

# THE NEW TIMES

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

VOL. 54, NO. 12.

Registered by Australia Post-Publication No. VBH 1001.

DECEMBER 1990.

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

## NO PEACE IN THE HOLY LAND

*by Eric D. Butler.*

"Peace on earth, goodwill towards all men." This is the Christian message at this time of the year. The overwhelming majority of people want to live in peace and harmony with their fellows, and only engage in conflict when they become the victims of centralised power. Centralised power, and the corrupting influence of power, enables power lusts to move individuals to support destructive policies, which they would reject if they controlled their own affairs and had genuine freedom of choice.

The spirit of Christmas finds it hard to break through the shadows, which darken the Holy Land at this time. A situation fraught with the most horrendous consequences challenges all Christians to examine basic causes, and to ask who are those foremost in the call for war. Dr. Henry Kissinger, a long-time spokesman for the International Money Power, and a supporter of an aggressive Zionist Israel, is typical of those who have been openly calling for war ever since the present Middle East crisis erupted.

One of the most outstanding prophets of our times is the courageous American Jewish authority on the Middle East, Dr. Alfred Lilienthal. Lilienthal is one of those Jews who rejected the exploitation of Jewish spirituality by the international Political Zionist movement from the beginning of the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948. Like other Jews who have taken the same stand, Lilienthal has paid dearly in more ways than one at the hands of the Zionist hate machine. The Christian concept of love is rejected by those who established the State of Israel by the use of sheer terror and Money Power.

Dr. Lilienthal has said that the founding of the State of Israel has been "one of the greatest geopolitical mistakes of the twentieth century. The state of Israel has wreaked havoc in the world by continuing to threaten the survival of civilisation." Lilienthal says, "We forget the basic fact of history. In 1948, the Israelis drove out tens of thousands of Palestinian Arabs from their homeland. And when the refugees insist on their right to return, and conflict ensues, Zionist propagandists promote the idea that Arab hostility and Hitlerian anti-Semitism are the same thing." Christians generally are not aware that tens of thousands of their fellow Christians were among the Palestinians driven from their homes by Zionist terror.

### THE SEEDS OF THE CRISIS

The seeds of the Middle East crisis were sown during the First World War, when the Palestinian Arabs and others who had lived under the yoke of the Ottoman Empire controlled by Turkey, were promised self-determination if they joined with the Western Allies against their Turkish overlords. British military strategists envisaged an uprising against Turkey as a major contribution towards defeating Turkey's ally, Imperial Germany. Harsh military realities resulted in the British breaking their promises to the Palestinians and others when in 1916 they were faced with the choice either of making peace with Germany, or of making a promise to Zionist leaders in exchange for an assurance that Zionist influence, primarily in the field of International Finance, could bring neutral America into the conflict.

### 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 desperate military situation of the Western Allies in 1916 was the result of the complete collapse of the Russians on the Eastern front.

The Balfour Agreement, signed by Lord Balfour on behalf of the British Government, and Lord Rothschild of the famous international banking family, in which the British government agreed to the establishment of a "national home" for the Jews in Palestine, was a manifestation of the reality that there is an international power above nations. The International Money power dominated both sides, and imposed conditions, which paved the way for the Second World War.

To their credit, successive British governments, charged with the responsibility of administering Palestine under the League of Nations Mandate, insisted that the Balfour Agreement did not mean the establishment of a new Jewish State. But the long-term objective of the Zionist leaders was exactly that. The Arab world became increasingly disturbed as illegal Zionist migration into Palestine continued in spite of British resistance.

The Second World War finished with the Soviet Union assisting in a massive Zionist invasion, which the British were unable to stem. Zionist terrorism eventually forced the British to say they had had enough and wanted to hand the problem of growing violence between the Zionists and the Palestinians over to the United Nations. The first major act of an organisation allegedly established to create stability and to prevent aggression, was to agree to the Zionist demands that a new State be created in Palestine, in spite of the protestations of the Palestinian people. When the vote for annexation of Palestine was first mooted at the General Assembly of the United Nations, it was feared that it would be defeated. Australian chairman, External Affairs Minister, Dr. H.V. Evatt, a prominent Fabian, then called for a recess, during which representatives of the International Money power applied enough pressure to persuade enough members to vote for the resolution establishing the State of Israel. The Soviet Union was the first to recognise the new State, established by the Zionist terrorists ahead of the proposed UNO programme.

### SOVIET EXPLOITS ARABS

The Arab world was incensed and the Soviet strategists exploited the situation with the radicalisation of the whole Arab world, which became increasingly anti-Western, throwing over traditional leaders in favour of the Assads and Saddam Husseins. The Soviets trapped Nasser of Egypt into the 1967 war, which Israel easily won in six days. Zionist Israel expanded its borders dramatically, taking over the Gaza strip, the Western Bank of the Jordan, all of Jerusalem and the Golan Heights. There was another flood of Palestinian refugees. As anticipated by the Soviet strategists, anti-Western feeling was further intensified throughout an Arab world which saw Zionist Israel as a poisoned thorn driven into the Middle East, with the aid and protection of the Western powers, mainly the USA.

