

# THE NEW TIMES

\$20 per annum.

Box 1052J, Melbourne.

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

VOL. 62, No. 4.

Registered Australia Post - Publication PP481667 100259

APRIL 1998.

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

## THE TURBULENT AUSTRALIAN POLITICAL SCENE

*by Eric D. Butler*

1998 will prove to be a defining year in Australian history. The rapid change of the political scene has produced a situation, which was unthinkable two years ago, when John Howard appeared to be in an unassailable political situation. He had won a massive majority at the 1993 Federal elections. The man once described as "the world's greatest Treasurer", Paul Keating, had led the Australian Labor Party to its worst electoral defeat since the 1930s. New Labor leader Kim Beazley was handed what appeared to be the impossible task of presenting Labor as a credible force before the next Federal elections, which John Howard can now hold at any time of his own choosing. Needless to say, Howard will hold the election at a time when he feels he has the best chance of winning. While nothing is certain in politics, John Howard and his advisers must know that in the current Australian political climate, they are far from certain to win.

While there is a general view that Howard will opt for a double dissolution, which means an election before the end of the year, all the available evidence, including the public opinion polls, indicates that the electorate is so volatile at present, with at least 40 per cent not yet certain how they will vote, that it would be foolish to make any definite predictions about the outcome of the elections. But it is certain that, unless something sensational happens, neither the Coalition parties nor the Labor party will control the next Parliament which, like the present Parliament, will be restricted by the Senate. If John Howard does decide to have a double dissolution election, making it easier for the smaller parties and Independents to win seats, this could open up a completely new scene in Australian politics. We do not rule out the possibility of some electoral shocks for the major political parties in the House of Representatives. Although the controllers of the mass media have decided to try to defeat Australia First leader Graeme Campbell, Member for Kalgoorlie, West Australia, by giving him the "silent treatment", it can be taken for granted that Campbell will survive comfortably.

### WHAT ABOUT PAULINE HANSON?

And what of Pauline Hanson, member for Oxley, Queensland, and leader of the One Nation Party? One Nation has announced that it is running a number of candidates, both for the House of Representatives and the Senate. There is no doubt that Pauline Hanson has been a political phenomenon, and that she has made a vital contribution to Australia's political culture. But the latest public opinion

polls, which show a steady decline in public support over recent

### OUR POLICY

To promote service to the Christian revelation of God, loyalty to the Australian Constitutional Monarchy, and maximum cooperation between subjects of the Crown Commonwealth of Nations.

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

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

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

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

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

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

months, confirm our own assessment that while there is still a lot of emotional support for Pauline Hanson, there are some doubts as to whether this will translate into votes when the Federal elections are eventually held.

When Pauline Hanson announced that she was forming a new political party, we said that she had been badly advised. Events since the launch of the One Nation Party have confirmed our original view. The production of the videotape, to be played after her death, smacked too much of gimmickry, and reflected badly on whoever advised the production of such a video. Establishing a new political party requires skilled organisers and a lot of hard work. Effective screening to ensure that candidates are of the highest quality is no easy task. Having had experience with some individuals now offering themselves as candidates to stand for One Nation, we would be appalled if, by some miracle, they managed to get themselves elected. There are, of course, several candidates who would be an improvement on present Federal politicians. We can only wish them well and recommend that League of Rights supporters assess them on their merits.

If press reports are correct, it appears that Robyn Spencer of Australians Against Further Immigration, has joined forces with Pauline Hanson, and will head the Victorian One Nation Senate team. We have the highest respect for Robyn Spencer, and her election to the Senate would greatly improve that important institution. While we would be pleasantly surprised if Robyn Spencer won a Senate position, a joint Hanson-Spencer Senate team in Victoria must increase the political pressure on all Coalition candidates. But our view, expressed on a number of occasions, is that electors refuse to vote for any candidate who will not give a written pledge that, if elected, his or her major priority will be to work and vote for the early introduction of a

constitutional mechanism enabling electors to have a direct say by referendum on major legislation.

The League of Rights has carefully built up the groundwork for making the Citizens' Initiated Referendum proposal a major issue at the Federal elections. It will be appropriate to remind electors that the concept was strongly endorsed by one of John Howard's senior Ministers, Mr. Reith, when he was in Opposition. Reith not only prepared an excellent Paper on the question, but convened a Canberra seminar on the subject.

### **THE TEST OF THE QUEENSLAND STATE ELECTIONS**

Should the Queensland State elections be held before the Federal elections, which appear likely at the moment, they will clearly indicate which way the Australian political wind is blowing at present. Although the mass media continues to pretend that Graeme Campbell's Australia First movement does not exist, our research clearly indicates that this fledgling party will poll strongly in the limited number of State electorates it is contesting. It is encouraging to discover that at the grass roots, Pauline Hanson supporters are prepared to co-operate with the Australia First supporters, ignoring the foolish edicts of Pauline Hanson's advisers. Australia First representatives have made it clear that they wish to exchange preferences with One Nation, thus maximising the nationalist, conservative vote. If One Nation's candidates poll poorly at the Queensland State elections, the wisest course for Pauline Hanson would be to heed reality, ignore her advisers, withdraw from a contest in the House of Representatives, and announce that in the national interest she will contest a Queensland seat in the Senate. Operating from the Senate, Pauline Hanson would still be able to exercise an enormous influence on the Australian political scene.

