

THE NEW TIMES

\$25 per annum

Box 1052J, Melbourne.

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

VOL. 62 No. 8

Registered Australia Post - Publication PP481667 100259

AUGUST 1998

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

BLEEDING THE BUSH

by Jeremy Lee

Australian farming outperforms other sectors of the economy. With about 100,000 primary producers left, and a total employment in the industry of 373,000 or 1.1 percent of the workforce, the gross value of production in 1995-96 was \$27.23 billion, of which \$21.3 billion was exported. This represented 28.3 percent of Australia's merchandise exports.

Yet the decline in farm numbers continues, despite the fact that Tim Fischer and John Anderson are 'listening'. *The Sydney Morning Herald*, (May 26 1998) reported:

"NSW is leading Australia's decline in farm numbers, with 20 percent of agricultural enterprises on the coastal strip and central north shutting down in the ten years to 1994-95. Since 1985-86, the rate of decline of the State's broad-acre farms has totalled 1.8 percent (national average 1.7), dairy farms 3 percent, horticulture 1.9 percent and others 0.9 percent - for a total decline of 1.8 percent (1.3 percent).

"But rather than severe drought or sudden market collapses forcing the State's farmers from their properties, NSW is at the centre of a progressive, nationwide structural adjustment in the rural sector, according to a joint study by the Australian Bureau of Agricultural and Resource Economics (ABARE) and the Australian Bureau of Statistics.

"Increasing numbers of farmers - no longer able to provide adequate family incomes because of changes resulting from global pressure for open-market economies - are either increasing the size of their holdings to provide a larger earning base or getting out of farming ..."

So what's new? Precisely the same comments were being made a quarter of a century ago when Doug Anthony took over leadership of the National Party, and the slogan "*Get Big or Get Out*" echoed through rural areas. The only difference is that we had over 250,000 primary producers then, rather than the declining 100,000 of the late nineties. Nothing has been learned. The real issues have been avoided. Rural Australia is collapsing.

WITHDRAWAL OF BANK SERVICES

The rural retreat is fast becoming a rout. Medical services are diminishing daily. Small country hospitals, once the pride of local communities, are either closing or having their ability

to operate curtailed, while the giant mega-hospitals in metropolitan centres suffer impossible demands, plus major funding crises. Country schools see the number of teachers reduced as pupil numbers diminish. Transport and small manufacturing wind down.

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.

The latest blow is the withdrawal of banking facilities. Local country businesses are either forced into all the inconvenience of electronic banking, hated by older members of the community; or driving long distances to larger centres to service cash requirements.

A major report by Dr Diana Beal and Deborah Ralston, of the Centre for Australian Institutions at the University of Southern Queensland has highlighted the trauma caused to local communities as the last bank branch closes. Headed "ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL IMPACTS OF THE CLOSURE OF THE ONLY BANK BRANCH IN RURAL COMMUNITIES", the survey covered five country towns in northern New South Wales, and two in southern Queensland. It said, "Over recent years the number of bank branches in rural communities has declined significantly, and figures suggest that perhaps as many as one in three major bank branches in rural communities were closed over the period 1993 to 1996."

The Survey made the following comments:

" . . . Many rural communities in Australia enjoyed their most populous period of the last 100 years in the time before World War I. That was a time for optimism, railway branch lines were being enthusiastically financed and built, farms were small, and the economics of farming were such that the average farm could support the farm family plus one or more workers and their families. Communities could support a relatively great number of businesses and government services. Better roads and road transport killed the branch railways, mechanisation on farms reduced the need for labour and, post World War II, ever declining terms of trade forced farmers to reduce further their labour forces. As a result, small towns have progressively lost many of the businesses and services they once enjoyed.

"Within this context of progressive decline, having a bank branch can be imbued with great importance in peoples' minds as an icon of the town's viability. 'A good bank manager makes a good town and confident people'.

"Respondents to the Survey were asked if the closure of the bank had made them more pessimistic about the future viability of their town. Approximately 90% of respondents indicated that they were now more pessimistic. As a follow up to this question, people were asked if they would leave the town if the opportunity arose, and thus transpose their negative feelings into action. 39% of those respondents reported that they would if they could . . . The loss of community confidence and the growth in negative feelings about the towns reinforce the trend towards physical decline. Further loss of population, services and businesses becomes almost inevitable. Between 82% and 93% of respondents thought the closure of the bank branch would contribute to loss of population, loss of businesses and services, consequent decrease in property values, reduced employment opportunities and lower community confidence..."

