*Komsomolskaya Pravda* Moscow, Jan. 25).

Contributing to his image as the stereotypical international capitalist, Berensky ostentatiously roars round Moscow in a dark-blue bulletproof Mercedes 600, protected by a BMW in front, and bodyguards in Mitsubishi jeeps on either side. His private security staff numbers 150, including 20 former KGB technical surveillance specialists.

In the view of the country's "democratic reformers", the US *News A World* article continues, "Berensky and his ilk" have "exploited for personal gain wrongheaded economic reforms that were impoverishing the average man". Berensky has proved that building wealth in the new Russia has much to do with government cronies smoothing the way and little to do with free competition . . . Most disturbing of all to Russian reformers is the impunity with which Berensky has operated. His road to capitalism would have landed him in jail in most civilised countries, but brought no criminal charges in the New Russia.

Berensky, reports the New York Jewish Weekly *Forward* (April 4, 1997), is "among those fabulously wealthy and hugely resented new Russian industrialists - robber barons accused of milking Russia dry - who bankrolled Mr. Yeltsin's presidential campaign, buying the keys to the state". Berensky has publicly boasted that he and six other top businessmen - some of them Jewish - control 50 percent of the Russian economy.

Not long ago Berensky bragged to the London *Financial Times*. "We hired First Deputy Prime Minister Chubais. We invested huge sums of money. We guaranteed Yeltsin's election. Now we have the right to occupy government posts and use the fruits of our victory." (Quoted in *Forward*, April 4, 1997).

An article in a December issue of the American business magazine *Forbes* accuses Berensky of running a criminally

corrupt business organisation. Headlined "Godfather of the Kremlin?" the article concludes, "It sure looks that way."

A major scandal erupted in late 1996, following Yeltsin's appointment of Berensky as deputy chief of Russia's national Security Council (akin to the US National Security Council), when it was revealed that he had acquired Israeli citizenship three years earlier.

Responding to those who questioned the propriety of a wealthy businessman with foreign citizenship holding a highly sensitive security post, "Berensky and a number of television and newspaper journalists in his employ responded with racial demagoguery, accusing his critics of anti-Semitism." Berensky "met with the editors of *Izvestia* for a series of interviews in which he mixed charges of anti-Semitism with thinly-veiled threats of violence." (*Forward*, Nov. 22, 1996) He has even brazenly insisted that Yeltsin has a moral and material obligation to Jewish business in Russia. (*Komsomolskaya Pravda*, Nov.5, 1996).

"Every Jew, regardless of where he is born or lives, is *de facto* a citizen of Israel," Berensky declared in a candid response to his critics. "The fact that I have annulled my Israeli citizenship today in no way changes the fact that I am a Jew and can again become a citizen of Israel whenever I choose. Let there be no illusions about it 'every Jew in Russia is a dual citizen'." (*Segodnya* - "Today" - Nov. 14, 1996).

The Security Committee of Russia's parliament (the Duma) has appealed to Yeltsin to remove Berensky from his sensitive Security Council position on the grounds that his dual Israeli-Russian citizenship legally disqualifies him from occupying the post. According to the Russian Federation's Citizenship law, he could legally occupy this post only on the basis of a specific agreement between Russia and Israel. No such agreement exists. Moreover, the Duma committee contends, Berensky is further disqualified because he has failed to sever his business connections after accepting the position. Finally, before he could be given legal access to classified information, the Federal Security Service would have to investigate and clear him. (*Segodnya*, Moscow, Feb. 19).

With good reason, the well-informed Jewish weekly *Forward* (Nov.22) has expressed concern that Berensky's illicit business activities and his arrogant public statements, as well as President Yeltsin's indulgence of him, may aggravate anti-Jewish sentiment and thereby jeopardise the future of all Russia's Jews:

Given that many of the moguls who backed Mr. Yeltsin's (re-election) campaign, including Mr. Berensky, are Jews, it seemed he was tempting, if not openly inviting, anti-Semitic conspiracy theories . . . Yeltsin's failure to fire Berensky really puts the future of democracy in Russia, and the bizarre situation of the Jews there, in even sharper focus.

