

THE NEW TIMES

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

VOL. 52, No. 2.

Registered By Australia Post-Publication No. VBH 1001

FEBRUARY 1988.

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

PRINCE CHARLES ON CONSTITUTIONAL HERITAGE

by Eric D. Butler.

The presence of Prince Charles at the spectacular celebration of Australia's Bi-Centennial celebrations in Sydney on January 26 provided a deep sense of history. He stood in Sydney Cove where, as a result of a decision made by his Royal forebears, a new nation was founded on January 26, 1788. And in probably the most matured address he has ever given, Prince Charles went right to the heart of what Australia was really celebrating — its Constitutional heritage. In a profound, but witty address, Australia's future King, and future King of all Crown Commonwealth nations, provided a striking contrast to empty clichés of the professed Socialist Republican, Prime Minister Bob Hawke.

American visitors present said they had never seen anything like it. The magnificent Sydney Harbour, described by Captain Arthur Phillips as the best in the world when he found it 200 years ago, was the perfect setting for an event, which bordered on the miraculous. Phillip's had said in his report to Lord Sydney that the harbour was one "in which a thousand sail of the line may ride in the most perfect security..." But on January 26 there were many thousands of ships and boats of all kinds. And packed around the harbour itself was an estimated two million people. Even a glorious day helped further the feeling that perhaps Australia was the "lucky country".

Beyond doubt the most outstanding feature of the celebration was the spirit. Not only did Australians turn out in numbers far exceeding expectations, demonstrating that they do care about their nation, that they will rally when provided with an appropriate focal point, but that they do respect one another. In spite of the huge crowds, the intense pressure on limited space, good humour prevailed. Those who arrived a day or more early, and pitched their tents, or marked out their little domain, were treated with respect by those who arrived later, accepting that they had to take less advantageous positions. Without any enforcing authority, the overwhelming majority accepted the common law principle that possession is nine points of the law. The right of way was readily granted to the disabled.

The waving of a mass of Australian flags, along with some Union Jacks, the welcome to the First Fleet re-enactment ships, and reception given to Prince Charles and Princess Diana, made it clear to Socialist Republican Bob Hawke and his colleagues that their proposed policies are not endorsed by the great majority of the Australian people. Even the radical activists attempting to organise Australians of Aboriginal background had to concede that, while treated generally with good-natured respect, they had no chance whatever of staging anything which would effect the general tenor of the day.

ROOTS OF CONSTITUTIONAL HERITAGE

But where does Australia go from here? Prince Charles has pointed the way with his reference to the nation's constitutional heritage. This heritage is one, which Australians share with other English-speaking nations, including the United States. That heritage reaches back through the mists of antiquity, back to the signing of the Magna Carta in England, back to those early centuries when England was being Christianised, and even back to the very beginning of Christianity

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 politics 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.

itself. At a time when great stress is placed upon the alleged virtues of the political vote, and democracy is equated with something known as "majority rule", it is essential to recall that the undergirding Christian value system of Western European Civilisation, was established long before the widespread use of the political vote.

Truth is not established by counting heads. If a vote on the shape of the Earth had been taken at one period in man's history, an overwhelming majority would have supported the Flat Earth views. C.H. Douglas observed that the Truths of the Universe transcend human thinking and cannot be changed. But they can be discovered and, if men seek to obtain the maximum of harmony in their affairs, they will humble themselves by painstakingly attempting to discover those Truths and obeying them. It was Lord Acton who enunciated the Truth known to the Founder of Christianity that all power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely. This is an absolute, which no "majority vote" can alter. In the story of the temptation on the mountain in the wilderness, Christ rejected the view that the Kingdom could be established if He had world dominion. The social philosophy of traditional Christianity favoured the de-centralisation of all power as a reflection of Reality. Stemming from Christ's famous answer to the tricky question concerning the Roman coin, that the individual should "render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are Gods", which gave to the State a legitimacy it had never had previously, but at the same time set limits never previously acknowledged, there developed the concept of a Universal Church charged with the responsibility of limiting the power of the State in order that the inviolable rights of the individual might be protected.

MAGNA CARTA

At the confrontation between the English Caesar of the day, King John, and his opponents, it was the Church leaders, headed by Archbishop Steven Langton, who insisted that while Caesar was essential, he had usurped the power over individuals which violated rights established under the influence of Christianity. Sir Arthur Bryant writes in his *History of England* "It was not Langton's wish to see the Crown overthrown, the law ignored, the realm divided, the barons petty tyrants. What he wanted was that the king should preserve the law his predecessors created. And it was to the law that the Archbishop appealed, not only of man, but of God. For it was the essence of mediaeval philosophy that God ruled the earth, and that man, and kings above all men, must further His ends by doing justice or it was not in Christian eyes government at all."

A study of *Magna Carta*, a great and historic landmark in the development of English Common Law and limited constitutional government, shows that it is basically a Christian document, restating the traditional Christian view that the individual derived inviolable rights from God, and that Caesar (government) exists primarily to ensure that those rights are protected. The clear implication of *Magna Carta* is that the power of government must be strictly limited, and that there is a Higher Law, which governments must obey. But in a world where the totalitarian and anti-Christian concept of government has developed to the stage where govern-

ments of all kinds increasingly claim that they are elected "to govern", and that providing they have the numbers, all laws are legal, the Common Law rights of the individual are being progressively destroyed.