SITUATION ANTICIPATED

The withdrawal of customer service by the banks is not peculiar to Australia. The Survey commented:

" . . . The closure of bank branches has accelerated worldwide and is a discernible trend in recent years. Stael (1995) and Denny (1995) predicted half the retail bank branches in the US and the UK respectively would be closed in the next 5-10 years. Australian banks are following a similar trend..."

To those who do not understand the real nature of banking this trend seems inexplicable. If banks make their living from the differential between interest paid on deposits and those charged for loans, why on earth would they withdraw a service that seems essential to the process?

The truth is that banks make their living in an entirely different way - by the creating out of nothing of the community's credit, with immense compounding charges for the resulting debt. Until the electronic age, customer service was a necessary, if tiresome, part of the process, for the accumulation of a cash, or liquidity base was the governing factor in the amount of credit that could subsequently be created.

But electronic banking and 'smart' card technology has meant that notes and coins play an increasingly insignificant role in bank transactions, and it is anticipated will eventually be phased out altogether. Once cash ceases to exist, the need for a banker and his customer to meet face to face in the normal business of transactions will be gone. Even automatic teller machines (ATMs), which spit out paper in response to a card and the right PIN, will be phased out. Transactions will simply be recorded by electronic transfer without any need for wallets, purses or even pockets!

In the intervening period, banks are only too happy to hand the day-to-day business of customer service over to licenced agents such as building societies or credit unions, so long as they can retain the monopoly on final deposits and the creation of fresh loans. If this can be achieved, the banks will have the best of all worlds. They will have not only a national, but a global monopoly on the creation of money, without which no person will live. The creation process will be virtually costless. It will have shed itself of any need to provide customer service. Computer systems will record every transaction, anywhere in the world, from centralised 'banking bunkers', charging a fee for every transaction. The business of loans, whether for housing, businesses or consumer spending, will be transacted by "agents", in the form of credit unions and other such societies, which receive small margins from the banks for taking over the burden of face-to-face negotiation. Bank directors, and to a lesser extent, shareholders, relieved of all chores except the preparation of annual balance sheets and the distribution of corporate bonuses and dividends, will be able to abandon themselves to the ultimate 'good life'!

POST-CASHAGE

This scenario has, of course, been widely discussed in banking circles. Australia's *Business Review Weekly* (April 29, 1996) in a feature article "MONEY'S ON ITS METAL IN THE POST-INDUSTRIAL AGE" carried the sub-heading: "As we move towards regional currencies and finally a global currency, money will become less a commodity and more a sign of value in a network." It added:

"There is an impending decline in traditional banking services, with electronic forms of money likely to make financial services considerably more complex and volatile. David Amdal, a consultant on financial product development, says banking services are 'out of sync' with customers . . . Banks are hampered by having to sustain substantial retail outlets. He says an over-the-counter transaction in a bank costs about \$2.80, an electronically lodged transaction costs about 23 cents. This

leaves the banks with the heavy cost burden associated with physical infrastructure . . . 'Customers are cynical and feeling powerless. People are also less interested in credit: they are realising what a trap borrowing is. The banks have a real problem in terms of finding their role in an enormously changing environment . . . Size now has very little to do with being competitive; you are already seeing credit cards with companies like General Motors and Telstra and Sony..."

(This is pure deception! A Telstra or Sony card does NOT mean that the company can now compete with banks in creating money in the form of credit. It simply means that these companies have been 'licenced' by the banks as agents in the business of offering special, company-oriented services.)

The article went on:

" . . . The second fundamental change is the internationalisation of money . . . Peter Ellyard, executive director of Preferred Futures, says one consequence will be a decline in the hegemony of the nation-state and the eventual demise of national currencies. National Governments already are unable to control their domestic money supplies except through the imposition of interest mechanisms.

"He says: 'the pirates in the financial markets are now able to bankrupt entire countries. We saw that recently with the United Kingdom during the Exchange rate Mechanism crisis. It will mean that we will see a move into regional currencies - such as the Eurodollar - and ultimately into a global currency. The role of national governments will be handed over to regions.' More than 60% of international trade and financial activity is undertaken by multinational companies that represent an economy equivalent in size to the US economy but which has little allegiance to domestic considerations. Ellyard says most international contracts for these companies will be written in US dollars, yen or Eurodollars, which will become either a de facto (or ultimately an actual) world currency. The control of these currencies will be in the hands of just a few players: the US Treasury, the Japanese Finance Department. But national governments won't want to cede that kind of control'."

WILL THERE BE CASH?

