

THE NEW TIMES

\$10 per annum post free.

Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne.

"Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free"

Vol. 49, No. 9

SEPTEMBER 1985

A CHRISTIAN RESPONSE TO STATE SLAVERY BY DAVID THOMPSON

The following paper was delivered by Mr. David Thompson, Assistant State Director of the League of Rights in Western Australia, at the Annual State Seminar held in Perth on August 10.

It is a demonstrable fact that Australia's Constitution, its institutions and its history are based on Christianity. The word 'history' itself is of interest - what do we understand of it? Surely all valid and relevant history has to do with the development of human associations? In our civilisation then, which we once called Western, Christian, history has to do with the modifying effect of Christ's teaching upon the development of human associations. Could it be that "history" is "His story" the story of the influence of Christ? "His story" history.

This is even more likely if we accept one Christian writer's definition of prophecy as history foretold. ("His story" foretold?) The test of prophecy is accuracy — if prophecy is inaccurate, it is merely a guess. If prophecy is history foretold, then history is prophecy fulfilled. That is, "His story" is prophecy fulfilled.

CHRISTIAN HISTORY

The opening words of the Australian Constitution include the phrase: "... humbly relying on the blessing of Almighty God " Every Parliament in the nation traditionally started each day's sitting with a Christian prayer. One valuable item belonging to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Library is a Bible, given to the then honourable member for Sydney West, William Morris Hughes at the opening of the Commonwealth Parliament on 9 May, 1901. It is signed on the title page by Hughes, the pre-title page by the Duke of York, and on the end papers by 58 of the Members of the first Parliament, including the Prime Minister and members of the Cabinet.

The nation's head, the monarch, is enthroned during a Church service, and presented with a Bible — "the most sacred thing this world affords". The British (and Australian) monarch is still formally the "Defender of the Faith", and members of all governments (including local government) take an oath or affirmation of loyalty. Traditionally, witnesses giving evidence in a court of law swear to tell the truth with a hand upon the Holy Bible. It is clear therefore, that while not all Australians are themselves Christians, our nation is a Christian nation, and our history and institutions reflect this. Our rich heritage is based in practical terms upon the British Westminster system of government, which is stable because of the three pillars upon which it is founded.

The First Pillar: The first is Personal Sovereignty, linked with the motivating moral force of Christianity. The Monarch symbolises the personal sovereignty of each individual subject. The very root of our system is that each individual draws his liberty and sovereignty from God, not the State.

The Second Pillar: The second pillar is the legacy of Common Law. Mr. Jeremy Lee, in his address to the Crown Commonwealth League Conference in Calgary, Alberta, in 1983, pointed out that the home of common law is the Inns of Court in London. He noted that the masonry of the Inns of Court bear three statues above the entrance: Alfred the Great, who codified the Ten Commandments into Britain's first simple legal system; Solomon the Wise, a Biblical figure symbolising the impartiality of the Judges; and Christ, "mediator and advocate" - representing the Spirit of the Law, where judgment can introduce the unwritten qualities of discernment and mercy, in recognition of

OUR POLICY

To promote loyalty to the Christian concept of God, and to a society in which every individual enjoys inalienable rights, derived from God, not from the State.

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, whether described as public or private.

To encourage 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 fact that laws are made for men, not men for the law.

Common Law also assumes that an accused is innocent until proven guilty, cannot be held without knowledge of the charges against him, has the right to face and answer his accusers, and under 'Habeas Corpus' may not be held without a fair trial. At least two people must be prepared to testify openly to the guilt of the accused, and for serious crimes, the accused may only be condemned by twelve of his own kind, known as a jury. (Note that Christ's disciples numbered twelve.) These principles are all a result of the Christian influence upon our forefathers, handed on to us as our inheritance.

The Third Pillar: The third pillar is the Parliamentary system, developed from the need of the Monarch to raise money by taxes, but tempered with the understanding that taxes only be raised with the consent and popular representation of the people. The development of Parliament reduced conflict between the crown and people — each able adult is responsible for helping to choose advisers to the monarch, these advisers serving in a government as representatives and Ministers. For additional stability and security, the Parliament as a whole is perceived to consist of three parts: the Monarchy itself, a House of Representatives, and a House of Review, or Senate in the case of Australia. This is known as a Trinitarian form of government, and bears a resemblance to the Holy Trinity.