Cut off from an understanding of their Christian constitutional heritage, and indoctrinated with the religion of Secular Humanism, it is not surprising that large numbers of young Australians, along with the young of other Common Law countries, are not equipped to defend themselves against a growing totalitarianism masquerading as democracy. In attacking the Australian Federal Constitution, and supporting a programme, which not only seeks to centralise all power inside Australia, but internationally, Australia's Fabian Socialists are acting logically in accordance with their collectivist philosophy. Like their spiritual fellows, the Marxists, they reject the Christian concept of every individual being a unique creation, of value in his own right; to them the individual is of little importance except as a statistic in a group.

THE BRITISH INFLUENCE

If Australians are to heed the message of Prince Charles concerning their Constitutional Heritage, they must come to understand completely that the underlying concepts of that Constitution are those developed under two thousand years of Christian influence. Many of the forefathers of the Federal Constitution, political giants and statesmen compared with the pygmies of today, knew the lessons of history concerning governments and power. They were familiar with the absolute concerning government, as stated by Lord Bryce in his *Modern Democracies*, "The natural tendency of all government is to increase its own power." The early Greeks, whose Natural Law philosophy was carefully noted by the great Christian philosophers like Aquinas, grappled with problem of government as they attempted to create genuine democracies with the will of the electors prevailing. The Greeks discovered that representative government required that only a limited number of the same kind of people should vote and that government must be close to the people.

The framers of the Australian Federal Constitution grappled with the problem of how could the creators of the proposed Federal government, the States, whose Trinitarian constitutions, consisting of Lower Houses, Upper Houses, originally elected on a more limited franchise, and the Crown, derived from Great Britain, ensure that the inevitable natural centralising tendency of the Federal government be checked? Every effort was made to keep power decentralised, with the Federal government having only limited powers in areas such as Defence and External Powers. The smaller States only eventually accepted Federation with the provision for a Senate in which all States, irrespective of size and population, would be equally represented, and possessing sufficient power to check the policies of any government. The Australian Senate is the most powerful Upper House in any Common Law country and, as demonstrated in 1975, can even force a government to face the electors at an early election by refusing to pass Supply. Contrary to the myths of John Pilger and others, that both the American C.I.A. and British Intelligence were responsible for the Crown's representative, Sir John Kerr, destroying the Whitlam government, the truth is that the Senate had been

blocking Supply for some time before Sir John Kerr, acting in accordance with the Constitution, ordered an election at which the people could say what they felt. What could be more democratic?

Not surprisingly, the Hawke Fabian Socialists, who have been far from pleased with the Sydney Cove address by Prince Charles, are attempting to exploit the Bi-Centennial year by pressing for "reforms" of the Federal Constitution, one major objective being to seriously weaken the powers of the Senate and to abolish the reserve power of the Crown. The totalitarians reject the concept of there being any type of veto over their policies.

CHRISTIAN ROOTS OF COMMON LAW

Even many professing Christians, including the clergy, are astonished when told that up until 1917 British Lord Chancellors had expressly stated that Christianity was part and parcel of the English Common Law. It was in 1917 that a weakened British House of Lords declared that Christianity was no longer a part of the law of England. This was a break with the tradition of law as expressed by the famous English constitutional authority, William Blackstone, who wrote:

"The Law of Nature being coeval with mankind, and dictated by God Himself, is of course superior in obligation to any other. It is binding all over the globe in all countries and at all times; no human laws are of any validity if contrary to this...'

Commenting on the break with the Christian Heritage by the House of Lords in 1917, but certainly not commending it, Sir William Holdsworthy, Professor of Law at the University of Oxford said:

"The Judges are obliged to admit that (Government statutes) however morally unjust must be obeyed . . . One might have thought that the excesses of the Nazi regime would have made our jurists realise the iniquity of such a theory of law. England's Attorney-General at Nuremburg demanded the death sentence for Germans who obeyed the Nazis, but back in England the same Attorney-General ("Times", May 13, 1946) said 'Parliament is sovereign, it can make any laws. It could ordain that all blue-eyed babies be destroyed at birth'. Herod could not teach our modern jurists anything. They are grimly earnest — 'Laws may be iniquitous, but they cannot be unjust'."

Professor Holdsworthy said at the time the House of Lords decided that Christianity was no longer part of the law of England, that 'It is not unlikely that Caesar now that he has deliberately abandoned the task of securing for God the things that are God's, will find considerably greater difficulty in securing for himself the things that are Caesar's' Events have grimly confirmed Professor Holdsworthy's warning. The challenge to authority in all its form is the greatest problem threatening the foundations of civilisation today. Authority has been undermined because the fountainhead of all authority is denied. Truly, "the fool has said in his heart there is no God."