For over 23 years, the Palestinians have remained under the yoke of the Israelis, who have defied all appeals to evacuate occupied territories. Desperate situations result in desperate action, and the Palestinians have resorted to acts of violence in an attempt to break the grip of those they see as their oppressors. The Palestinians have seen United Nations resolutions concerning their occupied territory blatantly ignored by an Israeli government run by former terrorists like Shamir. In sheer desperation, and in an attempt to focus world attention on their plight, Palestinian children have resorted to throwing stones. Israeli troops have responded by shooting a growing number of Palestinians. The Arab world has noted some harmless Western moralising, but no action to force Israel to evacuate the territories taken by force in 1967. Not surprisingly, the emergence of a

strong man like Saddam Hussein attracts strong support from the Palestinians.

It is no secret that Israeli leaders would welcome any situation, which they could use to stage military action against Jordan. King Hussein of Jordan knows this and has appealed to the West to move towards curbing Israel. In the event of an Israeli military attack against Jordan, Iraq is pledged to assist Jordan. This would be welcomed by Israel as a means of creating a general conflict in which, with — it is planned — American support, they could completely crush Iraq and solve the Palestinian problem. Saddam Hussein is playing the Palestinian card, demanding that there should be a general peace settlement in the Middle East in which the Israelis also withdraw from occupied Palestinian territory.

### THE PROSPECT OF PEACE

As this article is written, domestic pressures inside the USA have forced the Bush Administration to shift its stance. It appears that there will be a tense 1990 Christmas in the Holy Land, but no immediate military conflict. If the spirit of justice and peace can develop throughout the coming Christmas Season, the cries of the warmongers may be progressively drowned out by a worldwide demand that at long last the first steps are taken to remove from the Middle East the poisoned thorn of the Palestinian tragedy. If this is not done, then the world is threatened with a major explosion in the Middle East. The Christians should be in the forefront of a demand that the Christian West nails its colours on the wall of justice for all.

## MUGGERIDGE'S "WINTER IN MOSCOW"

The passing of one of the most outstanding figures of this century, Mr. Malcolm Muggeridge, has naturally resulted in many eulogies. Reference has been made to how, in spite of his Fabian background, Muggeridge's honesty and journalistic integrity resulted in his scathing indictment of Stalin's Soviet Union during the thirties. But it is not without significance that while some of those praising Muggeridge have mentioned one of his first works, a novel, *Winter in Moscow*, no reference has been made of how, in what is a fictionalised version of his own experiences in Russia, Muggeridge describes the Jewish monopoly of power in the Soviet. As far as we know, *Winter in Moscow* has never been re-published. Visiting the Soviet a few years after Muggeridge, British journalist Douglas Reed also commented on the widespread Jewish influence.

### BASIC FUND LAGGING

After an inspiring start, the League of Rights' Annual Basic Fund for 1990-91, with a target of \$73,000, has started to lag. As we go to press the Fund stands at just over \$40,000, leaving nearly another \$30,000 to be contributed. The "target" is the absolute minimum required to ensure that the League can operate successfully. While the crisis now being experienced by the Australian community has increased the economic burdens of many of our readers, we have no other alternative but to stress that this is a challenge, which must be met if Australia is to survive and be re-generated. A moderate contribution from all those readers who have not yet contributed will ensure that the target is quickly reached. All donations to Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne.

# ORGAN TRANSPLANTS AND THE "BRAIN DEATH" FALLACY

The following article by Dr. D.W. Evans, ----- "Home", P.O. Box 42, Bangor, Gwynedd, LL57, 2 TZ, U.K.

Let me say at once that I believe heart, liver and lung transplantation to be wrong. This is because, to be useful for transplant purposes, these organs have to be removed from living bodies, i.e. bodies which are respiring, pink and warm, and which bleed freely when cut. The donor's blood circulation is maintained by his own heart — right up to the moment when it is stilled by a chemical solution and itself removed.

The body reacts to the trauma of this evisceration just as it would to ordinary, therapeutic, surgery. It has to be paralysed with muscle-relaxant drugs to prevent the movements and spasms, which, if they were allowed to occur, would make the procedure difficult or impossible. Even so, there may be dramatic increases in blood pressure and heart-rate response to the incision and the further trauma of organ removal; these responses are identical with those seen in lightly-anaesthetized patients undergoing ordinary therapeutic surgery and, in those circumstances, are an indication to the anaesthetist to deepen anaesthesia in case his patient may be feeling pain or perhaps, have subsequent recall of intra-operative events. It may be that this everyday experience is the reason why some anaesthetists in charge of organ donors give them an inhalation anaesthetic as well as the muscle-relaxant; others, being persuaded that the obviously living body is that of a dead person, may aver that they give the general anaesthetic agent only for its effects in controlling the unwanted cardiovascular reaction.

To operate thus, not for the benefit of the life-long inhabitant of the body but to acquire his vital organs for the use of others might seem an odd thing for a caring surgeon to do. It might even seem a procedure of doubtful legality. It has been made possible in both respects by the invention and successful propagation of the notion that, although his body is undeniably alive, the donor can be regarded (and certified) as already dead before the operation commences because he appears to be deeply unconscious and a few simple clinical tests have indicated that he has no prospect of recovery. This is the syndrome, which has — unfortunately and misleadingly — become known as "brain death" or, in this country, "brain stem death".

It is fallacious to equate the state so defined with true and total death of the brain and I am therefore unhappy about the terms used to describe it: this is no mere semantic quibble but a real concern that use of these imprecise terms may manipulate thought. Indeed, I know it has done so in academic circles and I think it likely that a distraught parent, who is told that his son — who looks alive — is nevertheless dead, because the tests establish "brain death", will take this to mean that all possibility of residual life in the brain has thereby been excluded. This is, of course, not the case.

