

# THE NEW TIMES

\$25 per annum.

Box 1052J, Melbourne.

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

VOL. 63, No. 6.

Registered Australia Post - Publication PP481667 100259

JUNE 1999.

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

## SOCIAL CREDIT AND THE CONVERGENCE OF CRISES

*by Jeremy Lee*

The Social Credit message has appeared under a number of publishing titles through the years. The convulsion of the thirties Depression saw *The New Era* and *The New Age*. The latter has entirely different connotations these days.

The journal that Douglas himself edited for a number of years - *The Fig Tree* - was more of a literary magazine than a newsletter, with a series of brilliant contributors.

*The Social Crediter* has through its history been edited in England and Australia. *The New Times*, now in its sixty-third year, has been solidly Australian, albeit with a worldwide readership. It has only had two editors in that time, which must surely be a record - T.J. Moore and Eric Butler, who has written for, or edited the journal for well over half a century.

A common thread in the various titles has been the anticipation of a breakthrough into a world of peace and harmony. Perhaps it is symbolic of the times through which we are living that a Marxist Leninist journal also bore the title "New Times" for many years - and may still do so for aught I know. Whether it still exists or not, its vision is moribund. Yet it obviously enshrined the once-vibrant Marxist belief that the inevitability of history would usher in its own brand of *nirvana*.

There has been common ground, too, between the two vastly differing streams of thought in the acceptance of crisis as the handmaiden of change. The human tendency to hold fast to accepted methods and modes of thought is increased in periods of instability. Baulking at the unknown has saved many a society in the past; hence Lenin's recognition that a generation deprived of its own history is much more vulnerable to revolution.

That's where we are today. It is constantly amazing to find complete strata of young people without even rudimentary knowledge of the society in which their grandparents once lived, let alone the date of the Battle of Hastings, Trafalgar or Waterloo, Gallipoli or Tobruk. They are thus unshaped clay ready for the potter's wheel.

While this may appear dismaying, it is not necessarily so. The lessons of the past have been replaced by start-again trial-and-error. It is sometimes refreshing to run into groups of the young who live in a constant state of suspicion because they have few yardsticks to measure the situation any other way - and yet who have developed some intrinsic codes in their

### OUR POLICY

To promote service to the Christian revelation of God, loyalty to the Australian Constitutional Monarchy, and maximum co-operation 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.

relations with each other. Their ability to distinguish between the hypocrite, the deceiver and the 'true-blue' is often much sharper than their forebears. They may be cynical and worldly-wise long before their innocence should have deserted them. But they can pick a silk purse from a sow's ear with uncanny accuracy.

This bodes well for social credit. True, it has no power base to attract the masses. Nor should it have. It has no high-finance patronage to add gloss to its message. It must stand alone on its simple merits - the truth. No rouge or eye shadow; "what you see is what you get".

Without the so-called advantages of propaganda, the social credit proponent needs different skills. His message must be couched in terms that answer the true needs of his listener. It's no good selling ice to Eskimos! So his first discipline is not to preach - but to listen. He must discount the pain and bad language of his potential convert; he must remain unmoved by the shock-tactics of today's young people; and he must resist returning anger for anger.

These things having been done, he may well find a fresh canvas on which to paint the social credit vision.

These abstract thoughts make sense when we consider the probable catastrophe which lies immediately ahead. The convergence of crises is approaching rapidly. Financial depression, technological dislocation, human misery and

starvation may well be accompanied by "wars and rumours of wars".

In such a situation there will be all sorts of false messiahs, but very little truth. The social creditor has only one candle - but held correctly it will be the only real light around. The social creditor has known about the unfolding crisis for some time - and is not dismayed. It's part of the process. Although some may be wounded in the battle, the "New Times" will come.

Why? Because it is the only solution which unlocks the uniqueness and diversity of the human soul. It knows that individuals count, and that group-projects are only secondary. Thus it is immune to the social planner, the manipulator and the dictator. The potential in the hairiest skinhead is greater than the National Competition Policy. The future for the woolliest New Ager or the emotionally crippled teenager with a ring in her navel is more sacred than globalism, for all its grandiose predictions.

I believe we will see an example of this in the new video on the Coronation Service produced by Arthur Tuck. It's simple. It seeks neither to provoke nor to manipulate. It's the truth - the truth that a child can understand.

It's going to have a bigger effect than the loudest and most expensive advertising. And it's going to provoke a lot of questions, which social creditors who have trimmed their weaponry are well equipped to answer.