## VLADIMIR GUSINSKY

Nearly as rich and as influential as Berezovsky is Vladimir Gusinsky, another immensely wealthy Jewish banker and media magnate who played a key role in re-electing Yeltsin. (*Forward*, April 4, 1997) An outspoken advocate of Jewish interests, Gusinsky is a close ally of presidential chief of staff, Chubais. According to a *Wall Street Journal* report, he has ties to organised crime.

After a meteoric career building *Most Bank*, Gusinsky now devotes his energies to Media-Most, a new media holding company that includes the important MTV television network; a slick television weekly "7 Days"; a popular radio station "Echo of Moscow"; and a weekly news magazine, *Itogi*, which is published in partnership with *Newsweek* (owned by the *Washington Post* company); MTV-Plus satellite television network; and a 100,000-circulation daily newspaper *Sevodnya*, (*The Washington Post*, March 31, 1997.) He also has close connections with international media tycoon Rupert Murdoch.

When Prime Minister Chernomyrdin arrived in Washington D.C., in early February for a meeting with President Clinton, the 44-year-old Gusinski accompanied him. On the day of their arrival, author/journalist Georgie Anne Geyer wrote (*Washington Times*, Feb 6):

On the surface Gusinsky is chairman of the powerful Most Bank and the "independent" Moscow TV ... His bank was on the CIA's recent list of banks with Russian mafia connections. In 1994, Most Bank was the scene of a bitter shoot-out with Mr. Yeltsin's then-favourite KGB General Aleksander Kirzhakov after which Mr. Gusinski and his family temporarily exiled themselves in London. *Most Bank* is also known as a veritable den of former KGB men, and not KGB men from the professional intelligence sections, but from the notorious "Fifth Chief Directorate."

Mr. Gusinsky now has a new role to play. He has had himself named head of the Russian Jewish Congress, and the suspicion is widespread that he will use his growing contacts with the American Jewish community to cry "Discrimination!" whenever anyone dares to criticise his business methods ... We need to recognise what a delicate and dangerous moment this is in Russia when President Yeltsin's life hangs in the balance, and men like Mr. Berezovsky and Mr. Gusinsky are readying to fill the vacuum that will surely open soon. They have talked publicly about using "constitutional means" when the time comes to insure an appointed president rather than new elections (in particular to avoid a victory of the honest General Aleksandr Lebed).

### CRUCIAL JEWISH ROLE

No-one can really understand Russia's tumultuous social, political and economic situation, with its complex contending forces, without an awareness of the role of Jews, both in the past and today, and the popular attitude toward them.

During the Soviet era, Jews played a prominent, perhaps dominant role in the ruling Communist Party and in economic, cultural and academic life. (See M. Weber, *The Jewish Role in the Bolshevik Revolution and the Early Soviet Regime*, Jan-Feb 1994 Journal, pp. 4-14). Today Jews hold conspicuous positions of great wealth and authority. Although they make up perhaps three percent of the total population, Jews wield power vastly disproportionate to their numbers. As the *London Times* noted recently, (Jan 27, 1997):

Permanent Jewish figures today enjoy unprecedented positions of power in politics, the media and the private sector, and have emerged as some of Russia's most creative and talented minds. Boris Berenovsky, the most influential Russian Jew, who holds the post of deputy head of the Security Council as well as controlling a small business empire, even boasted recently that the country was run by seven key bankers, most of them Jewish.

Although anti-Semitism is still a powerful undercurrent in Russian society, and could resurface in the event of a nationalist leader coming to power, for the moment anti-Jewish sentiment is rarely voiced openly.

Besides such business figures as Berezovsky and Gusinsky, a recent *Forward* article (April 4, 1997) cites such high-ranking Jewish government officials as: Boris Nemstov, first deputy prime minister in charge of social welfare, housing reform and restructuring of government monopolies; Yakov Urinson, deputy prime minister for economic affairs; and Aleksandr Livshits, deputy head of Yeltsin's administration.

Anti-Semitism was strictly illegal during the Soviet era. Today anti-Jewish sentiment is not only widespread; it is openly and sometimes forcefully expressed, in spite of Yeltsin government disapproval. Russian newspapers frequently and often emotionally discuss their country's national-ethnic questions, the re-awakening of Russian nationalism, and the role of Jews in society, in terms of an ongoing struggle between nationalism and internationalism. "Isn't it a pity that anti-Semitism is flourishing in Russia today like 'chrysanthemums in a garden'," the frankly nationalist paper *Zavtra* ("Tomorrow") sarcastically comments (No 47, Nov. 1996).