THE AUTHORITY TO GOVERN

If the authority of the Monarch, and therefore the government, comes from God, we must review some of the developments towards this position. The problem of government has always been an adequate authority for a system of justice, or law. The Christian influence upon our system is unmistakable. It can best be observed by Henry De Bracton's influence on British law. Bracton was an English judge, living in the thirteenth century. He occupied the Bench within thirty-five years of Magna Carta, and in keeping with the universal thinking of the time, wrote *De Legibus et Consuetudinibus* in about 1250. In this, he said:

"And that he (the King) ought to be under the law appears clearly in the analogy of Jesus Christ, whose vice-regent on earth he is, for though many ways were open to Him for his ineffable redemption of the human race, the true mercy of God chose this most powerful way to destroy the devil's work, he would not use the power of force but the reason of justice..."

That is, by sheer power, God could have crushed Satan, but what of this example for men? Is sheer power right *because* of its strength? Bracton thought not, because Christ chose justice before power. Surely, then, justice itself is a Christian concept? Note also that the old English legend of King Arthur of the Round Table is based upon Arthur's conviction that "might is not necessarily right". The Arthurian tragedy is based upon Arthur's belief that even he, the King, must be subject to the law. Bracton codified this to mean that Christ's example is our measure *because* of *who* He is, rather than because of His power. Power is not first in law and society, but justice. This was the basis of the Common Law.

RUTHERFORD AND "LEX REX"

Another great development, confirming and re-stating the principle of Magna Carta, was the work of Samuel Rutherford, a Scot living between 1600-1661. In 1644 Rutherford produced "Lex Rex", which means 'law is king'. This was just as fundamental as Bracton's contribution, and defied the previous standard of Rex Lex - the king is law. The principle outlined by Rutherford was the same as Bracton's — the heads of government are under the law, and not a law unto themselves.

This tremendous principle gave every Englishman the guarantee of justice and security that he did not previously have. Principles established by Magna Carta, and confirmed by Bracton and Rutherford and his fellows were established in law, and Jed William Pitt to tell the House of Commons in the 18th century:

"The poorest man may in his cottage bid defiance to all the force of the Crown. It may be frail, its roof may shake; the wind may blow through it; the storms may enter, the rain may enter, but the King of England may not enter."

That is, an English-man's home is his castle.

Since the title of this paper is "A Christian Response to State Tyranny", it is well to point out that Rutherford defined tyranny as ruling without the sanction of God.

CHRISTIAN INFLUENCE ON SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Christianity had a unique influence upon how our society developed, from the roots of our social order in Britain. For example, the Christian revivals, which were held in Britain and parts of Western Europe, called for personal salvation, but they also called for specific social action. The prime example is the great revivals of John Wesley (1703-1791). Wesley preached the Christian revelation in Britain at a time when the industrial revolution was in full swing. Although the Church at that time completely missed the implications of the use of machinery rather than human labour and all that this might mean, Wesley and his fellows ministered directly to those effected by the 'revolution'. He went to the coalmines and the industrial centres, but he not only preached, he built schools and orphanages, encouraged free dispensaries and even set up a kind of credit union. He went beyond preaching and personal salvation, to introduce practical economic alternatives, demanding reforms where he saw blatant injustice.

It must be obvious, even to secular historians, that the

"THE ESSENTIAL CHRISTIAN HERITAGE"

By Eric D. Butler

This study of the Christian roots of English constitutional developments, with the stress on the value and uniqueness of each individual, is essential background reading for those concerned about the growing attacks on the Australian Federal Constitution. The importance of Magna Carta, English Common Law, and the limiting of the power of governments, clearly outlined.

Price 80c posted from all League of Rights addresses.

social results of revivals such as Wesley's saved England from its own form of the French Revolution. If it had not been for practical Christian strengths in Britain, an "English Revolution" would seem to have been certain. Perhaps this is an example of how Christian "credit" in a society averted a social disaster, or social discredit. It seems that since World War II, almost every effort to implant the British system of justice and law in non-Christian colonies or third world countries has ended in disaster. It seems that the level of social stability and goodwill — or 'credit' in a society - depends upon the influence of Christianity.

CONFRONTATION OF THE '80s

I recently heard a statement quoted from Professor Rousas Rushdoony, who is a contemporary Christian writer and a pastor. He is currently the President of the Chalcedon Foundation, established to encourage Christian scholarship. Rushdoony, who had been discussing the matter with a lawyer colleague, had made the following significant statement:

"The political confrontation of the 1980's will be between, not conservatives and liberals, socialists and anti-socialists, but between Christianity and humanism. In terms of that political confrontation, it will be a war to the death. Everything will be done to disguise from the Christians the reality of that battle, so that when the moment of crisis comes, they will continue to halt between two philosophies..."

Here we are now, halfway through the 1980's, and it is quite clear that although Rushdoony's statement has proved prophetic, it is clear that very few Christians even understood that they should be involved in a battle with humanism. If Rushdoony's moment of crisis were to arrive now, then it is clear that the forces of humanism are in the ascendancy.