---

## TRINITARIANISM

### THE WEAPON OF CHRISTIAN FAITH IN POWER POLITICS *(continued)*

*by Edward Rock, Chairman, Christian Alternative Movement*

*(The first part of Ted Rock's paper appeared in last month's New Times, causing widespread interest. The whole will be in booklet form shortly)*

#### ALTERNATIVES TO CENTRALISED CORRUPTION

In chemistry every action has a reaction. Human social chemistry demonstrates the same law. As the process of centralised corruption advances, God-given reactionary forces emerge to defend the bastions of a society based upon freedom and responsibility.

There are two proposals designed to reverse centralised power, which are of great merit. A combination of both would constitute a tremendous advance in Christian government.

First there is the growing demand for the Swiss system of Citizens Initiated Referendum, Voters Veto and the Power of Recall. The second, as yet not widely canvassed, may simply be called Citizen Controlled Democracy. While the Swiss system is designed to allow citizens to participate in the legislative process, the latter is designed to ensure, as near as humanly possible, elected representatives never escape the net of citizen control to betray their responsibilities to those who elect them.

Under the Swiss system of C.I.R a percentage of citizens . . . can petition for three forms of legislation: (1) Legislation initiated by the petitioning electors; (2) Veto of government-promoted legislation electors consider unacceptable; (3) Recall of unsatisfactory representatives to face the electors, and could include removal of unsatisfactory public servants from office.

Petitioners must obtain the required percentage of signatures, and once obtained the government must put the issue

to a referendum. Through C.I.R the Swiss have been able to defend the sovereignty of Switzerland in the face of pressure exerted by other European nations to enter unions destructive of national sovereignty...

In Australia it would only need one State to introduce C.I.R for it to mushroom in every other State and federally. C.I.R could then pave the way to reform the voting system that elects the three tiers of government. To complement C.I.R. the following should be the subject of very serious consideration.

#### Voter disillusionment

In 1996 the Morgan Gallup Poll asked a question of their interviewees. How much control did they feel they exerted over the respective levels of government, Federal, State and Local? The answers were hardly surprising. Only ten percent felt they had any control over Federal Government, thirty percent over State Government, but sixty percent felt they could have real influence over Local Government. The result only confirmed the fact that the further government is centralised the less confidence the people have in their ability to influence its decisions. Every aspiring dictator or politician intent on exercising the greatest degree of power over the people will make elimination of decentralised government a first priority...

A graphic example of that policy was given the people of the State of Victoria when Mr. Jeffrey Kennett and the Liberal-National Coalition succeeded the Labor Government in 1992.

On his first trip of subsequently many to New York to report to the international debt merchants who are Victoria's financial masters, on his return he immediately instituted a ruthless programme, never mentioned in his election campaign, of reconstructing Victorian Local Government to bring greater centralised control. The number of Local Governments was reduced to one third and the State passed various acts to severely limit Local Government autonomy so that the State Government virtually dictated the functions of Local Government. Although such a policy ran counter to the traditional policies of the Liberal Party, and also ran counter to a solemn promise given when his Labor predecessors had attempted the same policy a few years previously while Mr. Kennett was Opposition leader, when it came to choosing between the electors and his financial masters Mr. Kennett never hesitated to obey the dictates of the debt merchants. Every political leader in Australia today, Federal or State, in the absence of a higher moral authority and effective grass roots political control obeys mammon, and therefore cannot possibly serve God.

### **Receptive to People Pressure**

The Morgan poll revealed Local Government is much more receptive to people pressure simply because, of the three levels of government, it is more decentralised. Local Councillors are local people. They are elected by a relatively small number of electors who close the citizen net around them, . . . (and) who instinctively know with these small numbers they can exercise a high degree of control over their representative, a fact clearly highlighted in the Morgan poll.

Therefore the vital problem concerning control of State and Federal government representatives is to effect the same degree of control as has been achieved at Local Government level. Obviously it would be impossible to have an elected representative for every three thousand electors at the two higher levels, but it would be quite easy to bring State and Federal representatives under the same degree of Citizen control merely by appointing from Local Government the required number of State and Federal representatives to serve limited terms at the higher levels, remaining under the control of their small cohesive number of electors at local level. They would never relinquish their role as Local Government representatives, and after serving their term of office at the higher level, would resume their positions as a local councillor only. The contact between grass roots democracy and those more rarefied arenas of government where representatives seem to believe those they represent are lesser creatures, would never be broken, but remain intact and continuous. By serving limited terms at the more remote levels, always under the scrutiny of their three thousand electors, then returning to the grass roots, representatives would never lose touch with the *terra firma* of political representation....

Imagine, for example, the reaction to a representative who - like the Hawke-Keating government in 1983 - betrayed Australia's financial sovereignty to the international debt merchants . . .by deregulating Australian banks and opening the door to the current debt explosion we are now subjected to! Under a C.C.D.-elected government that sort of treachery would never even be contemplated. The same can be said for the Kennett policy of restructuring Local Government.

