

"All that is necessary  
for the triumph of  
evil is that good  
men do nothing . . ."  
— EDMUND BURKE.



# THE NEW TIMES

## SURVEY

THE AUSTRALIAN

LEAGUE OF RIGHTS

Vol.15, No.08

Registered Australia post — Publication PP343214 / 00016

August 2014

### Contents

Reality Is All One Piece .....	1
Eric Abetz Attacked For Linking Abortion And Breast Cancer .....	1
A Bill Of Rights For Victorians? .....	2
Abortion Breast Cancer Link Explodes In Asia.....	3
Chief Of Defence Sued For Mardi Gras Dismissal .....	4
With Liberty To Monitor All.....	5
An Authentic Australian Voice: Simon Leys .....	6
Ombudsman Finds Water Agency, Office Of Living Victoria, Mishandled Conflict-Of-Interest Concerns.....	7
Notice for 2014 New Times Dinner and Weekend Seminar.....	8

## Reality is all One Piece

*Both the things seen and the things unseen*



Too many people thought the League, and Eric Butler in particular, had made a cult figure of Clifford Hugh Douglas. That is because they couldn't - or wouldn't - grasp the truth, the *glimpses* of Truth, to which Douglas directed them. L.D. Byrne, a colleague of Clifford Douglas could write: "Divine Authority is manifested in Divine or Natural Law, the law which governs Creation - the law to which the stars and

planets are obedient, the Law which governs all forms of life, the structure of matter and the nature and behaviour of light. Man endowed with free will must seek and conform to that Law - that Canon of Rightness as the late Major Douglas described it - if he wishes to achieve harmony within the environment in which he finds himself, both in personal life and in the society which he creates."

## ERIC ABETZ ATTACKED FOR LINKING ABORTION AND BREAST CANCER

By Graham Young, *On Line Opinion*, 12 August 2014. Graham Young is chief editor and the publisher of OLO

He writes: After the treatment meted out to Eric Abetz, possibly the last thing I wanted to see in my email inbox was an article from a credible academic, with credible evidence, that there could indeed be a link between abortion and breast cancer. But there it was, and it has been published today. Despite the media reports there is an argument that can be made, and the fact that some people might take offence to that argument is no reason to avoid it.

The abortion breast cancer link is not one that I had heard much of before this article by Dr Lachlan Dunjey we published last week.

Eric Abetz was attacked on *The Project* by Mia Freedman, because of the views of speakers at a conference held by an organisation he supports. Freedman specifically chose the claim that there is a link between abortion and breast cancer as her point of attack. While there was a range of speakers of varying points of view, some of whom

represented political parties at odds with Abetz' Liberal Party, apparently there was only one speaker he was supposed to support entirely, and that was Dr Angela Lanfranchi, who asserts that the abortion link exists. Indeed, on Freedman's logic, I ought to be held responsible for Dunjey's article as well.



Senator Eric Abetz

(Continued on page 2)

Abetz has been criticised not just by Freedman, but by the AMA and others, on the grounds that this claim is scientifically incorrect and akin to alleging a link between autism and vaccination. A quick search of the Internet was enough to prove this claim wrong. While the preponderance of medical studies shows no link, there are some that do. There were no studies demonstrating the autism/vaccination link.

So it is more like studies of mobile phones and cancer where some studies show a link, but most don't. On that basis I have been using a mobile phone, holding it close to my head, and in a pocket in my trousers, for about 22 years. I don't feel the need to castigate someone who produces a new study contradicting what I believe to be the likely science.

Abetz was correct in everything he said to Freedman, and as she cut him off, we only have his word for what he was going on to say.

Which leads to this morning's article by Joel Brind,

**Watch Eric Abetz being interviewed on *The Project* – Youtube**  
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0YPuD9GDjGc&feature=youtu.be>

---

## **A BILL OF RIGHTS FOR VICTORIANS?**

---

The Federal Government has rejected a bill of rights but Victoria is pushing full speed ahead to enact one, with NSW now seeking to follow suit, claiming that not having one leaves its citizens out in the cold. I disagree.

Before Christmas, Victoria's Attorney-General Rob Hulls said he was bewildered by negative reaction to the proposed bill of rights. Parliament would continue to have the last word, he reassured people. It's a statutory model, not an entrenched model. What's the big deal?

**The big deal is this:** no matter which model is adopted, the outcome is effectively the same. Under a US- or Canadian-style bill of rights, judges can strike down statutes they don't like. Under a British- or New Zealand-style one, the kind Victoria seeks to copy, the judges get a power to interpret all other laws in a "bill of rights-friendly manner" - meaning they can read "black" to mean "virtually white" or "men and women" to mean "men and men", or just about any words to mean anything.

