

"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. 08

Registered Australia Post - Publication PP343214 / 00016

August 2018

## CONTENTS

All Power Corrupts By Arnis Luks	1
Social Credit and Democracy: The Problem - Part Two By M. Oliver Heydorn	4

### ALL POWER CORRUPTS By Arnis Luks

Recently the question was asked in a discussion group "Is Donald Trump the real deal or are the media playing us". This important question points to the root of a recurring problem of 'how we interpret the events going on in the world' (TRUTH). We recently witnessed the phenomena of (former) prime minister Malcolm Turnbull struggling for political relevance. The challenging forces are being asked by conservatives, including writer Andrew Bolt whether candidate Peter Dutton is a continuation of the same policy or a realistic leader for a viable conservative alternative?

*"The so-called 'Praetorian Guard' of the 'right' in the federal Liberal Party, Peter Dutton and Mathias Cormann, have aided and abetted the Liberals' embrace of higher taxes and higher government spending. And on issues that are supposedly important to 'conservatives' like freedom of speech, Dutton or Cormann have said nothing".*

Andrew Bolt, even though Dutton was unsuccessful, has only partly stated the case. The dialectics used within the conservative party steers us away from the true nature of the real problem. Without proper consultation nor accountability, our Prime Minister directed \$444 million to the Barrier Reef climate change action group which is the planned springboard to present a compelling case for world government. When this story leaked the party machine went into immediate damage control. I believe it has achieved its purpose of diverting public and media attention away from the real issue of 'ensuring accountable government and holding those individuals within the public service accountable'.

#### **Hello Rupert, bye-bye Malcolm - Friday, 24 August 2018 by Bruce Guthrie**

<https://thenewdaily.com.au/news/national/2018/08/23/hello-rupert-bye-bye-malcolm/>

*Anyone who doubts Rupert Murdoch's role in the political chaos that has played out in recent days has never worked for him at a senior level. Murdoch's annual visits to Australia invariably trigger seismic events both in and outside News Corp, the company he's presided over for decades. So is it any surprise that Malcolm Turnbull is facing his political demise less than a fortnight after Murdoch arrived here? Of course it isn't. Murdoch flew in on August 10 and set about doing what he always does: he attended the annual News Awards, which fete the company's best and brightest journalists, conducted one-on-ones with his editors and then signed off on the inevitable promotions, demotions and executions of the company's most senior staff. (I once endured all three on one of his visits – surviving a relatively benign one-on-one with Murdoch, accepting a News Award and then getting sacked, all in a matter of days.)*

*For good measure Murdoch also attended the 75th birthday of the Institute of Public Affairs on Monday night and was interviewed on stage with former Liberal PM, John Howard, by one of the media tycoon's preferred columnists, Janet Albrechtsen.*

*Throughout all this he would have been forming a view that Turnbull's time was up – in fact, he probably arrived with that view – and then imparted that message to his editors.*

*He wouldn't have had to tell his columnists or his TV commentators because they arrived at that view months ago and have been preaching it ad nauseum. Foremost here have been **Andrew Bolt, Miranda Devine and Peta Credlin.***

*They have been aided by an army of Sydney shock jocks, notably **Alan Jones, Ray Hadley and Paul Murray.** In the end it took just 11 days after Murdoch's arrival to bring about a party room spill. It played out less than 24 hours after that IPA appearance...*

**Bruce Guthrie is co-founder of The New Daily and a former editor-in-chief of News Corp's Melbourne newspaper, the Herald Sun.**

(continued next page)

(continued from previous page)

This same *modus operandi* was used by Rupert Murdoch to replace British PM David Cameron with Theresa May after the disastrous BREXIT result for world government. The attention of the community was diverted while she was selected and placed into No 10 Downing St. The Conservative party in Britain did nothing and skulkingly accepted the situation without adherence to their own party constitution.

***Bear in mind that Rupert Murdoch and George Soros are 'back room power men' for the money power and political parties are very much aware of this.***

**The case correctly stated:**

Firstly, in Australia the party machine has usurped the power of Parliament and as such the party leadership is subject to many outside influences. The party room decides most major policy decisions, so in effect the central leadership of the 'majority party' (with guidance) is acting as the ultimate authority of our land without scrutiny of the Parliament nor the electorate.