Humanism could be described as the religion of Communism, and in all its tenets, conforms to the communist philosophy. Humanism is not merely a lack of religion, but a confirmed religion in its own right, although anti-Christian. *The Humanist Manifesto (1973) II* states:

"In the best sense, religion may inspire dedication to the highest ethical ideals... We find insufficient evidence for belief in the existence of a supernatural... as non-theists; we begin with humans, not God, not nature, not deity... We appreciate the need to preserve the best ethical teachings in the religious traditions of mankind... We can discover no divine purpose of providence for the human species... No deity will save us, we must save ourselves"

HUMANISM AND TOTALITARIANISM

Humanists, having no God, must put something at the ideological centre, and it is inevitably man, society, government, or ultimately the State. Of this, the Soviet Union is the perfect example. The humanists pay lip service to 'freedom', but having no Christian consensus to contain freedom, it leads inevitably to chaos, or to slavery under the omnipotent state. Humanism is the way of death, says Rushdoony, and is the essence of original sin, of man trying to be his own God.

The humanist view of life, then, is the evolutionary view, that man is but matter in motion, accidentally

arranged. If this is the case, what is the humanist view of history (or "His story")? Does the humanist believe that events occur at random, and that man has no control over his environment? If he believes that man is merely matter in motion, then he must also believe that history is merely events occurring at random, which others have called the "village idiot theory of history". The Christian cannot accept the "village idiot" theory of history, but that man, made in the image of the Creator, has the ability to influence his environment, and by understanding natural laws, can develop human associations in a specific direction.

It is not too strong to say that we *are* at war, and there is no place for neutrality in the war. Either one confesses that God is the final authority, or one confesses that Caesar is Lord.

HUMANISM AND FABIANISM

Some of those who contributed to the *Humanist Manifesto*, like Sir Julian Hurley, were also heavily involved in the Fabian Socialist movement. In reality, the two are completely interlocking. If humanism can be described as the religion of communism, then it can also be described as the religion of Fabianism, because Fabian Socialists confirm that they are 'on a different road' but aiming at the same objective as the communists.

That our Prime Minister is an agnostic is a matter of public record - he has told us so himself. An agnostic holds that we know nothing of things outside the material world, and this is entirely compatible with humanism. It is not so well known that Mr. Hawke is also a dedicated Fabian Socialist. In a most significant address, not reported by the media in any way to my knowledge, Mr. Hawke addressed the Australian Fabian Society in Melbourne on May 18, 1984, in which he spelt out the Fabian approach of his Government. He equated "consensus" with the traditional Fabian approach of 'the inevitability of gradualism', or 'permeation' of Fabian principles into national government. In part, he said:

"...We all have to face the fact that if our Government is to make great and really worthwhile reforms -reforms that will endure, reforms that will permanently change this nation - then it is simply not enough to obtain a temporary majority at an election, or even successive elections.... For our reforms to endure, the whole mood and mind and attitudes of the nation must be permanently changed...."

Note what Mr. Hawke said; he meant it! Remember Rushdoony's prophetic warning. This is the face of humanism in our Prime Minister, and we are involved in a battle to the ideological death!

A change in the whole mood, mind and attitude of the nation can be achieved by doing away with all traditional aspects of our society, including the Christian-based Common Law, the Constitution, the impartiality of the courts, and the decentralisation of power in the hands of the people.

The whole system of law is undergoing enormous changes before our eyes. Common law is gradually being replaced by international law, which resembles the pre-Christian Roman law. This is happening under the influence of people like Senator Gareth Evans and

Senator Susan Ryan, and their humanist colleagues. Remember the Sex Discrimination Act? This is based upon international law in the same way as the Human Rights Commission is. Under the new "rights" legislation you are guilty until proved innocent, do not have the right to challenge your accusers, do not even have the right to legal representation, are subject to arbitrary decisions of people who do not necessarily have any legal training, can be tried 'in camera' and in some cases, can be forbidden to disclose the outcome of your "case" upon its conclusion.

INTERNATIONAL LAW

The Human Rights Commission is a prime example of the intrusion of international law. Our legislation is based on the work of the United Nations Human Rights Commission, which was formed to codify the Universal Declaration of Human Rights into a form that could be adopted by each member nation of the U.N. to become a part of, and eventually replace, our own statutes.

The U.N. Human Rights Commission published two statutes: the Draft International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and the Draft International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The final drafts of these Covenants were ratified by the Australian Government, and our own Human Rights Commission and Sex Discrimination Bill grew out of these Covenants.

