

Special points of interest:

- No evidence to suggest that such Machiavellian measures are necessary.
- Terrorism has been dealt with before by more liberal means.
- If we acquiesce to restrict our liberties then the terrorists have already won.

This has been our first edition of what we hope will be an interesting and intellectually stimulating publication twice each half term. We began this project on very short notice and have had fewer than three weeks to have this pilot finished and ready. On behalf of myself and all the contributors we would like to thank you for taking the time to read this publication and hope you will continue to do so.

Please excuse any typos or administrative errors which I assure you will be properly addressed in future as we get into a more routine and orderly production schedule.

Inside this issue:

Psychology of Modern Medicine;	2
On Duty	2
Blue Revolution	3
World News Columbia	4
Global Warming or Climate Change?	5
The Credit Crunch	5
Religion in Society	6
Note from the Editor	6

Eternal Vigilance

“The Price of Liberty is Eternal Vigilance” Thomas Jefferson made this declaration centuries ago, and he didn’t mean that we had to live with terrorism, or danger, as in Israel and Palestine or the relics of a nation that is Somalia, but that we must be vigilant in maintaining and protecting our liberties.

Terrorism has been a fact of live throughout history, especially in the 20th Century, a fact that is ignored by most and unknown to the rest who fail to equate the actions of the suffragettes, socialists, anarchists, IRA or numerous other groups around the world. These threats have been met with various levels of response- suffragettes were jailed on trivial charges such as breaking a window, anarchists and socialists in the United States were rounded up and deported without trial and there have been several controversies regarding trigger happy British paratroopers in dealing with the provisional IRA. The most lasting measure any of these led to (in terms of dealing with the situation, not voting rights and such) is the removal of rubbish bins from most public areas in the UK due to bin bombs.

The most important idea to retain from this is the damage and severity of the attacks. The IRA came within a small margin of bringing down the entire British government in an attack on the Brighton Grand Hotel where the Conservative Party Conference was being held and many, from a young boy killed by a bin bomb to Lord Mountbatten, a cousin of the queen. Casualties of the IRA totalled 1,821 and included 644 civilians. In the July 7th bombing in London just 52 were killed, although there

were over 700 injured. What was the response to these atrocities? Where were the calls for 90 day prison sentences without trial or charge? Where were the calls for a National ID card, or biometric scanning at ports and airports? Where were the blockades at the airports, the sub-machine gun armed police patrolling the streets? Why did the government not put a halt to the right to protest within view of parliament? The answer is simple: these absurd and illicit measures were not needed and never have been.

The information age has ushered in a new era of paranoia and panic unmatched in modern history, greater than the fear of communism, harder to justify than the response to ‘enemy’ nationals during the world wars. For all the university degrees and higher education among today’s young men and women they still surrender to fear mongering and consolidation of unchecked executive power. All these seemingly ignoring the fact that there have been no other attacks since those of July 2005 despite there being no detention measures in place. Perhaps the most intriguing facet is that if the government has no evidence, and cannot bring a charge to a ‘terrorist’ how can they possibly have good reason to detain them for 6 weeks, or even just 4? Why is it that in the United States, where there is arguably far more to fear, the authorities have needed no longer than 48 hours to charge any suspect. Although this in no way condones the actions of the Bush administration or those at Guantanamo Bay, these have repeatedly been struck down by the Supreme Court, guaranteeing the detainees the right to a civilian

trial. Yet Gordon Brown pushes ahead with plans to tear up the Magna Carta, and destroy the fundamental basis of civil liberties, supported, according to polls by the majority of the British people.