***Comment Wallace Klinck:***

*Party politics is a power game. The quest for power is without scruples or ethics and almost immediately will corrupt anything and everything that it touches. I have experienced the process directly:*

*"Well of course you are right, but we want to win the election and do not want to confuse the people with 'complexities'.*

*We will expose these matters after we get elected."*  
*There you have it. The next election is soon coming, but "after" is forever coming. Party politics, per se, is congenitally corrupt. Being the art of "compromise" for immoral ends, it spirals inevitably to degeneracy. "Policy is imposed upon the political arena from above by the Financial Powers, with which the mainstream media is concentric, compliant and subservient. Every effort is made to keep the attention of the electorate diverted to frivolities and irrelevancies. Key personages are placed in virtually all political parties and policy-making bodies to ensure that this policy is both implemented and enforced.*

***End Comment***

Senators Fraser Anning, Cory Bernardi, Pauline Hanson and Bob Katter MP could do all they can to insist on a change to policy. It is within their grasp of restoring the function of Parliament by refusing to allow any 'new law' to pass that has not been adequately debated. We are unable using the existing political processes to achieve effective representation. The party machine in its current form has us beaten. Where are we to begin on the road away from totalitarianism?

**The nature of things - human nature - natural law**

Lord Acton, KCVO DL (10 January 1834 – 19 June 1902) is perhaps best known for the remark:

**"Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely. Great men are almost always bad men..."**, which Lord Acton made in a letter to an Anglican bishop, directed at the centralising of power that the organised church gives to the infallibility of the holy father and magisterium.

*(This Week, 7 November 1992) More than 350 years after the Roman Catholic Church condemned Galileo, Pope John Paul II is poised to rectify one of the Church's most infamous wrongs -- the persecution of the Italian astronomer and physicist for proving the Earth moves around the Sun. Nicolaus Copernicus was the Polish astronomer who put forth the theory that the Sun is at rest near the center of the Universe, and that the Earth, spinning on its axis once daily, revolves annually around the Sun. The Pope said Copernicus 'showed the courage of the scientist in proposing better explanations', although he could not prove his theory, and published it as a hypothesis. Galileo, the subject of papal reconciliation last year, fell foul of the Church by proposing heliocentrism 'as certainty', noted the Pope. With a formal statement at the Pontifical Academy of Sciences on Saturday, Vatican officials said the Pope will formally close a 13-year investigation into the Church's condemnation of Galileo in 1633. The condemnation, which forced the astronomer and physicist to recant his discoveries, led to Galileo's house arrest for eight years before his death in 1642 at the age of 77. 'The claimed incompatibility between science and faith belongs to the past,' declared the Pope.*

**Power must be de-centralised**

The lessons of history show that the battle against centralised power continues everywhere to this day. The organised church is not exempt from this TRUTH of Natural Law, as is the ordinary council worker milking the system by unjustifiable use of the 'council car' to our prime minister allocating \$444 million to climate change activists leading to world government. Is there such a thing as a human being who can be trusted with too much power? I think not. We need to take into account 'what is' and also 'what works', not 'what ought to be'.

**The Search for Truth**

**Genesis 1:1** In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.

**John 1:1** In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made.

I come to three conclusions from the opening stanzas of both the old and new Testaments:

**God Exists  
God is a Trinity  
God Creates**

(continued next page)

(continued from previous page)

(Latin: *imago dei*) **We are created in His image.**

We must think predominantly in Trinitarian Terms if we are to be sufficiently creative to solve this problem of centralisation of power: a paradox - 'both and'.

Lord Acton presented the Natural Law as is readily observable for those who make the effort to look.

We in Australia have a limited constitutional monarchy that "WE have agreed to unite in":

***An Act to constitute the Commonwealth of Australia [9th July 1900]***

*"WHEREAS the people of New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia, Queensland, and Tasmania, humbly relying on the blessing of Almighty God, have agreed to unite in one indissoluble Federal Commonwealth under the Crown of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and under the Constitution hereby established:*

*And whereas it is expedient to provide for the admission into the Commonwealth of other Australasian Colonies and possessions of the Queen: Be it therefore enacted by the Queen's most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, as follows..."*

Our constitution, being a Christian document **that belongs to each and every one of us**, is based within the Trinitarian division of power. No house of Parliament has absolute power. In fact the power of the federal government is limited to the powers set within the constitution. Dialectics, as opposed to Trinitarianism, causes within the conflict 'the strongest to win'.