## "VOTING" ON IMMIGRATION PROCEEDING

With the endorsement of RSL leader Mr. Bruce Ruxton the "voting" campaign launched by The League of Rights at the National Weekend in October, is proceeding very satisfactorily. Tens of thousands of the special issue of *The Intelligence Survey*, with the "Voting form" on the back page, have gone out and the Australian people are in the process, for the first time, of having a vote on the current immigration and multicultural policy. It is proposed to continue this campaign up until the next elections. All readers are urged to invoke themselves, if they have not already done so, in this campaign. All State League headquarters have supplies of the special *Intelligence Survey*.

It is also basically fallacious to assume that the tests used have the power to forecast, with the absolute certainty claimed, the true death of the patient (i.e. the final cessation of his circulation) within a few hours or days of the diagnosis of "brain stem death." There are, in some ways regrettably, no absolute certainties in medicine. And in this context one need perhaps look no further than the reports of "brain dead" mothers giving birth to normal babies several weeks after the diagnosis to provide food for thought about timed prognoses — and, maybe, about the wider question of live births to mothers allegedly long dead...

## THE DYING ARE NOT YET DEAD

However, even if the tests could infallibly forecast death in the commonly-understood sense of the term within a few hours or days, would it be right (or logical) to hold that the patient satisfying these criteria is — to all intents and purposes maybe — *already dead*? I maintain that it is not correct, or proper, to confuse this state in which he is doomed to die soon — however certain that may be — with death itself. To my mind, a comatose patient without brain stem reflexes and dependent upon a mechanical ventilator is still a *living human being*; as such he is deserving of our every care, without intrusion of any third party interest, right up to the time when his circulation finally ceases and he can be truthfully described as a cadaver.

I continue to maintain this view despite its being dismissed, by the transplanters, as reactionary and akin to the stance of members of the Flat Earth Society... The implication is, I suppose, that it is somehow improper to examine too closely the fundamental concept and science involved in this novel re-definition of death because it has made possible such wonderful surgical advances. In other words, the spectacular achievements are held to justify the means — which (they appear to suggest) are therefore best left decently veiled. I think that a very dangerous philosophy. And having said so, I also have to say that I am far from convinced that transplantation of these vital organs really does constitute a lasting therapeutic advance. There is, in fact, no scientific evidence that — taking all relevant factors into account — these transplant procedures do more good than harm. As a perceptive colleague remarked, cardiac transplantation probably increases rather than decreases the sum of human misery. But the over-statement of the benefits, the impossibility of knowing the natural prognosis, and the many other clinical and logistic difficulties are — like the prospects for alternative ethical treatment strategies — another part of the story.

## CORRECTING A MISLEADINGLY ROSY IMPRESSION

Had the public been fully and frankly informed on all the relevant aspects, it might not have been persuaded that it wants transplantation at almost any cost. That it has been so persuaded — as I am frequently assured it has — offers ample testimony to the power of the media in forming public opinion. My hope is that the many sincere and highly talented people involved in journalism and broadcasting will, now that they are beginning to understand the facts of the matter, wish to use that same power to correct the misleadingly rosy impression of this really

## CHRISTMAS GREETINGS

We extend Christmas Greetings to our readers and their families. May your Christmas be a Holy and safe one. May we all return to the battles of 1991 refreshed in body and in spirit.

rather macabre activity which they may hitherto have helped to propagate. But their task will be far from easy, given that Society seems now to demand of Medicine that it shall provide an answer to Man's mortality.

To return to the fundamental issue, I must record my surprise and disappointment that theologians, philosophers and lawyers appear to have accepted the propriety of certifying and treating as dead, a patient on a ventilator who — though almost certainly doomed to die soon — still has his own natural blood circulation and other bodily and brain functions at the time. Some of them, apparently, see no essential difference between this late stage in the dying process and death itself; once the tests have pointed to a fatal outcome, he is "as good as dead", they say, and can be dealt with accordingly — though few, I imagine, would bury or cremate a man with a beating heart....

Others, including members of the judiciary I'm told, do understand the factual difference between the dying state called "brain stem death" and true death but do not think it matters in practice. The *useful* life of the patient on the ventilator is clearly over, they say, so why should his organs not be removed while there is still life in him if this is necessary for them to be of use to others? The fact that the donor has to be certified "dead" — by some doctors using arbitrary criteria which many or most doctors would not deem sufficient for the purpose — has to be accepted as a necessary preliminary to the surgery (to avoid the obvious legal and ethical difficulties). The rights and wrongs of such certification are, they say beyond their understanding and a matter for "the medical profession".

There is, in the U.K., no legal definition of death and so where the Law is concerned, a person is dead when a doctor certifies him "dead". By this means, the legal profession sidesteps the fundamental issue. But what would happen. I wonder, if one or more doctors certified a person dead and others (like me and many more) were willing to testify that he was still a living human being, and certainly not a corpse, when he was being operated upon for the removal of his vital organs? Or if the precise time and date of death mattered very much in the settlement of a civil action and one doctor said the deceased was dead at the time when the "brain stem death" criteria were sought and satisfied while another said he was not dead at that time and did not actually die until his heart was removed some hours or days later?

### WHERE MIGHT IT LEAD?

Such legal niceties apart, it seems to me that it is important not to allow confusion of "dying" with "dead" simply to avoid facing up to the ethical problems, e.g. allegations of active euthanasia, which beset even today's secular, utilitarian society. The "slippery slope" argument seems to me to have some force in this context. If utterly helpless young people being kept alive by mechanical ventilators today, whom will it be deemed appropriate to use as sources of organs and for experimental purposes tomorrow? Newborn babies with little or no forebrain (anencephalics) but who cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, be regarded as "brain stem dead" have already been used thus . . .