As the ruthless direction of globalism is spewing out the weak and helpless - the depopulation of rural Australia is an example - we come face-to-face with the question discussed at Mikhail Gorbachev's "State of the World Forum", held at San

Francisco's Fairmont Hotel at the end of September 1995. 500 corporate chiefs, politicians and bankers from across the world discussed the issue which no national politician dares mention - that, soon after the end of the century, a small number of multinationals, with economies bigger than many nation-states, will have enough technology at their disposal to produce all the world's productive requirements with less than 20 percent of the world's workforce. The majority of the world's population will live in poverty - even though there is more than enough for all to have a decent standard of living. The Gorbachev meeting is graphically described in Martin's "*The Global Trap*".

The scenario relates to these comments in the *Business Review* article:

"More sinister is a potential divergence between industrial approaches to money and post-industrial types of money. Ellyard says cash, the industrial form of money, will be confined to poorer people or countries, while electronic credit, the post-industrial form of money, will be available only to the rich. If money increasingly becomes a network rather than a tangible object of value, a pressing ethical question will be: Who gets entry to the network?

"Ellyard says: "Cash will survive in countries that are not equitable, while credit will become the form of money in countries that are more equitable. So in countries such as Bangladesh and Iran there will be huge black economies dominated by cash used by poor people to get outside the traditional tax system. The rich will use credit . . . Tony Stevenson, secretary-general of the World Futures Studies Federation, says bartering will become more common. "I think you will see more of a bartering system to get round taxation, such as the LETS system that now operates in Australia..."

But who will print the notes and mint the coins in this 'alternative' cash system? Under the Constitution, the printing of notes and coins is the exclusive prerogative of the Commonwealth Government. The Banks have decided to operate a system in which cash and coin is no longer required. They have a monopoly of the system, which distributes or circulates money. If they decide Australians don't need cash, what is the Government going to do?

It may be that the withdrawal of banking facilities from local country towns will force communities - and local councils - to address this question by devising alternative systems in the interests of survival.

THE 1998 NEWTIMES DINNER

The 52nd *New Times* dinner will be held on Friday October 2nd, at the Sheraton Hotel, Spring Street, Melbourne. The dinner is primarily a traditional League 'family' affair, and the organisers reserve the right to query or refuse any booking. Early bookings will assist organisers, which should be accompanied by the fee of \$35.00 per person. Every effort will be made to seat guests with selected friends, and a first class dinner is anticipated.

In view of the proposed 1999 republican referendum, the Saturday Seminar - the theme *Freedom Wears a Crown* - together with the Sunday Action Conference, will be of extraordinary importance. The League is firmly of the view that the republican assault can be defeated, and is now preparing the ground to take a vital part in the battle. But it will need a clear understanding of first principles, and a grasp of effective grass roots campaigning in which the League specialises. Attendance of this year's National weekend is therefore of heightened importance, and every monarchist actionist should be present if possible. Preparations are under way to present a first class panel of Seminar speakers. We urge supporters to mark their diaries, and make their plans. Some private accommodation can be arranged on a first-in-first-placed basis.

CANADA AND THE G.S.T.

Canada's dollar is currently falling faster than Australia's. It suffers the same debt crisis, the same loss of farmers and small businesses, and the increasing domination of multinationals. The introduction of a GST in 1991 has done nothing to bring increased prosperity to a country which the World Bank listed in September 1995 as the second richest country in the world - second only to Australia.

The World Bank did not mean that Canada or Australia were 'in the black'; that there were no debts and the coffers were full. The World Bank survey dealt simply with natural assets, or God-given advantages.

At a time when Australia is once more considering the pros and cons of a GST, some of the lessons of Canada should be instructive.

Prior to the introduction of the tax, Canadian polls showed almost 80 percent of citizens opposed to the tax. A new industry was spawned as an innovative company began producing protest badges saying *Gouge-and-Screw Tax*. They appeared across Canada.

Neil Brooks, of the Osgoode Hall Law School in Toronto, commented:

"In the first few years at least, there was wide agreement that the introduction of the GST in Canada had been a major disaster."

The Australian Financial Review (August 18, 1998) said of the Canadian experience:

"While the tax was installed after months of Senate wrangling, it brought down the Government at the next election, replacing it with a party which had as a core election promise the abolition of the GST. Seven years on and Canada still has its GST, but a Professor of Law at Deakin University, Rick Krever, says the experience in his former country shows there are very high political risks in introducing a GST.