Even Gennady Zyuganov, leader of the reconstituted Communist Party (currently the main opposition political force), has written in his book *I Believe In Russia*:

The ideology, culture and world outlook of the Western world becomes more and more influenced by the Jews scattered around the world. Jewish influence grew not by the day, but by the hour.

Reflecting the widespread bitterness of many Russians is a front-page article in *Zavtra* (Nov. 1996, No. 48), which charges that a group of "13 banker apostles" has gained control of the country. It went on to warn readers: "...The Constitution has been one-third torn to pieces right under your nose in the last five years, and from this day on you will live under the jurisdiction of the Jewish bankers whose wallets protect the thugs of (television stations) ORT and NTV."

Informed Russians are quite aware of America's special relationship with Israel, with the Jewish lobby's mighty influence in the United States, with the preferential treatment given by the US immigration agency (INS) to Jewish immigrants, and with the zealous US concern for Jewish welfare in general. Accordingly, Russian nationalists tend to view Jewish capitalists in their country as quasi-agents of the United States.

Concerned about a possible backlash, many Russian Jews, reports the Moscow correspondent of the *Forward* (April 4, 1997), now says "there are too many Jews in government. There are too many Jewish bankers running the country." Jews fear that with such a conspicuous profile they will be viewed as a group that has grown wealthy through dishonest practices at the expense of the productive working people, and that Russians will blame them for humiliating and ruining the nation. Anyway, a prominent Jewish community notes, "People here

have quite bitter memories of the participation of Jews in the (Bolshevik) revolution." (*Forward*, April 4, 1997).

Writing in *Zaftra* (No. 43, Oct. 1996), analyst Aleksandr Sevastyanov describes the contrasting attitudes of Russians and Jews with regard to Russia's future:

There are many Jews in the country who preach the idea of a new Russian empire for the simple reason that for them Russian imperialism is a synonym for internationalism under new circumstances. Not having succeeded in its time with the Comintern [the Soviet-controlled Communist International], they now say, "let's try an empire." Their idea is a flourishing multinational Russia, where the Russians themselves are not really the rulers.

For us nationalists, this kind of Russia is pure nonsense - not worth our time or our support. Every normal Russian believes in his heart, and rightly so: "We have created this state and we shall rule it." On the other hand, every typical Jew thinks to himself: "Yes, you Russians have created the state, but we Jews shall rule it because we are the elite of the Russian nation, the natural claimants to the role of an imperial people. And we shall do so because we are the richest, the most united, best educated, and the most cultured. If we do not rule Russia, then who?"

And, alas, today, we Russians are not yet in a position even to pretend to an imperial role. The Soviet empire collapsed because the Russian people lost the ability to preserve or prevent the collapse of the great nation they had built up over the centuries. To attempt to recapture its former ruling role, without first recapturing the ethnic strength that made it possible, would be suicidal. Solzhenitsyn is again right when he says: "Any attempt to restore the empire today would be tantamount to burying the Russian people." We must first concentrate on solving the problems that have weakened us as a people. They are, first and foremost, demographic, and only secondarily economic, social, military, cultural and the rest. We must reject all other activities that do not focus on the revitalisation of our people. We cannot permit ourselves to be diverted from our absolutely essential goal, which is ethno-egocentric - not even by the ephemeral lure of empire building.

### **A TIME OF OMINOUS TRANSITION**

Still emerging from seven decades of Soviet rule, Russians are groping toward a new sense of national identity. Not yet having come to grips with its past, this is a land of historical paradox. Thus, Lenin's embalmed corpse is still enshrined in a monumental sarcophagus on Moscow's Red Square, and not a single former Communist official has been brought to trial for Soviet-era crimes.

As Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn has observed, Russia today is neither an authentic political democracy nor a genuine free-market economy. While an ambitious few amass vast fortunes and great power through illicit deals, the country's productive workers, children and elderly suffer. A small oligarchy rules over a population that lives in near-destitution. "Democracy in the true sense of the world does not exist in Russia," writes Solzhenitsyn. He continues:

There exists no legal framework or financial means for the creation of local self-government. People will have no choice but to achieve it through social struggle . . . This system of centralised power cannot be called a democracy . . . The fate of the country is now decided by a stable oligarchy of 150-200

people, which includes the nimbler members of the old Communist system's top and middle ranks, plus the *Nouveaux Riches*... Our present ruling circles have not shown themselves in the least morally superior to the Communists who preceded them . . . Russia is being exhausted by crime, not a single serious crime has been exposed, nor has there been a single public trial . . . This destructive course of events over the last decade has come about because the government, while ineptly imitating foreign models, has completely disregarded the country's innate creativity and singular character as well as Russia's centuries-old spiritual and social conditions.

For the historically minded observer, the parallels between Russia today and Germany during the pre-Hitler Weimar republic years are striking and portentous. In each case, there has been severe economic, political and social upheaval, monetary chaos, substantial loss of territory, and humiliating subordination to foreign powers following the abrupt collapse of a seemingly entranced political regime. Unscrupulous individuals, many of them members of an alien ethnic minority, have exploited their foreign connections and the prevailing disorder to quickly enrich themselves at the expense of the common people. Major media and financial institutions are largely in the hands of people with no national loyalty. In each case, the social dislocation has come with a drastic fall in cultural and moral standards...

As a potentially wealthy country with a proud and illustrious past, it is difficult to imagine that Russians will permit the current miserable and humiliating situation to continue indefinitely. At the same time, it's hard to see how Russia's problems can be mastered without very drastic change.

### **BOOK NOW FOR NATIONAL WEEKEND**

Last year saw the historic 50th anniversary of the establishment of the Australian League of Rights. The future of Australia will have been decided long before the 100th anniversary of the League. The remaining years of the 20th Century will almost certainly be the decisive years, indicating the road, which will be travelled. The theme of this year's National Weekend will be the role of "Practical Christianity" in the process of regeneration. The vital task of the League of Rights in the rising political ferment will be discussed in depth at the National Action Seminar.

There will be exciting and encouraging reports of what is being achieved across the nation. Every actionist must be present. The National Weekend will start with the Annual New Times Dinner, on Friday, October 3rd. Held at the Sheraton Hotel, Spring Street, Melbourne, this will be the usual spiritual feast. Early bookings will be greatly appreciated by the organisers. \$35 per person.

Once again, we stress that arrangements can be made for discounted fares for interstate travellers. Also the best available accommodation rates in Melbourne. But early indications of interest are essential.

# AN UPDATE ON THE NEW EUROPEAN TREATY

The following excellent summary of the latest European Treaty has been prepared by a member of the United Kingdom Settlers' Association, appearing in the July issue of the U.K.S.A. Newsletter. It was prepared by Mr. Walter Winwood following the June meeting of EU Heads of Government in Amsterdam. Those interested in joining the U.K.S.A., or obtaining its informative newsletter, should contact the Secretary, P.O. Box 707, South Yarra, Victoria 3141.

## 1. What was the EU Heads of Government meeting in Amsterdam about?

The Heads of Government, including our Prime Minister, Tony Blair, and Foreign Secretary, Robin Cook, met in Amsterdam on 15th June 1997 to discuss and reach conclusions on a new European Treaty. A draft text was published in Brussels on 20th March 1997, together with a number of key amendments, which have been proposed and circulated by Member States.

## 2. What is the basic aim of the new Treaty?

It is to take major steps towards the creation of a new state. The European Union, instead of being a community of nation states, will become a "legal personality" in its own right, able to act as a single entity in international affairs. For example, it will be able to sign treaties and to conduct negotiations, binding all its constituent Member States. This will be a major further move towards creating a federal European state.

The new Euro state will have its role enhanced by extending the scope of EU lawmaking, increasing the competence of the existing European Court of Justice, which will be renamed the Union Court of Justice. The Council of Ministers will be given powers to impose penalties on any Member State found "in persistent breach of the Treaty" by suspending any of its Treaty rights.