It occurs to me that those theologians and others who have accepted the notion that "brain stem death = death" may have been misled by the assertion of some in the medical profession that at this stage they are satisfied there is no function remaining anywhere in the brain and no possibility of any such function ever returning, whatever may subsequently be done. It would not be surprising if they had been so misled for this is the stated basis for the move, in 1979, by the Conference of the Medical Royal Colleges of the U.K. from use of the "brain stem death" criteria as a justification for turning off the mechanical ventilator (so that natural death might be allowed to occur) to their use as a basis

for the certification of death itself. This change of use is clearly prompted by the perceived need to provide hearts and livers in a state suitable for transplantation; it served no other purpose, there being no need to certify death before discontinuing life-support solely in the interests of the patient (and his near and dear).

It was to provide a consensus basis for that most onerous decision, i.e. to terminate what was clearly otiose and unkind therapy, that so-called "brain stem death" criteria were promulgated by the Conference in 1976. The criteria were a distillation of those we had been using informally for some years and in which we had developed confidence with regard to their ability to forecast death within a short time of their fulfilment. I did not object to their propagation for that stated purpose for it seemed to me that their general adoption would make such decisions more comfortable, particularly for those faced with the problem only occasionally. However, in retrospect, I should perhaps have been suspicious that the stated purpose (in 1976) was not the only purpose even then envisaged because the Memorandum publishing the criteria acknowledged the involvement of the Transplant Advisory Panel . . .

### POLICY CONFUSES PROGNOSIS AND DIAGNOSIS

Be that as it may, Conference — the policy-making body to which the D.H.S.S. appeals for advice — simply decided, in 1979, that these same criteria which we had been using for purely purposes should henceforth be used, without modification, for the *diagnosis* (and certification) of *death* itself, i.e. while the circulation and other vital functions continued naturally. The justification offered for this enormous leap was that by the time these criteria were satisfied "all functions of the brain have permanently and irreversibly ceased." The redundant tents are interesting and may betray lack of confidence in their momentous edict. To almost anyone of a truly scientific disposition, and particularly to those with experience of the biological sciences, such a claim must have seemed at the very least incautious and — given that the criteria do not require that the greater part of the brain be tested at all — perhaps frankly ludicrous. But to understand the full absurdity of this claim, some knowledge of the tests used to diagnose "brain death" is necessary and I will therefore attempt to outline those in use for the purpose in this country.

It is of course, a requirement that the patient be deeply comatose (though grades of unconsciousness are, in point of fact, quite difficult to determine) and unable to breathe spontaneously, i.e. air is being delivered to his lungs by a mechanical ventilator. It is worth mentioning that this is the only function of this so-called "life-support machine"; it does *not* take over the circulatory function, as a lot of people seem to think. The blood flow through the body and parts of the brain, in such a patient, is maintained naturally by the beating heart.

It is a requirement that the cause of coma and ventilator dependence be known; common causes are severe head injury and bleeding into the brain but in some cases the brain damage is due to a period of anoxia and its extent may then be less easy to determine. When, after a few hours or several days, it seems likely that a fatal outcome will inevitably ensue, some of the reflexes with pathways through the brain stem — the stalk that connects the major part of the brain (the cerebral hemispheres) to the spinal cord — are tested. This involves looking for eye responses to light and to touch, and to the indirect stimulation provided by irrigating the ears with ice-cold saline. There must be no movements in the head and neck area in response to stimulation of any part of the body. Nor must there be any response to stimulation of the throat or windpipe. Finally, to test the all-important supposition that the patient will never again be able to breathe on his own, the mechanical ventilator is disconnected for

10 minutes; if there is any sign of a spontaneous inspiratory effort during this time, then the criteria for "brain stem death" are not satisfied. If there is no sign of any attempt to breathe, mechanical ventilation is resumed and an unspecified period of time is allowed to elapse before the brain stem reflexes are again sought. If they remain absent the ventilator is again disconnected for a similar test period. If there is still no inspiratory effort, and if temporary influences such as drugs have been excluded, the criteria for the diagnosis of "brain death" — U.K. style — have been satisfied and the patient is certified *dead*.

Mechanical ventilation is continued thereafter, sometimes for days, while the complicated arrangements are made for removal of his vital organs and, of course, throughout the surgical procedure involved in acquiring them.

### **MORE RIGOROUS TEST OMITTED**

It should be noted that steps are taken to prevent the donor from becoming short of oxygen while the ventilator is temporarily disconnected for these test purposes. This is to preserve the donor organs from anoxic damage, which would impair their suitability for transplantation. However, this inevitably means that the vital centre in the brain stem, which controls the breathing — the respiratory centre — is not subjected to the ultimate stimulus (lack of oxygen in the blood reaching it) to see if it can make a last-gasp effort. It is, in fact, tested only for the ability to respond to the less-powerful stimulus of a high carbon dioxide content in the blood still reaching the brain stem.

It should also be noted that the vital centres in the brain stem, which control heart rate and blood pressure, are not tested at all under the U.K. protocol. That they are still active in some, if not most, organ donors is shown by the fact that many of them continue to maintain their blood pressure naturally after the declaration of "brain stem death", and by observations of cardiovascular response to the trauma of organ removal which are almost certainly brain stem mediated.

