

THE NEW TIMES

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

VOL. 56, No. 8.

Registered by Australia Post-Publication No. VBH 1001.

AUGUST 1992.

Australian and New Zealand edition. Published in Melbourne and Auckland.

CONTRACTING OUT

by Eric D. Butler

It has been observed that, generally speaking, the world was much more stable during the Cold War period; there was a degree of rigidity as the two major super-powers, the Soviet Union and its allies confronted the USA and its allies. But like all professional prize fights, the confrontation primarily served the purpose of a promoter who stood to gain irrespective of what happened to the two confrontationists. The promoter has been an International Money power with the declared objective of centralising all power on a global scale. But that power appears to have suffered a setback with the collapse of one of the two main "prizefighters" the Soviet Union. The programme for progressively centralising power has been seriously undermined by peoples on both sides of the old Iron Curtain demanding the right to withdraw from centralised structures, which they feel do not serve their best interests. But the centralisers continue to push forward.

It was only the naked power of the Soviet Union's central government which for seventy years prevented the different parts of the Soviet Empire from doing what they have been doing — contracting out; saying 'No' to an intolerable imposition of centralised power into their domestic affairs. The right to say 'No' and to leave, without penalty, any organisation felt to be oppressive, is the only safeguard of individual rights against tyranny. But unless the contracting out of one form of centralised power results in an improvement in the lot of the individual, he may well feel that his previous state of slavery was preferable to his new freedom. Not surprisingly, large numbers of the victims of Communism are now dismayed to find that their economic situation is worse with unemployment and a lack of the State-aid, which Communism did provide. Russians have been quoted as saying that under Communism there was a certainty that at least a primitive standard of living was guaranteed.

Clearly the transition from a highly centralised and collectivist economy to a free economy requires a financial policy which ensures that the individual is protected and reasonably secure. It is highly unlikely that the large numbers of advisers from the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank currently advising the Polish, Ukrainian and Russian governments on 'reconstruction programmes', will be of any more value than they have been in Latin America. An early supporter of Social Credit, a Roman Catholic priest made the observation that financial orthodoxy was the bridge over which a society moved from Monopoly Capitalism to Communism. It may be that financial orthodoxy will be the same bridge over which societies will move from Communism to a new form of Monopoly Capitalism, similar to that of the National Socialists in Germany, or the Corporate State called Fascism in Italy. Both Hitler's Germany and Mussolini's Italy left the production system in private hands, but used central control of finance to direct broad production programmes.

However, irrespective of how an economy is operated, under centralised direction and debt finance, the basic problem of what to do with the production still remains. And the inevitable result is economic centralism and an attempt to sustain the

system by exporting production which cannot be consumed domestically. One of the arguments underlying Hitler's military drive to the East, including the Ukraine and Russia, was to provide "living space" for an expanding German economy. Hitler's successors are also attempting to move eastwards, not militarily but economically. Assuming that with German assistance, the vast resources of the Ukraine and Russia can be increased, what will be done with the vast increases in production? In pre-Bolshevik Russia, the Ukraine was "the breadbasket of

OUR POLICY

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

To defend the Free Society and its institutions - private property, consumer control of production through genuine competitive enterprise, and limited decentralised government.

To promote financial policies, which will reduce taxation, eliminate debt, and make possible material security for all with greater leisure time for cultural activities.

To oppose all forms of monopoly, whether described as public or private.

To encourage electors always to record a responsible vote in all elections.

To support all policies genuinely concerned with conserving and protecting natural resources, including the soil, and an environment reflecting Natural (God's) laws, against policies of rape and waste.

To oppose all policies eroding national sovereignty, and to promote a closer relationship between the people of the Crown Commonwealth and those of the United States of America, who share a common heritage.

Europe" A vast increase in wheat production in the Ukraine would have a devastating effect on world wheat markets. And there are suggestions that with its move away from a strictly Marxist economy, China can quickly move to become an exporter of wheat instead of an importer.

A TAIWAN EXPERIENCE

Nearly twenty years ago the writer was in Taiwan at a time when its anti-Communist fervour was white-hot with the island State bristling with military activity designed to meet any military challenge from the Communist-dominated mainland. The economy was booming. I was discussing the possible future with a younger Chinese who readily agreed that with the passing of time and the death of those Chinese leaders who had fled to Taiwan with Chiang Kai-shek to escape the Communist take-over in China, the expanding Taiwan economy could result in younger leaders rationalising the necessity to seek closer economic ties with the mainland in an attempt to make the Taiwan economy work. This is exactly what has happened, and a study of the Taiwanese press shows that this development is accelerating. A relatively underdeveloped China offers the prospect of vast export markets.

While the philosophy of economic determinism is accepted, that an economy can only be sustained by never-ending growth, this in turn requiring increasing attempts to export, with every nation being urged to become "internationally competitive", friction between nations is inevitable, this friction in turn being used as a reason for attempting to create "Common Markets". This inevitably leads to programmes for political centralisation, as is mooted quite openly now in the European Community. But political centralisation, leading, it is hoped by the world planners, to the establishment of some type of a New World Order, must result in centralised power being used to attempt to force people of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds into one unified society. All such attempts must end in greater disasters than those already suffered by mankind. This is as certain as the sunrise.