Handing more power over to a strongman whether left or right does not lead us away from the precipice of totalitarianism. It leads us to a dictatorship. We must think more deeply and plan a strategy based on 'what works'. **Our Constitution needs a hand by its citizenry or we will lose it for generations to come.**

Democracy does not mean having a vote. Democracy really means **"Power of the people over the people given power"**, but it only works if we do our vital part.

A slave empire monitors its population. The Chinese social (dis-)credit system monitors every member of their 1400 million people society and assesses them on a minute by minute basis. The monitoring is directed from the bureaucracy (public service) towards the individual. They have got their system upside down to 'what works to maintain freedoms'.

A Christian country monitors its public servants who have been 'handed power by the electorate'. Our own government, thanks to the 'No ID Card Paul Keating', and the more recent 'Online Health Record' and a plethora of cameras, smart listening devices and internet surveillance methods, have no trouble monitoring us on a minute by minute basis.

*New Times Survey*

**The Responsible Vote,  
The Responsible Voter,  
The Responsible Public Servant**

We need to develop our thinking further than just promoting CIR (citizens initiative, referenda and recall) and direct our energies towards monitoring all public servants who have been given **any power whatsoever**, and hold them each (as individuals) accountable, based on the Natural Law that 'all power corrupts'. They, as individuals, must be free to do their job, however, their policies will show soon enough whether they are acting in accordance with the wishes of the electorate and if not, as individuals, held to account, exactly as they are doing to us, but in reverse.

Likewise, we as individuals must adhere to the same standard and be held accountable for the choices we currently make with our secret ballot that have an effect on other people. **Correctly stated:** Sanctions must rest with the electorate in order to control all MPs and public servants. **But also correctly stated:** The outworking of the decisions we make in the polling booth needs to be available for scrutiny to the same standard that we insist of all our MPs and public servants.

Truth reveals that **Freedom** can only ever be **Moral** when we each act **Responsibly**. This in no way limits personal initiative or creativity. But it does hold each individual morally responsible for the decisions made.

**For Your Consideration**

I recently attended a polling booth and the electoral official informed me that in their future plans, the facilities 'may' be provided to vote from home using an internet connection. So if my vote in the future can be recorded from home, then I should also be able to login securely to the Australian Electoral Commission Database and withdraw my vote from any candidate if at any time this becomes necessary.

This new narrative would hold the politician constantly in the control of the electorate where they should be. No one can say 'this is all too hard' because it is currently being done and used against us. The system is already in place, it just needs to be bridled and redirected. All levels of 'personal decisions affecting other people' need to be transparent. But this only works if there is effective self-government. We cannot avoid personal responsibility. It starts and finishes with the individual. (free, moral and responsible) The highest form of discipline is Self Discipline - self government. It is as unavoidable as any other Natural Law.

**We must become our own medicine man**

Christianity is a religion of hope. By recognising and acknowledging Natural Law and the supreme being we call our Trinitarian God, we are authorised and empowered to bring about His Kingdom on earth as it is in heaven. This acting out in accordance with our faith has produced the bulwark of our freedoms, from

(continued next page)



(continued from previous page) Christians who were fed to the lions insisting on their Freedom of Thought and Religion, further: the Common Law, Trial by Jury, Innocent until proven guilty, Beyond Reasonable Doubt, Habeas Corpus, Magna Carta.

Australia as a nation has inherited this thinking and the precedents into our legal structure and the outworking of government.

The road back as Senator Fraser Anning alluded to is actually to turn forward to restore our freedoms, by devolution not revolution. Sen. Anning would do well, along with other independent thinking representatives to insist immediately on the restoration of Parliament and the dissolution and outlawing of the party system.

Without proper consultation and due process, our former Prime Minister directed \$444 million to a climate change action group which is the springboard to present a compelling case of propaganda for world government. He may have committed treason against the people of Australia by directly aiding and abetting a foreign power against our Constitution and our Nation.