Victoria's proposed bill of rights will have a "reading down" section (s.32) that requires courts to interpret all legislation as consistent with it, so far as it is possible to do so. This basically copies what is in the British and New Zealand models. The leading British case on this sort of direction is called *Ghaidan*. It held that when you have some other statute to interpret this new bill of rights requirement changes all the rules of the game. Interpretation becomes a sort of Alice in Wonderland exercise.

Listen to what the judges there said: "Even if, construed according to the ordinary principles of interpretation, the meaning of the legislation admits of no doubt, [the reading down provisions] may nonetheless require the legislation to be given a different meaning. [They] may require the court to depart from the intention of the Parliament which enacted the legislation. It is also apt to require a court to read in words which change the meaning of the enacted legislation."

**In other words, the judges can treat all other legislation in any way they want.**

All of us who are democrats at heart should worry about a

Professor of biology and endocrinology at Baruch College, City University of New York. In the end the decision to publish was easy. Brind is an expert in the field, and the evidence to back his case is strong, recent, and published in peer reviewed journals. I do not warrant that he is right, but I do warrant he has a right to be published.

### **Reaction – more of 'soft fascism'**

The reaction to Eric Abetz is yet more of the soft fascism currently invading our society where anything that offends collective beliefs is to be ridiculed and summarily dismissed because it doesn't suit powerful vested interests – in this case the medical and female identity industries.

The problem is that not only does the right to free speech, including the right to say things that might not be right, rest on the basis of human rights, but it is a scientific necessity. Those who try to limit it not only limit individual rights, but are anti-science, disputing the very methodology that has given us our extraordinarily wonderful and technological modern world. And if in 20 years time the scientific consensus has swung to support Abetz and Brind, how would our soft fascists like to be treated then?

provision that tells the unelected judges to do whatever they can to read any other statute as consistent with their view (not the voters' or parliamentarians') of what some abstract moral list requires.

What about New Zealand? In the case of *Pora*, three of seven New Zealand judges said that because of their bill of rights, the one Victoria is basically copying, an old statute no longer automatically lost out to a new one when the two were inconsistent. The judges said that they could use the bill of rights to give preference to the earlier statute, if they thought it would be more in keeping with a rights-respecting outcome. This would be a revolutionary change, giving the judges a huge increase in power.

A statutory bill of rights may leave parliament with the last word in name, but it gives judges a steroid-enhanced power of interpretation. They get to use a new "human rights-friendly" method to interpret parliament's words. In effect, they get a blank cheque.

When the then prime minister of New Zealand, Geoffrey Palmer, moved the second reading of its statutory bill of rights 15 years ago he said it would be a parliamentary bill of rights. He said it would provide no new remedies in the courts. In the past 15 years the country's judges have run roughshod over those assurances. They have consistently adopted a "living tree" sort of approach to interpretation. They have created a new bill of rights cause of action, enabling people to sue government, or the police, or some publicly funded body.

**Proponents of this bill of rights say that can't happen here. Want to bet your mortgage on that?**

So why should any voter worry about Victoria's proposed bill of rights or the one NSW is mooting? Because of what has actually, in real life, happened in Britain and New Zealand - places whose existing bills of rights Victoria and NSW propose to copy.

**One last point:** in Victoria the voters themselves didn't get a referendum to decide whether they'd have a bill of rights - the government decided that for them. So much for the "right to take part in the conduct of public affairs". Any bets on who would have won that referendum? ■

# ABORTION BREAST CANCER LINK EXPLODES IN ASIA

By Joel Brind, *On Line Opinion*, Tuesday, 12 August 2014

*Dr. Joel Brind is a professor of biology and endocrinology at Baruch College, City University of New York since 1986, a research biochemist since 1981, and CEO of Natural Food Science, a maker of glycine supplement products founded in 2010.*

---

The various credentialed purveyors of health information, such as the Australian Medical Association, the World Health Organisation, the US National Cancer Institute and the Cancer Councils still maintain that there is no link between abortion and breast cancer (ABC link), this despite the fact that this past February, a systematic review and meta-analysis of the ABC link was published in the prestigious international journal *Cancer Causes and Control*.

The study by Yubei Huang *et. al* of the Tianjin Medical University in China reviewed and compiled the results of 36 studies from mainland China. Reporting an overall, statistically significant risk increase of 44% (odds ratio or OR = 1.44) for women who've had one or more induced abortions, the Huang study confirmed the results I and my co-authors from Penn State Medical College had reported in 1996 in the *British Medical Association's epidemiology journal*.