The long and short of it is that these tests are nowhere near adequate to exclude residual life and function in a damaged brain. And, as if that were not bad enough, not even all of these tests have to be done when it is desired to certify death for transplantation purposes. In other countries, there is at least some attempt to test for residual activity in the higher centres of the brain. In the U.K. there is none. If persisting electrical activity (EEG waves) were sought here, it is certain that it could be found in many of these so-called "cadaveric" organ donors. Some would retain function in a part of the brain, which controls glandular secretions. These disconcerting facts are simply ignored by those who wish to call a donor's brain dead. They dodge the issue of their relevance by not doing the tests, which might demonstrate such activity.

### **THE BRIEF: TO PROVIDE ORGANS IN GOOD CONDITION**

In effect, exhaustive testing for residual life in the brain is proscribed. All in all, the rules governing the diagnosis of "brain death" in this country must be seen for what they are — a simplistic code developed in response to a brief to provide vital organs in good condition for the transplanters. A colleague has likened the process of their formulation to the activities of a committee of foxes taxed with the design of a henhouse.....

From the scientific point of view, it is most unfortunate that attempts to diagnose true death of the brain, while some independent bodily functions continued, ever became involved with transplantation. As we have seen, the idea that it might be diagnosable, in some circumstances, was seized upon by those seeking viable human organs, long before it had been adequately thought out or tested. The transplanters simply assumed that what they wanted to believe was true — and have steadfastly

refused to consider, or even see, the substantial body of evidence that denies their belief. Had they not become involved, with the consequences that ensued, we might by now be further along the road towards the possibility of secure diagnosis of the true and total death of the brain as an independent phenomenon. Should that become a scientific reality, the term "brain death" would be an appropriate description. And I, for one, would be prepared to consider the proposition that a patient with a truly dead brain was no longer a human being, i.e. because there is persuasive evidence that the brain is the quintessential organ and the home of the inner self.

### **A BETTER CRITERION**

However, the final cessation of *all* activity in every part of the brain would be a prerequisite for consideration of this proposition because Man does not yet know very much about the workings of his brain and we cannot, therefore, safely assume that pockets of residual activity here and there do not matter. That being so, we should need clear evidence of the absence of all metabolism, with no possibility of its resuming, in each and every part of the brain. Reliable evidence of the final cessation of blood flow (at normal temperatures) everywhere within the brain would be acceptable for this purpose and it is possible that techniques with the power to demonstrate this reliably (while the body is still alive) may one day become available. At the moment, we can only be sure that the cerebral circulation has ceased for ever when the bodily circulation has finally ceased, i.e. when the patient's heart, or some other pump such as those used in operating theatres to take over the heart's function while it is operated upon, finally stops. This of course, is the commonly understood criterion of death and the one still used by the majority of the World's doctors to diagnose well over 99% of all deaths.

To sum up, I would urge that: —

(1) The attempt to force upon the professions and public the notion that true death of the brain can be diagnosed reliably, while the body is still alive, be resisted. Likewise the contingent notion that a patient pronounced "brain dead" on current criteria is truly dead.

(2) If it be argued that the state defined by the "brain stem death" tests is, while not death itself, yet so close to death as to make no practical difference, let the inaccurate and misleading term be abandoned in favour of one which makes the situation clear, i.e. that neither the patient nor his brain stem is really dead at this time, though doomed he may well be. Full understanding of this essential point will perhaps for the first time, enable the opinion-formers of our society to debate the ethics of transplantation in an enlightened frame of mind. Up till now, the highly successful confusion of the of the dying and dead states, and the use of weasel-words such as "beating-heart cadavers", has manipulated thought to the exclusion of serious criticism.

(3) The misleadingly worded Donor Cards be withdrawn immediately. Many selfless prospective offers may have been made on a basis of serious misunderstanding; the signatories may have thought that the words "after my death" on those cards meant after their deaths in the commonly understood sense of the term. Indeed, I know that some highly-intelligent and otherwise well-informed people have carried these cards thinking that they were thereby authorising removal of the organs *after* the final disconnection of the ventilator and the subsequent final cessation of their circulation. When disabused of this cosy notion, some have expressed horror and some disbelief. Most, when the truth has dawned, have destroyed their cards; a few have continued to carry them after modification, e.g. specification that a general anesthetic be administered during removal of the organs.

### **ONLY FULLY INFORMED CONSENT VALID**

If a fair offer of organs is to be made by this means, the



wording on the Donor's Cards must clearly be altered to indicate the true circumstances in which the offer may be taken up. And, given the lack of relevant knowledge and comprehension of these matters, which seems to prevail in the general population, it may be that the signatory should be required to acknowledge that he has received a full explanation and understands what is involved.

The same considerations regarding explanation and understanding should, of course, apply when a relative is asked for the organs of a loved-one dying on a ventilator. In this tragic context real comprehension may be particularly difficult to achieve. However, without it there must remain serious doubt about the validity of the consent sought and given. As things are, it may seem paradoxical that such care is taken to ensure that consent to relatively minor therapeutic surgical procedures is given on a fully-informed basis while consent to the evisceration of a relative is usually sought by staff who are not medically qualified but who — perhaps for this reason and their sympathetic demeanour — achieve a higher percentage of assents to the removal of organs than do the doctors.