CONTRACTING OUT

What the world is faced with is not the prospect of a totalitarian World State, but of increasing convulsions and anarchy. But such is the momentum of events, and the grip of the collectivist madness, that nothing short of Divine intervention can prevent it running its disastrous course. For a number of reasons, Australians are better equipped than most peoples to stand aside from the worldwide collectivist drive. It is an appropriate time to recall the story of the little pig found wandering on the Scottish moors. When asked who he was and where he came from, he replied that he had been one of the Gadarene swine of the New Testament. As the herd stampeded towards the abyss, he decided that there wasn't much future in this policy. But what to do? He decided that the first thing to do was to pull out, explaining that he was loudly abused for his "negative" policy, one of his fellows even calling him a "fascist pig"! His colleagues had thundered by to their mass destruction. As yet he did not know what to do. But at least he was still alive and in the position to consider his future.

For a start, Australia might well emulate that little pig, and step aside from the world rush towards the abyss. By saving itself, Australia would then be in the position to offer a constructive alternative for the regeneration of Civilisation. Contracting out of collectivised power is the first necessary step towards salvation.

THE INDEPENDENT TIDE

Australia is being swept by a tide of ferment not seen for many years. A wide variety of action groups have emerged. The public opinion polls reflect what happened at the Wills by-election, when an Independent, Phil Cleary, won easily in one of Australia's traditionally strong Labor electorates, previously held by former Prime Minister Bob Hawke. The polls show a decline in support for the parties and growing support for Independents. Coming State elections in Victoria, Queensland, South Australia and Western Australia, will see a large number of Independent candidates and indicate the possible size of the Independent vote at the next Federal Elections, which will almost certainly be held in the early part of next year, with March being the most likely month.

Assuming that the Independent vote is strong, even though few Independents are elected, the Federal elections will also witness a large number of various types of Independents. Richard Farmer, Canberra political commentator, recently drew attention to the rising tide of support for Independents, estimating the current support at 10 per cent but expressed the view that at the Federal elections this could increase to 15 per cent. Farmer also drew attention to the way in which the parties were almost certainly going to react to the Independent challenge: by running a number of phony candidates who could, after attracting the Independent vote, then persuade the voter to allocate second preferences to the party candidate. The Labor party used this tactic at the last Federal elections with the result that while the Labor primary vote actually declined — the biggest decline being in Prime Minister Hawke's electorate — Labor still managed to win by obtaining most of the preferences from the "greens" and smaller groups.

THE ART OF THE POSSIBLE

Politics has been described as the "art of the possible", not the impossible. C.H. Douglas stressed that while a people still possessed a parliamentary system, financial and economic policies

"NEW TIMES" ANNUAL DINNER

IT'S LATER THAN YOU THINK

The Annual "New Times" Dinner, to be held in Melbourne on Friday, October 2, will, because of extraordinary developments, be one which no reader can afford to miss. We must stress that this function is a "family affair", a private dinner not open to the general public. The organisers reserve the right to decline any booking. Only close family members of supporters will be accepted as guests. Supporters wishing to interest friends and others in the League should invite them to attend the League's National Seminar on Saturday, October 3. This will be held in the YWCA banquet hall, Elizabeth Street, Melbourne.

The all-inclusive (covering cocktails and beverages) charge for the Dinner is \$30, which must be paid in advance. Providing seats are still available, bookings will be accepted up to the Wednesday before the Dinner. The organisers will make every endeavour to seat guests with those they nominate when making bookings.

MESSAGES: Overseas readers and others unable to attend may send appropriate messages to be read and to be published in the special Dinner issue of "The New Times".

Early bookings for the Dinner will greatly assist the organisers.

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

could be changed by bringing parliament under the effective control of the electors. This meant either forcing the existing Member of Parliament to represent the wishes of the electors, or, failing this, to replace the disobedient member with an obedient one. Douglas suggested a number of mechanisms for mobilising the will of the electors and providing the Member with clear evidence of what electors wanted, or did not want. Students of Australian history will recall how Douglas's advice was taken in Australia just prior to the Second World War, when an unpopular National Insurance Scheme resulted in hundreds of thousands of electors uniting to sign a simple demand form instructing their elected representatives to oppose the National Insurance legislation or risk defeat at the next elections. Members of the Commonwealth Parliament buckled as their offices were swamped with a flood of demand letters.

ELECTORS' VETO

Douglas observed that it was only possible to unite electors on some issue when there was enough political "steam". But that "steam" must be correctly harnessed so that it can move events. The present-day rigid highly centralised political party system makes it more difficult to force a party Member of Parliament to break with party dictates. There is no alternative but to support a movement to elect, for a start, at least a few Independents. But electors must ensure that they support only those Independents who sign an agreement that if elected their first priority will be to work for the introduction of a constitutional mechanism similar to that operating in Switzerland, where electors can unite to veto any unwanted policies. The stage is now being set in Australia for the concept of the Electors' Veto to be made the major election issue.

The growing threat to Australia's economic independence can only be met by Australians gaining effective control over their political system. That political system still remains available for Australians to use. Unless they find the will to do this, the current ferment across the nation will be dissipated. The coming State and Federal elections may well decide Australia's future.