As the rotational process proceeded, with each Council taking its turn in providing representatives at State and Federal

levels, the circle of continuity between each level of government would be without distortion. Representatives would only become eligible for service at the higher levels after serving an apprenticeship in Local Government. After their period of service at the higher level was completed they would then return to Local Government for at least the same period spent in higher office, the ego cleansing benefiting them for any return for another stint at the higher level!

Integrity in representation is by far the most important principle in democratic government. If it is evident there is a real opportunity to serve in a capacity free of intrigue and corruption the very best candidates would be forthcoming. There is not much point in having representatives who may be judged to be individuals of great capacity if they use that capacity in a dog-cat-dog party struggle for power in order to become instruments for the destruction of democratic representation.

### **Local elections pivotal**

The advantages of the form of Citizens Controlled Democracy (C.C.D.) outlined far outweigh the disadvantages. One of the greatest would be the elimination of the present circuses, which pass for State and Federal elections, dominated by those who have survived the intrigue and corruption involved in party politics. The power of the elector, so severely diluted in present State and Federal elections, would be replaced by the greater democratic power that exists at Local Government level, but now immeasurably enhanced by the knowledge that in Local Government elections the pivotal point existed for all power exercised by government.

Party politics has never successfully invaded Local Government elections for the very good reason electors, when they operate in small groups, are more in affinity with Christ's description of good and effective association. *"Again, I say unto you, That if two of you shall agree on earth as touching any thing that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in Heaven.*

*"For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them."* Matthew 18:19-20.

It is not contended that councillors should be declared Christians, but it is contended that Christ is more likely to be present in associations where the struggle for power is not a major factor, and those associations tend to be composed of numbers in which agreement can be more readily arrived at. Consider three people meeting to resolve a problem and come to a firm decision, then replacing the three with twenty all charged with the same responsibility. The analogy has similarities to three thousand electors electing and controlling a political representative as opposed to one hundred thousand given the same responsibility. The late Anglican Archbishop of Melbourne, David Penman, kept a cartoon on his office wall showing a large number of people gathered around a table. The caption underneath read: *"God so loved the world, he did not create any committees."* When it comes to effective democratic representation a good slogan is *"the fewer electors choosing their representative the better."*

Additional benefits of the C.C.D. proposal centres on appointments to the highest honours of political office, Prime Minister, Premier and Cabinet ministers, etc., now subject to a great deal of blackmail and horse trading. Under C.C.D. the same rotational system, which now sees Mayors and Shire Presidents appointed in turn, would operate. No longer would

we be plagued with infantile nonsense about the need for a 'charismatic' leader who always turns out to have feet of clay. Governing would become a service rendered by genuine servants, not a career sought after by those suffering from delusions of grandeur.

Another benefit would be political stability, with governments running their set term eliminating political grandstanding when snap elections are called to gain a political advantage. Under C.C.D. the present cynicism electors have towards political representatives would change and could result in them being held in the highest esteem as genuine servants, an extension of those who are ordained to act as the shepherds of Christ's flock.

### **Unity in trinity**

More importantly the three levels of government would have a unity in trinity now missing in the existing trinity of federal, state and local governments. It is well known that those who ascend to the rarefied air of Canberra regard State parliamentarians with condescension, if not outright disrespect, while many State parliamentarians tend to regard Local Government councillors in the same light. Under C.C.D. the guiding principle would more nearly follow the words of Christ in the high priestly prayer, *That they all may be one*. There would a unity in trinity, but with each member of the trinity carrying out its designated role.

## **MONARCHY AND TRINITARIANISM**

It may be assumed from the previous chapter that the most important institutions in the trinity are those in which the party system predominates. Not so. The importance attached to the popularly elected institutions is the need to minimise the corruption of power . . . . Comparatively speaking, it is only in recent history, since the divine right of kings gave way to a constitutional monarchy, that the exercise of power has taken on a Trinitarian character resulting in the evolution of the upper and lower houses of parliament. The Christian church played a major role in the transition of monarch from oligarchic omnipotence to its true Godly role, a servant. Today the same church is silent as the forces of evil mount their campaign to destroy what God created.

The monarchal institution is the catalyst in this trinity . . . . Its virtue lies in the heredity factor built into the exercise of power, the factor that is superior to any other factor because heredity has only one source; it is a gift of God. The power of the monarchal institution is the same as the power in the greatest of all institutions, the family. There was a time when the book of common prayer directed the people to pray for the monarch, *that under her we may be Godly and quietly governed*. The elimination of such prayers marked a dramatic decline in the status of family and nation. . . . The heredity factor cannot be obtained by political blackmail, intrigue, horse-trading etc., . . . Money used as filthy lucre, or what Christ referred to as the power of mammon, cannot buy into the monarchal institution.