It is this great concern that ordinary, public-spirited people have not clearly understood which has been one of the great driving forces behind my efforts to protest during the past decade. Because I feel so strongly that the "harvesting" of hearts etc. is a totally unacceptable abuse of the dying which should not be going on in a civilized society, I have the greatest difficulty in understanding why it is so tolerated. The likely explanation, it seems to me, is that the facts are not well enough known. Some of those who do know and understand — such as nurses and anaesthetists who have been involved — have simply left the transplant scene, usually without public comment. Even some of the surgeons who have been responsible for the removal of the organs have confided to me that they were uneasy about it and did not like doing what they felt they had to do. These pangs of conscience, and their expression, give me real cause for optimism.

As one of my advisers commented, some doctors seem to prefer to fudge the scientific issues rather than face the facts about what they're really doing. While that attitude is understandable, it cannot be right or successful in the long term. Sooner or later the truth will out. When it does, I trust that we shall see an end to this misconceived and, to my mind, abhorrent activity — one of the wrong directions taken by Medicine as a consequence of unrestricted technological advances.

---

## THE GULF AND "THE JEWISH QUESTION"

As on so many other issues, C.H. Douglas has been proved right with his observation of many years ago, that the establishment of the State of Israel would result in events which would bring the "Jewish Question" increasingly into open discussion. The current Middle East crisis has precipitated a debate inside the USA concerning Jewish influence.

President George Bush's dramatic reaction to Saddam Hussein's annexation of Kuwait initially had the support of an overwhelming majority of the American people, who accepted what the media told them about the alleged threat by Iraq to America and the rest of the world. The annexation of Kuwait was but a preliminary to an assault on Saudi Arabia. With the monopoly control of Middle East oil supplies, the Iraqi dictator would be able to bring the USA to its knees. Subsequently it has become clear that Hussein had no plans for any attack on Saudi Arabia.

The predominantly Jewish controlled and pro-Zionist media, the *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*, along with the major television networks, led the hysterical outburst. The same media played a major role in undermining the USA on the Vietnam issue, while being rather muted in its criticism of Saddam Hussein when he launched his war against Iran.

As it became more widely known that official USA policy

had encouraged Hussein to believe that there would be no serious American opposition to his proposed annexation of Kuwait, and that a massive American military build up was continuing in spite of the clear evidence that there was no military threat to Saudi Arabia, criticism of the Bush administration started to emerge. The more prominent of the critics was the widely respected conservative columnist Patrick Buchanan, a former speechwriter for both President Nixon and President Reagan. Another prominent critic was Joseph Sobran of the conservative Catholic weekly, *The Wanderer*.

A former supporter of Israel in the past, Buchanan had come to the conclusion that America's close ties with Israel were detrimental to America's best interests. He has become increasingly critical of Zionist Israel in recent years. When Patrick Buchanan wrote that there was only two groups "beating the drums for war in the Middle East — the Israeli Defence Ministry and its amen corner in the United States", he was immediately attacked by the pro-Israeli lobby apologists. Most of the attacks have been vicious personal smears, the old "anti-Semitic" charge being loosely thrown around. Well-known conservative William F. Buckley of *National Review*, a man who has managed over the years to keep his nose clean on the "Jewish Question", has mildly criticised his fellow Irish Catholic Buchanan, but has also pointed out the obvious, "that Israel's political influence is out of proportion to Israel's strategic importance to the United States." But having raised the question of Jewish influence, Buckley promptly took cover by saying, "Good luck to them. Jews are an uncommonly talented people who have contributed magnificently to American life."

Unfortunately, the collectivist philosophy of Judaism has resulted in a disproportionate number of Jews being prominent in all movements advocating the centralisation of power. Jews have been prominent in the various forms of the Marxist movement as they have in the field of Monopoly Capitalism. Anti-Zionist Jews like Dr. Alfred Lilienthal, the distinguished American Jewish authority on the Middle East, have suffered all types of persecution because they have tried to support traditional American values. But events continue to confirm the predictions of men like Alfred Lilienthal. And they are helping to bring a greater understanding of the "Jewish Problem", which is basically spiritual. The Christian revelation offers the rank and file Jew the opportunity to free himself from a collectivism which has been used to enslave him for centuries.

---

## SOCIAL CREDITERS AND THE FUTURE

Early in his work the founder of the Social Credit Movement, C.H. Douglas, said he had soon come to the conclusion that he had started a movement concerned with a battle which was not only going to last his lifetime, but many lifetimes to come. Social Credit brought new perceptions concerning a battle as old as man, a battle between Good and Evil, between Reality and Un-Reality.

There are both short and long-term aspects of the activities of the Social Credit Movement. The League of Rights came into existence for the purpose of advancing both aspects. The genuine Social Crediter must consider the long-term future as well as the here and now. Slowly but surely a growing number of younger leaders have emerged ensuring the continuity of the Social Credit movement. Over the years a number of legacies have made a vital contribution towards the on-going development of the movement. Present supporters wishing to invest in the future can safely consider making provision in their wills for the financing of an on-going programme in depth.

It should be clearly stated that the legacy is for the purpose of advancing the work of The Australian League of Rights, 145 Russell Street, Melbourne.

# THE ARCHBISHOP AND THE PRIME MINISTER

The following notes were produced by Mr. Ted Rock, Chairman of the Christian Alternative Movement in Victoria. The C.A.M. conducts regular mailing programmes to Members of Australia's Parliament, of which the following is a sample. Mr. Rock's address: 15 Simmons Court, Greensborough, Victoria 3088.