## 3. How are these changes to be achieved?

The new Treaty is likely to have seven main provisions. These are:

A. Most of the remaining powers of national veto in the Council of Ministers will be abolished.

B. More power will be given to the European Parliament so that, in legislative matters, its powers will be equal to that of the Council of Ministers.

C. Immigration and asylum policies will be transferred to Brussels from the governments of the Member States, including the issuing of visas and rulings on admissions.

D. The EU will take over competence to deal with nearly all issues to do with human rights, such as matters to do with discrimination, equality and gender, to which national laws, including the UK Common Law, will become subservient.

E. Europol powers will be substantially extended, requiring standardisation of procedures, training and organisation. Its operations within Member States will increasingly be directed from Brussels, rather than being controlled at national, regional or local level, as has long been the policing tradition in Britain.

F. A European Foreign Office will be established in Brussels, charged with aligning the foreign policies of Member States. There are also proposals to bring defence policy, now discussed in the separate forum of the Western European Union, under the direct control of the European Union.

G. Voting procedures in the Council of Ministers are to be changed to make it possible for "vanguard states" - those that want to merge more quickly into a United States of Europe - to

go ahead without first achieving unanimity among all Member States. This procedure will by-pass the existing veto arrangements. The rules will prohibit any non-vanguard Member State from prejudicing the purposes of such arrangements. It will also require it to accept the rules agreed by the vanguard Members if it decides to join later.

## 4. Are these new changes additional to those proposed in the Maastricht Treaty?

Yes they are. The Maastricht requirements to establish a Single Currency, and Independent European Central Bank, and to impose strict limits on the borrowing requirements of the EU Member States still stand, backed up by the penalties laid down in the Stability Pact agreed at Dublin in December 1996.

## 5. How much difference are these proposals likely to make to Britain's ability to act independently in world affairs?

If very substantial further powers are acquired by the European Union at the expense of the countries making up the Union, it clearly will make it much more difficult for Member States to pursue their own separate policy goals. It will also make it difficult for them to regain recognition of their status as sovereign nationals in the international community. For example:

A. For how long will Britain or any of the other fifteen Member States continue to be represented on the International Monetary Fund if they no longer possess a national currency?

B. Can we or any of the EU Member States play a significant part in the World Bank if more than half of our aid programmes are channelled through the European Development Fund?

C. If the EU has a single foreign policy and a single defence policy, how can Britain or France be accepted as permanent members, with the power of veto, on the Security Council of the United Nations?

D. The Commonwealth is an association of sovereign states. Can Britain, subject to a single European foreign policy, continue to operate as an independent member state?

## 6. Were all these issues discussed during the recent general

### **"THE TRAP"**

*by Sir James Goldsmith*

The late Sir James Goldsmith was a most unusual man. Given the background of the Anglo-French billionaire, his views on a wide range of subjects are astonishing. A born gambler, he was sent to Eton College by his father, but asked to leave after winning \$8,000 on a horse-racing bet. Polish Roman Catholic leaders were astonished to find that the views of the agnostic and much-married Goldsmith on how to regenerate Poland, were similar to the social teachings of the Church.

election?

Unfortunately, none of the major parties discussed any of these issues seriously during the general election.

**7. Where does this leave Britain in Amsterdam?**

Britain is going to be faced with an extremely difficult problem. Many of the proposals in the new Treaty were barely mentioned in the general election. They were not in any of the manifesto commitments produced by the Labour Party.

Many of the proposals are clearly going to be unpopular with the electorate. Opinion polls in Britain show that the public is less and less enthusiastic about further moves towards a United States of Europe.

**8. Could the Amsterdam Treaty proposals be turned down by other Member States?**

The proposals to be discussed were aired at the Dublin Summit in December 1996, and it was clear then that there was a wide measure of support for most of them among the other Member States. Britain was almost on its own in opposing nearly all of them.

**9. If Britain signed up to the Amsterdam Treaty, would this be irreversible?**

The rule of the unwritten British constitution is that what one Parliament decides, a successor Parliament can repeal. With European legislation there is no such provision.

It is intended to be permanent. The only way of reversing EU law in Britain would be the repeal of the relevant sections of the 1972 Accession Treaty between Britain and what was then the EEC, which provides the legal underpinning for EU law in Britain.

The stakes are therefore very high.