THE GOEBBELS DIARIES

Developments concerning the publication of the diaries of Nazi leader Goebbels, Hitler's propaganda director, have highlighted once again the truth of C.H. Douglas's comment that real history is far more than written accounts of events; that it is "crystallised politics". This does not mean, of course, that written accounts of events are not of great value in attempting to reveal the threads of real history. The most significant reaction to the Goebbels diaries has come from Zionist sources, with a cry of outrage that "right-wing extremist" David Irving should have been engaged by the London *Sunday Times*, allegedly at a high price, to present the diaries. Zionists are also concerned about the wide publication of any documents, which undermine historical myths in which they have a vested interest.

Any writer presenting views on history, which are contrary to the Zionist view, soon discovers that a far-reaching Zionist influence is a reality, which cannot be ignored. When Douglas Reed, a prominent European correspondent for *The Times*, London, resigned his position because of the censorship of his despatches concerning what was taking place in Hitler's Germany, he became an instant best seller with a series of books starting with *Insanity Fair*. Reed had a large international audience. But as his writings increasingly exposed the vast international influence of Zionism in the world drama, so did that influence work towards destroying Reed. The publication in 1951 of *Far and Wide*, by the well known English publishing firm of Jonathan Cape, in which Reed traced the close relationship between International Communism

and International Zionism, marked the end of Reed's career as a best selling writer. The shutters went up against him everywhere and he retired to South Africa, taking with him the manuscript of his most important work, *The Controversy of Zion*. Reed knew that no major publisher would dare to touch this work, which lay for years untouched in Durban, South Africa.

Only the initiative of well-known South African writer, Ivor Benson, rescued this masterpiece from threatened permanent oblivion. It was published in 1978 and with the co-operation of the Crown Commonwealth League of Rights, was circulated internationally. The product of more than three years of full-time research at the New York Central Library, *The Controversy of Zion* is a mosaic of over 2000 years of real history. No serious Christian writer has yet emerged to challenge Reed's theme that Christ's message of love, rejected so violently by His great opponents, the Pharisees, has been perverted over 2000 years by the spiritual descendants of the Pharisaical movement which Christ denounced in the strongest of language. Douglas observed that the essence of genuine Christianity had been eroded leaving a form of Liberal Judaism. It is probably true that the far-reaching significance of *The Controversy of Zion* will only emerge as the Zionist myth is demolished.

Whatever one thinks of David Irving, or his style of operating, he has emerged as a unique anti-Zionist demolition force. There is no evidence that he set out to become such a force. But as his relentless, almost ruthless, pursuit of original documentary material concerning the Second World War has brought new information to light, he has not been afraid to adjust his own views. Initially Irving had an open mind concerning the Jewish Holocaust, confining himself to saying that in all his researches he had not been able to find any documentary evidence that Hitler had directed a programme for the mass liquidation of as many Jews as possible. He accepted that it was highly probable that local German commanders took it on themselves to liquidate Jews and other minorities.

But when subsequently confronted with irrefutable evidence that the mass gassing of Jews at Auschwitz or anywhere else did not happen, Irving honestly accepted this and went to the trouble of meticulously correcting his major work, *Hitler's War*. Irving has demonstrated that, unlike most historians who never leave their lofty and detached centres of academia, he has been willing to go out personally and seek out information, much of it original. He is a man of incredible resourcefulness and courage. He is not afraid to go out to promote his own books; he is not prepared to adopt a passive role, which helps to make him so formidable. It is legitimate to question his interpretation of documentary material, but not even his critics can dispute that he has been like a bloodhound in tracking down documents, which would otherwise perhaps never become known.

One of the most revealing aspects of the Goebbels diaries

"THE PEOPLE'S PRINCE"

This attractively produced collection of major addresses by Prince Charles, with an Introduction by one of Australia's most distinguished Ambassadors, Sir Walter Crocker, a former Lieutenant Governor of South Australia, is a publishing first. A reading of these speeches reveals a very different type of man to that so often depicted by sections of the mass media. The Prince of Wales researches and writes his own material, and offers his views on a wide variety of subjects, ranging from architecture to education and international affairs. Should be in every public and school library.

\$15 posted from all League addresses.

affair and David Irving, has been the published reaction of a number of Australian historians. They could not dispute that David Irving had an outstanding record in the field of document research. But Irving had no "formal academic qualifications", he was not a "trained historian", and his record was sullied by his "extreme" views on subjects like the Holocaust. And there was a touch of envy in some of the comments emanating from a few of the so-called "trained" historians.

A DIFFERENT VIEW OF CHAMBERLAIN

Already the establishment historians have started to shift their positions as a result of the Goebbels diaries. Neville Chamberlain has been consistently portrayed as, at best, a weak man who allowed himself to be used by Hitler. Others, including latter-day gurus like the American Lyndon Larouche, charged Chamberlain with being pro-Nazi. At the time of the Munich conference, 1938, Chamberlain knew that Britain's military position was so weak that it would have been national suicide to go to war against Germany at that time. Goebbels reveals Chamberlain as a man doing his best for his country, describing him as "crafty". The Goebbels diaries reinforce the view of the Oxford historian A.J. Taylor, who in his detailed examination of the causes of the Second World War, said there was no evidence to support the view that Hitler had a long-term plan for world-domination.