The Prime Minister, Mr. Hawke, has invited Archbishop Hollingworth to confine himself to the "mysteries of the Holy Trinity, Father, Son and Holy Ghost", while others such as himself would deal with the unholy trinity of economic policy, monetary policy, fiscal policy and wages policy.

It is to be hoped the Archbishop will point out that no man, or any policy pursued by man, operates in a moral vacuum. The Archbishop had offered a very mild criticism of the current interest rate policy describing it as a "blunt instrument" by which moneylenders demand excessive proportions of the individual's income, thus exacerbating poverty.

It could be further pointed out by Christian leaders that knowledge and understanding of the Holy Trinity will lead to right policies. Such an understanding would quickly establish the correct role of Money, Government, and the distribution of purchasing power.

Had Mr. Hawke been the astute politician he likes us to think he is instead of savaging the Archbishop he may have enquired of him what policies governing the trinity of wages, fiscal and monetary control would emanate from the Holy Trinity of Father, Son and Holy Ghost? That would have put the ball firmly back in the Archbishop's court, and perhaps forced him to face a basic question regarding money the modern church refuses to tackle, that money is merely a symbol representing reality. It is not an object of idolatrous worship which modern society has made it in the absence of correct teaching from those charged with keeping the faith whole and inviolate. Time is running out rapidly for the Christian Church to reassert the authority of Christ to meet the modern crisis resulting from the worldwide practice of idolatrous worship of money.

The role of money in a society, which accepts the authority of Christ, is to release the reality, which God will always supply in abundance. The role of man (government) is to ensure the servant role of the monetary symbol. To elevate it into a mechanism of power as it has become, dominating the heart, soul and mind of the nations is a measurement of the departure from true worship of the one God in three whose Trinitarian nature constitutes the mystery Mr. Hawke sarcastically dismissed as irrelevant.

The Holy Trinity is the only basis of power under which the individual remains free in the full sense in which freedom is constituted. That is why early Christian constitutionalism insisted on a Trinitarian division of power, pioneered in Britain under Monarch, Lords and Commons, transplanted to Australia as Monarch, Upper and Lower Houses of Parliament in both Federal and State.

Allowed to flourish the Trinitarian system of government must inevitably eliminate monopoly government, and in turn monopoly finance, banking and business, replacing each with that form of democratic control Solzhenitsyn described as "democracy which evolved in the face of God". That form of democracy springing from its Trinitarian roots will ensure the economic and financial sovereignty of each individual, within a national sovereignty, eliminating welfare poverty and its international component, the world state, the twin gods of monopoly socialism.

The national and international proponents of monopoly socialism are terrified that in the protestations of the Archbishop there may lie the seeds of a genuine Christian revolt based upon the realisation that socialism is a philosophy of death of the human spirit and initiative, that it can never eliminate poverty, but only perpetuate it.

The opposite to socialism, that form of organisation proven beyond dispute as the only effective means of supplying individual needs, free enterprise (upon which the socialist battens like a parasite) there is also a Trinitarian basis, management, employee and customer. To operate most effectively each component is dependent upon finance. But at no time in the evolution of modern industry has any one of the three components enjoyed what each must have if the whole is to operate at its most effective level, financial sovereignty. Given that each component did enjoy financial sovereignty its operation would be near to flawless, the fruit of purely voluntary association in which coercion is eliminated.

But the concept is foreign to both Church and State under present management. The revolutionary nature of real freedom is the fruit of the "new commandment I bring you". That revolutionary concept for the provision of man's needs involving the elimination of human labour Christ spoke of in Mathew 6:24, 34, which has yet to penetrate the consciousness of the modern church. Modern technology is already signaling its arrival, the only barriers being monopoly government and its master, monopoly finance. But accompanying a growing consciousness amongst a few faithful Christians a new weapon has been added to its armoury. A weapon which will restore that "democracy which evolved in the face of God," the Citizens' Initiated Referendum, and Voters Veto, now operating successfully in Switzerland and pushing aside barriers in other countries. Nothing can stop its world wide acceptance, and with its coming the days of irresponsible party government control passively endorsing monopoly in its different forms is numbered.

---

## THE SOLZHENITSYN VISION

When the famous Russian writer, Alexander Solzhenitsyn, was expelled from the Soviet Union, he spent a short time in Switzerland before making the USA his new home. As a result of his stay in Switzerland, Solzhenitsyn extolled the virtues of the Swiss constitutional system, based upon the decentralisation of power and the right of the people to veto government policies. He said at the time that he regarded the Swiss Federation as the model for a Soviet Union freed from Communism. In his recent essay of 16,000 words, entitled "*How We Are To Rebuild Russia*", strongly criticised by Soviet leader Gorbachev, Solzhenitsyn emerges as a strong opponent of internationalism, centralisation, including mass industrialisation, and a supporter of Monarchy. Solzhenitsyn's vision of regeneration includes the re-birth of the Russian countryside and a reduction in the size of the big cities.

Solzhenitsyn is emphatic that the Soviet Union in its present form must be disbanded. He sees centralisation as a source of disintegration, not of strength. He writes, "We must make a choice once and for all: whether to go on with our empire, killing ourselves in the process, or of concerning ourselves with the spiritual and physical salvation of our people." The Great Russian urges that the Soviet divest itself of its "central Asian underbelly."

Solzhenitsyn takes the opportunity of outlining his views on a number of matters, including the menace of Western "popular" culture. He wants the traditional family strengthened, with an educational system based on Christian values. He supports widespread ownership of property. He sees that true freedom requires decentralisation.