Importantly, the Huang study confirmed the ABC link in a completely different population in a different time frame, as our original 1996 meta-analysis compiled worldwide studies between 1957 and 1996. The Huang meta-analysis also showed a clear dose effect, i.e., women with two or more abortions showed a risk increase of 76%, and those with three or more abortions showed a risk increase of 89%. In epidemiology, when increased exposure to the putative risk factor results in a higher risk increase, the factor (abortion in this case) is more likely to be an actual cause of the disease in question (breast cancer in this case).

To those of us who have been studying the ABC link for years, the growing breast cancer epidemic in communist China was an entirely predictable result of the "one-child policy". But the aggressive promotion of abortion has hardly been limited to China, and a veritable tsunami of peer-reviewed, published reports of the predictable epidemic elsewhere is starting to surface from all over Asia. In South Asia alone, at least a dozen studies have appeared (that I know about) just since 2008: nine in India and one each in Pakistan, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka.

In addition to adding confirmation upon confirmation of the ABC link, the recent South Asian studies provide a different perspective. It is not because of ethnic differences between South Asians and East Asians or Caucasians: The more than half century of research establishing the ABC link provides ample proof that when it comes to breast cancer risk factor, women are women, no matter their ethnicity. But there is a big difference in the baseline lifestyle of Asian women, and this makes a huge difference. Why?

Breast cancer is a multifactorial disease, with many risk factors. Most are related to reproduction and/or female reproductive hormones. Consequently, in the West (like the US), the baseline lifetime risk of breast cancer is high (around 10%) without considering abortion at all. That's because, long before abortion's legalization (and resulting high prevalence), women were taking contraceptive steroids ("the pill"), waiting longer to bear children, having fewer of them, not breast feeding them, and were themselves drinking

alcoholic beverages and smoking cigarettes. All of these increase the risk of breast cancer. Add abortion, and the lifetime risk goes up about 30%, from about 10% to about 13%. In epidemiological terms, that is expressed as a relative risk (typically expressed statistically as an odds ratio or a hazard ratio) of 1.3. (I.e., a 30% increased risk; the overall average relative risk we reported in our 1996 review.)

In China, where the baseline risk has been traditionally low, one would expect the average relative risk to be higher, and it is. However, it's not that much higher; an average of 1.44, because marriage and childbearing are restricted until the late 20s and parity is restricted to one or two children. These are substantial risk factors, to which abortion is factored in. Also, abortion is almost always done after the first childbirth, when its effect is smaller. Moreover, abortion is now so common in some parts of China (such as Shanghai) that the ABC link does not show up at all. In fact, another invalid study-because more than two thirds of women in the general population have had an abortion-just popped up in Shanghai this year.

But in South Asia, the traditional woman has (until very recently, and in many places, still currently) married and started having children in her teens, had many children, breastfed them all, never drank, never smoked, never took contraceptive steroids. Consequently, there is not much else to cause breast cancer besides abortion, and the ABC link therefore sticks out like a proverbial sore thumb. So what sort of relative risk numbers are coming out of South Asia? First of all, out of a dozen studies, ALL of them show increased risk, 10 of them with statistical significance. Adding up all the studies from the sub-continent, the average odds ratio comes out to be a whopping 5.54, over a 450% increase in breast cancer risk with abortion! One study in India (West Bengal) reported an odds ratio of 10.66, and one in Bangladesh (East Bengal) reported 20.62, almost a 2,000% increase in risk!

So in case there was any real question of epidemiological studies being ambiguous about the ABC link, the recent studies from South Asia provide an ideal population in whom to study the effects of abortion on breast cancer risk. And a clearer, stronger connection could hardly be imagined.

And it's simple to ballpark the ultimate effects of such an exposure as abortion on a population of over a billion women in India and China alone - Even one percent of that number is 10 million. And that's just not even including the rest of Asia, where similar results are starting to emerge, as reported in recent studies in Turkey, Armenia, Iran and Kazakhstan. With literally millions of women bound to get breast cancer because of abortion, one wonders what it will take to wake up the medical world to this unfolding tragedy.

Instead, we are treated, in the West, to a great wall of denial from so many recognized authorities on breast cancer risk. My challenge to them is this: Do they think all these brown and yellow people reporting such strong evidence of the ABC link in Asia must be incompetent in epidemiology? ■

# CHIEF OF DEFENCE SUED FOR MARDI GRAS DISMISSAL

## Army Reservist Sues Chief of Defence

**Bernard Gaynor writes:** As you know, Defence has terminated my commission as a Reserve Officer in the Australian Army because I opposed uniformed military participation in the Sydney Gay and Lesbian Mardi Gras. On top of that, I am now required to defend myself in the New South Wales Anti-Discrimination Tribunal against claims of homosexual vilification and demands for \$100,000.