---

## ACTOR MEL GIBSON HITS OUT

In a recent interview with the United States magazine, *Vanity Fair*, well-known actor Mel Gibson, charged that former Australian Prime Minister Bob Hawke oversaw the destruction of the Australian economy. He mentioned the role of the Fabian Society. Gibson is quoted as saying, ". . . why go in and take a country with a bayonet when you can use the banking system?" Describing what he claimed happened under Bob Hawke, Mel Gibson said, "A country with a triple A credit rating is now economically pretty sad", observing that "these problems were looked upon as a lot of bumbling and incompetence. But in fact they were quite well conceived, and carried off . . . It took 20 or 30 years for a country with the highest credit rating in the world, with 98 per cent of all known natural resources and only a population of 15 million, to be really ruined. So. I mean it couldn't have been done better if it was purposeful. "

Mel Gibson is reported as saying that people thought he was crazy when he started alluding to 'recurring patterns' he saw developing in the world economy.

It will be interesting, and perhaps revealing, to see how the critics treat his coming film bearing the significant title, *Conspiracy Theory*. If the film is as good as Gibson's *Braveheart*, it deserves the widest possible viewing. It could

prove to be one of those unrehearsed events which the global planners fear.

---

## ISRAEL CONTINUES TO DEFY THE UNITED NATIONS

Having established itself in the Middle East, with the backing of the Soviet Union and the USA, Zionist Israel has over the years defied even the resolutions of the United Nations, which endorsed its legitimacy. The UN has again passed a resolution censoring Israel for continuing to illegally build homes for Jewish settlers. As in the past, while administering a little harmless verbal wrist slapping, the USA refuses to support any type of sanctions against Israel. This attitude reflects the fact that the American government is subservient to the forces of Political Zionism.

The special international status of Jerusalem was agreed to at the UN in 1947, when the UN's General Assembly Resolution, called for Jerusalem "to be considered a *corpus separatum* under the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations." Zionist leaders accepted this proposal. But it was violated by Israel during the 1967 Middle East war. In his 1984 Apostolic Letter, *Redemptionis Anno*, Pope John Paul II advocated the granting to Jerusalem of "an internationally guaranteed special status." The 1983 re-establishment of diplomatic relations between the Vatican and Israel resulted in the signing of a "Fundamental Agreement", in which in Article 4 it was agreed that both the Vatican and Israel supported a continuation of the "status quo" in the Christian holy places.

But the agreement was violated when Israel indicated that it was going to authorise the building of Jewish settlements in East Jerusalem. There was widespread international condemnation of the Israeli policy, the matter being brought before the UN Security Council on March 7 and March 21 of this year. An emergency session of the General Assembly was held on April 24 and April 25. The Vatican reaffirmed its agreement that Jerusalem must have an international status.

In a classical example of Israeli double talk, the Israeli diplomatic representative in Australia claims that the Bar Homa settlement "is not a Jewish settlement, but a Jewish neighbourhood located within the municipal boundaries of Jerusalem." Israel is not a sovereign power in Jerusalem but a military occupier. Israel has violated the city's legal status and UN resolutions. With brazen effrontery Zionist propagandists continue to refer to what are illegal Jewish settlements as "Jewish neighbourhoods", all the while claiming that they wish to continue "peace negotiations" with the Palestinians. In the meantime the illegal building of Jewish settlements continue. This is provoking outrage among the Palestinians who find that in the face of Washington's refusal to defy the forces of political Zionism UN resolutions count for nothing. It is not surprising that the unfortunate Palestinians resort to acts of violence.

Peace and stability will never be established in the Middle East until the Zionist thorn is removed. And the continuing Middle East ferment threatens the whole of the world.

# IS THE PAULINE HANSON FACTOR WANING?

As we have pointed out previously, the Pauline Hanson factor is unprecedented in Australian politics. A combination of factors has been responsible. But the nature of the phenomenon has made it vulnerable to subversion. The political strategy being adopted by Pauline Hanson and her advisers does not reflect political realities. The building of a successful political party cannot be done overnight. When Sir Robert Menzies created the Liberal party, he and some extremely able strategists were building on party structures, which were already in place. Pauline Hanson, without political experience, is starting "from scratch".

