

"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. 19 No. 04

Registered Australia Post - Publication PP343214 / 00016

April 2018

CONTENTS

Have We Come to Love Our Chains? By Arnis Luks	1
Douglas Social Credit - The Policy of Freedom	5
Social Credit as Toryism By M. Oliver Heydorn, Ph.D	5

HAVE WE COME TO LOVE OUR CHAINS? By Arnis Luks

William Wilberforce was a leading figure in the campaign to abolish slavery. He first came in contact with Abolitionists (anti-slave-trade activists) in 1787 and continued with this group to campaign against slavery until his death in 1825. Eight years after Wilberforce's death the *Slavery Abolition Act 1833* abolished slavery in most of the British Empire. The most important point to make of this is that the abolitionists were few in number and continued in their campaign until the desired result was achieved. Wilberforce was convinced of the importance of religion, morality and education. He championed causes and campaigns such as the Society for the Suppression of Vice, British missionary work in India, the creation of a free colony in Sierra Leone, the foundation of the Church Mission Society, and the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals. These ongoing campaigns consumed the majority of his life.

DEBT AS SLAVERY

Slavery or servitude, in my view, is the inability to choose or refuse one thing at a time, go where you want and live where you want (within reason). The most obvious slave empires are within collectivist regimes where none of this is possible. A not so obvious, but equally insidious slavery system is within Monopoly Capitalist societies. Several years ago a Sydney massage parlour owner (brothel keeper) was charged with forcing immigrants into servitude or slavery. The imported workers could never redeem the debt of bringing them over to Australia. Are central bankers who ultimately control the financial system, not doing the same thing by placing our young homeowners into financial servitude for generations?

Global debt, as reported recently by the Institute of International Finance, is more than three times the gross domestic product of the entire world, \$233 trillion. This means that the entire world must continue producing at its current rate for three years, without including any of the steadily accumulating costs of that three years of production, and hand over all of this production to the slave owners - international central bankers. The world cannot be in debt to itself equal to 3 times the GDP. There is something clearly amiss here and it is this: the ability of bankers to create money out of nothing, issue it in the form of debt-loans, and then place a mortgage against the real assets of the world for the privilege of issuing this debt (credit). The debt is irredeemable. Finance - the money system (credit) - has been weaponised to centralise power in the hands of the central banking CABAL. They are the slave masters of the entire world.

The similarities between the brothel keeper controlling slaves and modern central bankers controlling governments and ultimately the taxpayer are obvious. Our leaders have placed us, our children and the entire nation into servitude to the international banking fraternity. Student loans are no different, as is plastic never-never payments. The bankers have made debt into a narcotic drug, they being the pimps. Debt goes on forever. It is often said the biggest pokie addict in SA is the state government addicted to the revenue from pokies. — Have We Come to Love Our Chains?

MEDICATION AS SLAVERY

A doctor or health authority will not force treatment upon a person against their will. No individual doctor in their right mind would force a chemical treatment upon a crowd of people in his waiting room that he does not know, has not examined, cannot monitor and has not asked their wishes - yet state enforced fluoridation does exactly that.

(continued next page)

(continued from previous page)

One person's biological makeup can be very different to the next person's – fluoridation represents a staggering ignorance of this fact. 'One size fits all' is simply bad medicine.

Numerous studies are finding the relationship between fluoride in drinking water and reduced thyroid functionality: <http://jech.bmj.com/content/71/10/1019>.

Fluoride only works if applied 'Topical' (to the outside surface of the teeth), not 'Systemic' (ingested orally using drinking water). Fluoride is a neurotoxin:

<http://fluoridealert.org/issues/health/brain/>

The human placenta does not prevent the passage of fluoride from a pregnant mother's bloodstream to the fetus. As a result, a fetus can be harmed (brain and nervous system) by fluoride ingested during pregnancy:

http://fluoridealert.org/studies/brain05_/

Fluoride has been added to our water supply progressively since 1953 beginning at Beaconsfield, Tasmania. Now about 90% of our nation's population receives fluoridated water.