---

## **BEHIND THE AUSTRALIAN WATERFRONT EXPLOSION**

C.H. Douglas predicted that all attempts to maintain the debt financial system must lead to an on-going type of civil war within every industrial community. Most industrial disputes have their roots in a struggle between employers and employees concerning money. Harmonious relations are impossible under a system, which progressively generates debt faster than it can be liquidated. In their attempts to remain solvent, employers naturally consider how they can reduce their labour costs. Every new labour-saving device is welcomed, but increases the problem of unemployment. Failing to tackle the basic cause of conflict between employers and employees, Union leaders have been fighting a losing battle. Strikes have merely increased the grip of the debt merchants, who push forward everywhere with programmes designed to increase their own power. Globalism is a manifestation of the philosophy of centralised power.

There was a time when the trade union movement, as it evolved during the early stages of the industrial revolution in Britain, might have given a lead in opposing the debt merchants. Some of the early Socialists like Kerr Hardie were emancipationists, and visualised a society in which both employer and employee co-operated harmoniously to increase the standard of living for both groups. But the trade union movement was subverted by the Fabian Socialists and their spiritual bedfellows, the Communists. They quickly moved to counter the threat of ideas developed by the author of Social Credit, C.H. Douglas. One of the early Soviet Russian leaders,

Molotov, said that Social Credit was the only idea they were worried about. Douglas observed that both the Communists and Big Business were a reflection of a common philosophy, the will-to-power.

The leaders of waterside unions have, over the years, developed a culture, which has often been violent. But the culture of Big Business has also resulted in a growing use of force to eliminate smaller businesses and to develop the modern, soulless corporation. As the Banks become bigger and more centralised, both those working in these institutions and their customers are increasingly treated as statistics. Prime Minister Howard and his colleagues refer to the rorts of waterside workers, but ignore the financial rorts of various kinds, which have done more economic and social damage than all the Unions put together. Waterside workers who have increased productivity find themselves summarily dismissed because they are members of the Waterside Worker's Union. The speed with which ships are loaded and unloaded through Australian ports will not solve Australia's basic problems.

The disease of centralism and globalism must continue to poison societies everywhere, with increasing social disintegration and violence. With his shock attack upon Australian waterside workers, John Howard has set in motion an explosive trail of events that may have scored a short-term political advantage, but Australia as a civilised nation is going to pay dearly for it.

# THE RISE OF THE MANAGERIAL STATE

While Professor Hayek's classic work, *"The Road to Serfdom"* is generally well known to students of political history, with new editions appearing from time to time, James Burnham's *"Managerial State"* which like Hayek's work, appeared during the Second World War, has been generally forgotten. The former Marxist, Burnham predicted that Mankind was threatened neither by Communism nor "Capitalism", but by the emergence of "The Managerial State". The following article by our British contemporary, *"On Target"*, of September 13th and 27th September, 1997, provides an excellent outline of how the Managerial State has emerged in modern times. *"On Target"* is printed and published by Intelligence Publications (UK), 26 Meadow Lane, Sudbury, Suffolk, England, CO 10 6 TD. By private subscription only: UK £20 per annum. USA surface mail US\$45 per annum, air mail \$50 per annum. Elsewhere overseas - surface mail £25 per annum, air mail £25 per annum.

## Moving Power Beyond the Reach of the Nation-State

In September this year United States President William (Bill) Clinton appealed for new markets for American exports. This was another way of stating, on the part of industrialised Western nations, supported in this instance by American muscle, that "we are over-producing beyond a rational balance of our domestic requirements, you have got some of what we want, and we are proposing to ram our surplus down your throats in exchange for some of your goodies - as and when it suits us; if need be by changing the balance of your domestic production to meet *our* requirements, even if that leaves your own economy in a shambles." This principle was evident recently in the case of Japanese rice production, that is currently perfectly adequate for domestic needs, when pressure was nevertheless applied to Japan to "open" her markets to foreign-grown rice. Some years ago the Australian commentator, Jeremy Lee, gave this situation an ironic twist in the case of sales of Australian condensed milk to New Zealand, and vice versa, when he suggested that the ships bearing this cargo meet halfway, switch the labels on the cans, and return home again! The polite euphemisms for this process are "growth", that is, overproduction to keep the commercial wheels turning at home, and "development". Development is another way of informing target nations, principally in the Third World, that they had better prepare to accept the benefits of Western technology, in other words, the surplus industrial output of the Westernised nations, for which they may enjoy the privilege of "money" borrowed from the International Banking system, on whose behalf the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (I.M.F.) will be only too happy to oblige. The organisations that give this banditry superficial respectability are such as the World Trade Organisation (W.T.O.), formerly the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (G.A.T.T.), and the North American Free Trade Agreement (N.A.F.T.A.). An important component of this structure is, of course, the International Armaments Industry, which burgeoned with the maturity of the Industrial Revolution at the turn of the last century, and has since required major conflicts to sustain its own "growth", and produce enormous profits and further control for the International Banking system. Until the first half of the present century the old European empires had organised their own discrete trading areas on a much smaller scale. But by 1900 there was going to be no stopping American industrial and commercial muscle. In 1880, the population of continental United States was 50,000,000; by 1910 it was 76,000,000; by 1920 it had risen to 105,000,000, and it now stands at 248,000,000. It is interesting to see the consequences today not only in Africa, where enforced "liberation" from the European colonial yoke that began in the 1950's left the continent wide open to "development" - rip-off by any other name - in pursuit of the progressive