Hitler had hoped to reach his major objectives without a world war. Taylor was badly smeared at the time his history appeared. Now the establishment historians are saying that perhaps they should reassess Taylor. They will certainly have to reassess Chamberlain, even if they do not probe too deeply and examine the significance of Chamberlain's comment that Britain had been "tricked" into the war. The Goebbels diaries confirm the view that it was legitimate for Chamberlain to explore the possibility of the Polish question, with particular reference to the predominantly German city of Danzig, being resolved diplomatically without risking war.

As C.H. Douglas has pointed out, the seeds of the Second World War were planted at the end of the First World War, that the "peace" which followed and the economic depression of the thirties, were part of a constant policy seeking world power. Hitler was a highly convenient tool who, like so many of his kind throughout history, has been unconscious of the long-term policies they are assisting.

Douglas's work, *The Brief for the Prosecution*, is recommended reading at the present time. He lacked access to the type of documentary material which has become available in more recent years, with much more to come as a result of the break-up of the Soviet Union, but he was able to predict in general terms that the future of Western Christian Civilisation was bleak while the policy of centralising power over the individual was pursued.

THE MULTI-FAITH CONFUSION

Challenging False Assumptions

*An Address given by DAVID HOLLOWAY to the Acts to Action Conference in September 1991
published in the British quarterly, "Home", June 1992.*

I want to speak this morning, first of all about why a fashionable multi-faith philosophy seems so attractive; secondly, what is involved in this philosophy of openness; and thirdly about the issue of Christian uniqueness.

THE ATTRACTIONS OF A MULTI-FAITH PHILOSOPHY

We live in dangerous times. I come from Tyneside. On Tyneside last week young people — truants rather than unemployed — were wantonly destroying, looting and being violent.

There is lawlessness at large. And who can deny that the context is social deprivation, which must be addressed, but the main cause is a breakaway from the Christian faith and from Christian values? That highlights our concern today about education, schools and the religious dimensions.

But let me start with higher education. There is a dialectic between schools and the institutions of higher education where teachers are taught what to teach. There is a crisis at present in such institutions. The President of Johns Hopkins University in the United States summarized the problem when he said this:

The failure to rally around a set of values means that universities are turning out potentially highly skilled barbarians.

Just to indicate how low we have sunk in higher education, let me remind you of two of the most famous Universities in the world - Harvard and Oxford. Harvard's original character contains the following educational mandate:

Everyone shall consider the main end of his life and studies to know Jesus Christ, which is eternal life.

And the motto of Oxford, my own University — as can be seen on the spine of most, or many, OUP books, is '*Dominus illuminatio mea*' — the opening of Psalm 77: The Lord is my

light.' But that mandate and that motto are light years away from the current educational philosophies of Harvard and Oxford.

You say, 'of course: we now live in a secular pluralistic society.' But that is very misleading. Let me explain:

A SECULAR THEISTIC SOCIETY

In the UK and in the United States we do not have a secular atheistic society: we have a secular theistic society. The majority believes in God — and in fact in the UK about 80 per cent like to think of themselves in some way as 'Christians'. We are secular in that God, the name of God and Christian values are now excluded from the public realm and confined to people's private lives. This exclusion is clear in the two key areas of education and the electronic media. The result is inevitable. Exclude Christianity from the classroom and exclude Christianity — positive Christianity — from our TV screens and Radio programmes and you have a secular society by definition. And that is why belief comes so hard. That is why it seems 'odd' being a committed Christian. There is no public acceptance of the Christian faith. But 'privately' we are far from being a Godless nation in terms of inner belief.

WHY?

Why is all this so? How has the situation come about? Things were not always like this?

Ever since the evolution of the sociology of knowledge in Germany in the 1920s — and popularised by Karl Mannheim to the English speaking world — we have known that the social environment powerfully conditions beliefs. But few Christians seem to have bothered about this discovery.

The sociology of knowledge is common sense. It simply says that when for example, post-modern intellectuals say that we must be sensitive to this or that aberrant group; or we must allow

the grosser forms of sexual experimentation; or we must allow other forms of self-expression that in previous generations would have led to imprisonment, it is not primarily that reason is dictating this new morality or these new attitudes. Rather it is that there is a 'plausibility structure' in place that means that people are conditioned to feel that such a morality or attitudes are reasonable. But this 'feeling of reasonableness' has often little to do with logic. It has much to do with social conditioning. And today this conditioning is effected by all sorts of things in society, not least by education and by the media.

The common 'feeling' that it is reasonable to restrain positive Christianity in the classroom in favour of a multi-faith substitute is palpably unreasonable. The 80 percent figure shows that. Most surveys over the past three years all tell the same story. The Independent Broadcasting Association survey on religious beliefs in Great Britain found, I quote:

"In total, claimed membership of any Christian faith accounted for 79 per cent of people. Even amongst people who are not at all religious, two out of three describe themselves as 'Christians'. 13 per cent of people admitted having no religion." (Godwatching. IBA. 1988).

The 1989 Mori survey for the *Sunday Times* confirmed these figures. 84 per cent claimed their religion was Christian. A Gallup survey a little later gave similar figures. This said that 77 per cent claimed to be in a Christian denomination. The figure for other religions — this needs to be noted — is between 2 and 4 per cent. That is why although being secular in the way I have described, we are not pluralistic.