'Fluoride' is a generic name for waste products from various industries: steel, ammonia, aluminium etc. Fluoride added to our water supply is industrial waste and is not of a pharmaceutical grade. Fluoride added to medication will enhance the effectiveness of the other ingredients. Fluoride in toothpaste is up to 1000 times the recommended dosage and users are advised not to swallow the paste:

<https://lotusdental.com.au/toxic-toothpaste-better-safer-options-kids-teeth/>
99% of fluoridated water in Australia is not used for human consumption.

"At the end of the Second World War, the United States Government sent Charles Eliot Perkins, a research worker in chemistry, biochemistry, physiology and pathology, to take charge of the vast Farben chemical plants in Germany. While there he was told by the German chemists of a scheme which had been worked out by them during the war and adopted by the German General Staff. This was to control the population in any given area through mass medication of drinking water. In this scheme, sodium fluoride occupied a prominent place.

Repeated doses of infinitesimal amounts of fluoride will in time reduce an individual's power to resist domination by slowly poisoning and narcotising a certain area of the brain and will thus make him submissive to the will of those who wish to govern him. Both the Germans and the Russians (Soviets) added sodium fluoride to the drinking water of prisoners of war to make them stupid and docile:

The Dickinson Statement: A Mind-Boggling Thesis - Victorian Hansard of 12 August 1987, by Mr Harley Rivers Dickinson, Liberal Party Member of the Victorian Parliament for South Barwon."

A point to note here is that as World War II ended (2nd September 1945 - VE Day 8th May 1945) Fluoride was already being added to water supplies in Grand Rapids, Michigan from January 25, 1945 - *Wikipedia*.

There is no need to add thousands of tonnes of toxic waste in the form of fluoride to public water rather than targeting those young who may be susceptible to caries. Oral hygiene could be managed individually without any fluoride supplementation to the entire population whatsoever. An equally damning report of Acquired Autism/Autistic Enterocolitis from vaccines can be found here: <http://www.alternative-doctor.com/vaccination/thrower.html>

Our freedom to choose fluoride-free water is hampered by the significant cost of sophisticated filtration systems or rainwater harvesting. Similarly, to avoid vaccinations incurs financial penalties imposed by our governments. No Jab-No Pay remember (Liberal). — Have We Come to Love Our Chains?

LAWS FOR SLAVERY

Draconian laws (think 18 C) are being enacted almost daily by all political labels. The VEET requirements (Labor Victoria) where bureaucrats are given the authority to pass laws, fine offenders, and confiscate property in regard to energy efficiency of homes and power consumption are the latest example. If your home is seized and sold by a zealous bureaucrat, dictator, or invader the result is the same.

Recently the entire anti-discrimination system in New South Wales was ruled unconstitutional by the High Court of Australia. The (Liberal) government changed its tribunal laws on the eve of the High Court hearing in an attempt to keep the complaint process alive. Other state's Attorneys General (Liberal and Labor), in concert joined the action to put the final nail in the free speech coffin.

The Anti-Discrimination Board of NSW has stated it will ignore these rulings and simply continue with its attempts to terrorise anyone and everyone into silence. The process is the punishment.

A recently elected government in SA (Liberal) has wasted no time to continue on with the collectivists program of council amalgamations.

We must recognise that our leaders are less than perfect, in fact, far from it. They may have vested interests in exploiting situations for their own benefit. A recent example is the British Prime Minister whose husband holds significant investments in BAE - a major military-industrial supplier. With the recent bombing of Syria these BAE shares are producing significant gains for that family and reportedly billions for other shareholders.

We recently had a politician who held the lease of the land proposed for a 'world uranium dump'. How convenient an outcome if the result had been different. — Have We Come to Love Our Chains?