However, a range of different people were involved in drawing up the Covenants, many from the Soviet Union, and some communists from Western countries. The Soviet influence is unmistakable. So unmistakable, in fact, that it almost seems that a large part of the Soviet constitution (yes, there is such a thing) is repeated word for word in the Covenants! If this is true, then the new Australian 'rights' legislation is based upon the Soviet constitution, not upon natural law, with its Christian base.

Dr. Charles Malik, of Lebanon, who later chaired the U.N. Human Rights Commission, said in 1952:

"I think a study of our proceedings will reveal the amendments we adopted to the old text under examination, responded, for the most part, more to Soviet than to Western promptings...."

AUTHORITY FOR "RIGHTS" LAW

The International Covenants upon which our law is now increasingly based, must have a philosophical source, and we must study the pedigree of this philosophical source. The preamble of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) recognises that: "...the inherent dignity and the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world..." This is most important.

The preamble to both International Covenants contains the following: "...Considering that, in accordance with the principles proclaimed in the charter of the United Nations, recognition of the inherent dignity and of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world, recognising that these *rights derive from the inherent dignity of the human person*...."

Note that the source of rights is man, not God. That is, the Covenants are based on humanism, not Christianity. The Human Rights Commission, the Sex Discrimination

Act, and all the "rights" legislation in Australia is *humanist law*.

The humanists are winning Rushdoony's "battle of the 80's", because the Christians, in the main, don't even know what is going on!

BATTLE FOR THE SCHOOLS

How, then, is the Christian to counter the enormous weight of humanist thinking that is dominating the government, and which is beginning to dominate our legal system? The first and most obvious thing is that the Christian must *become involved*.

In Australia, Marxists and humanists, fellow travellers - are not large in numbers. They intend to be the victors in the struggle by controlling key positions, and using those positions, as Prime Minister Hawke said, to change the mind, moods and attitudes of the nation. Note the following from *The Humanist*, Jan/Feb 1983:

"The battle for humankind's future must be waged and won in the public school classroom by teachers who correctly perceive their role as the proselytisers of a new faith ... These teachers must embody the same selfless dedication as the most rabid fundamentalist preachers, for they will be ministers of another sort, utilising the classroom instead of the pulpit to convey humanist values in whatever subject they teach, regardless of educational level — preschool, day care or large state university...."

Yet, every time Christians seek to become involved in the political process, they are intimidated by Marxists, who maintain that the church must stay out of politics, because the State and the Church are separate. This is merely a ruse to silence the Church and the Christian, and is used, as Rushdoony has said, to disguise the nature of the battle.

"SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE"

The perversion of the doctrine of the separation of Church and State has led to all kinds of other perversions. Tim La Haye, writing in *Restore* magazine, published by the Logos Foundation, made the following comments:

"Our forefathers never intended government to be isolated from God or the recognition of His existence. By constantly threatening Christians with the false interpretation of separation, the humanists have now rendered our government almost as secular as Russia's. They are even beginning to duplicate their successes in education - that is, expelling religion from the schools, equating morals with religion, and thus including morals in the expulsion. Morals and religion have no place in the humanist's scheme of education. The same concept is now working in government. First, separate religion and politics, then equate religion and morals, and subsequently exclude both.

"During a TV debate on homosexual rights, my opponent brought up the church-state issue. 'The church shouldn't get involved in politics. It will endanger its tax status.' That is ridiculous, by any legal definition. In the first place, morals are the church's business. If the church doesn't speak out on homosexuality, pornography, prostitution, abortion, divorce, and so forth, who will?

"At the 1979 NOW (National Organization of Women) convention in Los Angeles, the feminist leaders warned their delegates of the rise of the moral majority, who were rapidly awakening from their slumber to become moral activists. They challenged their followers to solve the problem by going home and threatening the Christians with 'the separation-of-church-and-state issue'. Obviously they did not care a snap about the church, but they wanted to neutralize its influence so they could continue to flood our land with "homosexual rights", "lesbian rights", "prostitute rights", and "abortion rights". What humanists call *rights*, the church consistently calls *wrongs*. Therefore, if we fail to get involved politically on these moral issues, the humanists will pollute our land."

Obviously, the State will not tolerate any gods beside itself. Religion must be removed from the market place, the school, and from all areas of public life.

OBEDIENCE TO THE STATE

If it is true that the State is ordained by God, then does this follow that we must obey at all times each dictate of the State? Is there a point where we must say, "enough is enough", or must we defer to a government that is so blatantly humanist and anti-Christian that it has become an instrument of evil?

The writer William Hallowell makes the following case:

".....Men owe allegiance to civil society, but because they have an ultimate destiny that transcends life on earth, they have a greater obligation and a greater allegiance, namely an allegiance to God. For there is an authority higher than the authority of any particular state. And if that is so, no state can demand our absolute obedience, or attempt to control every aspect of our lives..."