The APR quoted from a section Brooks had written on the Canadian experience in a forthcoming book about overseas consumption taxes, *"Tax Reform and the GST: an international perspective"*:

"In Canada they had a GST and income tax cuts, but nobody got the connection as they don't happen at the same time - you see the price rise at the checkout but don't realise the tax cuts

mean more money in the pay cheque. And by selling the GST as a panacea for everything - employment, exports and economic growth - if there is an economic downturn, the GST will be blamed for everything . . . The only political interest groups in Canada that favoured its introduction were those representing big business. The tax was bitterly opposed by trade unions, social policy organisations, consumer groups, small business, opposition political parties and provincial governments. Indeed, the GST was one of the most unpopular policies implemented by a federal government in Canada's history.

Before it became law a Canadian Senate Standing Committee held hearings throughout the summer of 1990. Brooks commented:

"To give some idea of the continued opposition to the GST, of the 370 witnesses the Committee heard, only 32 gave unqualified support to the GST . . . To get the Bill through the Senate, the Conservative Government had to invoke a never-before used provision of the Canadian Constitution to add eight extra Senators to the Senate.."

The Party, which introduced the Bill, the Progressive Conservatives, were annihilated at the following election, going from 169 seats in Canada's House of Commons to two. Power was transferred to the Liberal Party, which had campaigned on the promise of abolishing the GST. But the GST is still there. Canadians, it seems, suffer the same broken promise approach from their politicians as Australians.

Big business and the International Monetary Fund want the GST. That, it seems, is enough to ensure that popular opinion is overlooked, and that party politicians tow the line.

But using tax revenue to fund the "big sell" is a new step forward, even in the sorry mess that passes for contemporary politics.

WORLD DEBT CRISIS AND THE CHURCH

The world debt crisis is reaching critical mass. From Russia through Asia and the Third World, the business of rescheduling debts that have already been rescheduled umpteen times is no longer valid.

Kevin Watkins, a senior policy adviser for the international development and relief agency OXFAM, made some pertinent comments in a recent issue of *The Guardian* (UK):

"In the land of the blind, the one-eyed man is king - and when it comes to addressing problems in the crisis-prone global financial system, the one-eyed men of Wall Street and the International Monetary Fund are firmly in control.

During the 1990s, the destructive power of capital markets has been seen in Mexico, East Asia and Russia. The scenario has become all too familiar. Unexplained euphoria takes hold and sucks vast sums into unstable markets, generating huge profits for foreign investors. Then panic takes hold, capital takes flight, the currency collapses - and the IMF springs into action, bailing

out foolhardy investors, leaving behind economic collapse and social disintegration . . . Today the IMF is being revolutionised. Countries borrowing from the fund will be required to liberalise their financial systems; the upshot will be an unprecedented transfer of sovereignty to global markets, dominated by Wall Street's increasingly monopolistic conglomerates . . . Take the case of Indonesia. This year, the economy will contract by 15 to 20 percent, dragging another 40 million into poverty. Investment has collapsed, due to high interest rates and import shortages. Unemployment has tripled to more than 20 percent.

Thousands of private companies, viable before the crisis, have been pushed into bankruptcy. Meanwhile, public spending on health and education has fallen by a third, as the Government transfers resources into debt repayments. . . Commercial banks ignored clear warnings and increased lending to the country by 20 percent during the first half of 1997, with more than half of the new lending in high-interest loans of short maturity.

When a forced devaluation quadrupled Indonesia's external debt, the IMF loan secured repayments for foreign investors by nationalising foreign debt and transferring the costs of adjustment to the public budget, reversing more than three decades of poverty reduction in the process . . . In the case of East Asia, the authority of the IMF should have been used to force foreign investors to accept very large debt write-offs, and an immediate moratorium on repayments. It should not be used to subordinate the interests of the world's poor to those of Wall Street" (*end of quote*)

Finally, and half a century later than it should have been, sections of the Christian church are beginning to focus on an evil which has 800 million of the world's people living on the edge of starvation, with a death-toll of 35,000 a day.

The Australian (October 15, 1991) reported the remarks of His Holiness the Pope in South America:

"The Pope hit out yesterday at the kind of financial austerity plans imposed on debt-ridden nations by foreign lending institutions such as the International Monetary Fund. 'One must state firmly, so that the whole world hears it, that a country's

foreign debt can never be paid at the expense of the hunger and poverty of its people,' he told a meeting of Brazil's bishops..." More recently, 800 bishops of the Anglican faith met at Lambeth Palace under the chairmanship of the Archbishop of Canterbury during July and August of this year. A major item on the agenda was Third World debt. It remains to be seen what will eventuate.