**From Andrew Bolt, Herald Sun October 31, 2016**

*Miranda Devine reports:*

*The Australian taxpayer shovelled at least \$88 million into the Clinton Foundation and associated entities from 2006 to 2014, reaching a peak of \$10.3 million in 2012-13, Gillard's last year in office.*

*On the Clinton Foundation website, AusAID and the Commonwealth of Australia score separate entries in the \$10 million-plus group of donors, one rung up from American teacher unions. In 2009-10 Kevin Rudd handed over another \$10 million to the foundation for climate research, part of \$300 million he squandered on a Global Carbon Capture and Storage Institute. Gillard also donated \$300 million of our money to the Clinton-affiliated Global Partnership for Education. Lo and behold, she*

## **SOCIAL CREDIT AND DEMOCRACY:**

### **THE PROBLEM - PART TWO By M. Oliver Heydorn**

In this second article, I will continue to examine some of the structural problems with conventional democratic political systems that Douglas had identified in the course of his writings, especially in the writings of his latter years. Beyond the particular defects in the voting system which were discussed in the previous month's article, there are also problems with the party system and with how the voting and party systems interact with each other. Since there is quite a bit of information to cover, I beg the reader's indulgence if the following is reminiscent of a lawyer's *seriatim* brief.

#### **A/ PROBLEMS WITH THE PARTY SYSTEM**

One of Douglas' main objections where conventional democracy is concerned is that it has incorporated the 'alternate party' system as a chief component of its operating mechanisms and procedures. Douglas was

*became chairman in 2014 and has been actively promoting Clinton as president ever since — in a campaign video last December slamming Trump, in opeds trumpeting the next woman president and in appearances with Clinton spruiking girls' education. The Abbott government topped up the left-wing organisation's coffers with another \$140 million in 2014, bringing total Australian largesse to \$460 million, according to a press release from Foreign Minister Julie Bishop.*

What are we to make of the current Conservative party fiasco? Firstly **policy will not change**. Rearranging the deck chairs with another prime minister is simply a diversionary tactic, away from the \$444 million directed to the United Nations climate change policy towards world government.

***The donation fiasco under Julia Gillard, after her being deposed by Kevin Rudd to hold an election and then Rudd subsequently replaced by Tony Abbott as Prime Minister did not change the policy one iota with Abbott donating a further \$140 million to the Clinton foundation.***

Is Donald Trump the real deal or are the media playing us? **Is it just theatre?**

Mike Adams (NaturalNews.com) recently stated: **no one is coming to save us, we must save ourselves.**

The Policy direction must change for us to avoid totalitarianism.

#### **Absolute Power Corrupts Absolutely**

Lord Acton could have also added:

**"including those over whom power is exercised".**

Have I, as an English (ANGEL) Speaking Person, lost so much of my **Christian Faith-Heritage-Capital** that I now love my chains? Or can I take up my **Cross of this Age** to bring about God's Kingdom on Earth as it is in Heaven - **Unto God the things that belong to God?**

\*\*\*

convinced that the inner logic of the political party and the party system could only succeed in vitiating any real democracy:

“The idea of party government is comparatively modern, probably not ante-dating the Wars of the Roses, and contains in itself a subtle perversion of the democratic idea.”<sup>1</sup>

To begin with, let us observe that the whole *raison d'être* for a political party of any stripe or persuasion is to attempt to gain sufficient political power for itself so that it can form the government. As a result, competition and alliances for power amongst the various political parties end up replacing honest co-operation for the sake of advancing the authentic common good. The underlying and patently false assumption seems to be that in some mysterious way the best interests of the country will be served by

(continued next page)

(continued from previous page) alternating the reigns of power from one self-serving party, which ostensibly represents certain political and economic positions on the conventional spectrum, to another, which ostensibly represents an alternative:

“Once the idea is grasped, the criminal absurdity of the party system becomes evident. The people of this country are shareholders in it first, and employees of it only secondarily, if they are employees. Can anyone conceive of a body of shareholders consenting to the party system in their business? And this idea is just as applicable to undertakings carried on by the state as in the case of so-called private business. As shareholders we have an absolute right, and a right which by proper organisation we can enforce, to say what we desire and to see that our wishes as to policy are carried out, if those wishes are reasonable, that is to say, if they are practicable.”<sup>22</sup>