internationalisation of industrial production and finance. The guts of the already dangerously archaic and vulnerable industrial base of the United Kingdom continued to be sucked out early on, from the end of the 1939-44 War. Into the vacuum that is created went *foreign-owned* multinationals, such as subsidiaries of the expanding Japanese vehicle and electronics industries. This process has also gradually moved industries in the direction of cheaper labour of the Pacific Rim, where countries like Malaysia and South Korea have set up their own industrial production. The race is on for the spoils of the former Soviet satellites in Eastern Europe, the economically punch-drunk and vulnerable constituent states of the former Soviet Union and, now, China, with a population almost five times that of the United States. Prediction is virtually impossible but the impression one has is that of a number of political, economic and financial tigers holding each other by the tail, with a financial structure in particular likely to implode at any time.

## The *unelected* governance of International Finance-Capitalism

The so-called "Pacific Rim" countries have long been heralded as the coming region for development and investment, lead by the resurgence of the Japanese economy after the 1939-45 War. This means that the Far East became a focus for International Finance-Capitalism. It is also interesting that isolationist Myanmar (formerly Burma), with its authoritarian regime, has long been a target of the "International Community" and its tactically conscience-ridden Human Rights "Taskforce". Whatever business it was of Western finance - "money" largely artificially created by the Western-controlled private banking system - to be in the Far East at all, oiling the wheels of "development" for its own profit is a fact of the dismantled barriers of global business. Dismantled by whom, of course? Certainly not by elected governments, except as puppets of the International Elite. We have already seen a self-sufficient South Africa brought to its knees when outraged international liberalism was mobilised against the odious Apartheid regime to bring this about. <sup>5)</sup> Then, suddenly, in 1997, doubts began to be expressed that these countries of the Pacific Rim had overreached themselves. They may well have done; even culpably so, but only encouraged by external investment. In September this year the Malaysian Prime Minister, The Hon. Datuk Seri Dr. Muhathir Muhammed, addressing a meeting of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund in Hong Kong, dared to attack the International Finance-capitalist system for his country's predicament. It is also interesting that Dr. Muhathir also cited Jewish influence behind this problem, but the response in the British press was to ignore this obvious truism and remark on his stability in the light of this "outburst".

We now see the wheels of real power begin to turn. The international financier, George Soros, who also happens to be of Jewish origin like many others in the system, mounted an immediate attack on Dr. Muhathir Muhammed for the profligacy of his policies. Soros has made a vast fortune in currency speculation. In other words, playing with other people's "money". During the Exchange Rate Mechanism crisis of September 1992, Soros made a cool \$2,000,000,000, ultimately out of the British Taxpayer. Soros was elected by no one. Yet he not only has the gross impertinence, as a private individual, to address international conferences, he has set up a network of foundations and colleges in accordance with his own ideals, and he lectures heads of state who *have* been elected, (theoretically) to defend the interests of their electorates. Soros and his kind have not grown as much as a carrot or milked a single cow to sustain populations from whose economies he culls his obscene profits. On the scale of the high street he would long ago have been arrested for robbery. Instead he strides the global stage with his fellow speculators and bankers like a statesman, while the posturing of fatuous politicians at party-political conferences all-too-easily fool themselves and those who elected them that they are in control of the nation's destiny. This we shall not be told by a media owned and controlled ultimately by those in the "chain of command" of the International Elite - not if they value their jobs! Nearby Pakistan is already deeply in hock to the International Elite. Now, as the Malaysian economy sags, it is accompanied by the slide in the economy of Thailand. Indonesia, the focus of lucrative armaments contracts, was proclaimed as more economically responsible and stable, but Indonesia has now also followed that well-trodden path to the International Monetary Fund. In these elusive truths we therefore turn to *The Spotlight* newspaper in America, which, on 18th August this year published an article headed "Elitist cabal Crushes Weak Countries", with the sub-title "A billionaire 'philanthropist' is behind the collapse of at least one Third World country according to a diplomat". From this article we reproduce the following paragraph:

**"Their first target was Thailand, because for years the Thai government has gone its own way publicly rejecting the tutelage of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (I.M.F.)," says Dr. Pieter Diericks, a former economic adviser to the Indonesian government, now a Wall Street consultant on Southeast Asia."**