### **Greatest constitutional safeguard**

With the death of a reigning Monarch there is no constitutional crisis. No aspiring dictator can step in and take over the reins of power because those reins are firmly in the hands of the hereditary successor . . . . The greatest of all constitutional safeguards yet devised is given expression to in

the phrase, which when Queen Elizabeth dies will be, *"The Queen is dead. Long live the King."* The people know their best interests will continue to be served as before in a completely stable situation, the essence of good and Godly government. Such is not the case when a President or a Prime Minister dies or is displaced. Immediately the power lusts swing into action. Every effort is made to ensure the successor is the nominee of hidden power groups. As a constitutional document designed to thwart the will-to-power the Australian constitution has no superior and the primary reason is the non-power role of the hereditary Monarch. Those seeking the destruction of the Monarchy lust after the power the Monarch leaves in the hands of the people.

### **Compelling attributes**

To a limited extent there is concern amongst the Australian people as to who the government will recommend to the Queen as Governor General, but so often that concern is proved groundless by the effect the institution has on the incumbent. Two Labor stalwarts appointed by Labor governments, Sir William McKell and Mr. William Hayden, once they took office became so infected with the unspoken attributes of their office to offer the Australian people something infinitely precious, they became completely converted as strong Monarchists. It is now history that Gough Whitlam appointed Sir John Kerr because of his close affinity with the socialist cause, and relied on him to rubber stamp any legislation, which undermined the integrity of Australia's constitution. When it came to the crunch and Whitlam pushed his power designs too far, Sir John had no alternative but to obey the constitution and return power to the people, who voted overwhelmingly to dismiss Whitlam from office. That incident illustrated the non-power of the monarchal institution, which always defers power back to the people.

The essence of the power of a Christian monarchy was captured by Lord Menuhin, internationally famous as a violin virtuoso and conductor, who although an American citizen, chose by preference to live under the British Crown. Recorded in his biography, *Unfinished Journey*, is perhaps the most perceptive understanding of the superiority of the monarchal system in comparison to Republic:

*"Britain, which of all countries of the world has evolved with a minimum of revolution and the guillotine, is supremely fortunate in its daily acknowledgment of a value higher than power. Just as in a coral reef the remains of the previous generations constitute the physical protection of the species, so in Britain the fossilised heritage of the past gives checks and counter checks to society, most strikingly in the vestigial, symbolic presence of the monarchy which commands a loyalty owing nothing to power. Power must always be partisan; It belongs to money or the military, to Republican or Democrat, left or right, capital, labour or bureaucrat - to those in power. To have a nonpower above power seems to me the ultimate safeguard."*

#### **P.275,6. Unfinished Journey.**

The term Lord Menuhin coined, 'non-power', perfectly illustrates the power offered to man by Jesus Christ. Power never imposed, but the only form of power perfected to preserve freedom. It is this power which is the formidable opponent of evil in the world, and as Lord Menuhin has so conclusively shown, expresses itself more completely in earthly institutions in the hereditary British Monarchy.

The forces of evil have only one alternative to the continued existence of a hereditary Monarchy, its total elimination. In this respect the real motive behind one of the foulest crimes

perpetrated in all history, the total elimination of the Russian Royal family in the Marxist revolution has never been fully appreciated....

In Australia the Monarchy, the only institution presently free from the control of irresponsible power, cannot be abolished without a referendum of the people. That right is embedded in the constitution, a right the political parties would dearly love to deny the Australian people, and have it transferred to the parliament. After fifty years or more of unrelenting propaganda and misrepresentation, and little or no education on the virtues of the constitution, the time is considered right to destroy the Monarchy, the one institution frustrating absolute power needed to bring the whole world under one government.

### **Globalist republicans**

It is difficult to imagine Australians will support the move to a republic when it is obvious the driving forces are those whose primary love is money and power, and whose role is that of pawns of international forces seeking the destruction of all national sovereignties. Rupert Murdoch, whose media financed by the international debt merchants heads the attack, . . . Malcolm Turnbull, an international merchant banker, whose every interest is served by the decline of true nationalism and the advancement of international financial power, . . . or Janet Holmes a Court, reputedly the richest woman in Australia, whose husband boasted he could command at any time in the region of fifteen billion dollars of international financial credit when he was buying up Australian owned industries. Then there are those past discredited party leaders, Gough Whitlam, Malcolm Fraser and Paul Keating, the straw men created by the media who between them suffered the greatest defeats at the hands of Australian electors. In Whitlam's case reacting against the most blatant advancement of Canberra's centralism destroying decentralised autonomy, and handing Fraser the same thrashing for betraying their vote to reverse such policies, who with John Howard as his Treasurer ratified UN conventions which displaced Australian sovereignty and national parliamentary control with international edicts under the direction of an international bureaucracy....