(continued next page)

INDOCTRINATION FOR SLAVERY

Children and young adults at university are constantly fed a diet of social (ist) engineering. The Marxist orientated Safe Schools, Equity (Equality of Outcome regardless of merit or ability), Peace Studies, *Agenda 21* (2030), Environmental Studies, Sustainability, Sustainable Development etc. goes on and on. The Universities are preparing students for a Marxist dictatorship. The west has looked on at the last 100 years of Marxist carnage and offers nothing in response. It is as if we are asleep at the wheel of life, or worse, drugged. We have lost the will to fight as the Romans did with their civilisations collapse. We attempt to delay responsibility by 'harvesting without replenishing' the rich cultural capital that we inherited from past generations. Societal norms, such as family, marriage, children, community, binds us back to our religious foundations. Our Christian religion, whether we think it or not, is based on reality. If we don't look and learn from the past, (as the prodigal son finally did) we will repeat the mistakes of the past (think Romans) and suffer the consequences. We are subject to rules. We cannot avoid the consequences of violating them. — Have We Come to Love Our Chains?

-- extract

GODLESSNESS:

THE FIRST STEPS TO THE GULAG -

Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn

Templeton Prize Lecture, 10 May 1983 (London).

More than half a century ago, while I was still a child, I recall hearing a number of older people offer the following explanation for the great disasters that had befallen Russia: Men have forgotten God; that's why all this has happened.

Since then I have spent well-nigh fifty years working on the history of our Revolution; in the process I have read hundreds of books, collected hundreds of personal testimonies, and have already contributed eight volumes of my own toward the effort of clearing away the rubble left by that upheaval. But if I were asked today to formulate as concisely as possible the main cause of the ruinous Revolution that swallowed up some sixty million of our people, I could not put it more accurately than to repeat: Men have forgotten God; that's why all this has happened.

What is more, the events of the Russian Revolution can only be understood now, at the end of the century, against the background of what has since occurred in the rest of the world. What emerges here is a process of universal significance. And if I were called upon to identify briefly the principal trait of the entire twentieth century, here too, I would be unable to find anything more precise and pithy than to repeat once again: Men have forgotten God.

The failings of human consciousness, deprived of its divine dimension, have been a determining factor in all the major crimes of this century. The first of these was World War I, and much of our present predicament can be traced back to it. It was a war (the memory of which seems to be fading) when Europe, bursting with health and abundance, fell into a rage of self-mutilation which could not but sap its strength for a century or more, and perhaps forever. The only possible explanation for this war is a mental eclipse among the leaders of Europe due to their lost awareness of a Supreme Power above them. Only a godless embitterment could have moved ostensibly Christian states to employ poison gas, a weapon so obviously beyond the limits of humanity. The same kind of defect, the flaw of a consciousness lacking all divine dimension, was manifested after World War II when the West yielded to the satanic temptation of the 'nuclear umbrella'. It was equivalent to saying: Let's cast off worries, let's free the younger generation from their duties and obligations, let's make no effort to defend ourselves, to say nothing of defending others - let's stop our ears to the groans emanating from the East, and let us live instead in the pursuit of happiness. If danger should threaten us, we shall be protected by the nuclear bomb; if not, then let the world burn in Hell for all we care.

The pitifully helpless state to which the contemporary West has sunk is in large measure due to this fatal error: the belief that the defense of peace depends not on stout hearts and steadfast men, but solely on the nuclear bomb... Today's world has reached a stage which, if it had been described to preceding centuries, would have called forth the cry: 'This is the Apocalypse!' Yet we have grown used to this kind of world; we even feel at home in it. Dostoevsky warned that 'great events could come upon us and catch us intellectually unprepared'. This is precisely what has happened. And he predicted that 'the world will be saved only after it has been possessed by the demon of evil'. Whether it really will be saved we shall have to wait and see: this will depend on our conscience, on our spiritual lucidity, on our individual and combined efforts in the face of catastrophic circumstances. But it has already come to pass that the demon of evil, like a whirlwind, triumphantly circles all five continents of the earth...

-- end of extract

AN ASSESSMENT OF WHERE WE ARE

So, we are financially-indebted generationally; brainwashed with education, propaganda and advertising; manipulated and controlled into silence by draconian laws; and finally medicated to the point of a drunken stupor and somehow or other we think this is a normal and acceptable predicament to find ourselves in. We have come to the end of the road, the cliff, the abyss and the Gadarene swine are gathering to jump off into Marxist Slavery — Have We Come to Love Our Chains?