Also this year, the Evangelical Alliance has committed itself to a programme JUBILEE 2000, aimed at the cancellation of debt in the Third World. The National Director, Steve Bradbury, described the project thus in the Alliances's magazine TEAR:

"... Jubilee 2000 is a movement of Christians round the world who are demanding urgent action, and TEAR Australia wants you to be part of it. TEAR Australia is aiming to gather 40,000 signatures for an international petition urging a one-off cancellation of the backlog of unpayable debt for the world's poorest countries. This would change millions of lives, without taking away the responsibility of debtors to pay their future debts

Some will say this does not go nearly far enough. But even this limited objective can never be attained without direct confrontation with those who have mortgaged the world. The church will succeed or fail on the depth of its preparedness to confront evil.

Those interested in more information, or participation, should write to TEAR Australia, P.O. Box 289, Hawthorn, Victoria, 3122

INDIGENOUS AUSTRALIANS

When the Independent Member for Oxley, Pauline Hanson, passed the remark that she was an "indigenous Australian", she was scorned by the politically correct, and ridiculed. However, many others who remain unmoved by the professional guilt industry find it irritating when it is implied that aborigines are *real* Australians, and others are merely the offspring of European settlers, or "immigrants". Those who speak for the aborigines refer to them as 'indigenous Australians', which places the stamp of authenticity upon a race of people who claim aboriginal heritage, often ignoring their European heritage in the process.

The deliberate perversion of the meaning of words has a destabilising effect upon those who use them. The word 'gay' once meant something beautiful, while to 'discriminate' once meant to use good judgment. A study of the word 'indigenous' provides a similar example of misused meaning.

Mr. Bill Withers, a freelance journalist from Kununurra, in the north of Western Australia, recently raised this issue. If you claim Australian citizenship by virtue of being born in Australia, you are regarded as 'Australian'. Some who claim this status also claim aboriginal heritage, whether such heritage is exclusively aboriginal, or partly European. They are still 'Australians'.

CONFUSING SEMANTICS

However, those claiming aboriginal heritage also claim 'indigenous' status, and in general, deny such status to other Australians, irrespective of their birthplace. What does the term 'indigenous' mean? Withers provides the Latin root of the word: *Indu* (in) and *gignere* (born). Of the semantics involved, Withers writes:

"In recent times an increasing number of academics and journalists use the words 'indigenous people' to refer solely to Australian aborigines. They would be correct in referring to the Australian aborigines as indigenous people, but they are not correct in referring to aborigines as the sole indigenous people of Australia.

"Even the Australian Macquarie Dictionary is erroneously presumptuous in describing 'aborigine' as if it is etymologically defensible, it is not. The Latin words 'ab origine' described the first known inhabitants of Latium and Italy. It later became 'aboriginal' to describe the original inhabitants of any country.

THE INDIGENES

"Despite the roots and meaning of 'aborigine' in other English-speaking countries, the word 'aborigine' is definitive in the Australian Macquarie Dictionary and the Australian Statues. It is not stated that indigenous people are aborigines because that would be incorrect.

"You may not be an aborigine, but if you are an Australian citizen, born in Australia, *then you are indigenous to Australia* ..."

Thus, if "indigenous" status is confined to those of aboriginal heritage (however slight), then the question arises; to which country are you indigenous? Are you a native of any country other than Australia? If a person of aboriginal *and* European heritage describes himself as 'indigenous', is he not conferring this status upon his European heritage with just as much validity as his aboriginal heritage?

THE QUIET DEBATE

One of the quietest debates taking place in Australia today has to do with the original inhabitants of the continent. It is a quiet debate because there is speculation among archaeologists and others that the aborigines as we know them, were unlikely to be the *original* inhabitants. There is evidence that other groups preceded the aborigines, and were perhaps either driven out, killed off or absorbed by the aborigines.

Recent attention has been given to an amazing collection of rock art in the Kimberley area of W.A., known as the Bradshaws. This was named after Joseph Bradshaw, the first European known to have seen the paintings, who observed some of them in 1891. In an archaeological sense, the artwork is stunning, and in Europe would have been the centre of immense interest, and intense study. But the Bradshaws have attracted very little attention. Why?

Perhaps it has something to do with the stark difference between these paintings and other tribal rock art. The Bradshaws are clearly far superior, according to those who have studied them. Not only this, but they depict a much more advanced culture than the present aboriginal culture, and include one intriguing painting of an *ocean-going craft* thought to have been painted some thousands of years before Europeans came here.