Perhaps all those of us who consider ourselves modern, civilized individuals should open our eyes, step back and see this for what it is, a crisis indeed, but a minor one. How many of you walk the streets fearing a terrorist attack? Yet 42 day detention has not yet been implemented. Perhaps we should all follow the lead, if not the policies of former Shadow Home Secretary David Davis, who recently resigned as an MP to protest the extension of detention without charge. Of course you could trust the alternative- a ‘charismatic’ Scot who now seems to be little more than a pathological liar and who was just as responsible for Iraq as George Bush- who wouldn’t have invaded without Britain’s support, and his bigger, bulkier Scottish successor who has been little more than a disaster since becoming Prime Minister and is seeing his celebrated chancellorship be exposed for the flaws in his policies. Of course, you could acquiesce to the fear, to the media and to a government, which, as all, desires power, or you could wake up from this media induced stupor and fight for our fundamental liberties which will be far harder to reclaim than they were to lose. Left, Right, Center, this is a battle we must all face, and we must face it before it is too late. Time is of the essence 42 days and we may be too late. By *Dom Braybrook*

On Duty

Is our Duty stopping us being happy and free?

I was faced with a very big predicament when asked to write this article: Do I write about what interests me personally, or do I please the editor. Being a worm, I chose the latter, which is ironic, as it is linked to my predicament. Basically, is passion really worth more than duty?

I was thinking about this when I was given a task that seemed pointless to me, and the alternative was something I enjoyed and found interesting. So what did I do? The boring task that was asked of me by an authority figure that does not deserve to have authority over me. I repeat my use of the term "worm" to describe myself at this point. So what happens next? I simply use a universal example to draw the reader into what I am saying, and then I put across my point in a non-condescending manner.

We have all watched television, and read books. Well, some of us have read books, but we have all of us seen our hero faced with a moral dilemma, whether he listens to his head or his heart. Spiderman follows his heart, so does Homer Simpson, but do these values really matter in day-to-day life anymore? I struggle to find a real life example of someone choosing their heart in the first place, and getting what they dreamed of.

I am sure that many people have felt at some point that they were in some way higher than their duty, but I think of what stage my life is at the moment, and wonder whether this feeling of pompous superiority is really going to get me anywhere. I hope to go to uni-

Psychology of Modern Medicine

The idea of a placebo has been one that has been around for many years. The scientific definition of a placebo is, "An inactive substance that looks the same as, and is administered in the same way as, a drug in a clinical trial."

In real life terms, its basically it's a pill that pretends to help you, but in fact it does nothing. The use of placebos as a form of treatment has been proved to be extremely effective and has been proved that at least 95% of practitioners have administered a placebo at one point or another. A Dutch psychologist even found that 48% of doctors asked had used placebos at least 10 times in the last year. Unfortunately it has also been proved that placebos only effect one third of the population.

The reason I decided to write this article was because of a newspaper article I read a couple of weeks ago. A laboratory has been working on a pill for children. It is completely harmless and does not have any effects; however it has been proven to help a variety of illnesses. The psychological effect of the child taking this "drug" means that a positive reaction occurs within the body.

The drug developed by mother, Ms. Buettner is to go on sale from the 1st July this year. The pill is called "Obebalp". This is conveniently placebo spelt backwards. It has however raised some very strong ethical issues. Surely by taking this pill you are simply lying and deceiving to your child? Also as I've already stated the success rate of placebos are very shady. Ms. Buettner has

actually proved that the success rate in adults, 33%, is substantially smaller than that in children, 80%.

This drug looks and tastes just like a real pill. It has no side effects. It won't damage your child in any way. It has been proved to help with ailments. But it may go towards promoting drug use, and involves the mother or father lying to their child. Is this medical simplistic brilliance or just another wonder drug?

These questions can only be answered with time, but in the meantime, are the benefits worth the risk?

By *Nathan Nicholls*

versity, and being big headed will get me nowhere. I want to get a good job, but have all too soon realised that in order to get paid and survive, I will have to sell my soul. What have we come to?