To make matters worse, the Members of Parliament, who are supposed to be the representatives of the individuals in their constituency, have a very strong tendency, under the party system, to become slaves of their party and its leadership. Achieving, maintaining, and consolidating power for the party require that the members of the party follow the instructions of the party, even when such obedience is at odds with the wishes of the electorate or the prescriptions of natural law.<sup>3</sup>

Individual politicians are thus subordinated to the interests of the group such that they must often sacrifice their own intentions and beliefs, in a word, their integrity, in exchange for being considered a member ‘in good standing’ of the party and having any prospect whatsoever of garnering any influence with respect to the party’s programme or its implementation. How many times has a Member of Parliament been disciplined or threatened with discipline by the party whip because he wished to vote in line with the desires of those who elected him instead of in favour of the conflicting goals of his party? A system which subordinates individual policy to a partisan group policy cannot serve as an effective vehicle for the imposition of the *common* political policy of *individuals*. Should it come as any surprise that the various parties are more concerned with changing the *administration* in their own favour than with altering the *policy* of the existing order in favour of the common individual? More often than not, the party game is a competition for the right to exercise an anti-social power in the service of vested interests:

“Parties which would appear superficially to be separated by aims utterly divergent, such as, let us say, the German military party, and the Fabian section of the British Labour Party, are found on close of analysis to have identical objectives – the domination of a system over all effective individual dissent.”<sup>24</sup>

Political parties also weaken the strength of the voting public as a political force by destroying any possibility of unity amongst them. From the outset, the possibility that individuals could ever unite on a set of common policies is excluded *a priori*. By means of the party system, the population is divided into various antagonistic groups and conditioned to identify themselves with a particular party and to submit to its leader. There is, in consequence, a great deal of similarity between the political party phenomenon and the behaviour of individuals in regards to their favourite sports teams. The difference is that sports is, or at least should be, merely for entertainment; politics, on the other hand, is a deadly serious business:

“There has been a cant-phrase in politics in this country since the days of Mr. Asquith that the will of the people must prevail. Mr. Asquith was probably one of the greatest experts in modern history at arranging that the will of the people did not prevail. And the method which was followed though not initiated by him – a method which still appears to be successful – is to divide up the population into warring sects, each of which imagines it has a complete set of blue-prints for the construction of an immediate Utopia. Since practically all these Utopias are schemes for penalising somebody else, you have only to adopt each in turn and eventually you will have reduced everyone to a dead level of slavery, which is what is happening.”<sup>25</sup>

In sum, the very inner logic of the party system is at odds, i.e., militates against, the establishment of an effective democracy. It tends to artificially centralize rather than to distribute political power, and, in doing so, it lessens the power which individual citizens can exercise over their governments. It cannot be considered an appropriate mechanism for forwarding the true purpose of political association and so it must also be rejected alongside the standard voting system.

## **B/ PROBLEMS WITH THE INTERACTIONS BETWEEN THE VOTING SYSTEM AND THE PARTY SYSTEM**

The other dimension of the standard set of ‘democratic’ mechanisms which must be scrutinized has to do with the conventions which govern the various interactions that occur between the individual citizens (*via* the voting system) with the people who compose the various political parties and governmental bodies. Here too, we see that the nature of these interactions prevents the individual citizen from exercising any genuine or effective control over his government.

For example, it is often assumed that it is correct for the public, as well as for their elected representatives, to be preoccupied with purely technical methods, i.e., *how* a government should do something. This tends to take the focus of the electorate and

(continued next page)

(continued from previous page)

of their representatives off of *what* the government should be doing. **As a result, political discussion and debate often centre on questions of administration as opposed to questions of fundamental policy.** The different parties are then given the task of proposing different technical methods by means of which policy can be realized:

“In this country the two main obstacles to a genuine democracy are the party system, with its offshoot, the Front Bench oligarchy, and, secondly, a mistaken idea on the part of the Member of Parliament that he is supposed to understand the methods by which results desired by the general public should be attained, and to pass laws which specify the actions of executive bodies and interfere with technical undertakings.