(continued next page)

(continued from previous page)

DEVOLUTION AND RESOLUTION, NOT REVOLUTION

William Wilberforce and the Abolitionists continued to campaign against slavery for 46 years or more. Wilberforce was convinced of the importance of religion, morality and education. We and our religious leaders need to again believe in the healing and saving power of the gospel truths. Ω— Have We Not Forgotten God?

FINANCIAL FREEDOM

One hundred and five years ago Denison Miller, as director of the Commonwealth Bank of Australia, pursued a policy of significant infrastructure projects and expansion of credit to accommodate long-term low-interest loans for housing and industry. He, as governor of the future Reserve Bank of Australia, was able to provide sufficient credits for the processing of Australia's contribution for World War I, debt-free.

Britain, on the other hand, using conventional financial arrangements was still in debt for that war until 2014, 100 years later. We would do well to educate ourselves of Dennison Miller's efforts and repeat them. Our own institution must be established to issue debt-free money and especially new credits to finance our economy and all infrastructure projects so we, the people comprising our nation, are in a position to purchase what we produce — Have We Not Forgotten God?

CULTURE FOR FREEDOM

Not all religions are the same. Christianity alone places the intrinsic value of the individual above all state institutions. Christianity alone stand as the bulwark for freedom of the individual. We must cherish our foundational Christian faith based on "we the people"

HUMBLY RELYING ON THE BLESSING OF ALMIGHTY GOD !

All are required to take up their cross if society is to be regenerated and flourish. This means that those that are in the forefront and doing well must be buffeted and strengthened because they are leading the way. Those that are coming from behind must also be buffeted and strengthened if they are to develop as individuals. Australian youth desperately need mentors. We must all be buffeted to strengthen our nation — Have We Not Forgotten God?

LEADERS FOR FREEDOM

We would do well to insist that all the share investments of every politician, public servant and bureaucrat be made available to see their derived benefits and the projected gains for all industry to 'policy shifts'. We cannot trust politicians, industrialists and religious leaders to be anything other than the weak, pathetic, sinful human beings we all are. They, as individuals, cannot be trusted with absolute power.

Neither can we if we were in their position, and to think differently is delusional.

Political power must be divided and devolved back to the individual. If a lesser form of government can perform the task then the authority to perform the task should reside there — Have We Not Forgotten God?
CHOICES AS FREEDOM

Mass medicating must cease, and, without penalty, all health decisions returned to the individual to administer as they see fit.

Politicians and any other person on the public payroll must be held to account. CIR, Citizens Initiative, Referenda and Recall must be written within our Constitution to hold all in public office to account.

We must rebuild all forms of industry and manufacturing within our own borders to ensure self-reliance and independence — Have We Not Forgotten God?

POLICIES FOR FREEDOM

Immigration, as a form of industrialisation for new homes and infrastructure-expansion needs to be replaced with realistic policies that ensures an homogeneous, stable society.

Rescind all those stifling laws affecting Freedom of Speech, Freedom of Thought, Freedom to Discuss and Robustly Debate in the Arena of Ideas

— Have We Not Forgotten God?

EDUCATION FOR FREEDOM

Subjects taught at our schools and universities should be centered around our rich cultural heritage of Freedom, Magna Carta, Civics, Limited Constitutional Government, Common Law, Trial by Jury, Habeas Corpus, Freedom of Speech, our Flag, our Founding Fathers, all rooted in the Christian philosophy having taken several thousand years to develop to this stage of maturity.

We are fortunate to have inherited these systems as part of our British and Christian history. University studies directed towards Marxist social engineering should be defunded as should the Marxist sympathetic public broadcasters — Have We Not Forgotten God?

HISTORY OF FREEDOM

We need independence and self-reliance which is well within the Australian people's psyche to achieve. We must go back to the fork in the road from which we strayed. We must revisit and regenerate our cultural inheritance so that our youth and those who come after are invigorated and inspired to pursue a worthy goal of societal renewal and regeneration.