I want to write for my life. Writing could well be the calling that inspires me, but will it put food on the table, to coin a horrible phrase? I wanted to make my own business and be self-employed, but will I have the motivation to get up and do what I have to do? Human nature gives us an imagination, an overwhelming sense of Self and a brain that can accomplish almost anything, and I feel it is wasted on listening to the radio, reading trashy magazines and listening to poor quality music. For those people that have let their brain go for granted, shame on you. Society is mind numbingly boring enough as it is without us giving up hope on the one thing that can make us happy. Let us celebrate what we have, because I can tell you free of charge, that life as we know it is changing quickly, and I don't see much hope for happiness at the moment.

To the Brain, and Unique personalities... A dying part of our society, but one in which I have considerable faith in.

So what do we do?

What can we do?

We can begin reading more books, we can actually try and understand the correct use of apostrophes and commas, we can talk to people like they are fellow humans, not as mentally challenged 8 year olds, we can say please and thank you and not expect anything in return, we can smile at a stranger instead of frown. It's a start, but I fear it will take a minor miracle for us to all be happy again...

By *Harvey Hancock*

Blue Revolution?

From the War in Iraq to government spending and international relations, all signs in the United States point to a huge democratic victory come November when the world's only superpower goes to the polls to elect its new Commander in Chief. This was typified by the 2006 midterm elections in which the Democrats seized control of both houses of Congress as well as a majority of state governorships (though their senate majority is a precariously small 51-49 including two independents who 'caucus' or vote with the Democrats).

The Democrats have however historically done well in the legislature – until 1994 they controlled the House for 40 years. The presidency however is another matter- there have only been 14 Democrat presidents in 180 years of existence. The Republicans by contrast have had 18 presidents in 154 years. Much of this is due to the makeup of the electoral system- House elections are held in constituencies of 300,000 people meaning that a city may have 10 representatives whereas another district, as with that of Texas Representative Ron Paul, may take up a large portion of the state of Texas. This is important because suburban and rural voters as well as those in the South and Med-West generally vote republican while urban voters tend to favor Democrats. Presidential elections are held in such a way that Electoral College votes are allocated in a winner takes all fashion based on popular vote in the entire state. These issues could feature heavily come election day.

Through perhaps the most invigorating primary campaign in history the world watched in awe as the heavily favored Democratic Party's candidates Hillary Rodham Clinton and Barack Obama duelled for their party's presidential nomination with the latter eventually coming out on top. Meanwhile the Republicans had chosen their candidate months ago to little fanfare as former Prisoner of War John McCain took the Republican nomination. In Britain today, having lived under the Welfare State for decades, we see it as an indisputably good thing, horrified at the prospect of a world without it, even though economics suggests that a better standard of living, and greater freedom could be achieved without it. This is one of the main reasons polls and opinions show that the UK has a negative view of the Republican party, even while knowing very little about it. The admittedly anti-US British media does much to perpetuate this as does the catastrophic current administration. The Republicans are called warmongers yet this is as far from true as calling New Labour a right wing party, it may not be as openly socialist as it once was, but the signs are

still there- Labour MPs sang The Red Flag upon the nationalization of Northern Rock. It is necessary to look at history to understand the truth. Democratic presidents entered America into both world wars. The great hero of the idealistic left, John F Kennedy invaded Vietnam, but the 60s anti war movement never mentions that aspect, he also botched an invasion of Cuba at the Bay of Pigs. Bill Clinton meanwhile was the first person to accuse Iraq of having WMDs, a fact that is n record regardless of Michael Moore's opinion

But this is in the past and what matters is the here and now. The Democrats last year as they began their primary campaign stood poised to sweep the table as a reply to unpopular Republican policies. They were so heavily favored anything other than a huge win will be a defeat, and a loss would be rather hilarious to non partisan commentators. Yet polls suggest this could be the outcome. Barack Obama and John McCain poll within 5 percentage points of one another, inside the margin of error, making it a tie game. Why is this? Why the astounding turnaround? It can perhaps best be explained like this "We have a candidate who cannot win, running for a party that cannot lose and a candidate who cannot lose running for a party that cannot win" – a 21st century Unstoppable Force vs. Immovable object, making for what could be one of the best elections in recent times (let's hope we avoid a repeat of 2000).