It is significant that one of the most influential Marxists of this century, Professor Harold J. Laski, stressed that the idea of Christianity being an essential part of the British Constitution, must be rejected in favour of the concept of the "sovereignty of Parlia-

ment". This totalitarian concept is widespread today, with the result that modern governments now believe that if they can persuade a majority of electors to vote for them, irrespective of how this is achieved and how small the majority, they have the "right" to do as they like until the next elections. The lawyers and judiciary are expected to spend their time interpreting the stream of laws passed by governments without any reference to Natural or Christian Law. Added to this is the framing of regulations, which have the force of law, by non-elected officials using delegated power. One of the first to perceive the erosion of responsible government and the freedom and rights of the individual, was a former Lord Chief Justice of England, Lord Hewart, who caused a major sensation after the First World War with his aptly described book, *The New Despotism*. The warning was brushed aside by Professor Laski and those who accepted his philosophy. Laski blatantly stated that government should be able 'legally' to acquire any property desired. He said that it did not matter if financial compensation had to be paid, as the government could then take care of this through its taxing powers! The sequel to Lord Hewart's *The New Despotism* came from the pen of another eminent English constitutional authority, Professor G. Keeton, 30 years later. Keeton's book was called *The Passing of Parliament*. One of the most significant chapters in this book was "On the Road to Moscow". Only the shell of the once famous British Constitution remains. It is a far cry from that period in English history when, as described by Blackstone in his *Commentaries*, 1765, that Edward I had confirmed Magna Carta by a statute "whereby the Great Charter is directed to be allowed as the common law; all judgments contrary to it are declared void; copies of it are ordered to be sent to all Cathedral Churches, and read twice a year to the people; and sentence of excommunication is directed to be as constantly denounced against all those that by word, deed or counsel act contrary thereto, or in any degree infringe it." This explains why Communist literature always seeks to pervert the real significance of what Magna Carta was really about.

THE BASIC QUESTION

What is being discussed is not merely of academic interest. Shortly after he left his office as Governor of South Australia, Sir Marcus Oliphant stressed that democracy was virtually dead in Australia. Australians now lived under an "elected dictatorship." The same can be said about all the so-called democratic nations. The very future of Civilisation itself depends upon how the scope of human law can be checked. An eminent lawyer, Professor R.W. Chambers, has succinctly stated the issue: "Upon that difference — whether or not we place Divine Law in the last resort above the law of the State — depends the whole future of the world."

One thing is certain: the drive towards increasing totalitarianism is not going to be checked by appealing to the mass, irresponsible party political vote. The original concept of Parliament was that it consisted of representatives elected by a limited franchise and was responsible primarily for controlling the Executive by voting on how much taxation would be made available. But with the progressing widening of the franchise and governments using taxation as an instrument of control, elections have increasingly become contests in mass bribery. The very voting system itself, now elevated to

the stage where a government claims to have a mandate to do virtually as its likes, because of what is termed the "majority vote", is a means by which electors are manipulated to vote for their own destruction — all in the name of democracy.

Douglas wrote "Genuine democracy can very nearly be defined as the right to atrophy a function by contracting out. It is essentially negative, although, contrary to the curious nonsense that is prevalent about 'negativeness', is none the less essential for that reason". The instincts of Australian electors are still basically sound, with every proposal, either Federal or State, being met by a resounding NO. Opposition to the threatened Bill of Rights and the ID ("Moscow") Card united electors across artificial political divisions. Effective defence of the nation's constitutional heritage requires that all attempts to weaken the present Federal Constitution be defeated; that a national "Defend the Consti-

tion" campaign stress that traditional Common Law rights be regained, and that electors unite to petition the Crown at all levels of government, for the introduction of the principle of the Electors' Veto, as exercised in Switzerland, where electors can challenge unpopular legislation and force a national vote. When the Swiss Federal government decided that Switzerland should join the United Nations, the electors forced a referendum at which nearly 70 percent of the electors vetoed the proposal.

Unless Australians can re-generate understanding of their true Constitutional heritage, with its Christian roots, they will not halt the dangerous slide towards a Slave State. Prince Charles has provided real leadership. He has thrown out a challenge, which Australians can now take up as a major part of their Bi-Centennial celebrations. They can also set an inspiring example to the rest of the world.

“Churchill's War” a book to be reckoned with

British-born hard-hitting journalist Doug Collins, who has lived in Canada for many years, says that Churchill was one of his heroes. But in the following review of David Irving's biography of Churchill, in the *"North Shore News"*, Vancouver, of December 2, Collins provides what can only be described as a professionally honest review of a book, which the Zionist machine is making every endeavour to suppress.

Shortly before he died, Harold Macmillan was shown the manuscript of *Churchill's War*, by David Irving. Macmillan former British prime minister and head of the great publishing house, read it and said: "Over my dead body." He would not publish it.

Other publishers said the same, not only in the U.K. but in the U.S. Now, however, the book has been printed by a small Australian publishing company (Veritas) and is being sold here. In Aussie it is a best seller.

Macmillan's attitude was understandable. He was close to Churchill. But the man hasn't yet been born who was without warts, and Irving shows all of Churchill's and adds a few. Among other things, he paints Churchill as a lush who alarmed Mackenzie King and worried Franklin Roosevelt.

If you are a Churchill fan, as I am, you will hate this book because Irving hates Churchill. He has made no secret of it in his book-plugging tours. But that only adds to the fascination of this 600-page tome that took 10 years to put together.

In Irving's view, Churchill should have made a deal with Hitler. That he failed to do so led to the breakup of the British Empire, in which the Americans joined joyfully. It also doomed much of Europe through air attack and led to the triumph of Bolshevism. Hitler is shown as wanting nothing from the British except the return of the former German colonies.