The Democratic Labor Party emerged as a result of the famous "split" in the Labor Party, lead by men who were already politicians and who had had considerable experience in political organising. At no time did the DLP look like obtaining government, state or federally, but its preferences kept the Liberals in office for many years, and forced some changes in policy. During the years the DLP held the balance of power in the Senate under the leadership of the late Frank McManus, it made valuable contributions on defence and foreign policy issues. The main base of the DLP was in Victoria, where the influence of Melbourne Roman Catholic Archbishop Dan Mannix and the organisational skills of National Civic Council leader B. A. Santamaria, were major factors.

A combination of factors, one being the retirement of Menzies, led to the erosion of support for the Liberal Party and the electoral successes of the Labor party, first under Whitlam and then Bob Hawke.

The emergence of Don Chipp's Australian Democrats was the result of the Democrats being led by a man who had been a Federal Minister, who also had considerable organisational ability, and came forward at a time when large numbers of the electors had been disillusioned with both the major political parties. It was Don Chipp's Senate vote, which prevented Federal Treasurer John Howard from imposing one of the most iniquitous taxes ever proposed in Australia, a Sales Tax on literature of all kinds. The role of the League of Rights in defeating the Howard tax has yet to be told.

There was a time when the Australian Country Party, later to become the National Party, although a minor member of Coalition parties, first with the United Australia Party and later the Liberal Party, played a more independent role in politics. Sir John McEwen was the last Federal leader of the Country-National Party who played a major role in shaping federal policies. Even Menzies had to heed John McEwen. The decline of the influence of the National Party started with National Party leaders supporting the finance-economic policies, which eroded their electoral base, rural Australia. Today's National Party, led by the pathetic Tim Fischer, has completely surrendered its original philosophy of nationalism, and has embraced the philosophy of internationalism. Its death is only a matter of time.

While the dismal record of the Liberal-National Coalition is

witnessing a small recovery in support for the Labor Party, the overall political situation is one in which a large section of the community has no real faith in any of the present political parties. Pauline Hanson has acted like a catalyst in this situation, talking about the questions, which concern large numbers of people. But it is not surprising that electoral support has appeared to ebb from the initial high level of support. The present level of support, as measured by the public opinion polls, suggests that a Hanson team could elect several members of the Senate. Not surprisingly, the polls indicate that her strongest support is in Queensland. But Pauline Hanson would be well advised to observe carefully that electoral support in her own electorate of Oxley has slipped to a dangerously low level. The new boundaries do not appear to assist her.

If Pauline Hanson is receiving realistic political advice, it is essential that she is not projected as the leader of a new party which can turn Australia around overnight. The much more politically experienced Graeme Campbell, with his Australia First party, is not making this mistake. He has correctly assessed that large numbers of Australians, perhaps the majority, are now completely cynical about all politicians, asking, "How can you trust any of them?" Campbell has met this question honestly, agreeing that the electors have every justification for being cynical, and having as one of the "core policies" of Australia First a constitutional mechanism similar to that of the Swiss constitution, which enables electors to veto by referendum any legislation of which they disapprove.

Pauline Hanson can take credit for having helped to generate a grass roots movement, which, together with events, is forcing the Howard government to modify its attitude towards both immigration and tariffs. But there is still a long way to go, and it is hoped that Pauline Hanson and her advisers do not make the mistake of believing that any political party is an end in itself. If they are to be of real value to the individual, parties should be seen as one of the means assisting individuals to get what they want.

---

## CANADIAN WEEKEND

Eric and Elma Butler will be guests of honour at the Canadian Weekend in Alberta, to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the publication of Ron Gostick's "Canadian Intelligence Service". Eric Butler will give the first Paper at the Seminar on Saturday, October 18th. He will speak on "The History of the League of Rights and Its Vision". Well-known journalist Doug Collins and famous criminal lawyer Doug Christie will also be speaking. North American New Times readers may contact Mr. Eric Boswell, Brooks, Alberta, for information concerning the Albertan Weekend.

Following the Canadian programme, Eric Butler will make a short visit to meet with British Social Crediters before returning to Australia via Western and South Australia. In late November he will address both the Perth and Adelaide Conservative Clubs.