Why then, do I describe Europe's darling, Barack Obama, the young, idealistic Liberal who carries the flag of the Democratic Party as unelectable? The answer is quite simple. America never conformed truly to the wave of left-wing thought that spread across Europe after the Second World War, and Ronald Reagan assured that the remnants of the left were banished to the fringes of American politics. If he won, Obama would be by far the most left wing president in American history. Race is also a factor. As much as Britons like to kid themselves, race is a factor even here, where an insignificant majority of non-Caucasians sit in parliament and no leader of the three main parties has been anything other than white, ever. The Americans are a step ahead here. If fears over this 'grave change' weren't already prevalent enough, Obama has been tied closely to a radical pastor who believes the United States created HIV to kill black people and has been broadcasted across the airwaves crying "God Damn America" – this will not help Obama in an election. Other friends of his have included another pastor who portrayed Hillary Clinton as a white supremacist and members of a 60s radical left

group called The Weathermen who have been tied to attempted terrorism. He has also admitted using cocaine- not a big positive in Christian America, and has a wife who is considered by many a far left socialist. This, as well as his constantly being caught in mis-truths could be a serious problem for him, Newt Gingrich's Republican propaganda machine have some explosive ammunition.

John McCain on the other hand is considered a national hero, narrowly losing the Republican nomination in 2000 he spent 5 years as a prisoner of war in Vietnam where he was routinely tortured to the point where he can no longer raise his arms above his shoulders. McCain even went so far as to refuse to be returned to the United States early (his father was the highest commander in the Pacific) on the principle that every soldier captured before him should be returned first. On returning to the United States he entered into public service and has a history of working across party lines- Barack Obama on the other hand is perhaps the most partisan member of the senate. McCain is competent if not strong on almost every issue before him and his stance is almost perfectly inline with that of the American people. It was his 'surge' strategy which is widely held responsible for the falling off of violence in Iraq. So what is the great drawback with McCain? Only, according to some, his age. At 72 he would be the oldest first term president in US history, raising fears about his competence (although Reagan, one of America's most popular presidents was reelected at age 74). This, many say is a major drawback however it should never be discounted that the seniors in America, who see McCain as one of their own, come out in force come election time, and the baby boomers, who are about to reach retirement age in their millions, could help an older candidate- Obama does not do well among older voters. McCain may also benefit from the loss of Hillary Clinton, many of whose voters have pledged to support him rather than Obama.

Another factor to consider is the candidate from the Libertarian party, former Republican Bob Barr a conservative who may draw votes away from McCain, who many see as too moderate.

The Democrats have almost everything in their favor this November, but if the usual pattern of American politics holds, don't be surprised to see another Commander in Chief from America's most successful presidential party. Democrats may be left to reflect on what Bill Clinton warned them upon his election 16 years ago- that they must never return to the politics of the 60s, 70s and 80s, which saw their presidents in power for only 8 years to the Republican's 28.

By Dom Braybrook

World News: Columbia

The United States is Colombia's largest trading partner, representing about 40% of Colombia's exports. To keep Colombian products competitive and at a low price Colombian exporters rely on the peso being low in relation to the dollar. However, due to the US slowdown the dollar has seen a fall in price. Unfortunately for some Colombian firms, the price of the peso has seen big increases almost simultaneously with the US dollar decrease. This was mainly due to the success of President Uribe's policy on Democratic Security. Uribe's policy was to bring back security in all aspects of Colombia's society by increasing the force of the police and the military and make sure that there would be representation of the state in all towns and villages. Before president Uribe came to power the previous governments had allowed the guerrillas, known as the FARC, to con-

trol certain areas of the country due to the lack of strength and size of the authorities and the difficult mountainous terrain. The FARC were free to commit many crimes, including extortion and kidnapping, which drove out foreign investment and the educated Colombians. This made the peso very cheap, but this suited exporters. However ever since the president had started to increase military power and started to control of more and more of Colombia, the country had started to become a safer investment for foreign firms. This created more professional jobs for Colombians coming out of university and instead of emigrating after graduation, which became the usual trend, educated Colombians started to stay and keep money in the country. The final outcome was that the peso grew in price.