My crime: objecting to naked homosexual men exposing themselves to children at gay pride parades in Toronto and for highlighting remarks made recently ...”

Bernard Gaynor has announced he sued the Chief of Defence Force for terminating his commission as a major in the Army Reserve on 11 July 2014. The former Chief of

Defence Force, General David Hurley, signed off on the decision during his last day in office and will soon become the next Governor of New South Wales.

Mr Gaynor’s legal team has lodged documents with the Federal Court, objecting to the decision on 20 separate grounds. These include breach of natural justice, improper exercise of power, errors of law, lack of evidence and exercise of discretionary power in bad faith.

Mr Gaynor will also argue that the decision conflicts with the implied freedom of political communication and conflicts with section 116 of the Constitution. This states that no religious test shall be required to hold a Commonwealth office.

Mr Gaynor has asked the Federal Court to issue orders overturning the termination decision and has sought damages for loss of military wages and reputation. “This legal action will put the hierarchy of the Australian Defence Force on trial. Defence investigations have cleared me of wrongdoing and I will produce that documentary evidence in court.” Mr Gaynor said. “I will be alleging that it is not me who has breached Defence policy and lawful general orders but the Chief of Defence Force. I will lodge as evidence Defence’s own documents that show the Defence Intelligence Training Centre monitored and reported on the internal activities of a registered political party (Katter’s Australian Party) and that the Commanding Officer of this institution is concerned about conservative political opinions.”

“Defence’s own Quick Assessment reports also admit that the Mardi Gras is a political event in support of gay marriage and that Jesus Christ was vilified during this

parade. These same documents state that Defence members would be severely dealt with if they attended an event in uniform that vilified Mohammad.”

“Additionally, Defence documents implicitly admit that participants at the Mardi Gras performed sexual acts in front of children. The Chief of Defence Force will be required to justify why he has terminated the commission of an officer for objecting to Defence support of this parade. These actions appear to be a blatant violation of Defence policies prohibiting uniformed attendance at events of a political nature, sexually-explicit activity in the workplace, inappropriate advocacy of a particular sexual orientation and

religious and political vilification.

“Furthermore, the Chief of Defence Force has relied upon a military policy that states Defence should recognise and value difference and respect religious belief to terminate the commission of a Catholic officer with Arabic language skills. This is the same Chief of Defence Force who wrote to me on 22 August 2013 that the public articulation of my religious beliefs undermined confidence in my ability to uphold the values of the Australian Army. I will be alleging that this decision violates the very policy on which the Chief of Defence Force based his decision to terminate my commission.”

“This is an important legal action. It will determine whether it is lawful to object to military involvement in domestic political activity and how much freedom Christians in the military have to express their views. It will also determine if the organisation charged with defending the freedoms of all Australians has the power to deem that those who publicly express a view that homosexuality is immoral cannot serve this nation,” Mr Gaynor said. ■



## YOUR ATTENTION PLEASE!

Bernard Gaynor is a special guest for the New Times Dinner and a Speaker at the National Seminar— Friday 3rd and Saturday 4th October 2014.

Bernard is in the ‘front line’ making a stand for traditional Christian values and needs your support— see box on page 8 for further information.

# WITH LIBERTY TO MONITOR ALL

<http://www.hrw.org/node/127364> - 28 July 2014

**Don't Shoot the Messenger – we're only letting you know about it!**

**How Large-Scale US Surveillance is Harming Journalism, Law, and American Democracy**

The 120-page report documents how national security journalists and lawyers are adopting elaborate steps or otherwise modifying their practices to keep communications, sources, and other confidential information secure in light of revelations of unprecedented US government surveillance of electronic communications and transactions. The report, based on extensive interviews with journalists, lawyers, and senior US government officials, documents how government surveillance and secrecy are undermining press freedom, the public's right to information, and the right to counsel, all human rights essential to a healthy democracy.

**Kellie Tranter – Lawyer and Human Rights activist**

<http://www.onlineopinion.com.au/author.asp?id=5017>

The announcement this week that Federal Cabinet has given in principle support to the retention of customer data by telecommunications companies for up to two years - so that government agencies can access it without a warrant - suggests that government representatives just don't understand the consequences of retaining everyone's metadata and giving spy agencies access to it. The Australian population generally, and lawyers and journalists in particular, should be deeply concerned. Metadata is not just "the envelope" rather than its content. It is not some sort of harmless or innocuous activity log, which is exactly why the spy agencies are so keen to have it stored and accessible. It is the index to a person's electronic communications, detailing the when, who, where and how often of each contact. As journalist Glenn Greenwald asks in his book 'No place to hide Edward Snowden, the NSA and the Surveillance State': 'Would the senator, each month, publish a full list of people he/she emailed and called, including the length of time they spoke and their physical locations when the call was made?'