The question arises as to why the humanist should obey the state in any case. If the Christian obeys the State because the state has a moral force ordained by God, then why should a person who does not believe in God, obey the State? The only answer must be because the state has the guns and the patronage. Therefore, the humanist state must inevitably be a totalitarian state.

Francis Shaeffer, the author of *A Christian Manifesto* makes the following contribution:

"The civil government, as all of life, stands under the Law of God. In this fallen world God has given us certain offices to protect us from the chaos which is the natural result of that fallenness. But when *any office* commands that which is contrary to the Word of God, those who hold that office abrogate their authority and they are not to be obeyed. And that includes the State.

Romans 13:1-4 says

"Everyone must submit himself to the governing authorities, for there is no authority except that which God has established. The authorities that exist have been established by God. Consequently, he who rebels against the authority is rebelling against what God has instituted, and those who do so will bring judgment on themselves.

For rulers hold no terror for those who do right, but for those who do wrong. Do you want to be free from fear of the one in authority? Then do what is right and he will commend you. For he is God's servant to do you good. But if you do wrong, be afraid, for he does not bear the sword for nothing. He is God's servant, an agent of wrath to bring punishment on the wrongdoer.

"God has ordained the state as a *delegated* authority; it is not autonomous. The state is to be an agent of justice, to restrain evil by punishing the wrongdoer, and to protect the good in society. When it does the reverse, *it has no proper authority*. It is then a usurped authority and as such it becomes lawless and is tyranny.

In 1 Peter 2:13-17 we read:

"Submit yourselves for the Lord's sake to every authority instituted among men: whether to the kind, as the supreme authority, or to governors, who are sent by him to punish those who do wrong and to commend those who do right. For it is God's will that by doing good you should silence the ignorant talk of foolish men. Live as free men, but do not use your freedom as a cover-up for evil; live as servants of God. Show proper respect to everyone: Love the brotherhood of believers, fear God, honor the king.

"Peter says here that civil authority is to be honored and that God is to be feared. The state, as he defines it, is to punish those who do wrong and commend those who do right. If this is not so, then the whole structure falls apart. Clearly, the state is to be a ministry of justice. This is the legitimate function of the state, and in this structure Christians are to obey the state as a matter of conscience (Romans 13:5)."

CHURCH FATHERS AND THE STATE

What is the Christian to do when the state violates that, which is its legitimate function? Some of the earliest Christians forfeited their lives because they would not obey the State in a civil matter. Stuart Perowne, in his study of Christ, the church, and their relationship to the Caesars, says:

"Of the attitude of Christians to the state, this was in brief that, while they were ready and anxious to pray for Caesar, as their Master had taught them, to render him the things which are his, they refused to pray to him. This attitude simply confirmed the belief that they were a seditious and subversive organisation."

The point was, that while the Christians were willing to pray *for* Caesar, this put Caesar on a level with all men, rather than on a level with God. This the Caesars could not tolerate, and the Christians were thrown to the lions. To the Roman Empire the Christians were rebels, and their crime was civil disobedience.

TYNDALE AND BUNYAN

Down through our history, Christians have disobeyed the State when they believed that the demands of the State were contrary to God's law. They suffered accordingly. William Tyndale was the English translator of the Bible, and lived from 1490 to 1536. He advocated the supremacy of the Scripture over the State and the church. For many years he successfully evaded the authorities, but eventually the government tried and executed him for his views. Similarly, John Bunyan was

found guilty of breaking the king's law. He was thrice arrested for preaching without a state licence, and for failing to attend the Church of England. Eventually he was imprisoned for twelve years, and wrote many of his literary works from prison, including *Pilgrim's Progress*.

It seems clear that at some point, the Christian must say "enough is enough", and at this point, he has not only the right, but the duty to disobey the State, and accept the consequences.

Shaeffer says: "It is time we consciously realise that when *any* office commands what is contrary to God's Law, it abrogates its authority. And our loyalty to the God who gave this law then requires that we make the appropriate response to such a tyrannical usurpation of power.....The early church carried out their civil disobedience in the only way available to them. They came to the clear issue of worshipping Caesar or not, and rebelled in refusing to do so, though they knew the cost. It seems to me that in most of the Iron Curtain countries the Christians are in about the same position as the early church..."

IN DEFIANCE OF THE STATE

There are examples of people in Australia today who refuse to be intimidated by the humanist state. In the field of education, a number of small, Christian schools have been established in order to protect children from the humanists, and provide Christian education. These schools undertake a constant battle against the State. An 'education crisis' meeting was held in Adelaide on June 1, 1985, in order to assess the problem. Keynote speaker was Pastor Peter Vacca of Bethesda Christian Centre, calling for the Church to "rid herself of the grave-clothes" of insecurity and self-centredness, and become involved in the great issues of the day.