## **STRUCTURING SOCIETY TO SUIT THE REQUIREMENT**

Illusions and Delusions of "Democracy" As the International Finance-Capitalist system continues to consolidate its grip on the human race, we may identify two important factors. The first is the process of conditioning the general public to accept this global state. The second is that the enormous complexity of power structures today, as they extend both physically and politically beyond national boundaries, has brought with it its own monolithic organisations that render earlier relationships redundant. To achieve this we are contemplating the ideological Struggle of Godless Materialism, for the mind. In other words, the continuum of the war "without bullets". The dumbing-down of the English-speaking population on both sides of the Atlantic is a matter of record, of which we mention just one example, from the United States, in this edition. We have also repeatedly pointed out the "wall-to-wall"

mind-numbing trash of effectively all television channels, and the pornographic and superficially mindless rubbish that abound on the magazine and news stands in the United Kingdom. This is compounded partly by the selfish indifference, and partly by the bigotry of a so-called educated, professional and managerial class who believe they can obtain an "impartial" and "balanced" view from the established press, of course owned and controlled, if they did but know it, by the Ruling Elite. Those few in politics, government, journalism, education or the church, who can work matters out for themselves, or who perhaps function at various levels with this system, prefer for the most part to sit on their hands and take the money. We may consider the formal doctrines and mechanisms of the former Soviet system as appropriate to harnessing certain parts of the world to International Finance-Capitalism. If we consider the parallel, gradual and far more subtle influences of International Socialism, we can do no better than read Rose L. Martin's exposure of the leaching of Fabian Socialism across the Atlantic from the end of the last century<sup>(6)</sup>. In the end the result has been the same; the consolidation and centralisation of power while ordinary electorates are left to fight and play out their spurious political differences amongst themselves.

As one moves from the City-State and the Nation-State to the United Nations and the "Global Village", it is inevitable by the very nature of this consolidation, in a modern technological society, that government becomes progressively remote from the power and will of the people, and "democracy" increasingly cosmetic, particularly so when authority that should rightly be decentralised to provincial levels where it can be best exercised is nevertheless controlled centrally. This was pointed out as early as 1929 by no less than the then Lord Chief Justice of England, Lord Hewart of Bury.<sup>(7)</sup> With the telling sub-title "Public and Private Rulers and How to Make Them Accountable", this critique was taken still further by Morton Mintz and Jerry Cohen almost half a century later.<sup>(8)</sup>

## **The Age of Monolithic Power**

A press report of an inquiry that followed the publication of Lord Hewart's book, in 1929, was illuminating: The need for safeguarding the public against the possible abuse of powers by Ministers of the Crown is emphasised in the report of the Committee of Ministers' powers issued last night "We see this passage (in which Lord Hewart condemned secret decisions by departmental tribunals) and, indeed, the whole of the book, as a warning against possible danger of great gravity." Of the custom of delegating legislative power to Ministers the report says that it may have advantages, but risks of abuse are incidental to it, and we believe that safeguards are required.

We need hardly be surprised, in view of all that has been written on this broad front over the years, that this monolithic, bureaucratic government machinery has gone from strength to strength in its accretion of power. Domestically in the United Kingdom in more recent times, we have seen the power of the Social Services to intrude on, and destroy, stable family life. We have seen the same politically correct officialdom, still wet behind the ears after its progressive college and university education, seek to dictate to war veterans who survived the breaches of Normandy, in 1944, how they may boil their eggs. On the 19th this year no less than the *Financial Times* newspaper informed us of plans to lay down what we might or might not eat in restaurants. In agriculture the same oppressive

bureaucracy has been employed to destroy agricultural resources through the Salmonella and B.S.E. "weapons"<sup>(9)</sup>. Given some reservations about the history of commercially produced animal feed in the latter case, what was significant was the deliberate suppression of rational arguments that did not fit this scenario. The linear consequence of this attrition, along with the destruction of other agricultural resources, such as fruit-growing orchards, has been to reduce the self-sufficiency of the Nation, and bring it increasingly within the power of the multinational conglomerates that control the bulk of the world's commercial food production and distribution.

## NEW SCALES AND DIVISIONS OF POWER

In the United States, where hereditary freedoms are purportedly enshrined in the Constitution, comparable organs of bureaucracy, such as the Federal Bureau of Investigation (F.B.I.), the Inland Revenue (I.R.S.), and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, has taken the process of bureaucracy even further, to draconian levels. The I.R.S. has been deployed to carry out what are nothing more than fiscal attacks on selected victims. In 1992 the Weaver family perished in the siege of Ruby Ridge, and the following year, at Waco, members of the Branch-Davidian sect perished in what was nothing less "than a full-scale military assault that even employed armoured weapons. Such episodes are normally monitored only by *The Spotlight* and other privately owned Populist channels, but on these occasions the atrocities even came to the attention of the mainstream press in the United Kingdom. However, other sea changes in the corporate and governmental balance of power are taking place, and again the sheer scale in the United States lends itself to discussion. Once again we turn to the *Strategy Weekly* newsletter of Prudential Securities, and the "Potomac Perspective" pages of commentator Mark Melcher, in a feature called "The New Political Paradigm". This we reproduce here in the style of the original, with only minor amendments and the exclusion of the first three paragraphs that were germane only to the United State scenario. The essential theme was the position of organised labour following a dispute that involved the United Parcel Service company (U.P.S.), and the Teamsters Union:

In Any Case "Labour" Versus Capital May be An Outdated Paradigm. In short, I believe that the U.P.S. strike wasn't "just what labour needed," as many liberal commentators maintained. It was more probably exactly what labour didn't need, especially at this point in time, when the globalization of production, the globalization of competition, the rapid growth in employee profit-sharing plans, and the technological revolution, which places a premium on skills rather than on union affiliation, have greatly lessened the appeal of union membership for the vast majority of workers. The bottom line is that it isn't American labour versus American capital any more, but American labour and capital versus the capital and labour of other nations in a global marketplace.