According to Irving, Churchill was his own general, admiral and air marshal and was the architect of many disasters. He caused the Germans to invade Norway by planning to move into that country himself, but was out-smarted. Churchill also committed a war crime by smashing the French fleet at Dakar.

He messed up in the Mediterranean by going to the aid of Greece and defending Crete. This split the British Army of the Nile, and caused the 1941 defeat in Libya. General Wavell became the scapegoat.

As Britain moved deeper into the mire, he sold everything to the U.S. -- British assets in North America and scientific wonders of the day in which the Americans lagged far behind. His aim was to get the Americans into the war. To achieve that, nothing was sacred.

For 50 beaten-up old destroyers, only two of which were of any use, he traded bases in the West Indies "in perpetuity." The Americans, meanwhile, far from wanting to save civilization, were nothing but hard-eyed Yankee traders. Lend-Lease was a rip-off and it wasn't until their own ass was kicked that they came in.

There's a lot more. Irving contends that Churchill invited the bombings of Britain by striking at German civilian targets

first, albeit with much less success than Hitler had when he attacked the U.K. Of the raids that killed 7,000 people in London in September 1940, he writes:

"The British people could not know that for reasons of grand strategy Churchill and Bomber Command had done their utmost to induce this outrage." Winston, meanwhile, is quoted as saying during the Blitz: "The sound of these cannon gives me a tremendous feeling... "

Irving may be correct about much of this. For my money, Churchill was right to fight Hitler tooth and nail at whatever cost. Who is to say what the Nazis would have done if Britain had concluded a deal? Wasn't there a deal over Czechoslovakia? Did that stop the invasion of Poland?

The one thing that sticks in my throat, though, is Irving's heavy hint that Churchill was a coward. Privy to nearly all German plans through Ultra, the marvellous British code-breaking system, Churchill, says Irving, used that knowledge to skip out of London when the Luftwaffe was coming — while urging the hapless peasants on to greater efforts. (This has been emphatically denied by Sir John Colville, one of Churchill's key secretaries in 1940).

With regret, however, I must say that this book will have to be reckoned with when the final tally on World War Two is made. The research is awesome. There are also some laughs. We learn, for instance, that the Americans called the foppish Anthony Eden "Miss England".

NEW UNHAPPY LORDS

They have given us into the hand of new unhappy lords,
Lords without anger and honour, who dare not carry their swords.
They fight by shuffling papers, they have bright dead alien eyes;
They look at our labour and laughter as a tired man looks at flies.
And the load of their loveless pity is worse than the ancient wrongs,
Their doors are shut in the evening; and they know no songs.

G.K. Chesterton, In "The Secret People".

HOW ANTI-FLUORIDATION BATTLE WAS WON IN THE NETHERLANDS

The policy of fluoridating public water supplies is a manifestation of a totalitarian philosophy. Support for this philosophy cuts across party political divisions, as witnessed by the fact that in Australia both the Labor Socialists and the "anti-Socialist" Liberals are united in insisting that people must be subjected to compulsory medication via the water tap.

British scientist Dr. Geoffrey Dobbs has been prominent in the anti-fluoridation battle in the United Kingdom and, in the following review (in "Home" U.K., January 1988) of the book, "*Moolenburgh Fluoride - The Freedom Fight*", by Netherlands doctor Dr. Hans Moolenburgh, stresses that the basic issue is not medical, but freedom of choice.

The social conflict about the fluoridation of public water supplies has always been, from the start, *primarily* a political conflict; only secondarily about fluoride, its effects on teeth or health, or anything else. Politics is about power, and more especially about the power of the rulers over the ruled and the resistance of the latter, of which this book describes an outstanding and successful example in one country, namely The Netherlands.

Fluoridation is exclusively an imposition of Governments and their bureaucracies upon the citizens. Without Government money extracted by force of law from the very people it is used against, it is an impossibility. As the subtitle to Dr. Moolenburgh's book clearly shows, he is very well aware that this is the primary consideration, although the part which he and his medical colleagues played in investigating and publicising the effects on the health of their patients was also of critical importance.

No doubt most of those who have been active or interested in this question of fluoridation, or in health generally, or in the purity of water or the environment, will already have bought the book or intend to do so. Yet it will be of vital interest also to all those who are concerned about human freedom, who should be grateful to the author in that, having won his battle in his own country, he has not rested on his laurels but has gone to the trouble of giving us an account of it to help the rest of us who are still engaged, not only in this, but in other similar struggles for freedom. As he writes (on p. 126): "Learning how to fight fluoridation gives you power to fight the far more dangerous threat of totalitarian thinking that sweeps the world today and threatens to bring back the Dark Ages."

As a Farmer Doses His Cattle

The story is entertainingly told, in excellent, colloquial English, and there is no need to recapitulate it. In most respects it parallels the history of Fluoridation in Britain, but in certain vital respects departs from it. As usual it starts with a simple experiment for the benefit of the populations of two Dutch towns, to be carried out by qualified dental scientists to which no official, status-holding person could, or did, raise any objection. Neither, at first, did the common citizens; since the thing was so new and unprecedented it took some time for them to realise its monstrous nature, in that, for the first time, people were to be collectively dosed by their masters without consultation or choice, much as a farmer doses his cattle, deeming himself a superior being wholly in charge of their lives.