Pastor John Schriver maintained that the State oversteps its authority when it interferes with Christian education. Pastor Schriver is from the Grace Bible Church, which refuses to register its school with the State authorities.

Pastor Peter Frogley of Foundation Centre Christian School, reported that his school has been deregistered by South Australian authorities, and said: "parents need to know where they draw the battle lines on behalf of their children." The battle for the Fountain Centre Christian School continues through the courts.

In Victoria, Mr. Barry Tattersall, principal of Canaan College, also refuses to be intimidated by the State. When threatened with deregistration, he remained unmoved. When threatened by fines, he remarked that he would not be paying fines, due to lack of funds. When threatened with jail, he remained similarly unmoved.

THE ABORTION BATTLE

Mr. Murray Vilkelis-Curas, of Mildura, is presently facing bankruptcy proceedings in Victorian courts, because he refused to pay taxation money that could help fund abortions. He believes that an individual's involvement is consummated by the tax transaction, and therefore he cannot become part of a government-sponsored process of destruction by being an accomplice in a normal crime - murder of unborn people. He said, "It is intolerable for me to participate as a citizen in this part of society. They can take what I have — nothing is as important as the spiritual security I've searched for."

Francis Shaeffer, in *A Christian Manifesto*, says:

"Please read most thoughtfully what I am going to say in the next sentence: If there is no final place for civil disobedience, then the government has been made autonomous, and as such, it has been put in the place of the living God. If there is no final place for civil disobedience, then the government has been put in the place of the living God, because then you are to obey it even when it tells you in its own way at that time to worship Caesar. And that point is exactly where the early Christians performed their acts of civil disobedience even when it cost them their lives."

It is our responsibility as Christians to draw a firm line between the province of Caesar and the province of God. Each person must draw his own line. But if we believe that line from the Lord's Prayer: "Thy Kingdom come, on earth as it is in Heaven..." then the line *must* be drawn, and the Christian must stand firm, irrespective of the consequences.

BURKEING THE ISSUE

From June "Home", U.K.

Common citizens who venture to question the right of their representative in Parliament to be a party to the growing interference of the political power with their lives, are liable to be told that, on the authority of the great Edmund Burke, the representative is not a delegate, and is returned to Parliament to use his own judgment.

The original words of Edmund Burke, to the Electors of Bristol in 1774 are seldom quoted, vis:

"Your representative owes you, not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion."

This is, of course, an important half-truth—the half of the truth which suits the politician; and Burke also, however golden-tongue, was indubitably a politician. The other half, which it does not suit them to remember (though he did) is that politicians are power-seekers, and that power corrupts the judgment.

Doubtless, in Burke's day, electors were expected to be a small mob of bribable and bullyable illiterates, while M.P.'s were expected to be educated gentlemen, at least able to quote their Horace; though nowadays the electorate, taken in bulk, is a vast mass of media-bribed and brainwashed, and compulsory State-male educated semi-literates, and many, if not most, of their representatives come into the same category. Indeed, since universal 'education' is enforced by Act of Parliament, this is inevitable.

Since all the properties — knowledge, intelligence, wisdom — which can produce a sound judgment are properties of the individual, and collectivities possess none of them, neither the majority vote of the electors nor of Members in Parliament can have any validity as a judgment. Moreover, in Parliament the individual judgment of M.P.'s is further distorted by the pressures of careerism and the Party system. This consideration has produced the proposal that, whereas the electors ought to vote openly and responsibly and be prepared to back their vote with a proportion of their money, M.P.'s should have a secret ballot in Parliament so as to evade the intolerable pressures of Government and Party — as may be necessary also to avoid intimidation in some Trades Union ballots.

What is being covered over here in this talk of a representative's 'judgment' is the vital difference between a man's judgment in his own affairs and someone else's. The first is a matter of free will and choice in which the individual alone knows the facts, whether or not he has the wisdom. The other, unless invited, is a piece of opinionated interference, in most cases necessarily based upon ignorance of the facts. And whereas people's will and choice in relation to their own lives may vary as widely as do people themselves, so that they could never agree upon a *positive* collective choice, the expression of the *negative* will, that they should *not* be restricted, or interfered with, in the intimate details of their own personal lives by having the impertinent 'judgments' of politicians imposed upon them, *does* validly present, not the opinions, but the will, of the people. And this, and not mass-induced opinions, is what genuine democracy is about.