And knowing that your entire communications index will be available to government spy agencies has its own chilling effect on communications. Greenwald also notes that 'what makes a surveillance system effective in controlling human behaviour is the knowledge that one's words and actions are susceptible to monitoring'. The recent Human Rights Watch and ACLU report "With Liberty to Monitor All: How Large-Scale US Surveillance is Harming Journalism, Law, and American Democracy illustrates this, outlining in detail how large-scale surveillance by the U.S. government is undermining the important work of lawyers and journalists.

There is little Australian commentary on the likely effect of mass surveillance on the legal profession. Australian lawyers seem to be more complacent about the issue than their US counterparts. But in both countries lawyers, like journalists, often are sought out by whistleblowers seeking advice, or they are instructed to act in sensitive commercial, civil and criminal cases which may involve the government.

The Human Rights Watch and ACLU report reveals that in the US 'Lawyers increasingly feel under pressure to adopt strategies to avoid leaving a digital trail that could be monitored; some use burner phones, others seek out technologies they feel may be more secure, and others reported travelling more for in-person meetings'. Lawyers also said they are reluctant to take on cases that might attract surveillance, with the resulting erosion of the right to representation which is 'a pillar of procedural justice under human rights law'.

Edward Snowden's US defence attorney, Jesselyn Radack, described the lawyer's position to a forum in Sydney this week. 'I feel like I'm using drug dealer tactics. I meet in person. I pay in

cash. I use burner phones. I feel like I'm on the wire or something. It's kind of a throwback to the underground parking garage days and the days of deep throat, and it is absurd that we have to go to such measures, but until there are some limits on what the Government can do I think it's better to be safe than sorry. And I represent a lot of people in the sorry category who've been caught and are being overly prosecuted by the Government'.

We've already seen reports of the communications of US-based law firm Mayer Brown with its client, the government of Indonesia, coming under surveillance by an Australian intelligence agency, which in turn provided the intelligence to the United States; of the National Security Agency and FBI covertly monitoring the emails of prominent Muslim-Americans, including lawyers, and of the notorious ASIO raids on East Timor's Australian lawyer Bernard Collaery.

Who else is a potential target in Australia? Lawyers defending asylum seekers because they may have information relating to 'serious threats to Australian border and territorial integrity'? Lawyers advising protest groups making plans to carry out non-violent actions at G20 meetings? Lawyers still seeking justice for David Hicks? Lawyers involved in the Securrency banknote corruption case because of its consequences for the 'national interest'?

Edward Snowden's warning this month that lawyers are a target prompted immediate action by UK Law Society president Andrew Caplen to review the ramifications of surveillance for lawyers: 'I will be writing to other professional bodies to discuss the impact spying is having on members' confidential communication with clients or patients. I will also be writing to relevant academics, civil liberties groups, lawyers and other experts both nationally and internationally, to invite them to collaborate with us in addressing wider issues on surveillance and the rule of law'.

Caplen's response mirrors the concerns of the American Bar Association, the New York City Bar Association, the National Association of Criminal Defense Lawyers, and the National Lawyers Guild. They 'have yet to reach a consensus around the precise implications of surveillance for lawyers' professional responsibilities...'

**Australian lawyers' representative bodies seem to be lagging far behind**

I spoke with Philip Argy, the Chairman of the NSW Law Society's Legal Technology Committee, who said he was not aware of any similar review being carried out by the NSW Law Society or the Law Council. He did confirm that "Most lawyers would be horrified if proper legal processes were not followed and it became apparent that intelligence agencies were snooping on clients' confidential information. Particularly if the breaches were widespread and verified."

Perhaps Australian complacency comes from not appreciating the significance of metadata collection and analysis as a surveillance tool. Hopefully it doesn't flow from an uninformed acceptance of Government assurances. Whatever the reason, Australian lawyers need to step into action, both to protect their own interests and comply with their professional obligations to their clients, and to protect the common interests of other professions - especially journalists - and Australians as a whole. Mass collection of citizens' data, including metadata, by or for spy agencies is a real threat to individual freedom of action and communication; it is inconsistent with what we regard as personal freedom in a democratic society and it simply cannot be justified, without a warrant, on any of the lame grounds so far trotted out by government. ■

# An Authentic Australian Voice: Simon Leys

By Nigel Jackson

## Simon Leys, *The Hall of Uselessness, Black Inc., Melbourne, 2011.*

This 451-page collection of forty essays and occasional pieces by a retired scholar of Chinese takes its title from a couplet by Zhuang Zi: 'Everyone knows the usefulness of what is useful, but few know the usefulness of what is useless.' Plainly the author writes from a spiritual perspective which, to use the formulation of T. S. Eliot, recognises the superiority of the contemplative life over the active. Yet this does not stop Simon Leys (real name Pierre Ryckmans) from engaging profoundly with religious, political, historical, social and artistic issues of sublunary human existence. His defence of traditional ways of life is elegant, witty, adroit and succinct, but never stuffy or drab.