We are not a 'church going' society. According to the European Values Group, reported in the press on Tuesday, only 13 per cent attend Church every week in Britain; but even that report said the majority wanted a birth rite. 79 per cent marriages and 84 per cent funerals. They found 71 per cent believing in God.

WHY IS SECULARISM SO RAMPANT?

So why have we got into the state we find ourselves in? Why have we allowed ourselves to be so conditioned that the common wisdom is that we must soft peddle Christianity in the classroom and the Public Square generally? Why is secularism so rampant? Let me give you some more sociology.

The American sociologists, Peter and Brigitte Berger, have recently highlighted the importance of the 'new class' in the analysis of contemporary society.

The 'new class' hypothesis contradicts the common assumption that the country is ruled and run by the 'middle class'. Rather, it argues that in all advanced capitalist societies the middle class has split. This results in an 'old' middle class — producing goods and services and made up of business people and the older professions. But there is also a new middle class producing knowledge — through education, the electronic media and via the administration (and advocacy) of social and personal services.

As Brigitte Berger claims, this new class "controls many of the institutions central to the so-called post-industrial society . . . the vast educational empire, the media and a seemingly boundless therapeutic apparatus, as well as increasing segments of both public and private administration."

THE 'NEW CLASS' CONTROLS KNOWLEDGE

And the new class seeks to extend its power and influence. It has vested interest in increasing centralism as centralised funding often provides most of its support. Furthermore, it has acquired far greater influence than the old middle class for the new class is essentially a 'knowledge class' and so directs and

controls communal information.

And it pervades the world of the Church, which then further affects the world of education in its religious aspects. But as in the wider society, so in the Church. Members of the new class are never in a majority, yet they have disproportionate influence. Indeed, most of the Church leadership — many of the clergy and the central bureaucrats — are part of the new class. This is ensured by today's higher education that is coloured by new class values; and by the fact that the Church's bureaucracy tends to be a particularly effective repository for new class assumptions and attitudes.

The new class, of course, is in a linear succession from the European Enlightenment. Apart from the basic Enlightenment convictions that man is perfectible through education or evolution and that God, if he exists, is distant, the main emphases of new class values cluster around the concept of human self-fulfilment.

The 'new class' also has a scant regard for history. In this it follows Kant in his view of 'enlightenment' as the emergence from 'immaturity', with immaturity being "the inability to use one's own understanding without the guidance of another." Common sense calls this 're-inventing the wheel.' New class enthusiasts call it 'exploration'.

Now it is these very people, 'new class' clerics and laymen from the churches, people socially conditioned to respond in predictable ways to a whole range of issues, that generally are invited on to SACRE's and agreed syllabus committees. That is our experience on Tyneside. And it is these very people that too often have been staffing our teacher training colleges and University Departments of Education. It is these people that too often staff the Board of Education of the General Synod.

But something must be done. You may be happy with children who know nothing of the Bible. You wouldn't be if you were a head teacher on Tyneside, with Police having to protect your school. While I was on the General Synod, I heard the then Home Secretary, Douglas Hurd, say that for many children it is as though the Old Testament has never been written. A MORI poll last Easter revealed that there is now a terrible ignorance, especially among the young, about the basic elements of the Christian faith. The press reported:

"Many Church leaders and politicians laid the blame firmly at the feet of the country's education system. Father of the House of Commons, Sir Bernard Braine said: "We are now reaping years of neglect in schools. The education system has failed." (*Sunday Express*, 31 March 1991).

Of course we must restrain young people when they are violent and they must be punished. But where is the real fault? Surely with the 'new class' elites, in the church and on the city councils who have allowed this situation to develop.

RELATIVISM AND OPENNESS

Let me now turn to the issue of 'relativism'.

At the end of his or her schooling a young person too often emerges with the belief that there is no such thing as clear and definite truth. Alan Bloom, himself a University Professor, says this:

"There is one thing a professor can be absolutely certain of: almost every student entering the university believes, or says he believes, that truth is relative The danger they have been taught to fear from absolutism is not error but intolerance."

This, of course, is a recipe not only for the destruction of critical thought but also of action. "The students," Bloom continues:

"cannot defend their opinion. It is something with which

they have been indoctrinated. The best they can do is point out all the opinions and cultures there are and have been. What right, they ask, do I or anyone else have to say one is better than the others? If I pose the routine questions designed to confute them and make them think, such as, 'If you had been a British administrator in India, would you have let the natives under your governance burn the widow at the funeral of the man who had died?' they either remain silent or reply that the British should never have been there in the first place. It is not that they know very much about other nations, or about their own. The purpose of their education is not to make them scholars but to provide them with a moral virtue — openness."

THIS IS ALRIGHT - IF

Now this is alright — this cult of openness — if you believe that everything is good. But frankly I don't. Nor do I want to be open to hooligans killing and maiming people; I don't want to be open to militant homosexuals who blasphemously disrupt a service of Holy Communion — as they did at Jesmond Parish Church this past Sunday; I don't want to be open to Muslims who seek to kill Salman Rushdie, although personally I do not want to commend the *Satanic Verses*. Some things, for good reason, I want to say are wrong and false — full stop.