### **A devious game**

A strong political leader, aware of the real issues, would have invited the republican advocates to win seats in the parliament, repudiate the oath of loyalty to the Queen and demonstrate their acceptability to the people of Australia. The republicans knew they would fail miserably in such a contest and would only succeed by back-door methods. In John Howard they had a ready tool. He accepted the demand for a constitutional convention which could be stacked with a sufficient number of republicans to keep the political ball rolling towards measures which could further undermine the officially accepted monarchists, themselves with only a weak understanding of the institution they were supposed to defend.

History will reveal the papier mache monarchist John Howard is in reality a republican playing a devious game. If the constitutional monarchy survives he will claim victory, if defeated he will claim it was his initiative which enabled them to succeed. Against that deviousness he is a declared globalist who has accepted the sellout of Australian constitutional and financial sovereignty to an external power as ruthless in its power designs as the enemies the Anzacs fought to defend

Australian sovereignty. His international political and financial masters, . . . see the British monarchy as their greatest obstacle to complete world power, and John Howard's political life is guided by their agenda. John Howard has condoned ministers in his government, and members of the rank-and-file repudiating their oath of loyalty to the Queen. He has co-operated in every way to ensure the republican steamroller is not impeded by red-blooded debate on the relative merits of the two systems offered. While making weak statements such as *"If it works, why fix it?"* he makes no effort to demonstrate how superior are those works, how it ensures continued stability and transfer of power in government. Or how every time a new President has to be appointed or elected the powers of division are unleashed, dividing the people, and at enormous cost to the taxpayer. Or how the rich and powerful controlling vast sums of money for the candidate they desire, will be assured vast media support, and any genuine patriot will be just as easily discounted, as was Graeme Campbell and Australia First. John Howard made no attempt to point out that the constitutional monarchy is beyond the reach of such corruption of power, nor demand from party members the same expression of loyalty to the Queen as when he required them to ratify the directives of his globalist masters.

### **Turning point in history**

The outcome of the convention is a referendum, which the proponents of the republic, knowing the full weight of propaganda and money power will be at their disposal, believe they will achieve the success they desire. Whatever happens Australia is at a turning point in its history. Will Australians accept a constitutional change, which will ensure the victory of the globalists and the final destruction of national sovereignty? Or retain the present constitution unchanged? Or perhaps evolve a new system by which the principle of non-power remains intact against the assault of the will-to-power?

It will be interesting to see if the instincts of the present generation of Australians is vastly different to those thousands who rallied to King and country in two world wars in defence of their nation in what was really a defence of sovereignty, not only of Australia, but other nations, beginning in W.W.2 with Poland and extended to every other nation in the world, especially the Commonwealth of Nations.

What is so essential is the preservation of the principle of non-power now embodied in the constitution in the person of the Monarch. As such the Queen functions as an Australian patriot and not as an alien as the peculiar argument used by the republicans infers. It is those Australians who have sold their patriotism to the globalists who are alien to Australia. As Queen of Australia Her Majesty has a just claim to dual citizenship just as some who sit in our parliament who claim the same status. The concept that we must get rid of the Queen with a hereditary line which equates with millions of Australians but at the same time can be described as an alien is the product of a mind one would associate with those more versed in football commentaries.

### **Guarding against the lust for power**

Perhaps Australia will produce an alternative satisfactory to all sections of the community, other than those whose hatred of all things British is impossible to assuage. In this respect we could return to the concept of a Citizens Controlled Democracy (C.C.D.) operating to allow all those who aspire to the highest



office in the land to graduate from Local Government through to State and Federal government, become Governor General for a limited term before returning to the place from whence they came. Appointment would become automatic to the individual with the longest period of service at the three levels of government thus eliminating political power-play, backroom

deals, accusations of bias by the government of the day etc.. The appointment would become an appointment of honour the humblest Australian could aspire to from birth. The undergirding principle being to guard against the lust for power and defending the internal power of individual and nation.

---

## POVERTY, TAXATION AND REVOLUTION

The combination of Federal, State and local taxes in Australia currently takes over \$10,000 per head of population, man, woman and child, or more than \$40,000 for the average family of four. This has divided society into rich and poor on a scale never seen before. One third of Australians live below the poverty line. Tens of thousands are homeless. Those that have families need two wages to survive. Home-ownership is diminishing. Young people without employment income have no hope of their own home or land. The following thoughts from the Catholic Encyclical *Rerum Novarum*, issued by Pope Leo XIII, first published on May 15, 1891, are particularly apt in 1999:

The State should favour Multiplication of Property Owners. If a workman's wages be sufficient to enable him to maintain himself, his wife and his children in reasonable comfort, he will not find it difficult, if he is a sensible man, to study economy; and he will not fail, by cutting down expenses, to put by a little property: nature and reason would urge him to do this. We have seen that this great Labour question cannot be solved except by assuming as a principle that private ownership must be held sacred and inviolable. The law, therefore, should favour ownership, and its policy should be to induce as many people as possible to become owners.