Consider some of the things which this allegedly 'superior

judgment' of politicians has imposed in recent years upon the personal life of the citizen: the supplanting of our customary system of weights and measures, adapted to the human body and human convenience by the arbitrary, invented, continental metric system, including the idiot, minuscule gram for groceries, and the imbecile litre for both drinks and petrol; the crudification of our coinage to fit in with imposed, built-in, credit-inflation; the treasonable handing over of the whole population to remote control by alien politicians and bureaucrats with a passion for 'harmonizing' the customs and life-styles of the vast herd of man flesh thus brought within reach of opinionated interference, including such details as what seeds we may grow in our gardens, and whether vicious hooligans may be birched; and especially the abolition of our sane system of food-subsidies, enabling the consumer to buy at the World price while the producer could make a living, in favour of the insane Continental system of inflating food prices to bribe the producer to produce huge surpluses for destruction or dumping abroad.

Add to these the politicians' 'judgments' that local governments were too close to the people and had to be grossly enlarged into remote bureaucracies, increasingly controlled from Westminster; that ancient counties should be abolished and their successors re-named; that local railways should be torn up rather than used as bus-routes; that driving cars into collision, with other vehicles or people should be made safer by compulsory seat-belting, at some considerable cost in pedestrians' and cyclists' lives if we are to believe the statistics; that carcinogenic diet and neglect of oral hygiene should be made safer by forcing an alleged caries preventive into the bodies of protesting water consumers, moreover, at their forced expense, and that the legal judgment which found this to be *ultra vires* should be overruled.

JUDGEMENT GONE MAD!

In 1774 Edmund Burke must surely have taken for granted that some residue of Christian sanity would set a limit to the 'judgment' or representatives. He could not then have imagined such a nightmare as a Parliament which would enable and condone the transformation of a Christian nation into a multiracial, multicultural, multi-religious but mainly heathen mishmash, in which abortion is a major function of the State Health Service, in which, with Parliament's aid, one marriage in three is claimed to end in divorce, in which homosexuality is publicly and socially promoted, in which Orwellian restrictions and thought control are applied to race and sex, and in which, though the outcome is still uncertain, the citizens have to struggle desperately to stop State medical preparation of schoolgirls' bodies, behind their parents' backs, for sterile copulation, and the use of embryonic human beings for laboratory experiments.

These being the sort of 'judgments' imposed upon us by our Parliamentary masters in their pursuit of power over us, it is not surprising that the idea is widespread among the young that Man is born to find violent or coercive means of forcing his opinions upon others rather than minding his own business.

What is so ironic is the persistent quotation of the great Edmund Burke, later the famous denunciator of the 'anti-Christian Republic' of France and its corruption of the minds and morals of the young, in defence of a representative's right to impose upon the people a similar corruption, historically derived from that of the French Revolution. Burke's remark about a representative's judgment can be correctly interpreted only in the light of another statement of his:

"There is but one law for all, namely, that law which governs all law, the law of our Creator. . ."

HOME

HOME is published monthly (except September) by Home Publications Ltd. *Editor:* Mrs. E.S. Dobbs, *Editorial Office:* Bodifyr, Lonpobty, Bangor, Gwynedd LL57 1HT. *Advisory Editor:* Mrs. B.M. Palmer, Sidcup.

LAST CALL FOR DINNER BOOKINGS

No supporter who can possibly attend should miss the 50th Anniversary Dinner of "The New Times", to be held in The Victoria, Lt. Collins Street, Melbourne, on Friday, October 4. Because of the special occasion, there will be more than the usual number of highlights, not the least of these being a revealing address by Mr. Eric D. Butler.

The Annual "New Times" Dinner is a strictly "family
NEW TIMES—SEPTEMBER 1985

ARTHUR ALBERT CHRESBY

It is with deep regret and sense of loss that we record the recent death of one of the pioneers of the Social Credit Movement in Australia, Mr. Arthur Albert Chresby. Mr. Chresby died in Melbourne after a long illness.

The funeral service was conducted by Mr. Horton Davies and the address given by Mr. Eric Butler, whose close association with Arthur Chresby went back over nearly fifty years.

Mr. Butler said that Arthur Chresby was a unique man of rare talents. Although he had no formal training in constitutional law, he had in recent years established a wide reputation as an outstanding authority in this field.

Mr. Butler said that he had always felt it was a blessing in disguise that Arthur Chresby had only lasted one term in the Federal Parliament, that his talents were too valuable to be wasted in sterile party politics.

Arthur Chresby's strong support for the Monarchy was based more on practical grounds than on sentimentality. He had taught thousands of Australians to make correct use of their traditional constitutional institutions.

Arthur Chresby was not unduly concerned about material things but his self-imposed mission of service to the Truth. Many younger Social Creditors benefited from his advice and encouragement.