Personally, I do believe there is truth; I believe that Jesus Christ is the way, the truth and the life and that truth is as relevant for public as for private life. I do not believe I should force my views on anyone. But I do believe that I should seek to persuade and educate people into the truth. For that reason I warm to a challenge I read recently.

It was a challenge to recapture our institutions of education for Christ. It was referring to higher education — but what was said is equally relevant to schools. It was a call to Christians everywhere for bold action. It argued that educational institutions so often are no longer places for the pursuit of truth but, if only we have eyes, they are the locus for an ideological struggle being waged for the minds and hearts of the young. But it is not overt. The struggle is subtle. Its tools are the quiet construction of plausibility structures manipulated into place, little by little, by new class elites.

This challenge was a six-point manifesto. Let me give it to you:

- 1) Realize the great heritage that Christianity has afforded western civilization.
- 2) Admit that an unfounded bias has arisen against analysis from a Christian perspective.
- 3) Acknowledge that the Bible does not teach us to abandon the world but rather saturate it with a Christian vision.
- 4) Realize that education is now a battlefield.
- 5) Categorically reject the notion of neutrality — it fosters the denial of absolute truth.
- 6) Develop an integrated Christian view because Jesus Christ is the solution to mankind's problems.

No society can cohere without some super-ordinate value system. There have to be some common assumptions. And the common assumptions, as the opinion polls tell us, are Judaeo-Christian in Britain. People at large do not want a 'multi-faith' culture. True, they do not want a theocracy with an archbishop replacing an ayatollah. They simply want Britain to be 'broadly Christian' while at the same time preserving the freedom of minorities. At a high point in the last Coronation service the then Archbishop of Canterbury presented the Queen with the orb. He added these words: "Receive this orb set under the cross, and remember that the whole world is subject to the power and

empire of Christ our Redeemer." The world, according to the British constitution, as evidenced in the Coronation service, is not subject to Mohammed or Marx, but to Christ.

Of course, religious minorities acting within the law must be protected and never required to agree to such a Christian proposition. But that Coronation proposition governs, however loosely, our public life.

WHEN RELIGIOUS MINORITIES DO BEST

And there is evidence that religious minorities fare better when there is a dominant religious tradition than when there is attempted neutrality. This is very relevant for religious education and education generally.

Professor John McIntyre of Edinburgh in one of the Farmington Occasional Papers has argued that there is a 'religious rake's progress.' First, there is 'neutrality' in religious education, where each religion of the world is presented neutrally. That then slides into 'subjectivism' where choice is emphasised such that religion is a matter of purely subjective preference. Finally, there is 'indifferentism,' where it is a matter of pure indifference which religion you choose. Obviously, before long you may well get humanism, agnosticism or atheism.

He then argues that many members of other faiths see that their own faith fares as badly as Christianity under a cult of openness: and they feel that, paradoxically, they are better off when Christianity is presented as the 'true' religion and the other religions are disregarded. It is simply that other faiths stand a better chance of being taken seriously when one faith at least is taken seriously, than in a situation where they are all treated neutrally. Professor McIntyre's conclusion is this:

"even for the sake of the subordinate cultures and the other faiths which sustain them, we have to ensure the continuance of the dominant culture and the values, ideas, concepts and beliefs which are its inspiration."

It was T.S. Eliot who said, "no culture can appear or develop except in relation to a religion." If we want our culture to disintegrate — destroy the Christian faith; but all other beliefs and values will come crashing down with it! And remember, if all the religions are taught on the 'super-market' principle — namely that it is simply up to children to choose according to preference — a positive philosophy and itself a religion is being taught; and that is, 'truth claims' are not only unimportant, but they are, by implication, being denied in respect of any particular religion. That, in the words of McIntyre, is the final emasculation' of religion. And that is why the thematic approach is to be avoided in the teaching of RE as being a chief vehicle for the 'super-market' principle.

LEAGUE NATIONAL SEMINAR ON NATIONAL HERITAGE

The theme of the League of Rights' 1992 National Seminar, to be held in Melbourne on Saturday October 3, will be "*Defending The Essential National Heritage*", with an outstanding panel of speakers dealing with different aspects of the heritage, including the economic and cultural. The high standard of the Seminar will be set in the first Paper, to be given by one of Australia's most eminent constitutional authorities, Dr. David Mitchell, who will be dealing with the attack on the Constitutional Monarchy.

The Seminar will be held in the Banquet Hall, YWCA, Elizabeth Street, Melbourne, starting at 2 p.m. There will be a wide display of literature, including special material on heritage.

Further details of Seminar to be published shortly.

IS THERE INTELLECTUAL INTEGRITY IN ASSERTING CHRISTIAN UNIQUENESS?

I now, briefly and finally, want to talk about Christian uniqueness. I can only speak as a Christian. I believe in the uniqueness of Jesus Christ. Some will say that is due to my ignorance and that I do not know much of the experience of God outside the Christian tradition. Or it is due to my arrogance and I do not realise how much I do not know.