At a time when most 'China experts' around the world were praising Mao Zedong and misrepresenting the worst totalitarian tyranny of the 20th Century as a wonderful social experiment, Leys was one of the few who told the truth. Brought up happily in a French-speaking Roman Catholic family in Belgium, Leys (born in 1935) had a classical education (Greek and Latin) at the secondary level, then studied law (his parents' choice) and art history (his own choice) at university. There he fell in love with China, initially through contacts with fellow-students from the East, and decided to devote his life to the study of this most ancient of civilisations and cultures, so different in so many ways from Western European society. Leys travelled to China briefly in 1955 and later spent twelve years in Taiwan, Singapore and Hong Kong, before moving to Australia in 1970, where he taught Chinese literature at the Australian National University before becoming Professor of Chinese Studies at the University of Sydney from 1987 to 1993. He developed not only a profound understanding of Chinese culture and civilisation, but also a deep love of the Chinese people. He was horrified by their suffering under Mao and, perhaps, even more so by the obtuseness of most Western commentators on Red China at the time.

Leys provides a fine summary of the evils of communism and, especially, its Maoist version: 'The Communist Party is in essence a secret society. In its methods and mentality it presents a striking resemblance to an underworld mob..... no communist party ever received an electorate's mandate to govern. In China, the path that led the communists to victory still remains partly shrouded in mystery..... a communist regime is built on a triple foundation: dialectics, the power of the party, and a secret police..... before securing power, the party thrives on political chaos.....'

'Systematic terror was applied on a national scale as early as 1950..... By the fall of 1951, 80% of all Chinese had had to take part in mass accusation meetings, or to watch organised lynchings and public executions.....'

'In the Siberian camps [in the U.S.S.R.] the inmates could still, in a way, feel spiritually free and retain some sort of inner life, whereas the daily control of words and thoughts, the actual transformation and conditioning of individual consciousness, made the Maoist camps much more inhuman.'

'Besides its cruelty, the Maoist practice of launching political "campaigns" in relentless succession generated permanent instability, which eventually ruined the moral credit of the party, destroyed much of society, paralysed the economy, provoked large-scale famines, and nearly developed into civil war.....'

'The famines that resulted from the "Great Leap" produced a demographic black hole into which it now appears that as many as 50 million victims may have been sucked..... At the time, China experts throughout the world refused to believe that there was

famine in China. A BBC commentator, for instance, declared typically that a widespread famine in such a well-organised country was unthinkable.' (pp 344-351)

Leys briefly sets out to explain why he and a tiny minority of others saw things as they were and why hardly anyone else listened to them. He argues that 'what people believe is essentially what they wish to believe' and reminds us that 'among primitive tribes, idiots and madmen are the objects of particular respect and enjoy certain privileges', because 'they alone can be forgiven for speaking the truth..... For Truth, by its very nature, is ugly, savage and cruel; it disturbs, it frightens, it hurts and it kills.' As a result, lies often rule. Leys also points to an absurdity, within the United Nations Organization, that followed the brief but appalling tyranny of the Khmer Rouge in Cambodia: '...for another dozen years [after the collapse of Pol Pot's regime] the votes of the murderers carried in the General Assembly as much weight as the votes of – let us say – Germany and Japan, and more weight than the Vatican.' (pp 352-362)

Ironically, Leys himself may have fallen victim to another worldwide intellectual scam, for he adds that 'one is reminded of the good souls who, probably wishing to restore our faith in human nature, insisted that, in Auschwitz, gas was used only to kill lice.' (p 356) The mass blindness of intellectuals about Maoist tyranny in the late 20th Century shows that mass blindness about the extent of the misrepresentation of Nazi treatment of Jews during the past forty or more years is perfectly possible and credible. Leys states (p 34) that 'full light has been cast upon this entire era' (the horrors of the Nazi regime); but his foolish explanation of the phenomenon of Holocaust revisionism suggests that he has not applied his scholarly abilities to the subject. Perhaps he, too, like many others, believes what he wants to believe, in this context.