The effect of all this is to confirm, once again, that the old labour-versus-capital paradigm, which was a principal feature in American politics for almost exactly a century, is no longer of much importance. This once all-important tension, which actually defined the Republican and Democratic parties for decades, took root during the Marxist and Utopian socialist movements that followed the Civil War, bloomed in 1886 when Samuel Gompers founded the American Federation of Labor,

began to wilt in the early 1970s, with the advent of Richard Nixon's appeal to the "new Republican majority" of blue-collar workers, and became an endangered species in 1989, when the Berlin Wall fell and a new era of global competition emerged from the rubble.

**It's Not Just the Democrats Who Are carrying Lunchbuckets Today . . .** Throughout most of the 20th century, the Democratic Party was the preferred political home for blue-collar workers. Today, the Republicans get a majority of their votes from these so-called "Joe Six-packs" and their wives. Conversely, the Republican Party was, from the time of the so-called "Robber Barons" in the late 19th century until very recently, the home of big business.

... Nor Is It All Republicans In The Boardroom. Today, while G.O.P. still has a huge following in the small-business community, the boardrooms of most of America's corporate giants are filled with Democrats, who aggressively support the Washington colossus in exchange for huge amounts of business, for important tax breaks and direct subsidies, and most importantly, for a steady stream of regulatory initiatives and trade rulings that serve to cripple their smaller competitors at home and abroad.

Needless to say, these are not novel observations on my part. The history and ramifications of the decline of union power in the United States has been a regular topic of discussion among political pundits for a long time. What hasn't been discussed among this genre is the nature of the political paradigm that has, during the past couple of decades or so, slowly replaced the old one.

**The New Dichotomy Is a Very Different One** In fact, most political pundits today don't seem to know that such a thing exists. Liberal commentators still appear to labour under the misconception that the Democratic Party represents the blue-collar worker in his fight against the "capitalist dogs". Conservative pundits, on the other hand, seem to believe "we are all capitalists now" and that no significant threat to free enterprise exists any more. Both assumptions are wrong.

... With Workers and Businessmen Lining Up together the reality is that a powerful new paradigm has emerged on to the American political scene that has completely changed the nature of the Democratic Party, and is a direct threat to America's traditional brand of enterprise capitalism.

... To Face An Increasingly Powerful Government Bureaucracy. Simply stated, this new paradigm, which is as dynamic, fascinating, and certainly as important to the future course of society as the old labour-capital one, involves the tension between the authority of government bureaucrats, and their allies in some of the nation's most important boardrooms, and the classic American concept of individual freedom.

No Union Boss Was Ever as Powerful as Today's Bureaucrat . . . Unions have the clout to close down vast American enterprises for any serious length of time, as they once did. But government today has the power, vested in mountains of laws, regulations, and court rulings, to destroy or badly cripple any business, or any industry, in the United States, large

or small, whether it be a meat-packing plant in Nebraska, a restaurant in Brooklyn, or the entire tobacco industry. No union boss in U.S. history has ever had this kind of pure, unadulterated muscle.

**. . . Be He From The F.B.I. or The E.P.A. . . .**

Government today also has the kind of power to kill, maim, malign, and confiscate the property of individual citizens that the nation's founding fathers would have found astonishing, as was discovered, for example, by such a diverse lot as the Branch Davidians in Texas, a falsely accused "terrorist" in Atlanta, and dozens of ordinary farmers, who have been pilloried for filling in low spots in their own fields, which the E.P.A. (Environment Protection Agency) bureaucrats now call "wetlands".

The scope and raw power of the tens of thousands of nameless, faceless bureaucrats in this nation is almost beyond comprehension. Somewhere, someplace, taxpayers are paying people to write hundreds of pages of complicated regulations specifying exactly which public housing residents can own a pet (old people who need companionship), how many black men and how many women of any colour should be firefighters in Podunk, Iowa, and (how's this for hubris?), how many doctors is "too many".

. . . And Business Has Been More Than Willing To Facilitate This Abuse. Helping with this task are millions of big-company, private-sector bureaucrats, whose bosses have learned that fortunes can be made if government bureaucrats can be "helped" to make and enforce decisions that favour them over their competitors; who are blind to the lesson learned by so many Frenchmen during "the terror", that those who help place the heads of others on the block soon find their own there.

Operating between these private and public sector bureaucrats and their bosses are tens of thousands of lawyers who live on the system like bloodsucking leeches in a swamp full of sows, operating in a special environment, designed by them, of "legal bribery" and "honest graft".