THE BRADSHAWS

The best-informed Bradshaw expert, Grahame Walsh, who has devoted his life to finding and studying them, believes that the people who painted them came from overseas many

thousands of years ago - perhaps even pre-dating aboriginal settlement. Walsh takes the view (*The Australian Magazine*, 18/7/98) that these early Australians were technically and socially sophisticated. Not only would it have taken a high degree of co-operation to build, sail and navigate such ocean-going boats, but a high degree of organisation and mutual trust.

ADVANCED CULTURE?

Further, "if abundance of rock art in the region is an accurate reflection, a significant part of the Bradshaw people's free time was devoted to art. Hunting, fishing and gathering, the stuff of survival, was probably the responsibility of the non-artists . . . Making paint and brushes - in some cases building scaffolding to reach rock faces high above ground level - and developing technique must have required enormous collective commitment...."

Academic interest and government funding to research this rich catalogue of human history, which may tell us so more about the settlement of Australia, has not been forthcoming. There is obviously political sensitivity about the issue.

WHO WAS FIRST?

Last year the Ngarinyin people from near Broome claimed the Bradshaws as a part of their living culture at UNESCO headquarters in Paris. But Billy King, reported to be one of the region's most senior aboriginal elders, angrily rejects both the claim, and the delegation as representatives of his people. Until about five years ago, no one talked about the Bradshaws, even among the aborigines, and King claims that his people know little about them.

It is almost certain that the political sensitivities to the Bradshaws come from the suggestion that aborigines were not necessarily the 'first' inhabitants. It may eventually be demonstrated that they, like the Europeans some thousands for years later, were settlers, colonists, or horror of horrors, *conquerors*. Does this mean that even the aborigines may not be "indigenous"?

GLOBALISM AND THE CANADIAN EXPERIENCE

"Nothing in recent years has been more saddening than the spectacle of Prime Minister Chretien and senior ministers beating the foreign bushes for increased investment in Canada instead of staying at home and spanking the banks to make them provide adequate credit to Canadian entrepreneurs. Canada already has one of the highest levels of foreign ownership in the industrialised world, second only to Australia, and the costs are enormous. They will be even greater in the years ahead. Furthermore, according to a United Nations report called the World Investment Report, about two-thirds of mergers and acquisitions in Canada for the 1991-93 period involved foreign investors. The immediate result of this activity is more down-sizing with a loss of jobs. The long-term result is a greater outflow of profits, interest, dividends and royalties - a drain on our foreign exchange reserves we can ill afford..." (Page 84).

"Globalism is simply a code word to camouflage what is really going on. Globalisation is not about trade, as its promoters would have us believe, it is about power and control. It is an

attempt by the largest international banks and multinational corporations to run the world their way, for their own benefit and by their own set of rules, rules that would allow them to undo a century of social progress and to alter the distribution of income from inequitable to inhuman. In fact the empire they plan would be an evil empire in the truest sense. It would be an empire where individual countries, especially the smaller ones, would lose the flexibility to pass good and humane laws in the interests of all the people. Gold would be absolute monarch and goodness a mark of disloyalty.

This evil empire is not a figment of the imagination. Plans are well advanced and it will be a reality unless we take immediate steps to stop it..." (Foreword).

The quotes above from "THE EVIL EMPIRE - GLOBALIZATION'S DARKER SIDE", by Paul Hellyer, former senior Cabinet Minister, House of Commons, Canada published by Chimo Media Ltd. Toronto. ISBN 0-96944394-5-8 \$16 posted from all League bookshops.

THE VATICAN STATEMENT ON THE HOLOCAUST, "WE REMEMBER: A REFLECTION ON THE SHOAH"

TWO MEVS

A Jewish Anti-Zionist Writer

The Truth at last about Pope Pius and The Holocaust

by Dr. Alfred M Lilienthal

In its March 18, 1998 editorial "The Vatican's Holocaust Report", *The New York Times* hails Pope John's repudiation of anti-Semitism, but calls on him to take the next step by pointing to the failure of Pope Pius XII to speak out against Nazi atrocities. *The Times* concludes that a "full exploration of Pope Pius' conduct is needed." At the same time Jewish organisations and the chief rabbi of Israel blasted the Vatican apology as "too little, too late."

The full and complete story of Pius XII's activities brings to mind Gilbert and Sullivan's "*HMS Pinafore*": "Things are seldom what they seem. Skimmed milk masquerades as cream."

The media, particularly the printed, have persistently and consistently gone out of its way to bring to its readers any and all references to Nazi genocide against the Jews in Europe. The incredible and incessant number of references, often on the front page, to the Swiss withholding of deposits of Holocaust victims is but the latest "looking back" with guilt to the European tragedy.