In the build up to the announcement of the new

base rate the Colombian government was heavily pressured into lowering the rates in the hope to decrease the price of the peso, with national protests on the streets of by coffee plantations, flower growers and other exporting producers. However when it was announced on the 4th July that interest rates would stay the same at 9.75% the government had said that the control of inflation, currently at 6.4% p.a CPI which had increased due to shortages in oil, took precedence over the "dollar problem".

The government has attempted to ease the problem by buying \$20 million daily over a monitored period of time but has left exporters watch their profits decrease at alarming rates.

By *Andrew Porras*

Global Warming or Climate Change?

The earth is warming up, the climate is changing and there is an overwhelming scientific consensus that global warming is occurring and it is human-induced. In recent years, there is evidence to show that the temperature, in various regions, is increasing and there are also extremities in weather patterns. Proof of this is that the number of natural disasters has quadrupled in the past two decades. "This is no freak year. It follows a pattern of more frequent, more erratic, more unpredictable and more extreme weather events that are affecting more people," reported Oxfam director Barbara Stocking. The most recent, of course, was the cyclone that hit Burma, killing an estimated 50,000 people, and leaving over 2 million homeless.

So, what is global warming? It is the increase in the average measured temperature of the Earth's near-surface air and oceans. It is mainly due to the increase in greenhouse gases, such as CO₂, the greenhouse effect. Human activity has increased the greenhouse effect. The three main gasses, methane, water vapor and carbon dioxide absorb the radiation emitted by the Earth and re-radiate the energy as heat back towards the Earth, causing it to warm up.

However recently, scientists have discovered that not everywhere would heat up due to

the increased levels of CO₂ in the Earth's atmosphere, the UK, France and Spain are just three of the countries that would get cooler due to the effects of global warming causing the Gulf Stream to switch off, causing a lack of warm water to heat the countries up. Thus, 'Climate Change' was the subsequent name given to Global Warming

Also, global warming is a bit of a narrow title for what is happening at the moment due to the increased likelihood of more hurricanes, floods, tsunamis, earthquakes and volcanic eruptions. Although, an increase in temperature at the planet surface does mean that the seas are warmer and there is therefore more energy to drive these extreme weather conditions.

The other side of the argument is that climate change is not mainly caused by human activities. There are other 'natural' extremities, such as the orbit of the Earth has caused it to be closer to the sun than ever before, adding to the temperature of the Earth.

I therefore come to a conclusion about which is the most accurate name for the dramatic effects on our planet. If I were to call it Global Warming, I would be giving the impression to other people around me that I believe it is all man made, which is partially true. The main culprit is

the burning of fossil fuels, giving out CO₂, mainly from cars and power plants. In 2002 about 40% of U.S. carbon dioxide emissions stem from the burning of fossil fuels for electrical use, no doubt this has increased over the last six years. The second principle cause of atmospheric carbon dioxide is deforestation, which is responsible for 20-25% of carbon emissions entering the atmosphere. All of this has led to a huge change in the temperature of the Earth's atmosphere.

On the other hand, I would have to agree with the fact that it is partially a naturally occurring catastrophe. It is climate change because not the entire planet is forecasted to warm up, due to the Gulf Stream. Also, there are far more natural disasters occurring more than ever, which is again, not called global warming. Finally, there are naturally occurring 'sunspots' which is an extremely powerful flare emitted towards Earth which can cause disruption on the planet.

To conclude, if I were to describe the effects on our planet, I would have to use both terms, because it is warming up (Global Warming) but then there are significant changes in weather patterns causing more natural disasters.