Incidentally, so far as I know, Dr. Moolenburgh is the only other writer on fluoridation beside myself who has used this accurate comparison with the treatment of cattle, which many shy away from as being an exaggeration. It is not. It sums up the essence of the matter, and to evade it is to transfer the conflict to inessentials, such as health effects, however much they may have their place.

As elsewhere, the whole weight of official, medical prestige was employed by the propagandists to promote the measure and to suppress all contra-indications, which were left to the public to cover for themselves; so that local Councils agreed to it after hearing only one side. The conflict came later in most of the big cities, including Amsterdam. In Haarlem, however, the announcement of impending fluoridation stirred up such opposition (led by Dr. Moolenburgh) that it never was carried out. In time the many local oppositions consolidated into two main groups, one of which, with a name translated as 'Tapwater Vigilance', ultimately succeeded in obtaining, on a second

Appeal against lower court judgments, a decision from the High Court that fluoridation was '*without legal foundation*'.

The parallel with what happened a few years later in Britain is close, although here the adverse legal decision was in a Scottish court, which might not necessarily apply to the rest of the country. In both countries the advance of fluoridation was halted, and in both the fluoridators, well aware that what they had been doing for years had always, almost certainly, been illegal at once claimed that this showed that the law must be changed by Parliament to legalise it. But here came the difference. In Holland public awareness and pressure and publicity were, in the end, sufficient to stop the Fluoridation Bill being passed. In Britain it was opposed only by a handful of M.P.'s at an all-night sitting, and easily pushed through by what was described at the time as the Government's 'pay-roll vote', and took a very minor place in the media as compared with the following Bill on telephone-tapping.

Why this difference between parliamentary success in Holland and, so far, parliamentary failure in Britain?

A Practical Solution

First of all, Holland is a smaller and more compact country than the United Kingdom, with about one-seventh of the area but a quarter of the population. Proportionately it had been more extensively fluoridated than the U.K. so that for more people it was a practical rather than a theoretical issue. For instance, Greater London has never been fluoridated, or even subjected to urgent promotional pressure.

Then, the authorities in the Netherlands early on conceded a most important point of principle, namely, that water consumers have a right to be supplied with unfluoridated water. This resulted in standpipes being erected in certain cities. In the great city of Amsterdam there were only five, and when the crowds trying to draw from one of these attracted attention it was then so heavily chlorinated as to make the water practically undrinkable! But in the flower-growing district of Aalsmeer, where jerry cans of pure water had to be provided, the demand grew to such proportions (e.g. 1200 cans a day!) as to become a major embarrassment to the authorities and was later an important factor in preventing the passing of the Fluoridation Bill. In Britain this essential right has never been conceded. The Dutch experience has shown that it is the critical point to fight for.

True as it is that freedom of choice is the vital thing, it scarcely arises if people have no good reasons for wishing not to drink extra fluoride added to their water. The mere fact that this substance is highly suspect and its effects on health notoriously controversial ought to have been ample reason for *not* putting it in. It is, of course, the duty of our 'health advisers' to put both the pros and the cons with, if anything a cautious emphasis upon the cons, rather than thrusting that duty upon members of the public. It is easy enough for professionals to make fools of amateurs who venture to argue with them in public over technicalities, whether in medicine or anything else. This is where we look to the medical profession itself to defend the public from such one-sided information as they have been given by the official promotionists of fluoridation.

Investigated for Themselves

In Britain, with a few notable exceptions, the medical and dental professions have failed in that duty, and have allowed those who speak for them to imply that the opposition is based upon technical ignorance. In contrast, in the Netherlands, not only were Dr. Moolenburgh and his colleagues outspoken in their

opposition on the correct grounds of freedom of choice, but on the medical side they were not content to quote the American examples of damaging effects described by Dr. Waldbott and a few others, but formed a group which set about investigating the truth of the matter themselves. In due course they received ample evidence that such toxic effects did occur among some of their patients, and even themselves, after drinking fluoridated water; which ceased after drinking unfluoridated water, and recurred after returning to fluoridated. The situation, as might be expected, was not simple. After a time people might become adapted to the higher fluoride intake, but symptoms might recur when they were detoxifying after stopping it, and of course many other factors affecting health would inevitably contribute to the outcome.

The fact that these effects, hitherto heavily discounted because they had been reported only from the U.S.A., were now confirmed from a European country had a powerful influence. But what disappointed Dr. Moolenburgh, as it has the reviewer, was that, while other opponents would constantly appeal to him to come and present his evidence to support them, nowhere did they seem willing to get down to it and investigate the truth of the matter themselves. One would have thought that, once these

symptoms had been described by reputable doctors, others, all over the world, whether opposed on principle or completely open-minded, would not rest until they had checked the facts, carefully and honestly, for themselves. Had this been done, as it surely would have been in the absence of unilateral, official propaganda discounting all but favourable reports, we should have long ago seen the end of fluoridation.