While it is understandable why the "reformed" Communists

like Gorbachev do not like the Solzhenitsyn message, it is not a message that will be welcomed in the great centres of power in the West either, where there is an on-going attempt to impose policies exactly the opposite of those being advocated by Solzhenitsyn. The central feature of the human drama has always been the conflict between two philosophical points of view:

centralised power or de-centralised power. Solzhenitsyn reflects the traditional Christian view concerning power: that sovereign individuals should freely associate to achieve common objectives; that centralised power is of the Devil.

The Solzhenitsyn vision is a powerful antidote to the current worldwide drive towards collectivism.

# INFLATION—THE AGE-OLD SWINDLE

## THE SOCIAL CREDITER

As we all become more impoverished as the rate of U.K. inflation rises above the unacceptable level of 10 per cent, an insight into its existence in Biblical times is provided by Arthur Kay, Minister of Trinity Presbyterian Church, Bolton. The following are extracts from his address: \*

What people refer to today as inflation, the rise in prices, is not really inflation. Rising prices are only the symptom of which inflation is the cause. This is actually the Biblical view of the matter and the Bible gives us a good example of inflation at work. You can find it in Isaiah 1: 21-23.

" As far as we can tell from the archaeological evidence, coins were not used until about two hundred years after Isaiah's prophecy. What they did use was a specific weight of metal — the shekel was a weight — and a shekel of silver or gold was a specific measure of currency. But in Jerusalem, in Isaiah's day, silver would be melted, and an inexpensive base metal (in this case verse 25 indicates that it was probably tin) would also be melted and a quantity of the tin would then be poured into the vat of silver and the mixture, the alloy, would then be poured out into a mould to become a small brick when cool.

Now tin is a nice shiny metal, just like silver. Who would know? The ingot would still look like silver. Who would possess scales sufficiently accurate to detect the change in weight produced by the tin? Only another silversmith: and one corrupt silversmith wouldn't last long in business, unless the other silversmiths decided not to expose him, but "rather to join in the corruption. But even a silversmiths' cartel would soon be broken by someone from outside unless the market was stitched up with cooperation from the rulers.

The corrupt silversmiths would bribe the rulers, and the rulers would impose government controls against honest newcomers.

So, under government control, or at least with the connivance and cooperation of the government, the silver would be debased. And whereas before there was one shekel of silver, the next day, without the hard labour of mining scarce silver, there would apparently be two. Overnight, the rulers and the silversmiths doubled their spending power. And this is where the robbery came in. Those first in the debased silver chain could now buy twice as many goods and services as they had been able to the day before, when silver was pure. And what has happened? Suddenly more money is circulating than there was before. The money supply has been increased - inflation!

Now along comes the ordinary citizen . . . into the market to buy goods and services, but the goods and services are gone; because the rulers who had the money first bought at yesterday's prices. Then as the storekeeper sees that demand for his goods is going up, he puts up his prices — *more demand, higher prices*. And as people see more silver ingots in circulation, the market value of the ingot falls — *more supply, lower prices*.

Things have not changed. Our paper money and our laminate coins are clearly dross. And, if inflation is an increase in the money supply, who increases the money supply? There are only two kinds of people who increase

## November—December 1990

the money supply: those who do it honestly, and those who do it dishonestly.

The ones who increase the money supply honestly are the people who mine money metals like silver and gold, but the rise in world population, together with the scarcity of gold and silver and the difficulties of obtaining them, mean that, when these precious metals are used as money, changes in their supply are relatively insignificant as inflationary devices.

Counterfeiters inject money into the system dishonestly - but the individual counterfeiter with his offset-litho printing machine knocking out a few thousand £10 notes isn't even worthy to be compared with governments and banks who, at a whim, frequently write a treasury note or a deposit certificate for millions of pounds.

Who causes inflation? Not primarily workers demanding wage increases, or consumers demanding goods — but governments who print money and connive at the banks who create credit out of thin air.

Yet government ministers sit there wringing their hands and telling us all how difficult it is to control inflation. And I'm not only talking about our current government here, or the Conservative party in particular. Every western government is doing the same thing and the socialist ones are usually the worst offenders.

Aside from governments who can print money, there is another wonderful device for inflating the money supply known as *fractional reserve banking*.

This is what happens today. The government, through the Bank of England, requires the clearing banks to maintain only a small proportion of their deposits in cash or other liquid assets like Treasury Bills. Remember that: the back up reserves need represent only about 10% of the total money supply.

What does this mean? Say you take £100 in cash and deposit it in your bank. The Bank of England requires your bank to keep about 10% of that cash in reserve at the Bank of England in a non-interest paying account. It can do what it likes with the rest.

So your bank sends 10% of your £100 off to the Bank of England as a reserve. What does it do with the other £90? Why, it loans it out, of course. So the chap who borrows the £90 writes a cheque for £90. The person who receives that cheque deposits it into his bank, and that bank duly sends £9 of that £90 off to the Bank of England. And what does it do with the remaining £81? It lends it out! The borrower then writes his cheque for £81, the recipient banks it, the bank sends £8.10 to the Bank of England, and loans out £72.90.

And so it goes, from bank to bank, multiplying merrily, so that your original £100 deposit eventually creates an additional £800 in loaned money. Now that's inflation! Was there ever a more efficient engine for creating misery than this?

The best remedy that civil government could effect to remove inflation is to work towards the abolition of the fractional reserve banking system.

\* The full text of Mr. Kay's address is available free from P.O. Box 21, Bolton, England, BL2 3RD.