Mr. Butler expressed the view that one of Arthur Chresby's most valuable legacies was his book, *Your Will Be Done*, which he felt should be a textbook in all schools.

affair", open only to readers and close members of their families. The organisers are holding seats for all those whom are expected to attend, but have not yet booked. But they are urged to do so IMMEDIATELY.

The organisers reserve the right to decline any book bookings.

The Dinner donation is \$20 per person, or \$38 for a married couple. The donation must be sent with booking.

Those attending may indicate whom they prefer to sit with. Those requiring a fish or vegetarian dinner should state this.

Guest of Honour will be Mr. Barry Tattersall, Principal of Canaan College, the brilliant front-line campaigner on the education front. Mr. Tattersall will address the Dinner, which will be chaired by Mr. Jeremy Lee.

A feature of the Dinner will be the extensive historical display.

Guests may arrive from 6 p.m. onwards and must be seated by 6.55 p.m.

OUTSTANDING TEAM OF SPEAKERS FOR LEAGUE SEMINAR

Also to be held at the Victoria, on Saturday, October 5, the National Seminar will be addressed by the most impressive team of speakers in the history of the League.

R.S.L. leader Bruce Ruxton will be making special mention of the South African situation in his address on Australia's defence situation.

Dr. Rupert *Goodman*, Reader in Education at the University of Queensland, and National President of The Flag Association, will address himself to the national flag issue and the reason for the attack on the flag. A brilliantly entertaining speaker.

Mr. Barry Tattersall will outline what is happening on the vital battlefield to preserve Christian education. This address will be an absolute treat.

Mr. Bill Daly, the dedicated young National Director of The New Zealand League of Rights, will bring his audience a picture of New Zealand under the Lange government, and what the Lange policies mean to Australian defence.

The final Paper will be given by Mr. Jeremy Lee, National Secretary of the Institute of Economic Democracy, who will be summarising the deepening Australian crisis and what is required to meet it.

The Seminar will be opened with a short address from the League's National Director, Mr. Eric Butler, while outstanding League figures like Mr. Chas Pinwill, Queensland State Director, Mr. Robert Nixon, W.A. State Director, and former New Zealand National Director, Mr. David Thompson, now full time with the Australian League of Rights, and Mrs. Betty Luks, Assistant S.A. State Director, will be participating by chairing Papers or moving votes of thanks.

BOOK DISPLAY

There will be an even bigger and more comprehensive book display than ever. The doors of the Banquet Room will be open at 1 p.m. to enable people to survey books at their leisure.

Entrance to the Seminar is \$4.

MESSAGES FOR ANNIVERSARY DINNER

Although a big attendance, including a number of veteran supporters, is anticipated at the 1985 Annual "New Times" Dinner, commemorating the 50th Anniversary of "The New Times", the overwhelming majority of its readers can only be present in spirit. But they can send appropriate messages to be read at the Dinner, and to be re-published in the special Dinner issue.

Messages should be sent to The Chairman, "New Times" Annual Dinner, Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne, Australia, 3001. Cables, telegrams and verbal messages may be rung through to (03) 63-9749.

JEWISH MIGRATION FROM SOVIET UNION

The Australian Jewish News of August 23 reports that the number of Jews being permitted to leave the Soviet Union is increasing. July arrivals at the Intergovernmental Committee for Migration in Vienna brought to 675 the total number for the first seven months of 1985.

Non-Jews leaving Russia must do so at great risk. Obviously International Zionism has a close working relationship with the Soviet Union, irrespective of what the Soviet says about Zionism.

A MESSAGE FROM SOUTHERN AFRICA

By Ivor Benson

A brilliant booklet, which answers all the nonsense about the "evils of apartheid". This is an address given by Mr Benson in Australia in 1972. Prophetic.

\$1.50 from Box 1052J., G.P.O., Melbourne, or all League bookshops.

DID TUTU CONDEMN VIOLENCE?

Did Bishop Desmond Tutu condemn violence and more specifically the barbaric torture and murder of Miss Maki Skosana (24), images of which shook TV viewers around the world?

The answer is yes, but only conditionally.

He did not remind his listeners of the sixth commandment, "Thou shall not kill." He did not condemn the fact that the girl was summarily burned to death following a simple denunciation, possibly the victim of a tragic mistake, without any kind of trial or opportunity of defending her innocence. He uttered no expression of regret at the horrific death suffered by the unfortunate woman. He offered no word of sympathy or of condolence to the girl's family.

Then what did he say?

He was highly critical of the negative impact of the scenes of the killing on overseas support for the "liberation struggle." He warned that after seeing such pictures foreign sympathisers would doubt whether black South Africans were ready to rule. In other words, he regretted that the whole thing was an exercise in bad publicity.

Printed and Published by The Australian League of Rights, 145 Russell Street, Melbourne, Victoria, 3000.