A final point, made by Dr. Moolenburgh, is that, whereas the Dutch know from experience what totalitarianism is like, through being occupied during the Second World War, Britain and the U.S.A. have not had that grim experience, and are less ready to recognise it and to refuse to endure it, when disguised as a method of improving children's teeth. Nevertheless, the dogged resistance of the British people, which, after thirty-five years of continual pressure and propaganda from the State 'Health' bureaucracy, has still averted this impudent imposition from about five-sixths of the population, is in itself a victory of no small order. With the example of the Netherlands before us, it augurs well for the future, and has already added strength and experience to the resistance to even more serious and intimate invasions of personal and family life.

ULSTER - THE SENSELESS TRAGEDY

by Ivor Benson.

In the following article in the November-December issue of "Behind the News", (P.O. Box 1564, Krugersdorp, 1740 South Africa) South African journalist and news-analyst Ivor Benson, draws attention to an aspect of the Irish situation, which is generally ignored.

The news that made big newspaper headlines in Britain this month (November) was the Remembrance Day bombing at Enniskillen, Northern Ireland, that killed eleven people and injured 63, including several children.

There was universal condemnation of the deed, and even the IRA, who admitted having placed the bomb, tried to escape full blame by arguing that it was British Army electronic interference which actually triggered the explosion, implying that it was not intended to kill and injure so many.

The deed was deplored by all, but not so the aim behind the deed, the incorporation of Ulster in a united Irish Republic. How could it have been otherwise when the constitution of the Republic continues to enshrine the ideal of a "united Ireland"? Indeed, it is an ideal supported almost unanimously by the Irish everywhere — in Ireland, the United Kingdom and by their descendants in the United States to the third and fourth generation.

There is, therefore, every reason to believe that the killing, maiming and destruction will continue, possibly on an even greater scale than ever. A crazier and more confused state of affairs it would be hard to imagine, brilliantly clear and perfectly intelligible in its parts, as when that bomb went off opposite the war memorial at Enniskillen — everyone knows what that means - but in its totality a tangle of conflicting interests and passions offering no possibility of being resolved.

In any complex situation, as the Chinese savants were saying millennia ago, the meaning of the part is to be found only in the whole to which it belongs; the Irish problem has very many parts, but is itself only part of a much bigger picture of an unprecedented age of conflict and tragedy.

We shall at least have a better idea of the kind of problem we are trying to solve if we can acknowledge, without further debate, that we all live today in a vast world of lies generated by power politics in which warfare of the kind we can all understand has been largely replaced by a warfare on the battleground of the mind which very few can understand. It has been virtually impossible for the whole truth to emerge as common property because too many of those involved have a vested interest in keeping it under wraps, a vested interest reinforced in many cases with a firm belief that the truth could do more harm than good.

Behind the Scene

All we need concern ourselves with at this moment is that

small segment of truth which, sooner or later, because it will not go away, will completely transform the situation in Northern Ireland: the simple and incontrovertible fact that what the IRA are fighting for in Ulster has been rendered completely meaningless by what has happened behind their backs inside the Republic of Ireland.

More precisely, a sovereign and independent Republic of Ireland is today pure make-believe. And all the politicians at the top, plus some of the top bureaucrats, must know this. That is why the British Government would cheerfully surrender Ulster to the Republic of Ireland. Mrs. Thatcher would not dare say so, but Ulster's so-called "loyalists" know it, and at once recognised the recent Anglo-Irish Agreement as a further step in that direction. And Mrs. Thatcher would have no conscientious misgivings about doing it because she knows that for all practical purposes *the Republic of Ireland is still a part of the United Kingdom*.

What many people outside Ireland do not know, but every Irishman knows full well, is that for all purposes that really matter there are no boundaries between the United Kingdom and Eire, no immigration control and very little customs control. Not only are the Irish permitted to enter Britain without permits, but are immediately placed on public assistance if they need it, and can even register for the vote in British elections. And since an Irish passport, for all purposes of residence and travel, is exactly the same as a British passport, Ireland's Department of Population Registration can be regarded as a mere branch of the British Home Office.

The anomalies that arise are then studiously disregarded by media and politicians, as when criminal proceedings were taken by the British Government recently against a clerk at the Irish Embassy in London accused of selling Irish passports to wealthy Asians, it emerged that the Irish had not even been asked to waive diplomatic immunity.

It would seem, therefore, that the main purpose served by the parliament in Dublin, with its warring factions of Irish nationalism, is to sustain the illusion that the Republic of Ireland is a sovereign and independent nation, an instrument of the will and destiny of the Irish people. What powers it does have are, in fact, hardly distinguishable from such as are exercised within the

United Kingdom by Scotland and Wales.

'CONFUSION IS A WEAPON'

Now let us look at the Irish situation in the context of that much bigger political and historical picture to which it belongs, a picture that includes the whole of the United Kingdom and much else. What a different view we now get of the Irish situation!

British hegemony no longer means what it used to mean. There was a time when it meant English hegemony, no more and no less. But what can it mean when Britain itself has ceased to be a sovereign and independent nation? Is there then any difference except one of degree between the two talking shops, the one in Dublin and the other in London? Is the House of Commons any less a piece of political stage furniture than the Dail?