All I shall say with regard to ignorance is that I have read and travelled widely and spent some time as a missionary with the Church Missionary Society in the Sudan, working in the Muslim north, in Omdurman. But with regard to arrogance it cannot be stressed too often that truth has nothing to do with questions of arrogance, pride or humility. Rather it has all to do with matters of fact. The claim to the uniqueness and finality of Jesus Christ is a truth claim and, therefore, a question of fact. That is why all claims cannot be right. Peter Cotterell, an English Christian theologian puts it like this:

"Islam says Jesus wasn't crucified. We say he was. Only one of us can be right. Judaism says Jesus was *not* the Messiah. We say he *was*. Only one of us can be right. Hinduism says that God has *often* been incarnate. We say only once. And we can't both be right. Buddhism says that the world's miseries will end when we *do* what's right. We say, you *can't* do what's right; the world's miseries will end when we *believe* what is right.

"The fact is that the world's religions *may* agree about the peripheral matters but they disagree precisely about the most important matters of all. Any intelligent person could decide that one is right and the rest wrong. But no intelligent person can seriously believe that all religions are

essentially the same."

Nor is this Western triumphalism. To say that Christ is unique is not to say that other cultures are therefore inferior; nor is it to say even that Christian activities are unique. The *uniqueness* simply lies in *whom* Christians believe in. It is Christ who is unique, not the West, or the followers who worship him.

THE PROBLEM OF 'NEW AGE' SPIRITUALITY

I must conclude. I believe that we all have to be alert on all fronts. Because religion is relegated to the private sphere, there is not sufficient frank discussion of the issues — amongst those of us who agree and disagree. But more open discussion would reveal that a major problem will come, in our schools, not from the main religions wanting to disagree, but from what is called 'New Age' spirituality. This is the religion *made* for an age of 'openness' It is the assumption that God can be known directly in the human spirit. It is a mystical pantheism. If we are spiritual, we will find God, it says, in our inner selves. So Jesus Christ is unnecessary. Before long we are into Earth Mother mysticism and the occult. But that is another story.

So, what can the Church of England do? I address this question to those of us who are Anglicans. At Jesmond Parish Church we have three goals: Godly Living, Church Growth, and Changing Britain. The Church of England could do worse than corporately accept those goals and pray and work to implement them. This would mean reform and biblical renewal, a massive programme of evangelism and church growth, and an aggressive programme of Christianization in our schools and on the media.

But in the words of the Old Testament prophet it is 'not by might, nor by power, but by my Spirit, says the Lord of hosts.' Zech. 4,6).

STATE BANKS THEIR POWERS - UNDER WHOSE CONTROL?

by O.K. Fauser

The author of these notes, Mr. Keith Fauser of West Australia, has long been active in studying the question of what credit creating powers do State Banks have in Australia. He was recently responsible for the West Australian National Party conference carrying a resolution opposing the proposed change to the W.A. Rural and Industries Bank.

Let's start with the Constitution (31 October 1986)), and we find under Section 51—XIII that the Federal Parliament has power over Banking — other than State Banking which plainly means that a State Bank comes under the control of the particular State Parliament and no other.

Now let's see where a State Bank stands in relation to authority in terms of the Banking Act, and we find recorded in Reserve Bank of Australia publication *Functions and Operations* (pages 19(8) under Prudential Supervision of banks -- "*the Reserve Bank exercises prudential supervision over the operations of banks subject to the Banking Act. State Banks operate under State Legislation . . .*" and then (8.1) under authority to carry on banking business we read "*Banks other than State Banks require an authority in terms of the Banking Act, and turning to Reserve Bank of Australia Report and Financial Statements 30 June 1990 - page 33 — under Supervisory powers, we find written "Banks owned by State Governments are not subject to the Banking Act".*

This simply and plainly means that neither the Federal Government nor the Reserve Bank should have any control over a State Bank, — or a State Parliament in relation to the operation of its State Bank.

Now let's have a look at some of the Powers of a State

Bank!!!

Turning to the Rural & Industries Bank of WA Act 1987 (No. 83 of 1987) we find on page 7 under Powers of Bank — 13(d) — "*establish credits and give guarantees and indemnities*".

Now let's see how this particular power compares with the Reserve Bank Act 1959 — and we find on page 3 — under "General Powers" 8(g) — "*to establish credits and give guarantees*" and further to that, let's try the Commonwealth Bank Act 1959 - pages 10-29(g) and 20-(74)-(f) - "*to establish credits and give guarantees*".

This then becomes very important because it is telling us that the State Bank has the same powers, within a State, as the Reserve Bank has within the Commonwealth.

Now it would be a good idea to have a look at the "Charter" of these same banks, and I will quote in part from the Reserve Bank Charter — ". . .it is the duty of the Board, within the limits of its powers, to ensure that the monetary and banking policy of the Bank is directed to the greatest advantage of the people of Australia -----the maintenance of full employment in Australia and the economic prosperity and welfare of the people of Australia."

The Commonwealth Bank Charter also uses the same fine expressions of "*are directed to the greatest advantage of the people of Australia and have due regard to the stability and balanced development of the Australian economy*".

What does it say about the "functions of Board" of the Rural & Industries Bank of WA - on page 4 of R & I Bank Act 1987 -we read and I quote — 6(3) "*within the limits of its powers, the Board shall ensure that the policy of the Bank is directed to the greatest advantage of the people of Western Australia and promotes the bal-*

anced economy of the State".