The tempo of the Holocaustomania has most recently been stepped up in order to induce deep feelings of guilt, particularly on the part of Christians, at a time when Israelis and Palestinians are very much deadlocked in their negotiations and Tel Aviv could use renewed public sympathy.

Accusation in the *New York Times*' editorials and in its letters to the editor, also appearing elsewhere in the media, that Pope Pius XII (Eugenio Pacelli) did nothing during World War II to help Jews prove factually to be a total perversion of the truth. This aged canard has been advanced in support of the demand that the Vatican now issue a further and fuller apology to the Jewish people as the bishops of France have already done. A close examination of the historical record reveals the very many positive actions of the wartime pope on behalf of endangered Jews. In 1934, as papal secretary of state, Pacelli had urged Pope Pius XI to open the doors of Vatican City to Italian and German dissidents. Shortly before his election, the pope-to-be demonstrated his concern for Jewish intellectuals by sending a letter (dated Jan. 12, 1939) to the four cardinals of the U.S. and Canada, begging them to try to remedy the "deplorable reluctance" of Catholic universities in those countries to accept more German Jewish professors and Jewish thinkers on their faculties.

As pope the following year, he founded the Catholic Refugee Committee in Rome and put in charge of this activity his own secretary, Father Robert Leiber, and his housekeeper, Mother Pasqualina. According to Monsignor G. Roche's well-documented study *Pie XII Avant l'Histoire*, this committee paved the way for tens of thousands of German Jews to enter America as Catholics, providing them with a regular and efficient service documentation, baptismal certificates, financial

aid, and arrangements abroad. This French historian estimated that by 1942 over one million Jews, on Vatican directives, were being housed in convents and monasteries throughout Europe.

The Holy Father himself set an example by taking care of some 15,000 Jews at Castel Gandolfo, as well as several thousand in Vatican City, where the refugees of all faiths included such famed diplomats as the future Christian Democratic Prime Minister Alcide de Gasperi and Socialist leader Pietro Nenni. By 1943 these refugees were overflowing into the papal apartments themselves. Chief Rabbi of Rome Israel Zolli subsequently became a Catholic convert, reportedly in gratitude for Pius's wartime protection, and took as his given name, Eugenio, Pius XII's given name.

Meanwhile, under the personal authorisation of Pope Pius, Monsignor Angello Roncalli, the future Pope John XXIII, was working assiduously at his Istanbul post to help many hundreds of thousands of Eastern European Jews on their way to Palestine. In France the pope's deputy, Cardinal Eugene Tisserant, and his Joint Distribution Committee were doing everything in their power to facilitate Jewish emigration under the very nose of the government of Marshall Henry Philippi Petain.

An underground printing press at Nice, protected by the archbishop and the mayor of the city, produced 1,895 identity cards, 1,360 work permits, 1,230 birth certificates, 428 demobilisation letters and 950 baptismal certificates before it was discovered. And as far as Hungary was concerned, the Holy Father, through personal correspondence with Regent Miklos Horthy, won guarantees that the country's 800,000 Jews would not be deported if they submitted to mass baptism.

Because of this show of concern for the Jewish plight, often in a spectacular way, Eugenio Pacelli might rather have been accused of pro-Zionist sympathies. As a cardinal coming into New York harbour in October 1937 aboard the *Conte di Savoia*, he asked the ship's captain to fly, alongside the papal flag, the six-pointed star of the future state of Israel in honour of the 600 Jewish refugees then on board. And just prior to the entrance of the German army into Rome in 1943, the pope ordered the Papal seal to be prominently engraved on the main Roman synagogue for its protection.

The famed, highly successful play "*The Deputy*", by Rolf Hoehhuth, which ran on Broadway in 1964, nevertheless was an exposition of the theme that Pope Pius lacked compassion and could have saved many Jewish lives. The main condemnatory evidence against the pope was his reluctance to go along with President Roosevelt's suggestion that the pope publicly condemn the extermination of Jews at Auschwitz. The pope always had to face the possibility that such an open condemnation of the Nazis could lead to the seizure of Vatican City.

Did that reluctance to take up the Roosevelt suggestion spell out anti-Semitism? As Jesuit Father Robert Leiber, his secretary, wrote, "The Pope sided very unequivocally with the Jews at that time. He spent the entire fortune he inherited from his family as a Pacelli on their behalf."

The Holy Father had similarly been silent on any condemnation of the multifold illegal actions and cruelties of the Communist regime, which was fighting the Hitler horde. That silence, however, had been in accordance with the specific promise extracted from him by the U.S. and Britain, who had, meanwhile, become allied with the Soviet Union.