By James Ireland

ments of their mortgages, the bank could repossess the house which in itself is worth more than the mortgage and so they make a larger profit. Now what the banks did with a lot of these loans was to pack them together and sell them to investment firms such as Bear Sterns. By packaging many of them together, the credit rating was improved through diversification under the theory that some loans will be repaid.

However this all went wrong when house prices began to fall. Suddenly the mortgages were worth more than the houses they were used to buy (negative equity). This meant that many mortgages were making a loss. Thus investment firms began losing money quickly due to these bad loan packages. In order to survive in the market, firms had to raise money in other ways such as offering rights issue (offering existing shareholders more shares at a discounted rate). Some firms were unable to find sufficient firms to keep afloat and so they were bought out by other firms (Bear Sterns were bought out by JP Morgan at very low prices). Banks were also losing money as a result of the credit crunch in various ways. Generally banks obtain their money through trading with other banks in the money markets. Once banks start losing money, uncertainty creeps in to the market and banks are less inclined to lend money to each other. This is because they did not know which banks were suffering heavily from the credit crunch and may not be able to repay any loans. Therefore, banks stopped lending to each other and so they had less money available with which to offer loans. Also, banks are much less likely to take risks and so would only offer loans to very credit-worthy customers. Therefore, for these two reasons credit was less obtainable, hence the 'credit crunch'.

By Daryl Warren

Credit Crunch

What is the credit crunch?

Almost everyone is aware of that there is a credit crunch at the moment, but when pushed, very few actually know what it is and how it occurred. So let's start with what a credit crunch actually is. A credit crunch is defined as a shortage of available loans. Therefore this implies that financial

institutions must have reduced the number of loans that they are offering. This is exactly what has happened in the UK and US in the past year. Now we have to establish what caused them to reduce the amount of loans they give out.

This story begins a long time ago, when banks began giving mortgages to people who were unlikely to be able to repay them. This was during a time

when house prices were steadily rising. The banks applied the assumption that they would continue to rise. Therefore, as time passes, the house will be worth more than the mortgage (this is known as positive equity). The banks decided to offer loans to less credit worthy people (sub-prime). This was in the knowledge that when they could no longer afford the monthly pay-

Religion in Society

A claim commonly made in 21st century British society is that religion no longer has a purpose in our lives, that it has become obsolete or at least insignificant. This view is especially prevalent among the modern left, as evidenced by Liberal Democrat leader Nick Clegg, and numerous Labour cabinet members including David Miliband, the Foreign Secretary being confirmed atheists as well as books written by Christopher Hitchens, Richard Dawkins and many others. In many ways it could be argued that this is indeed true, that science has made religion pointless and little more than a fantasy involving 'people in the sky'. Evolution in particular has long been used as a prime example of science refuting religion, and the possibility of stem cells being able to one day extend life indefinitely, in combination with genetic engineering has been likened to playing god.

The question however is this: Is it now or will religion ever be truly obsolete? This, is, admittedly a hard question to answer. It should, rightly, be split into two different questions. Will religion become obsolete as a source of knowledge? Ostensibly the answer is yes. Eventually, we are likely to reach the point where, whether or not we know everything, we know more than religions offer. The second question is more difficult - will religion become obsolete as a source of guidance?

This answer is far more complex. It is accepted by most today that morality is relative, ideas such as stealing to survive or killing to prevent more death are often accepted as morally justifiable if not right. Relative morality is however, by definition, subjective. This means that science, the government or any other secular organization cannot tell us what is morally 'right'. Now, the obvious argument here is that religion cannot either, if morality is to be accepted as relative. You will find no argument with this here. The difference is, however, religion, as a free belief can offer guidance. The Christian teaching to "Love thy neighbour" however is not a morality teaching, but a source of advice on how to act in certain situations, similarly to how philosophical teachings are applied. It could even be argued to support relative morality- love thy neighbour even if they have done wrong. This same teaching is applied in some form or another to almost

every religion in existence.