At the recent annual conference of Britain's Conservative Party there were more than a hundred resolutions from party branches on the subject of law and order, more than thirty of them demanding a restoration of the death penalty. There can be no doubt that those resolutions reflect what the great majority of the people of Britain feel and think about their country's rapidly worsening crime situation. So why cannot the people of Britain get what they so obviously want?

The answer is one that Home Secretary Douglas Hurd would not have dared to utter and of which the hundreds of dele-

gates would have had no inkling: the British — their leaders rather — have surrendered what has always and everywhere been recognised as the first and most important responsibility of any government, that of maintaining law and order. Under the terms of the Treaty of Rome and enabling legislation passed by the House of Commons (European Communities Act of 1972) "Community Law" which outlaws capital punishment and corporal punishment, supersedes any antecedent national law dealing with crime and punishment.

Much else of national sovereignty has been surrendered by the governments of national sovereignty has been surrendered by the governments of Britain and Ireland in exchange for the supposed benefits of membership of the European Economic Community and an imagined "piece of action" in helping to establish a planned New International Economic Order (NIEO) — a euphemism for totalitarian world rule.

Nationalist sentiment — indeed all sentiment — being much stronger in Ireland than in Britain, Ireland's rulers find themselves in a risky situation; hence the prolonged foot-dragging over Britain's demands for the extradition of Irishmen wanted for all alleged terrorist offences in Ulster and elsewhere in the Kingdom.

It might even be argued that the fiery Irish nationalism that continues to be burned off in the north might otherwise be giving sleepless nights to the NIEO-oriented politicians in the south.

The True Celebration Of This Nation is in its Constitution

PRINCE CHARLES IN SYDNEY ON JANUARY 26.

The following is the complete text of the brilliant and inspiring address by Prince Charles in the Sydney Opera House forecourt on the occasion of Australia's Bi-Centennial.

My wife and I are delighted to be able to return to Australia at this very special time, to celebrate with you your nation's Bicentennial.

It is a historic and splendid occasion for all of us — not only here in Australia, but all over the world, and not least in the United Kingdom.

The modern nation of Australia began here, 200 years ago today. They were harsh beginnings, and the people who were sent here against their will had little cause to rejoice.

And all that was just yesterday. As history goes, 200 years is barely a heartbeat.

Yet look around you, and see what has happened in that time. A whole new free people. The people of a whole new free country, Australia. If it takes regular visitors from an old country to help you decide whether you should be celebrating or not, my wife and I will be glad to be of assistance. We are both very happy to have been invited to the party.

When Captain Cook discovered this part of the Great South Land and claimed it for the British Crown, he was sailing in quest of knowledge.

And whatever is said about the founding of the British Empire, the astonishing courage and resolve of many people like Captain Cook who dramatically advanced the sum of human knowledge in their quest for discovery and trade should not be ignored amidst the less worthy aspects of the story.

But as still happens today when knowledge is invariably examined for its less exalted application, King George III's ministers fairly soon saw the practical possibilities of a place where inconvenient people could be transported and forgotten.

There is no point now in trying to gloss over the circumstances in which the country of which you are rightly proud began. Indeed, to face those facts is a necessary part of realising just how proud you should be.

For the sad truth is that in those early days of the colony nobody was free. The men who guarded the convicts were in prison along with them. They were all a long way from home, and they all no doubt thought that Australia was the worst place in the world.

But the best part about the story is that they made their prison into a new home, where freedom became not just the dream of those in shackles, but a reality for everybody.

It didn't happen by accident. It took the intelligence and courage of brave men and women.

Even within the astonishingly brief span, which covers the whole history of modern Australia, the process of making liberty an institution took time.

For the original people of this land it must all have seemed very different, and if they should say that their predicament has not yet ended, it would be hard to know how to answer, beyond suggesting that a country free enough to examine its own conscience is a land worth living in, a nation to be envied.

Anyway, most people who live here now seem to think Australia is the best place in the world, and the rest of the world finds it difficult to argue.

By now, almost every country on Earth is the old country to some family in Australia. Coming from your first old country, and celebrating the 22nd anniversary, to the month, of my first transportation to Australia, let me say, on behalf of all the lands and peoples who have contributed to your heritage, that you have the best of us.

Australia is its own creation, but in a very real sense it belongs to the world. Australia is an international nation.

People from anywhere feel at home here in Australia. It's that sort of place. In two world wars, Australians fought wholeheartedly against intolerance and tyranny. They didn't just fight for the old Empire, which has now receded into history. They fought for freedom, which lasts, if it is looked after and nurtured.

One of Australia's oldest ties with the oldest of its old countries is the rule of law. They were harsh judges who sent the first Australians out here, but they were wisely framed laws that turned convicts into free men and women. And free men and women helped make a democracy, which has become a model for the world.

They didn't do it just by being good-natured and easy-going — however famous they were, and you are, for those qualities. They did it by carefully writing down the laws of a

reasonable and humane society.

The spirit of liberty that they felt within themselves they made legible to others. The true celebration of this nation is in its Constitution.

In those dry-sounding but hard fought for rules and regulations, every family in this remarkable country has its rights protected and cherished.

As it happened so long ago, many of you may not realise that part of my own education took place here in Australia.

Quite frankly, it was by far the best part and something, which I shall always cherish. It gave me an insight into the character of this country and the individuals who have shaped it by the force of their personalities and by their infectious good humour.