Many excellent results will follow from this; and first of all, property will certainly become more equitably divided. For the effect of civil change and revolution has been to divide society into two widely different castes. On the one side there is the party, which holds the power because it holds the wealth; which has in its grasp all labour and all trade; which manipulates for its own benefit and its own purposes all the sources of supply, and which is powerfully represented in the councils of the State itself. On the other side there is the needy and powerless multitude, sore and suffering, always ready for disturbance, if working people can be encouraged to look forward to obtaining

a share in the land, the result will be that the gulf between vast wealth and deep poverty will be bridged over, and the two orders will be brought nearer together. Another consequence will be the greater abundance of the fruits of the earth. Men always work harder and more readily when they work on that which is their own; nay, they learn to love the very soil which yields in response to the labour of their hands, not only food to eat, but an abundance of good things for themselves and those that are dear to them. It is evident how such a spirit of willing labour would add to the produce of the earth and to the wealth of the community. And a third advantage would arise from this: men would cling to the country in which they were born; for no one would exchange his country for a foreign land if his own afforded him the means of living a tolerable and happy life. These three important benefits, however, can only be expected on the condition that a man's means be not drained and exhausted by excessive taxation. The right to possess private property is from nature, not from man; and the State has only the right to regulate its use in the interests of the public good, but by no means to abolish it altogether. The State is, therefore, unjust and cruel, if, in the name of taxation, it deprives the private owner of more than is just.

---

## CRANKING UP THE TREADMILL

The leading article in Queensland's main daily (*The Courier Mail*, 7 June 1999) carried the stark headline ONE-INCOME FAMILY FACES EXTINCTION. It started: "Australia's single-income families are \$24 a week worse off than they were in the 1980s and could be wiped off the economic map within fifteen years . . .". The article went on to say that half Australia's children lived in families where both parents worked, compared to 38 percent in 1982. The information came from the Income Distribution Report, produced by the National Centre for Social and Economic Modelling. The only reaction to this news recorded in the article was from Ben de Jong of the Family Council of Queensland, who was horrified. ". . .What's going to happen to the children who come along?" The following perceptive insight into what may be aptly termed "God's Social Credit" is from the monthly prayer calendar of the Glen Park Gospel Church, attended by Ted and Nancy Rock. The author is Chris Trinham ThL., a carpenter-builder who shares pastoral duties with an engineer and a Doctor of Divinity. Chris Trinham is a former principal of the Eltham Christian School

### Surplus Economics

"And the leaders of the children of Israel saw that they were in a bind, after they were told, 'You shall not reduce anything from your daily quota of bricks. . .'"

Exodus 5:19.

The story is that Moses had demanded Pharaoh give his people time to make a sacrifice celebration to the Lord. Pharaoh

instead made their labour even harder. He reasoned that if his slaves had time for recreational pursuits, then they did not have enough work. So he required them to find their own materials as well as maintain their regular production quotas.

Consider what has happened to the industrialised world during the last decade. Machines have taken over the tasks of

men. Machines do not complain, can work twenty-four hours a day, never form trade unions and do not strike for better pay or conditions. Many have lost out not only to the machine, but also to the rough and tumble of the competitive market. Australia's largest companies no longer compete with one another, but with world supply and demand as the communications revolution continues, and have found themselves reduced to being but niche traders.

Like Israel in Egypt, people who enjoy paid employment today, work much harder for what they get. A recent study indicated that many smaller businesses successfully increased their output, not only due to machines, but rather the efforts of their employees.

Such pressure strains the resources and resilience of the worker. As the demands of family living increase, parents have less time to invest in the welfare of their children, less time for one another and an increasing need for personal space. Something has to crash. Life demands a surplus, a margin between its demand and supply.

Surplus is intrinsic to creation's rhythm. Animals need to rest, the heart pauses between each beat. Day has its night but also twilight. The tide flow has its make, its ebb, but also its turn when the stream is still. Winter regenerates in spring, summer recuperates through autumn.