Public opinion must be harnessed and energised to rebuild away from the Marxist false-utopia which always produces carnage and slaughter by despots. By doing so, we build-on from our historical culture, righting the wrong of collectivism, and rejecting slavery in all its forms.

— We Have Not Forgotten God ! —

DOUGLAS SOCIAL CREDIT - THE POLICY OF FREEDOM

(1) In the sphere of Government:

- (a) The restoration of the Constitution centered in the Crown, and recognition whence all authority derives and that it involves corresponding responsibility.
- (b) The systematic elimination of laws and bureaucratic controls, which are unnecessarily limiting personal freedoms.
- (c) Drastic and progressive reduction of debt and taxation.
- (d) Freeing of the economy by appropriate adjustments of the monetary system to correct its inherent defects, to be carried out under the administration of an independent monetary authority responsible to parliament.
- (e) More effective control of Parliament by the electorate in all matters of policy.
- (f) Reform of the Senate so that it becomes a more effective check on the House of Representatives, with corresponding second chamber checks on all State Legislatures.

(2) In the sphere of Economics:

- (a) The institution of a Just Price, involving the reduction of retail prices in order to balance the purchasing power of the nation with the prices of goods coming on the market; without loss to individuals, and having the effect of increasing all incomes - to be financed by a system of subsidies.
- (b) The increase and expansion of existing welfare benefits - old age pensions; war service; widow's and disability pensions; children's allowance etc. - as a preliminary step to the systematic introduction of supplementary incomes to earned income, if any, payable to all citizens as a National Dividend accruing to them as co-heirs in the National Cultural Heritage. Such dividends would increase with the increase in automation and production, and conversely would decrease with any decrease in production.
- (c) The foregoing measures to be administered by the national monetary authority referred to in (1) (d) above.

Ref: <https://alor.org/New%20Times/pdf/NT2823.pdf>

SOCIAL CREDIT AS TORYISM By M. Oliver Heydorn, PhD

In my recent article entitled "Jordan Peterson, Classical Liberalism, and Social Credit" I tried to make the case that Social Credit is rightly understood as 'Christian' rather than Liberal. As a follow-up to that piece, I thought it would be opportune to explain in greater detail why and how it is that Social Credit is incompatible with the economic and political philosophy of Liberalism. To be sure, certain forms of Liberalism, such as Libertarianism or Welfare Liberalism, may be even further removed from Social Credit than is Classical Liberalism, but it is my contention that there is something in the nature of Liberalism itself which cannot be squared with the Social Credit ethos.

An alternative way of expressing the difference in kind which exists between Social Credit and the constellation of Liberal positions that were just mentioned would be to describe Social Credit as a species of Toryism. "Social Credit is Tory" is actually tantamount to saying "Social Credit is Christian." In the course of this article I hope that the justification for the equation of those two propositions may be revealed as self-evident.

Let us begin by considering the following statement issued in 1962 by the Canadian Social Credit Secretariat. Its purpose? To clarify the true nature of Social Credit right after 30 (!) 'Social Credit' MP's had been elected to the Canadian Parliament:

"... Social Credit policy is traditional Tory-ism or genuine conservatism expressed in terms applying to industrial capitalism. In a world in which liberal, socialist, and other "left-ist" policies are dominant, Social Credit, as an expression of genuine conservatism appears revolutionary in nature – as indeed it is. A free society rooted in the Christian ethic, which is the goal of traditional conservatism, can be achieved only by bringing to birth a new civilization involving a fundamentally changed viewpoint of human relationships with the nation."

The word 'Tory', in the sense of traditional conservatism, is to be understood here as a consistent political/economic or social philosophy and not in the sense of any particular political party, whether in the United Kingdom, Canada, or elsewhere. Those parties, while they may still employ the moniker, usually bear the most tenuous of ideological connections to Toryism as a historical phenomenon.

The Tory bloc in British political history can be traced back to the Cavaliers during the English Civil War.

In opposition to the Roundheads and to their ideological descendants, the Whigs, the Cavaliers stood for the integrity of a rather robust interpretation of traditional British constitutionalism.