While I was here I had the Pommy bits bashed off me, like chips off and old block, and the results are only too obvious.

I keep coming back for more, and it is always a special pleasure. But my wife and I are particularly glad to be here this year, on this great day, to help you — as if you Aussies needed help in anything! — to celebrate your good fortune and to wish you well for a future that holds out such great promise.

Christopher Dawson and The Crisis of Western Civilization

by Dr. Glenn N. Schram
in "The Christian News", U.S.A.

It would be difficult to find a more unpopular writer today than the English historian Christopher Dawson (1889-1970); Educated at Winchester School and at Oxford, Dawson in 1914 joined the Catholic Church. He denied that it is a function of the Church to create a reign of earthly peace and justice.

He was dismissed by Professor Judith Shklar in her book *After Utopia* as a "Christian fatalist," or holder of the belief that Europe would die if it persisted on its path toward irreligion; and he was eclipsed by his contemporaries Arnold Toynbee and Eric Voegelin as a philosopher of history.

Nonetheless he had an important perspective, which we ignore at our peril. He saw the trend of the times as toward totalitarianism, and strongly implied that the only thing that could save Western Europe and the United States from a totalitarian fate was a renaissance of Christianity.

It is true that Dawson failed to describe the situation quite so starkly, and that his views along these lines were for the most part expressed during the 1930's in the face of Stalinism in the Soviet Union and fascism in Germany and Italy.

But as late as 1960 he could write that "the fundamental distinction which Christians make between Church and State and spiritual and temporal authority is the opposite of totalitarian and is perhaps the only ultimate defense of man's spiritual freedom against the totalitarian challenge and the growing pressure of the secular state."

In this article I shall focus on his 1935 book, *Religion and the Modern State*, for it contains his most detailed discussion of the problem of totalitarianism. To Dawson, totalitarianism had two sides. On one side it was the final result of movements toward secularization and ever-greater power in the hands of the state, but on the other side it fulfilled a spiritual need created by the very secularization of which it was an expression. He wrote:

"The rise of the new State may be regarded as the culmination of the process of secularization in Western history and the unification of our culture on a purely materialistic basis. But on the other hand it may equally be regarded as the result of a spiritual reaction against the materialism of nineteenth century

bourgeois society: as an attempt to find some substitute for the lost religious foundations of society and to replace the utilitarian individualism of the liberal-capitalist State by a new spiritual community."

Dawson thought it unlikely that a totalitarian regime in England or America would be Communist or Fascist; rather, it would be indigenous to the Anglo-American world and would probably have strong overtones of social reformism and humanitarianism. Nonetheless as a totalitarian regime it would try to control all aspects of men's lives.

Dawson saw totalitarianism as involving an attempt to create a New Jerusalem on earth: "there is the Muscovite Jerusalem which has no Temple, there is Herr Hitler's Jerusalem which has no Jews, and there is the Jerusalem of the social reformers which is all suburbs." It is this aspiration to divinity, which prompts the totalitarian state to claim "to embrace the whole of life and to demand the total submission of the individual will and conscience."

The fundamental error in totalitarianism, Dawson said, "is the ignoring of Original Sin and its consequences or rather the identification of the Fall with some defective political or economic arrangement," such as the power of the capitalists or the Jews. This lesson seems to have been forgotten in many religious circles today.

For Dawson, the only Kingdom of God, which we have a right to expect on earth, is the Church, which performs several important functions. It provides the individual with the wherewithal to resist totalitarian claims by the state. It also helps to preserve civilization.

For when a civilization ceases to believe itself to be based on the Law of God, it is doomed to destruction by the decay of its own energies. Thus Professor Shklar is not very wide of the mark in her assessment of Dawson as a "Christian fatalist."

But what of the establishment of totalitarianism? Where does Dawson say that the only alternative to it for Western Europe is a renewal of Christianity? The passage, which comes closest to making this assertion, is the following:

"All those ideals, which we regard as typically Western — the supremacy of law, the recognition of the moral rights of the individual and the duty of society towards the poor and the oppressed — are not the invention of modern democracy. They are ultimately products of the Christian tradition and find their only true justification in Christian principles. Either these elements must be . . . brought back to their natural basis in the Christian tradition, or they will be eliminated by the reconstitution of society on purely materialistic foundations as a closed order in which human nature is entirely subordinated to the needs of the state machine."

At issue, therefore, is "the choice between the mechanized order of the absolute State . . . and a return to spiritual order based on a reassertion of the Christian elements in Western culture."

Nothing in these views ought to be taken to mean that Dawson favored a theocracy or anything like it. He knew history too well to be optimistic about the results when ecclesiastics become involved in politics or political parties "adopt religious programmes and claim to represent the cause of God." He wrote:

"In a sense it is quite true to say that all our troubles are due to the neglect of Christian teaching and that Christianity is the remedy for our social as well as our individual evils. But it is not like a patent medicine that is warranted to cure all diseases. It offers no short cuts to economic prosperity or social stability."

Nevertheless he believed that Christianity can "transform social life not by competing with secular politics on their ground but by altering the focus of human thought and opening the closed house of secular culture to the free light and air of a larger and a more real world." The need for Christianity to perform this role is greater now than it was a half century ago, when Dawson wrote these words.