Surplus is inalienable in Scripture. Creation was revealed to Adam in six days, the seventh a day of rest, a principle enshrined in our seven-day calendar. But Scripture also provides ancient Israel with six feast holidays throughout the year. Additionally, every seventh year was a sabbatical when they ate the surplus and the field was allowed to rest. Then in the added sabbatical jubilee year (7+7+1) all debt was annulled. The Levites were to carry the burden of their work from maturity at twenty-five until they were fifty and then the next generation took over. The soldier who married had automatic leave for a full year for adjustment. The concept of surplus enables the fruit

of labour to be enjoyed; the stability of life to be retained.

How can these things be? In creation God has provided His surplus. Wealth is generated by God through the processes of creation, recreation and procreation. Wealth creation comes to industrious man through his endeavour through surplus. There is enough and to spare. Wealth as commodity or goods can be exchanged, bartered or preserved for use in time of need. The harvest is stored in the pantry to be eaten throughout the year, or stored through agreed symbols of value called money. The simple reading of Scripture shows that God intends all people to not only enjoy the fruit of their labours, but also the blessing of His surplus.

However one person can steal the wealth or surplus of another. Ned Kelly discovered this Robin Hood had a different motive, but the same method. The taxman is another kind of Robbing Hood redistributing wealth. But so is inflation, the compulsory union due, the unscrupulous salesman, fashions change, keeping up with the Joneses, designed obsolescence and worthless investments to name a few. Gambling in any form, sex industries and the drug culture have a massive cost to society. The heaven that is over us turns to brass and the earth beneath our feet becomes iron.

The Lord warned His ancient people that if they forsook Him and the principles of His Word, He would smite them with consumptive disease, with a fever, an inflammation, with intense burning, and with the sword, with blight, and mildew which would pursue them to the death (*Deuteronomy 28:22*). Our world also has its blight and its mould.

The Bible is not a restriction to our freedoms, but a manufacturer's handbook showing how true freedoms are achieved. The Christian way of life is a blessing to any people, and those who turn their back on God as the English speaking peoples, including Australia, have done over recent generations will find that the enjoyment of God's manna has melted with the dew.

---

## THE FATAL FLAWS UNDERLYING NATO'S INTERVENTION IN YUGOSLAVIA

The following paper is by Lt Gen. Satish Nambiar (retired), who was the first Force Commander and Head of the United Nations Mission in the former Yugoslavia from March 1992 to March 1993. He was also Deputy Chief of Staff of the Indian Army, and since retirement has been the Director of the United Services Institution in India. (We are indebted to the May edition of the United Kingdom *"On Target"* for this article):

My year long experience as the Force commander and Head of Mission of the United Nations Forces deployed in the former Yugoslavia has given me an understanding of the fatal flaws of United States-NATO policies in the troubled region. It was obvious to most people following events in the Balkans since the beginning of the decade, and particularly after the fighting that resulted in the emergence of Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, that Kosovo was a "powder keg" waiting to explode. The West appears to have learnt all the wrong lessons from the previous wars and applied it to Kosovo.

Portraying the Serbs as evil and everybody else as good was not only counterproductive but also dishonest. According to my experience all sides were guilty but only the Serbs would admit that they were no angels while the others would insist that they were. With 28,000 forces under me and with constant contacts with UNHCR (United Nations High Commission for Refugees),

and the International Red Cross officials, we did not witness any genocide beyond killings and massacres on all sides that are typical of such conflict conditions. I believe none of my successors and their forces saw anything on the scale claimed by the media.

### UNTENABLE

It was obvious to me that if Slovenians, Croatians and Bosnians had the right to secede from Yugoslavia, then the Serbs of Croatia and Bosnia had an equal right to secede. The experience of partitions in Ireland and India has not been pleasant but in the Yugoslav case, the state had already been taken apart anyway. It made little sense to me that if multi-ethnic Yugoslavia was not tenable that multi-ethnic Bosnia could be made tenable. The former internal boundaries of Yugoslavia which had not validity under international law should have been redrawn when it was taken apart by the West, just as it was in the case of Ireland in 1921 and Punjab and

Bengal in India in 1947. Failure to acknowledge this has led to the problem of Kosovo as an integral part of Serbia.

It is ironic that the Dayton Agreement on Bosnia was not fundamentally different from the Lisbon Plan drawn up by Portuguese Foreign Minister Cuteliero and British representative Lord Carrington to which all three sides had agreed before any killings had taken place, or even the Vance-Owen Plan which (Bosnia-Herzegovina leader) Radovan Karadzic was willing to sign. One of the main problems was that there was an unwillingness on the part of the American administration to concede that Serbs had legitimate grievances and rights. I recall State Department official George Kenny turning up like all other American officials, spewing condemnations of the Serbs for aggression and genocide. I offered to give him an escort and to go see for himself that none of what he proclaimed was true. He accepted my offer and thereafter he made a radical turnaround. Other Americans continued to see and hear what they wanted to see and hear from one side, while ignoring the other side. Such behaviour does not produce peace but more conflict.