The Bureaucracy Rarely Answers to Anyone. Being a bureaucrat in America today means never having to say you're sorry, for mandating air bags that kill children, for destroying families with pernicious welfare programmes, for wrecking the educational and legal systems with crackpot experiments and the imposition of politically correct nonsense, and for thousands upon thousands of other asinine rules that are based on bad science, bad sociology, and bad economics, all hiding behind the hubristic mask of "we're here to help you."

**The Rise Of The New Class Has A Long History.** To better describe this new paradigm in American politics, I will turn to the thoughts of three brilliant men from three different eras, all of whom have written about this tension between the legitimate requirement for the expansion of government authority in an increasingly complex society and the desire on the part of individuals, and the need on the part of free enterprise, for freedom from government tyranny.

Read in concert, I believe these quotes form a mosaic that almost perfectly defines the characteristics of the new political paradigm, which, I believe, will define American politics for decades to come.

I'll begin with an observation by Tocqueville, who saw it all developing as early as the 1830s. He put it this way:

I think, then, that the species of oppression by which democratic nations are menaced is unlike anything that ever before existed in the world; our contemporaries will find no prototype of it in their memories. I seek in vain for an expression that will accurately convey the whole of the idea I have formed of it; the old words despotism and tyranny are inappropriate; the thing itself is new, and since I cannot name, I must attempt to define it.

I seek to trace the novel features under which despotism may appear in the world. The first thing that strikes the observation is an innumerable multitude of men, all equal and alike, incessantly endeavouring to procure the petty and paltry pleasures with which they glut their lives. Each of them, living apart, is as a stranger to the fate of all the rest; his children and his private friends constitute to him the whole of mankind. As for the rest of his fellow citizens, he is close to them, but he does not see them; he touches them, but he does not feel them; he exists only in himself and for himself alone; and if his kindred still remain to him, he may be said at any rate to have lost his country.

Above this race of men stands an immense and tutelary power, which takes upon itself alone to secure their gratification and to watch over their fate. That power is absolute, minute, regular, provident, and mild. It would be like the authority of a parent if, like that authority, its object were to prepare men for manhood; but it is well content that the people should rejoice, provided that they think of nothing but rejoicing. For their happiness such a government willingly labours, but it chooses to be the sole agent and only arbiter of their necessities, facilitates their pleasures, manages their principal concerns, directs their industry, regulates the descent of property and subdivides their inheritances; what remains, but to spare them all the care of thinking and all trouble of living?

Thus it every day renders the exercise of the free agency of man less useful and less frequent; it circumscribes the will within a narrow range and gradually robs a man of all the uses of himself.

Next, I turn to the thoughts of the brilliant turn-of-the-century sociologist Max Weber, who is widely credited with being the first to view the importance of this phenomena in a modern sense. Weber is best known for his wonderful book *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, . . . These thoughts of Weber were contained in a much larger and lesser-known book of his, published in 1921 and entitled *Economy and Society*.

Weber Saw It Emerging . . . It was here that Weber pointed out that society is not divided into two classes, capital and labour, as [Karl] Marx maintained, but into three. Between capital and labour, Weber said, there is a new, emergent middle class of white-collar, technical and administrative personnel, "whose share in the economic product depended on skill and educational status rather than on the ownership of property or the power of collective organisation."

The quote in the preceding paragraph is from *The Oxford Companion to Politics of the World*. The following quotes from the same volume will I think explain Weber's view of the new paradigm.

Weber's most notable contribution, however, lay in identifying the importance of bureaucracy to modern politics. His definition of bureaucracy, not as a type of political system, but as a continuous, professionalised, and rule-governed form of administration, showed it to be increasingly prevalent - thanks to its being uniquely equipped to handle increasingly various and complex organisational tasks - in all spheres of modern life.

On the basis of his analysis he demonstrated that the socialist ideal of a society without domination was Utopian, and predicted that the replacement of the capitalist entrepreneur by the state administrator would create a monolithic power structure as

oppressive as that of ancient Egypt and as economically stagnant as that of late imperial Rome.

In Weber's view, the key concern about bureaucracy was not that it be replaced but that it be checked, on the one hand, within a framework of mutually limiting power structures and, on the other, by ensuring that bureaucratic organisations were themselves subordinate to the control of individual leaders selected on the basis of non-bureaucratic principles and acting under such principles.

### **. . . And One Contemporary Writer Sees Its Dangers.**

Finally, I'll turn to the thoughts of Vanderbilt University's Alasdair MacIntyre, from his extraordinary book on moral philosophy, *After Virtue* (discussed by Mark Melcher earlier, in an article called "Does Liberal Activism Bestow 'Character'?")

MacIntyre's analysis is far too complex to present here in its entirety. But simply stated, he argues that the tension between individual freedom and modern-day bureaucracy is not exclusively about material matters, as implied by Tocqueville and Weber, but has an important moral element.

In fact, MacIntyre says, this tension is a stepchild of the great moral struggle that began with the attempt by Enlightenment philosophers to establish a moral scheme based on reason alone.