Leys is on firmer ground with his discussion of the role of the university. He chose to take early retirement because of the gathering corruption he observed in the government of universities generally, whereby they were becoming transformed into managerial operations for 'customers' requiring qualifications for careers. His own understanding of the true nature of a university is much like that of Cardinal Newman. He states: 'A university is a place where scholars seek truth, pursue and transmit knowledge for knowledge's sake – irrespective of the consequences, implications and utility of the endeavour.' (Zhuang Zi, one is confident, would have agreed.)

Leys rightly asserts that 'students should not be recruited at any cost, by all means, or without discrimination.' And he boldly confronts certain prejudices of our times: 'The elitist character of the ivory tower... is denounced in the name of equality and democracy. The demand for equality is noble and must be fully supported, but only within its own sphere, which is that of social justice..... Democracy is the only acceptable political system; yet it pertains to politics exclusively..... truth is not democratic, intelligence and talent are not democratic, nor is beauty, nor love – nor God's grace..... in its own field, education must be ruthlessly aristocratic and high-brow, shamelessly geared towards excellence.' One may, of course, feel that Leys here genuflects too readily to the very ideals of equality (equity is better) and democracy (aristocracy being preferable). (pp 398-399) Leys also points out that 'the very concept of the 'university' has rested for some 700 years on the absolute autonomy and

*(Continued on page 7)*

freedom of all academic and scholarly activities from any interference and influence of the political authorities.' (p 318) He does not, however, comment on the case of Henri Roques, who became the first man in the history of French universities to have his doctorate 'revoked' by government order. Roques' research had shattered the credibility of the 'confessions' of Kurt Gerstein, thus striking at one of the major roots of 'Holocaust' historiography.

Although Leys offers no support or sympathy for Holocaust revisionists, he courageously analyses at length the protean intellectual career of French author André Gide, who was a serial paedophile, during which he provides an important quotation from Gide's response to being awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1947: 'If I have represented anything, it is, I believe, the spirit of free inquiry, independence, insubordination even, protest against what the heart and reason refuse to approve. I firmly believe that the spirit of inquiry lies at the origin of our culture.... What matters here is the protection of that spirit that is "the salt of the earth" and which can still save the world...the struggle of culture against barbarism.' (p 90)

The blindness of Western commentators to the Soviet tyranny of 1917-1990 is also fruitfully examined by Leys. 'When we read the writings of Soviet and East European dissidents and exiles, we [learn of]... their amazement, indignation and anger in the face of the stupidity, ignorance and indifference of Western opinion and especially of the Western intelligentsia, which remained largely incapable of registering the reality of their predicament.' (p 33) 'In 1935 Boris Souvarine, a former secretary of the Third International who had escaped from Moscow back to Paris, wrote the first documented analysis of Stalin's murderous political career. This monumental and courageous work remains to this day a landmark in the unmasking of Stalinist crimes.' Leys tells of Souvarine's recalling of the obstruction he had faced, of 'the vile and sinister obstacles he had to overcome when... he first attempted to publish his historical masterpiece in Paris. At the time the leading figures of the French intelligentsia avoided him as if he had the plague.' (p 147)

This human tendency to avoid facing up to unpleasant truth is a recurrent theme in *The Hall of Uselessness*. Leys quotes Saint

Augustine: 'People have such love for truth that when they happen to love something else, they want it to be the truth; and because they do not wish to be proven wrong, they refuse to be shown their mistake. And so they end up hating the truth for the sake of the object which they have come to love instead of the truth.' (p 130) And in discussing the work of Evelyn Waugh, which he perhaps overvalues, Leys remarks: 'The arbiters of public opinion do not forgive those who openly mock intellectual fashions or transgress political and aesthetic taboos. Social conformity has its dungeons where the irreverent are to be confined behind thick walls of silence until complete oblivion.' (p 168)

A victim of such jaundice was the philosopher Jean Francois Revel: 'Far more vicious was the invisible conspiracy that surrounded Revel with a wall of silence.... His books were not reviewed, his ideas were not discussed; if his name was mentioned at all, it was with a patronising sneer, if not downright slander.... On international affairs, on literature, art and ideas, he had universal perspectives that broke completely from the suffocating provincialism of the contemporary Parisian elites.... he became disenchanted with the contemporary philosophers who, he felt, had betrayed their calling by turning philosophy into a professional career and a mere literary genre. "Philosophy", he wrote, "ought to return to its original and fundamental question: How should I live?".... He held... to one central idea... the belief that each individual destiny, as well as the destiny of mankind, depends upon the accuracy – or the falsity – of the information at their disposal, and upon the way in which they put this information to use.' (pp 196-197)

Readers of *New Times Survey* can see that, in the perspective of the understanding conveyed by Leys, the lifelong labours of Eric Butler and his associates to oppose tyranny and totalitarianism were not the eccentricity of misfits, let alone 'anti-Semites' or 'neo-Nazis', but part of a central human project which others also were carrying on around the world – and still are. Leys' work (he has published many other books and essays) deserves the widest circulation by those who care for intellectual freedom, high culture and spiritual truth.