None of these is correct.”<sup>6</sup> This assumption of technical competence thwarts the genuine will of the people in a variety of ways. For starters, the majority of the electorate and indeed the majority of the party members themselves are in no position whatsoever to offer a professional judgement as to the efficacy and overall appropriateness of various technical methods. The general lack of sufficient intellectual capacity and/or technical knowledge on the part of the bulk of the population is a reality which any real democracy must meet head on; i.e., we must stop pretending that the submission of technical questions to the electorate is a suitable means for ensuring that the people will get what they really want and have a right to expect from government:

“It is not democracy of any conceivable kind to hold an election upon any subject requiring technical information and education.”<sup>7</sup>

Unfortunately, it is quite common for political parties to present all sorts of positions on purely technical methods in their programmes that are above the heads of most of the citizens and indeed above the heads of most of the party’s own membership:

“Nothing could be more fantastic, for instance, than to hold an election on, say, whether aeroplanes or airships would be better for the purpose of defence, or for any other purpose. Yet the information which is required to give an intelligent opinion on the use of tariffs or monetary policy is at least as high an order, and is, in fact, in the possession of far fewer people, than the thorough knowledge of aerodynamics necessary for an election on aeroplanes versus airships.”<sup>8</sup>

A variation on this misdirection of the public’s attention is to consider that part of the task of ‘democracy’ is to ask the public to decide on which people, i.e., which political party and which personalities, would form the best *administrative team* for implementing the technical methods (which neither they nor their supposed

representatives understand). Naturally, this sort of selection is also beyond the competency of the majority.

The second major problem with the technical focus is that by diverting the people’s attention from basic questions of policy (over which they should have control and are far more likely to agree) the division of the population into warring camps by means of the party system is only intensified. A tremendous amount of political energy and indeed of the political *social credit* is exhausted in considering and wrangling over a plethora of technical methods that the bulk of the population is not even competent to evaluate. This is one of the basic ways in which political activity can and has been misdirected. The people are bound, as a result, to be even more confused and frustrated, divided and conquered:

“What is *certain*, however, is that the mechanism of democracy can *never* be applied with success to *methods* of realising a policy. An understanding of this has enabled our lords and masters to split the so-called democracy of this country on every occasion on which it was desirable to the maintenance of their power.

“To submit to a democracy a highly technical question such as Free Trade or Tariff reform, with its endless implications, is as absurd as to submit to a democracy the relative advantages of driving a battleship by steam turbines or diesel engines. Any decision obtained upon such a subject by means of a popular vote can be demonstrated mathematically to be wrong. The more complex a subject is the more certain it is that an understanding of it will be confined to a few people who will, of course, always be outvoted by the majority who do not understand it.”<sup>9</sup>

A third major problem with consulting the public on technical methods is that very often the range of choices with which the electorate is presented is actually, in reality, merely a choice between different technical methods of implementing *the same policy*. It is possible to allow talk of purely technical methods to so dominate the political discourse that questions of policy are completely ignored thus making it easier for a particular policy or set of policies to be subtly imposed: “... the aim of the political wire-pullers is to submit to the decision of the electorate, *only alternative methods of embodying the same policy*.”<sup>10</sup> This is most easily accomplished by getting the different political parties to represent different possible technical methods to the public as their only distinguishing calling cards.

Alternatively, if the attention of the electorate is focused not so much on the methods themselves, but on deciding which party has the best administrative team, it is still often the case that changing the administration will not translate into a policy-change. (continued next page)



(continued from previous page)

The electorate is merely being given a choice as to which team it would prefer to administer the same overarching policy. Now, if the general electorate is not even in basic agreement with the policies that are being pursued, it should be clear that the choice it is being given as to methods and/or administrative teams can be of no democratic value whatsoever:

“It is not democracy of any conceivable kind to hold an election at regular or irregular intervals for the purpose of deciding by ballot whether you will be shot or boiled in oil.”<sup>11</sup>

The focus on technical methods in lieu of fundamental policy has a fourth consequence: it is also partially responsible for the tendency in the standard democratic system for politicians to both regard themselves and to be regarded as ‘public affairs experts’ who were elected to manage our affairs on our behalf. This elevates them to the status of temporary despots who are supposed to look after us and do to us and for us what they think is best for us:

“The present Administration of this country is of course purely mon-archic and monotheistic, and as a natural consequence, ‘Common’ or ‘Natural’ Law has lost both its meaning and its sanctions, since the House of Commons, with its Cabinet which is the unitary locus of Sovereignty, has become a rubber stamp for administrative works orders, masquerading under the name of Laws – a function for which it was never designed and for which it is grotesquely unfitted.”<sup>12</sup>

The contrast existing between rotating dictatorship and the authentically democratic spirit should be clear. ‘Elected’ rulers are still regarded as rulers, rather than as mere administrative servants of the citizenry. What good is it to have some power to change the membership of the ostensible government if one does not have much power to alter the policy of that government?

Closely connected with the idea that politicians are delegates rather than mere representatives is the belief that it is proper to hold elected officials personally responsible for the attainment or non-attainment of desired results. However, since the elected officials are not the first-rate experts in the civil service who design the methods by means of which any policy-objective can be realized, it is not reasonable to hold them responsible for the use of improper methods:

*“That democracy consists in empowering a set of pseudo-experts, elected by majorities of non-experts at stated intervals, to pass highly technical laws which are ultimately enforceable by all the tremendous powers of the state ... is, and must be, an illusory conception ... if it were the only conception possible, the doom of democracy would be automatic and inevitable.”*<sup>13</sup>

The focus placed on the elected officials as those who are ultimately responsible (when it is actually deemed that someone can or ought to be held responsible for something) does serve to hide, however, the incredible power which the Civil Service wields under standard democratic conventions. Douglas’ observations on this subject remain, *mutatis mutandis*, valid for our present times:

“Although the general public has partially awakened, during the past few years, to the immense power exercised by the permanent and superior Government Services, it is probable that few persons who have not intimate experience of the workings of a great Government Department, understand how completely the Permanent Heads of those Departments are immune from public control. They are, in the first place, appointed under a system which ensures that they shall possess a habit of mind suitable for incorporation in the formal machine of government (and in passing it may be noted, that for success in this initial stage, a purely Classical education is almost essential). Once appointed, their promotion and success is subject to secret influences whose ramifications may be said to extend to the ends of the world. The ostensible, or ‘Political’ head of a great Government Department, is a mere tool in the hands of the superior Permanent Officials (and this is pre-eminently so in the case of a Treasury). It is not a difficult matter for the Permanent Officials of a Government Department to obtain the removal of the Political Head of it, but it is a matter of practical impossibility for the Political Head to obtain the removal of one of his own Permanent Officials.”<sup>14</sup>

In practice, it is often the case that the civil service bureaucrats are actually in a position, on account of their superior technical knowledge, to govern without any parliamentary oversight or even awareness. In other words, the representatives, i.e., the second-class experts, can become powerless in relation to the first-class experts, i.e., the permanent officials. The responsibility for any failure can then be laid at the doorstep of the elected representatives, or, what is worse still, at the doorstep of the government or, even worse yet, at the doorstep of the electorate for having made technical mistakes when it came to deciding what and for whom they should vote. Knowledge is power and the power which their expertise confers on them can enable the governmental bureaucracy, under the present system, to exercise that power without responsibility. This whole phenomenon was dubbed ‘administrative lawlessness’ by Lord Hewart:

“The system to which he [Lord Hewart - OH] refers does not merely place the anonymous bureaucrat above the law. It places the law, and the sanctions of the law, at the unchecked

(continued next page)

(continued from previous page) disposal of the bureaucrat.

“It should be realised that the situation of an anonymous lawmaker has become at least temporarily impregnable, and is a violation – admittedly only open rather than covert – of the principles of Parliamentary government without those principles having been renounced. That is to say, while the Act proceeds from the bureaucrat, or his shadowy inspiration, the responsibility, and the odium, rest still upon the Member of Parliament who is constitutionally, but not actually, able to check him. The stealthy separation of power from responsibility, which is so marked a feature of secret societies, is now incorporated into Government activities. For some time, much too long a time, no Bill has been presented to the House of Commons which has not been drawn up by the Treasury, whoever ostensibly sponsored it. But someone did sponsor it, and a façade of responsibility has been maintained until recently. This has now gone. ‘The State’ makes laws *tout court*. ‘The State,’ in fact, is quite probably some little naturalised alien full of bright ideas from the ghettos of Mid-Europe, looking for preferment to any quarter rather than that affected by law-making.”<sup>15</sup>