He Argues That 'Scientific' Government Has A Fatal Moral Flaw. The efforts of these men were doomed from the start, MacIntyre says, because they had to reject, due to the nature of their project, the notion that man has "an essence which defines his true end," that life has a divine purpose, either in the Aristotelian sense that man must fulfill his role as dictated by "nature", or in the theological sense that man must fulfill God's will.

Without such a theological framework, MacIntyre argues, "the whole project of morality becomes unintelligible," and moral philosophy becomes nothing more than an arena for competing notions that have no basis other than "logic", which is, of course, debatable.

The result of this futile quest, MacIntyre says, was that the Enlightenment philosophers succeeded in eroding belief in the theistically based moral order of the Middle Ages, but failed to establish an alternative order that would stand the test of time. Hence the fight continues today, in the midst of moral chaos, only today, the cudgel of "reason" is wielded by bureaucrats, instead of by Enlightenment philosophers, or their successors, the nineteenth-century reformers. MacIntyre puts it this way:

The civil servant has as his nineteenth-century counterpart and opposite the social reformers: Saint Simonians, Comtians, utilitarians, English ameliorists such as Charles Booth, [and] the early Fabian socialists. Their characteristic lament is: if only government could learn to be scientific! And the long-term response of government is to claim that it has indeed become scientific in just the sense that the reformers required. Government insists more and more that its civil servants themselves have the kind of education that will qualify them as experts. It more and more recruits those who claim to be experts into its civil service. And it characteristically recruits too the heirs of the nineteenth-century reformers. Government itself becomes a hierarchy of bureaucratic managers, and the major justification advanced for the intervention of government in society is the contention that government has resources of competence, which most citizens do not possess.

Private corporations similarly justify their activities by referring to their possession of similar resources of competence. Expertise

becomes a commodity for which rival state agencies and rival private corporations compete. Civil servants and managers alike justify themselves and their claims to authority, power and money by invoking their own competence as scientific managers of social change.

These experts can achieve "ends", MacIntyre notes, but these are necessarily value-based, and the system has no means of judging values, other than the subjective views of the individual bureaucrats and the organisations that employ them.

It Has No Moral Basis But Makes Moral Judgments Anyway. The result, he says, is a society in which the meaning of such words as right, wrong, moral, immoral, truth, lie, justice, and injustice is increasingly subjective, having no basis other than the passing whim of whichever "expert" happens to be in charge at the time. In such a society, MacIntyre notes, the statement "This is good" has come to mean nothing more than "Hurrah for this!"

Needless to say, MacIntyre is pessimistic about the prospects for individual freedom when pitted against the power of modern-day scientific "experts". He notes that, in contrast to places where military force is often the deciding factor in social struggles, "in our culture we know of no organised movement towards power which is not bureaucratic and managerial in mode, and we know of no justifications for authority which are not Weberian in form."

In one sense, MacIntyre's pessimism is understandable. Modern society demands a much larger and more powerful bureaucracy than did the sparsely populated, chiefly agricultural society of 18th-century America. And as MacIntyre notes, there is no reason to expect that this power won't be used to achieve "ends" that restrict individual freedom and that are morally adrift.

On the other hand, I am encouraged that champions of individual freedom, and of traditional Judeo-Christian moral teachings, are finally beginning to mount counter-assaults against such things as the important bureaucratic tool of judicial activism, against constitutionally questionable regulatory actions in such areas as racial quotas, restrictions on religious freedom, and radical environmentalism; and against the unchecked growth of "entitlements", which are the "walking-around money" that today's bureaucrats use to solidify their power base.

### **Will government Crush The Individual? The Jury's Still**

Out In the end, of course, the battle is not over whether bureaucracy will become ever more powerful. That issue has already been decided in favour of the bureaucrats. The fight is over whether this power can be, as Weber suggested, checked by "mutually limiting power structures" and by the adoption of mechanisms that will ensure that bureaucratic organisations are "subordinate to the control of individual leaders selected on the basis of non-bureaucratic principles and acting under such principles."

So far, the United States hasn't been too successful in this regard. But the fight ain't over 'til it's over, as they say. And history demonstrates that freedom and transcendent principles have a way of finishing strong. Whatever the outcome that, in my opinion, is what American politics will be about in the next century. We'll see.

# GOING BANANAS

## Dividing the Spoils - The Fruits of Other People's Labour

On the 21st August this year the *Daily Mail* made an announcement of almost cosmic importance at the very top of its front page: "Revealed: The secret of Tony Blair's £42 aftershave". From here the reader was directed to page 3, where the whole page had been devoted to the sage of the Prime Minister's toiletry with the sensational introduction: "On the scent of the latest Blair extravagance, it's eau de Tony at £42 a time". As early morning commuters rocked shoulder-to-shoulder inwards towards city centres, so they would have been able silently to soak up this mind-boggling trash like human sponges. This is part of the process of the meltdown of the British mentality. Come the weekend they would be flocking to the Sunday supermarkets to celebrate the Sabbath; baseball-capped, tee-shirted, jeans-clad human scrapie that regards the "teletubbie" as a kindred life-form, bent on the week's purchase of pre-cooked, pre-frozen, pre-packed "telly convenience meals", without the slightest regard to the source of the vital ingredients. The iniquities of factory farming at home, or the destruction of Third World economies involved in bringing them the necessities of life. As long as Manchester United or Tottenham Hotspur survives the next round of the European Cup, or Ian Woosnam waddles into the lead in some golf championship or other, all would be well.