(continued next page)

(continued from previous page)

According to that vision, the Monarch, the nobility, the common law, and the Church had an important role to play in the socio-political life of the nation, a role which ought not to have been undermined in the name of ‘democracy’ or of a liberal interpretation of the ‘free society’. The Tory insistence on the supremacy of the traditional British social order as it had evolved organically through the ages over and against ‘innovations’ such as ‘the supremacy of Parliament’, ‘free market fanaticism’ (which views the free market as an end in itself rather than as a means to an end), or ‘administrative lawlessness’ in the Civil Service bureaucracy, can be encapsulated in the phrase “God, King, and Country”.

Such was the gist of Toryism as a current in British political life. But it is also possible to express the essence of the Tory worldview and its opposition/incompatibility with Liberalism in more purely theoretical terms. Such an analysis simultaneously reveals that the social orientation of the Tory, i.e. his general position on the due relation that should exist between the individual and his associations, is identical to that held by the Social Creditor.

Social Credit claims that every association exists for some definite purpose that can be identified by human reason. Thus, economic association exists for the sake of delivering the goods and services that people need to survive and flourish with the least amount of human labour and resource consumption. Once we have determined an association’s true purpose, the various means that must be adopted to achieve that purpose in an effective, efficient, and fair manner may be referred to as the association’s functional necessities. In the case of economic association, for example, sufficient cost-liquidating purchasing power or income must be made available so that all of the costs of production can be liquidated; only thus can distribution and the demands of solvency be met in the easiest manner possible.

Now, given this schema, Toryism would be the view that in order to deliver the benefits of association to those individuals who make up the association – including the maximization of their legitimate concrete freedoms – it is necessary to insist on the priority of functional necessity. But, at the same time, Toryism maintains that the only restrictions that can be imposed on the individual are those that are necessary for the fulfillment of an association’s true purpose. All restrictions are functional in nature. No association has the right to impose restrictions or to make demands on people which go beyond what is required for the fulfillment of the common good. The individual’s concrete freedom, both in terms of positive and negative rights, is maximized to the greatest possible extent under this set up.

Toryism thus represents a kind of correct balance, or happy medium, between the individual and his associations if it be assumed that the right end of association is to secure the common good of individuals. This can be contrasted, to speak in Aristotelian terms, with the error of excess, on the one hand, and with the error of defect, on the other.

The error of excess is the error of all collectivistic interpretations of association, i.e., communism, socialism, fascism, etc. On the basis, perhaps, that ‘the end justifies the means’, Collectivism falls into the mistake of violating what should be regarded as the individual’s legitimate rights and freedoms by imposing restrictions and/or demands that go beyond functional necessity.

As a direct result, the individual’s time, effort, and other resources end up being harnessed in the service of group policy, so that a social ideal, alien to the true and original purpose of the association, can be imposed on the individual and on the community as a whole. The individual and his interests are thereby illegitimately subordinated to the group, or, more typically, to an oligarchic elite who control the group for their own selfish benefit.

But there is also the error of defect, and that is where Liberalism/Whiggism come into play. Liberalism falls into the opposite error vis-à-vis collectivism. By focusing on the maximization of alleged negative rights as the very purpose of association, the individual becomes emancipated not just from collectivistic domination, but also from some of the functional necessities of association for the common good.

Since this form of ‘liberation’ impairs the capacity of an association to fulfill its true purpose, the real or concrete – as opposed to theoretical – freedom of most individuals living under such a regime actually suffers as a direct result. While they may be freer from public (as opposed to privately originated) demands and restrictions in theory, they also tend to be denied the benefits of association to the extent that they might rightfully expect. These benefits end up being usurped by private vested interests which have been left unregulated by the public power.

Before moving on, I must make mention of the fact that – all propaganda to the contrary – we do not live in Liberal societies, or at least, we do not live in purely Liberal societies. Our modern Western ‘democracies’, so-called, tend to incorporate at one and the same time (but not, obviously, in the exact same way) both liberal and collectivistic policies (the latter usually appear in the form of socialism or cultural Marxism).

(continued next page)

(continued from previous page)

The end result is that things that should be prohibited, for the sake of an association's due functionality, are not, while things that should not be prohibited, things involving the exercise of an individual's legitimate freedoms, are restricted and, to make matters worse, demands are made on individuals that the group has no right to make.