All very fine and grand words, which proposes a very serious question — does anyone really believe these charters are being followed as they should be by the various Boards of Management? I think not — because on further reading from the Reserve Bank of Australia Report and Financial Statement of 30th June 1991 — I find on page 36 — under Bank supervision, Banks supervisory role has three primary objectives, namely:

- a) Preservation of confidence in the Banking system as a whole.
- b) the stability and integrity of the Banking system,
- c) and the domestic and international payments systems and the protection of bank deposits.

Nothing at all mentioned about "greatest advantage of the people of Australia".

So the question we all should now ask ourselves is: are we going to stand by and allow our R & I (State Bank) to continue to have its powers relating to "establish credits" etc., eroded under Bank regulations imposed by the Reserve Bank — which follows rules laid down by the Basle Supervisors Committee of the Bank for International Settlements" as one can read on page 27 of Reserve Bank of Australia Report and Finance Statements 30 June 1988.

One should now pick up a good English dictionary and find what is meant by "establish credits". I have done this and I find the following description:

First have a look at the word "establish" and we find "*to bring about, create*"; now have a look at the word "create" and it says "*to cause to exist, to bring into being - originate*". Now look up "originate" and its meaning is described as "*to bring into being, create, invent*" so we should now see what "invent" means and we find this explanation — "*to conceive of or devise something entirely new*".

So when we now go back to the various powers of the R & I Bank — the Commonwealth Bank and the Reserve Bank and read that each bank has the same powers enabling them to, among other things, "establish credits", it should not be difficult for a person with average education and intelligence to understand what is being said.

Summing up — this means that the State Parliament could instruct the R. & I Bank to "establish credits", to enable it to carry out any essential public works etc., that would contribute to the "greatest advantage of the people of Western Australia" - without any Bank regulation restrictions imposed upon it by the Reserve Bank — or any foreign body.

EMERGING TRADE BLOCS

Former Australian Prime Minister, Mr. Bob Hawke, says that he is afraid that if Democrat Bill Clinton wins the coming American presidential contest, this will increase the chances of a restrictive US trading bloc being created. Hawke said that the formation of world trading blocs was one of the most important questions facing the world today. Mr. Bob Hawke did not mention that as Australian Prime Minister he had advocated the establishment of an Asian trading bloc with Australia as a member.

The recent announcement by President George Bush of the North American Free Trade Agreement, designed to create the world's biggest free trade zone, covering the USA, Canada and Mexico, is a manifestation of a philosophy, which claims that the problems of the world can only be solved by increasing centralisa-

tion. The emergence of bigger and more highly centralised trading blocs is a confirmation of the predictions of the founder of Social Credit, C.H. Douglas. Some time before the Second World War one commentator said that events "appeared to be in the pay of Douglas". Douglas was able to predict events because he had demonstrated that the modern economic system could only be operated under orthodox financial policies, by progressive economic expansion and centralisation, with smaller industries being absorbed by bigger industries, the development of chain stores on a national scale at first, and then on an international scale, with eventually the organisation of nations into trading blocs. Behind all these developments were those who believed, some quite sincerely, that the problems of man could only be solved by the establishment of some type of a World State.

As Douglas demonstrated, ever since the start of the Industrial Revolution, which faced mankind with a completely new situation in the evolution of Civilisation, under orthodox finance industry was progressively distributing over any given period of time, insufficient purchasing power to meet the total financial costs being generated. The problem was masked by a policy of vast economic expansion, this resulting in the First and Second World Wars and enormous economic waste. The doctrine of "growth", linked with the doctrine that an industrialised nation could only solve its internal problems by "export drives", has led to the attempt to establish "Common Markets". But as eventually it is demonstrated that these markets must also be enlarged, this leads automatically to the view that if all these markets could be amalgamated into a global market, man's problems would be solved. One of the measures of the attempt to maintain the growth doctrine is the astronomical growth of debt, which Douglas correctly predicted.

The basic problem remains as Douglas outlined it in his first major work, *Economic Democracy*:

“ . . . the primary requisite is to obtain in the readjustment of the economic and political structure such control of initiative that by its exercise every individual can avail himself of the benefits of science and mechanism, that by their aid he is placed in such a position of advantage that, in common with his fellows he can choose, with increasing freedom and complete independence, whether he will or will not participate in any project which may be placed before him.”

In order to make this possible the individual must have access to adequate financial credit as a right. He can then choose what he wants from the economic system. With this power over his own destiny, man would be able to reject all forms of economic sabotage. He would retain control of his own national sovereignty and be in the position to preserve his own culture.

THE GROWTH MADNESS

The concept of growth as a solution to man's problems has a powerful attraction for the Utopians of all kinds. Not without significance, many of these Utopians take the famous Greek philosopher Plato as their model. The American-based Larouche movement praises Plato, who taught that if he and his fellow "philosopher-kings" had the power, they could create the perfect society. Currently in prison, Lyndon Larouche is a devotee of the growth doctrine, with a grandiose scheme for colonising Mars, with Larouche claiming that this will be of great benefit to the world's economy. Douglas wrote about the possibility of extracting sunbeams from cucumbers, but asked what true human purpose this would serve. "The eyes of the fool are on the ends of the world" is a warning, which has considerable relevance at the present time.