Finally, there is this common problematical feature of our ballot-box ‘democracies’: the party platforms unveiled at election time mean that even with regard to the policy-objectives that might be included (as opposed to purely technical proposals), individuals cannot choose one thing at a time. If one votes for the party, the entirety of the party’s programme is being at least formally supported and this apparent endorsement is often interpreted by the party leadership as a *carte blanche* approval or mandate. Insofar as one does not, in fact, accept some aspect or aspects of the party’s platform, one is actually being compelled to go along with the whole package if one chooses to vote for that party. This is incompatible with true freedom since, as Douglas never tired of repeating: one must be able to choose or reject one thing at a time if the integrity of one’s choices is to be maintained:

“Liberty is really a simple thing, although difficult to come by. It consists in freedom to choose or refuse one thing at a time.”<sup>16</sup>

### CONCLUSION:

From the point of view of establishing an effective democracy, the foregoing analysis has demonstrated that the standard democratic mechanisms are completely ineffective. Consequently, it should come as no surprise that Douglas held that the Great Britain of his time – and the same sort of judgement is equally applicable to all other conventional democratic systems with which we are familiar – was not an effective democracy:

“... whatever else it may be, Great Britain is not, and never has been, an effective democracy, and was never less so than at present.”<sup>17</sup> \*\*\*

### References:

- 1 C.H. Douglas, *The Nature of Democracy* (Vancouver: The Institute of Economic Democracy, 1934), 5.
- 2 C.H. Douglas, *The Tragedy of Human Effort* (Vancouver: The Institute of Economic Democracy, 1978), 8.
- 3 There have been numerous cases, for example, of candidates who were selected by local party organizations being rejected and replaced by the centralized party authorities because the latter judged the former to be unsuitable as a means to the end of gaining political power for the party. The message to the prospective candidates is clear: fall into line if you wish to have a chance of sitting in the legislature.
- 4 Cf. C.H. Douglas, *Credit Power and Democracy* (Melbourne: The Social Credit Press, 1933), 145:
- 5 Cf. C.H. Douglas, *Security Institutional and Personal* (Liverpool: K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 1945), 6-7.
- 6 Cf. C.H. Douglas, *Security Institutional and Personal* (Liverpool: K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 1945), 11.
- 7 C.H. Douglas, *The Tragedy of Human Effort* (Vancouver: The Institute of Economic Democracy, 1978), 9.
- 8 C.H. Douglas, *The Tragedy of Human Effort* (Vancouver: The Institute of Economic Democracy, 1978), 6.
- 9 C.H. Douglas, *Security Institutional and Personal* (Liverpool: K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 1945), 12.
- 10 C.H. Douglas, *Social Credit*, rev. ed. (New York: Gordon Press, 1973), 126.
- 11 C.H. Douglas, *The Tragedy of Human Effort* (Vancouver: The Institute of Economic Democracy, 1978), 6.
- 12 C.H. Douglas, *Realistic Constitutionalism* (London: K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 1947), 7-8.
- 13 C.H. Douglas, *The Alberta Experiment* (Western Australia: Veritas Publishing Company PTY. LTD., 1984), 48-49.
- 14 C.H. Douglas, *Social Credit*, rev. ed. (New York: Gordon Press, 1973), 126-127.
- 15 C.H. Douglas, *The Brief for the Prosecution* (Liverpool: K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 1945), 73.
- 16 Cf. C.H. Douglas, *Social Credit*, rev. ed. (New York: Gordon Press, 1973), 38. Cf. C.H. Douglas, *The Development of World Dominion* (Sydney: Tidal Publications, 1969), 124: “The whole object of civilisation is that a man shall be able to choose or refuse one thing at a time. Until he can do that, he is a determinist, and ought not to resign himself to the idea that [for example – OH] he cannot have atomic energy to free him from ‘full-employment’ without having atomic bombs to render his further employment unnecessary.”
- 17 C.H. Douglas, *Realistic Constitutionalism* (London: K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 1947), 9.



**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