Indeed, I fear that the liberal-collectivistic dynamic is actually a manifestation of the Hegelian dialectical trick: thesis-antithesis-synthesis, with the synthesis shorning both Liberalism and Collectivism of whatever benefits they may hold in theory and, more often than not, simultaneously delivering the worst of both worlds in practice. It is in the resulting synthesis that we live. The individual is thus squeezed in a pincer movement from both the left and the right, all the while his associations fail to deliver satisfactory results.

Besides the intuitively given character of the difference between Toryism on the one hand and Liberalism/Collectivism on the other (and that in itself should actually be sufficient to settle the debate for anyone who has studied Douglas' works and especially his social philosophy), what further evidence do we have that Social Credit can be classified as a form of Toryism?

Well, to begin with, it is noteworthy that Douglas explicitly claimed on more than one occasion that he was a Tory and even did so in order to stress his opposition to Liberalism/Whiggism. Indeed, Douglas' works, especially his later works, contain innumerable critiques of Whigs and Whiggism ... so many, in fact, that they cannot all be referenced here.

Let us consider just the following quotes from Douglas:

"I am a Tory."

"Temperamentally, I am a non-party Tory, not a Liberal, but my chief objection to Liberalism with a capital letter is that while many of its expressed sentiments were admirable, most of its major policies were abominable. Quite in the modern technique, in fact."

"To the extremely small extent that I can be said to have any party politics, I am a Conservative. In my opinion this is a conservative country, although it has been for many years, and is, governed by Whig policies. If I can do even a little to awaken you to a consciousness of what I mean by that, I shall be especially gratified."

Now, if Douglas was a consistent Tory (which is most likely given what we know of his character and intellect), then his self-identification as a Tory is *prima facie* evidence that Social Credit would probably fall more into the Tory as opposed to the Liberal tradition of thought.

And indeed, Douglas also made it explicitly clear that Social Credit itself was anti-Whig or anti-Liberal, and was, therefore, incompatible with and in opposition to the policies which, to a greater or lesser extent, had come to dominate Great Britain for a number of decades if not longer:

"You will gather from what I have just said that so far from coming to you as a propagandist of subversive doctrine (an idea which financiers are most anxious to convey) I am, in my own opinion at least, asking you to consider whether conservative opinion in this country has not yet been betrayed into the support of policies which are traditionally alien to it and to the vast majority of us, and which genuine conservative opinion would repudiate if it were conscious of its true implications.

"A minute or so ago I said that the policy of this country was and is a Whig policy. Now I should like you to place this statement side by side with the accusation which is universal on the Continent, in regard to both British and United States policy, that it is hypocritical. Because the keynote of Whig policy, which is predominantly a policy based upon orthodox finance, is hypocrisy – the justification, on some allegedly moral ground, of policies which are in fact not merely narrowly selfish, but pragmatically disastrous.

"I should like to emphasise at once that Social Credit is not an artificially concocted plan either of my own or of any one else's. That is exactly what its opponents wish to argue about. While I am satisfied that the technical proposals which have been associated with it are reasonably sound (and I must add that the conviction is only strengthened by the complete failure of its opponents, either here or elsewhere, to establish their criticisms), the fundamental idea is simply the antithesis of Whiggism, namely, that the first essential of a stable, peaceful and successful society is to get at the truth and to present – not misrepresent – the truth to everyone concerned. "Credit is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen," and no stable society can endure on false evidence."

Beyond this, Douglas made his support for what can only be described as traditional Tory positions in both politics and economics quite clear. Take, for example, his speech before the Constitutional Research Association delivered in May 1947 and entitled "Realistic Constitutionalism". In the printed version of his remarks Douglas wrote:

"The main point to be observed is that to be successful, Constitutionalism must be organic; it must have a relation to the nature of the Universe. That is my understanding of 'Thy Kingdom come on earth, as it is in Heaven'.