The necessity for the utmost secrecy in the relations between the Vatican and the Allied Powers as the Nazis spread their hold on Europe was further emphasised in British documents. The 1972 release of British Foreign Office papers showed that Pope Pius XII had learned of the Nazi plans for invading France and the Low Countries in May 1940, and had then tipped off the British. According to Jesuit historian Reverend Robert Graham, the pope's information about the impending assault had come from a German spy, who was in fact a double agent. The invaluable information was forwarded to 10 Downing Street in a coded cable from the British minister at the Holy See. The Holy Father was at the same time involved in negotiations with certain anti-Hitler officers seeking a British guarantee for non-humiliating peace terms in the event that their planned coup d'etat should be successfully staged. After the fall of France, the pope asked the British to destroy any record of the Vatican's involvement in abortive negotiations with the anti-Hitler resistance.

It is true that the release by the Vatican of its own documents for 1943 showed that Rome had been deeply disturbed by the growing possibility of a Jewish state in the Middle East. But opposition to statehood did not vitiate the quiet diplomacy carried on in behalf of the European Jews, as these papers revealed. The Catholic leadership had long insisted that refugeism be distinguished from statehood. Cardinal Luigi Maglione, then secretary of state, suggested "other territories which would be more suitable" for a Jewish entity, while Pope John, even when as papal nuncio in Istanbul he was helping Jewish refugees reach Palestine, was expressing fears that his efforts might lead to the "realisation of the Messianic dream."

Monsignor Domenico Tardini, deputy secretary of state, wrote to the papal legate in London, Monsignor William Godfrey, "The Holy See had never approved the plan to make Palestine a Jewish homeland." This followed in a clear line the traditional Vatican opposition to the objectives of Zionists, expressed guardedly by Benedict XV in 1921 and forthrightly by Pius X to Herzl himself in 1904. This was only changed with the Vatican's full recognition of the Israeli state and exchange of diplomatic representations in December 1993 in the wake of continued enormous Zionist pressures exerted particularly on Cardinal O'Connor in New York.

But this same 688-page volume contained documents that the Vatican protested strongly the mass arrest of 1,027 Jews in the Rome ghetto and their transportation to death camps north

of Italy. Cardinal Maglione summoned the German ambassador to the Holy See, Baron Ernst von Weizaccker, and in the strongest language (according to the introduction to the volume) indicated that the raid on the Jewish quarter "was painful for the Holy Father, painful beyond words, that in Rome itself, under the very eyes of a common Father, so many persons are made to suffer simply because they belong to another race."

"What would the Holy See do if things were to continue like this?" asked the German envoy.

"The Holy See would not like to be faced with the necessity of voicing its disapproval," the cardinal replied, indicating that the pope might make a public protest, the first of the war. "For now the Holy See hopes not to say anything that the German people might consider an act of hostility during a terrible war, but there are limits."

The ambassador indicated that the raid in Rome had been made on orders from Berlin and Hitler. He asked whether he could keep the protest to himself and not report it to Berlin, and the cardinal agreed.

"Your Excellency has told me that you will do something for the poor Jews," the cardinal said. "I thank you. I leave the rest to your judgment. If you think it more opportune not to make any mention of our conversation, so be it."

Secretiveness was maintained because mention of the conversation was deemed to be "dangerous and counterproductive". Of the 1027 Jews arrested on October 6th, 1943, only about 15 returned alive. But, as British Minister to the Holy See, Sir Francis Godolphin D'Arcy Osborne noted in the British Foreign Office documents, the Vatican's intervention "seems to have saved a certain number of Jews," and, as importantly, there were no further mass arrests after the Vatican's move. The 22,000 Jews who remained in Rome went into hiding as of that day, often helped by local Catholic clergymen, including the famous Reverend Marie Benoit, a Cappucine, who became a legendary figure in rescuing Roman Jews.

Perhaps the best summation of Pius XII's efforts on behalf of the Jews was contained in the book *Three Popes and the Jews*¹, by Israeli journalist and diplomat Pinchas E. Lapid:

"The Catholic Church under the pontificate of Pius XII was instrumental in saving at least 700,000, but probably as many as 860,000 Jews from certain death at Nazi hands . . . these figures exceed by far those saved by all other churches, religious institutions and rescue organisations combined."

This history of most constructive efforts by Pius XII certainly should not be shrouded by the prevailing Holocaustomania spun by *The New York Times* and other segments of the media.

'Lapide, Pinchas E., *Three Popes and the Jews*. (New York Hawthorne Books, 1967), pp 214 15