A further angle on this issue is on ultimate questions. The most obvious one, the 'meaning of life' is likely, in scientific terms alone to be no more than to procreate, or, in even more secular circles, simple to enjoy yourself. The latter of which could launch an astronomical argument in to decadency which will not be included here although the Daily Mail will be happy to oblige you if you feel compelled to read that argument. Some people will be content with the idea that life is meaningless; others however, will feel very unnerved and isolated by this idea. Many people still need "the opiate of the masses" in order to function. This may not be a bad thing, almost every major religion teaches against drug use, the excessive use (or use at all) of alcohol, as well as lying, stealing, murder and many other things that are considered by most to be wrong. In America for example, crime rates, alcohol and drug use are phenomenally lower among Evangelical Christians than among the rest of the population (please hold the George W. Bush jokes) and you never hear about binge drinking in Saudi Arabia, although this doesn't redeem their numerous human rights abuses.

In Britain especially, anyone suggesting that the nuclear family is a good thing is denounced as 'out of touch' and a 'reactionary conservative', but the evidence supports their position. Crime rates are much higher among children from single parent households, as is drug or alcohol abuse, smoking, mental health issues- including those whose parents divorced at a young age. Now, everyone is entitled to their opinion, and personally I believe those who preach that strict, traditional parental family is the only way are just as wrong as those who dismiss its importance. Family is important, anyone who has had to live without one could attest to that. Family does not need to be seen in such narrow terms though. Family is family, it could be two homosexual parents, or non-parental blood relatives, it could be a 'brotherhood' religious or otherwise, or it could be system of strong friendships and friends who support each other. Not all religions support or promote this view, but they tend to support the idea of strong (but not authoritarian) families and discourage divorce, which is logically,

beneficial to children and people in general.

Many people would also argue that religion is not destined to remain a source of guidance. Those who have read "The God Delusion" or the many comparable books, or anything by Marx will be well aware of these arguments. A much more contemporary argument (which ironically is attributed to a time long ago) is that secular laws rule the day. This has been the position of many rationalists for centuries, starting with the Greek philosophers. It is best summed up in the phrase "Nothing is true, everything is permitted", which is often, correctly or not, attributed to a Grand Master of the Hashshashin, a branch of Shia Islam in existence for about 200 years between 1090 and 1271. Ignoring for a moment the cries of philosophical nonsense, it is important to look at the meaning of this quote. Far from any abstract meaning, it simply implies that, nothing is absolute- there are no divine laws, and that nothing should be considered wrong unless dictated by logic. The idea was that laws should only be made on a logical, secular basis and religion should not dictate legality. This is arguably the dominant idea in the western world, and I am, generally, inclined to agree.

This does not however, mean that religion does not have a place. Religion, so long as it is chosen and not forced upon an individual - or pressured onto them by threats of damnation or other consequences- can be a source of strength, guidance and socialization. In many cases it could also be a source of unity - very few Muslims subscribe to the idea of "The World of Islam" or "The World of War" mentioned in the Koran, nor do most Christians or Jews believe in a vengeful, smiting God. It is my belief, that although religion has no place in the laws of society, a voluntary association which results in a reduction in alcoholism, drug use, crime and soaring abortion rates (the issue of which is contentious but I doubt many are arguing for increasing the number of abortions if we can help it) is a positive influence on society now, and could, and possibly should continue to be in the future.

By Dom Braybrook

Note from the Editor:

If you would like to respond to an article or query one of the contributors you can contact us at bspolitics@gmail.com and we will respond as hastily as we are able (though perhaps not over the summer). Any unaccredited articles were written by myself. Feedback and comment or response is also welcome and a selection will be printed in the next issue. Anyone wishing to respond to an article or write a rebuttal will be credited if they so wish, and also if they wish, details will be passed along to teachers- members of the VI form; journalism or contribution to such an extra-curricular would look good on a UCAS application!