### **MEDIA SENSATIONALISM**

I felt that Yugoslavia was a media-generated tragedy. The Western media sees international crises in black and white, sensationalising incidents for public consumption. From what I can see now, all Serbs have been driven out of Croatia and the Muslim-Croat Federation. I believe almost 850,000 of them. And yet the focus is on 500,000 Albanians (at last count) who have been driven out of Kosovo. Western policies have led to an ethnically pure Greater Croatia, and an ethnically pure Muslim statelet in Bosnia.

Therefore, why not an ethnically pure Serbia? Failure to address these double standards has led to the current one.

As I watched the ugly tragedy unfold in the case of Kosovo while visiting the United States in early to mid-March 1999, I could see the same pattern emerging. In my experience with similar situations in India in such places as Kashmir, Punjab, Assam, Nagaland, and elsewhere, it is the essential strategy of those ethnic groups who wish to secede to provoke the state authorities. Killings of policemen is usually a standard operating procedure by terrorists since that usually invites overwhelming state retaliation, just as I am sure it does in the United States.

### **BELGRADE GOVERNMENT DRIVEN**

I do not believe the Belgrade government had prior intention of driving out all Albanians from Kosovo. It may have decided to implement Washington's own "Krajina Plan" only if NATO bombed, or these expulsions could be spontaneous acts of revenge and retaliation by Serb forces in the field because of the bombing. The OSCE (Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe), Monitors were not doing too badly, and the Yugoslav Government had, after all, indicated its willingness to abide by nearly all the provisions of the Rambouillet "Agreement" on aspects like cease-fire, greater autonomy to the Albanians, and so on.

But they insisted that the status of Kosovo as part of Serbia was not negotiable, and they would not agree to stationing NATO forces on the soil of Yugoslavia. This is precisely what India would have done under the same circumstances. It was the West that proceeded to escalate the situation into the current senseless bombing campaign that smacks more of hurt egos, and

revenge and retaliation. NATO's massive bombing intended to terrorise Serbia into submission appears no different from the morality of actions of Serb forces in Kosovo. Ultimatums were issued to Yugoslavia that unless the terms of an agreement drawn up at Rambouillet were signed, NATO would undertake bombing. Ultimatums do not constitute diplomacy. *They are acts of war.* The Albanians of Kosovo who want independence, were coaxed and cajoled into putting their signatures to a document motivated with the hope of NATO bombing of Serbs and independence later (Emphasis added).

### **UNBECOMING**

With this signature, NATO assumed all the legal and moral authority to undertake military operations against a country that had, at worst, been harsh on its own people. On 24th March 1999, NATO launched attacks with cruise missiles and bombs, on Yugoslavia, a sovereign state, a founding member of the United Nations and the Non Aligned Movement; and against a people who were at the forefront of the fight against Nazi Germany and other fascist forces during World War Two. I consider these current actions unbecoming of great powers.

It is appropriate to touch on the humanitarian dimension for it is the innocent who are being subjected to displacement, pain and misery. Unfortunately, this is the tragic and inevitable outcome of all such situations of civil war, insurgencies, rebel movements, and terrorist activity. History is replete with examples of such suffering; whether it be the American Civil War, Northern Ireland, the Basque movement in Spain, Chechnya, Angola, Cambodia, and so many other cases; the indiscriminate bombing of civilian centres during World War Two; Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Vietnam. The list is endless. I feel that this tragedy could have been prevented if NATO's ego and credibility had not been given the highest priority instead of the genuine grievances of Serbs in addition to Albanians.

### **MEDIA PROVOCATION**

Notwithstanding all that one hears and sees on CNN and BBC, and other Western agencies, and in the daily briefings of the NATO authorities, the blame for the humanitarian crisis that has arisen cannot be placed at the door of the Yugoslav authorities alone. The responsibility rests mainly at NATO's doors. In fact, if I am to go by my own experience as the first Force Commander and Head of Mission of the United Nations forces in the former Yugoslavia, from March 1992 to March 1993, handling operations in Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and Macedonia, I would say that reports put out in the electronic media are largely responsible for provoking this tragedy.

Where does all this leave the International Community, which for the record does not comprise (in theory, solely) the United States, the West and its newfound Muslim allies? The portents for the future, at least in the short term, are bleak indeed. The United Nations has been made totally redundant, ineffective, and impotent. The Western world, led by the United States of America, will lay down the moral values that the rest must adhere to; it does not matter that they themselves do not adhere to the same values when it does not suit them. National sovereignty and territorial integrity have no sanctity. And finally, secessionist movements, which often start with terrorist activity, will get greater encouragement.

One can only hope that good sense will prevail, hopefully sooner rather than later.