Can one expect those who mutely absorb the ceaseless diet of media rubbish seriously to be conscious of produce labelled with the logo of almost every country but their own, while small businesses are driven to the wall and provincial newspapers carry weekly announcements of the public auction of one British farm after another? The anaesthetised man in the street is told only of the "International Community" and of the United States quest for economic "opportunities". He has come to accept the increasingly intrusive powers of the United Nations as a fact of life almost without noticing, thanks to the superficiality of televised analysis and news reporting. So what price the humble banana, or who grows it? Are we being cynical? Put it to the test. Step outside and look around!

Bananas come largely from the Caribbean area and Latin America. In the former, French communities are a part of Metropolitan France, and British communities are mainly members of the Commonwealth. Latin America is, of course, to all intents and purposes colonised by the United States, as an historic interview between television commentator Jon Snow and Professor Noam Chomsky some years ago made chillingly clear. At the beginning of this month the United States demanded that the European Union "comply with demands" by the World Trade Organisation (W.T.O.), that it "dismantle" its banana import regime. What this meant was that because the European powers enjoyed a £2,000,000,000 annual banana trade with those Caribbean countries, with which they had historic colonial ties, in a closed loop trading agreement, the United States and its Latin American satellites were being denied a share of the goodies. The World Trade Organisation, like the United Nations, acting as a cloak for United States muscle as we saw in the Gulf War of 1991, claimed that the existing banana agreement broke world trade "rules", and that this was

"unlawful". In the same *Financial Times* report the United States Under-Secretary of State, Mr. Eizenstat, was also quoted as expressing concern about United States meat imports to Europe, and as stating that there was "no scientific foundation" for the ban. This, he pointed out, could "open the door" to "all sorts of trade protection measures on both sides of the Atlantic". This episode encapsulates what economic muscle is all about, with all the finesse of some giant sea bird hell-bent on cracking open shellfish to get at the succulent pickings inside.

A letter to the *Financial Times* of the 19th September from a commodities specialist defended the World Trade Organisation "ruling" with the statement that central American banana farmers were "on contract to multinationals" and that they had been "discriminated" against for years. What the writer did not say was what the multinationals were doing there in the first place, and who ultimately profited in a region of the world renowned for its subsistence economies and poverty. The best defence came from a correspondent in *The Daily Telegraph*, and the much maligned Glenys Kinnock, wife of the former British Socialist leader, and now a Member of the European Parliament; following her own discussions in the United States which, as she pointed out, "has never exported a single banana." At stake is the future of small Caribbean farmers who were faced with the power of the multinationals, when their share of the market was about 5 per cent of that of Latin America, and represented between 40 and 80 per cent of their domestic revenue.

We have mildly satirised this banana "war" but, in the much wider context of financial, industrial and commercial muscle, it demonstrates what "investment", "development" and "open markets" are all about. First World populations, reduced to mindless self-indulgence and controlled by increasingly powerful bureaucracies, are of as little consequence as those Third World economies and their peasantry that are harnessed to the requirements of the Global Elite. History is laced with exploration, colonisation and exploitation. We are not about to start a unilateral crusade of conscience. Until a century ago ordinary people were largely unaware of the world outside their immediate environment, as Fred Hoyle has written. But what should concern us with the development of modern methods of communication is how we have been concurrently emasculated not only from the truths of global power, but also from any meaningful control over our own destinies. It is a situation that little short of revolution on the scale of that in France of 1789 is likely to change.

(5) *On Target*, passim.

(6) Martin, Rose L. *Fabian Freeway - High Road to Socialism in the US*, 1996, Western Islands, 1966.

(7) Hewart of Bury, The Right Honourable Lord, Lord Chief Justice of England, *The New Despotism*. Cosmopolitan Boole Corporation, New York. 1929

(8) Mintz, Morton & Cohen, Jerry S. *Power Inc. - Public and Private Rulers and How to Make Them Accountable*, The Viking Press, 1976

(9) *On Target* Vol. 26, Nos. 6 & 7. 14th & 28th September, 1996

*Tomorrow's Money - By Seven of Today's Leading Monetary Heretics*. Stanley Stott, 1936.

Knuth, E.C. *The Empire of "The City" - The Five Ideologies of Space and Power*, E.C. Knuth. 1946.

Sombart, Werner. *The Quintessence of Capitalism - A Study Of the History And Psychology Of the Modern Businessman*. T. Fisher Unwin Ltd. 1915.

EXTRA COPIES: As a service to our readers, extra copies of 'On Target' are available (at last) at £2 for a single copy, £1.50 each for 2 - 10 copies; 75p each for 11 - 50 copies; and over 50 copies at 50p each.