Nigel Jackson reports: "Simon Leys (real name Pierre Ryckmans) has died - today (11 August), I believe. He was 78". ■

---

## Ombudsman finds water agency, Office of Living Victoria, mishandled conflict-of-interest concerns

Alison Savage, *ABC News*, 5 Aug 2014

The ombudsman has found Victoria's water agency the Office of Living Victoria (OLV) has mishandled conflict-of-interest concerns involving its staff. The office was established by Water Minister Peter Walsh in May 2012 to manage the change in the way water services are managed in Victoria. The ombudsman's report highlighted relationships between OLV staff, including senior management and contractors and consultants hired to do work for the office. It also found OLV hired staff without properly advertising and interviewing for the positions, in breach of government guidelines.

"It has seen staff engaged for significant periods of time without a formal interview process and on occasions with no referee or background checks," the report said. "These same staff were then offered fixed-term contracts within the VPS (Victorian Public Service), again without advertising the roles or formal interviews being conducted. Conflict of interest was

poorly understood and badly managed by OLV."

The ombudsman was also critical of procurement practices in the agency. In one example examined by the ombudsman, three companies provided quotes for events management services. The ombudsman found OLV accepted the most expensive quote without explaining why. The report found OLV rushed a number of project briefs, quotations and other documents. "In some cases they were prepared after the contract was in place, to give some semblance of credibility to the arrangement," the ombudsman said.

The report makes four recommendations, including calling for an audit of OLV's financial management and a review of hiring protocols. It also found the investigation into the office was hampered by poor record keeping and investigators were not confident they had been given all the documents they needed.

(Continued on page 8)

# The Wholeness of Life

Venue: Hazel Mackenzie Hall;

Grants Gully Road, Clarendon SA

## BOOKINGS

Ph: 08 8396 1245

M 0421 925 557

\*\*\*\*\*

**New Times Dinner, Friday 3rd October**

**Seminar, Saturday 4th October and**

**Frank Bawdon Memorial Dinner.**

**Divine Service and 'Action Conference'**

**Sunday 5th October.**

\*\*\*\*\*

## SPECIAL GUESTS

**M. Oliver Heydorn, Ph.D. the author of 'Social Credit Economics' and 'The Economics of Social Credit and Catholic Social Teaching'.**

**and**

**Bernard Gaynor who is defending himself against charges of 'racial vilification' and now required to defend himself in the New South Wales Anti-Discrimination Tribunal against claims of homosexual vilification and demands for \$100,000.**

**Join our special guests for the New Times Dinner and a weekend not to be missed.**

## Water Minster defends OLV performance

Mr Walsh acknowledged mistakes were made in the management of the water agency but said the OLV had operated effectively. "I think the key thing here is that when mistakes are made we've actually acted and made changes to make sure they're not repeated," he said. "We would acknowledge that mistakes have been made by both OLV and the Department of Environment and Primary Industries and these are being addressed. Good governance and effective and timely policy reform are not mutually exclusive, but having said that, OLV has delivered some significant benefits."

Labor spokesman James Merlino said Mr Walsh should resign. "It has been an unmitigated failure of Peter Walsh - the Office of Living It Up Victoria," he said. "Jobs for mates, absolute rorting. This has been a mess. There's no doubt that Peter Walsh has been on an absolute frolic at the expense of Victorian taxpayers. He should be held to account."

The Government recently abolished OLV's status as a stand alone entity and the body's chief executive, Mike Waller, stood down last month.

<http://www.abc.net.au/news/2014-08-05/ombudsman-finds-victoria27s-water-agency-the-office-of-living-5649514> ■

### 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 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.

Published by The Australian League of Rights, G.P.O. Box 1052, Melbourne, 3001.

A monthly journal — subscription \$30.00 p.a.

Editorial: Betty Luks, P.O. Box 27, Happy Valley, S.A., 5159.

E-mail: [bluks@alor.org](mailto:bluks@alor.org) Website: [www.alor.org](http://www.alor.org)

(The views expressed in articles in this journal do not necessarily reflect those of the publisher.)

Electoral comment authorised by Louis R. Cook, Nathalia Rd, Numurkah.