(continued next page)

(continued from previous page)

When England had a genuine Trinitarian Constitution, with three inter-related and inter-acting loci of sovereignty, the King, the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and the Commons, these ideas were instinctive and those were the days of Merrie England. Since the Whig Revolutions of 1644 and 1688, and the foundation of the Bank of England under characteristically false auspices in 1694, the Constitution has been insidiously sapped by the Dark Forces which knew its strength, and the obstacle which it offered to treachery.

We now have only the mere shell of the Constitution, Single Chamber Government dominated by Cartels and Trades Unions, (Mond-Turnerism), based on unitary sovereignty, to which the next step is the secular materialistic totalitarian State, the final embodiment of power without responsibility. ...

“Speaking, not of course as a lawyer, but as a student of history and organisation, it is my opinion that the restoration of the supremacy of Common Law, the removal of encroachments upon it, and the establishment of the principle that legislation by the House of Commons impinging upon it is ultra vires, is an urgent necessity.

The locus of sovereignty over Common Law is not in the electorate, because Common Law did not derive from the electorate and indeed ante-dated any electorate in the modern sense. In the main, it derived from the Mediaeval Church, perhaps not directly, but from the climate of opinion which the Church disseminated. ...

“But whether by the strengthening and elevation of Common Law, and its repository in the care of an effective Second, non-elective, Chamber, or by some other method, clearly defined limits must be placed on the power of a House of Commons elected on a majority principle.”

In his talk, “The Realistic Position of the Church of England”, Douglas even argued for a return to the Medieval position in which the Church had a formal, though not totalizing, role in the government of the nation:

“Before the Church of England can become what it should be, an integral, primary, and effective part of the Constitution, so that the phrase ‘Christianity is part of the Law of England’ may have real meaning, it is faced with the problem of restoring its locus standi.

“It must be insisted that Christianity is either something inherent in the very warp and woof of the Universe, or it is just a set of interesting opinions, largely discredited, and thus doubtfully on a par with many other sets of opinions, and having neither more nor less claim to consideration.

“The Roman Catholic Church has always recognised this, and has never wavered in its claims. It may be (and here I write with diffidence and proper humility) that the most direct path to an effective Church, is at least, close rapprochement, and at the most re-union of all the Churches making claims to Catholicity.”

This is the Tory – and Social Credit - vision for society. Democracy? Yes, but democracy within the right limits. Individual Freedom? Absolutely! But, it must be true liberty and not irresponsible licence. A certain knowledge of truth and a respect for the Canon (i.e., the natural law) must come first as the condition of the possibility of both an effective democracy and of genuine personal freedom ... as we have been told repeatedly:

“The truth will set you free.” *John 8:32* ***

FORUM & BASIC FUND

Readers will have noticed reference in the journals about the move into producing filmed forum discussions on Social Credit. This will be the 2018 outreach to a different audience, especially the younger brigade who dislike attending meetings or reading articles.

The League has employed substantial funds to provide suitable equipment for the filming and editing for eventual availability via youtube. Actionists are taking up the battles.

It is also time to remind readers about donations to ensure the good work continues. The current fund stands at a little over \$ 17 000. Thank you to those who have donated and for those who wish to assist us reach the target of \$60,000 please send yours to our Office at Happy Valley, SA -- *Nat Dir*



THE LEAGUE'S WEBSITE: — alor.org

blog.alor.org thecross-roads.org

Subscription to On Target \$45.00 p.a.

NewTimes Survey \$30.00 p.a.

and **Donations** can be performed by **bank transfer:**

A/c Title Australian League of Rights (SA Branch)

BSB 105-044

A/c No. 188-040-840

or by cheques directed to:

‘Australian League of Rights (SA Branch)’

or on the **Veritasbooks.com.au** website:

<https://veritasbooks.com.au/cat/subscriptions>

“NewTimes Survey” is printed and authorised by K. W. Grundy.

13 Carsten Court, Happy Valley, SA.

Postal Address: PO Box 27, Happy Valley, SA 5159.

Telephone: 08 8387 6574 **email:** heritagebooks@alor.org

Head Office Hours - Mon., Tues., Wed. 09.00am - 3.00pm