WHERE THERE IS NO VISION THE PEOPLE PERISH
By Arnis Luks - Proverbs 29:18

A SHORT TERM CAMPAIGN

John 15:13 (KJV) Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.

The world watched in hopeful anticipation as the skilled cave divers, seconded from around the world, came to the rescue of the trapped soccer team and their coach from within the Thailand cave. The rescuers demonstrated bravery and charity, risking their own lives repeatedly to recover the soccer team and their coach.

The lead cave divers who rescued the Thai football team from a flooded cave are now back home in Britain. Richard Stanton 57, John Volanthen 47, and Jason Mallinson 50, landed at Heathrow airport, deflecting the 'hero label'. "Its not like that. If you could do the same for someone else's child you would" said John Volanthen, an IT consultant from Bristol. "The result is the important thing. The kids came out, the coach is good, the [Thai navy] Seals are good. Job done" he said.

Dr Richard Harris, a 53-year-old South Australian anaesthetist and experienced cave diver, swam into the cave on June 23 and remained alongside with the Thai medical team to triage the 12 members of the Wild Boars soccer team and their coach until their safe extraction.

During the extended execution of the rescue, Petty Officer First Class Saman Kunan, a former member of Thailand’s elite Navy SEAL unit, after entering the cave network to lay oxygen tanks along a potential exit route, completed his task but on the way back lost consciousness. His diving partner performed CPR but was unable to revive him.

UNSUNG HEROES

As demonstrated in practical outcomes, a group of committed individuals (some with outstanding skills) working under the direction of the designated leaders, can achieve significant goals. The faithful dealings (social credit) demonstrated was a combination of practical (physical) and metaphysical (spiritual) out working. Without necessarily knowing the individual children, nor their coach, a team of over 1000 people worked tirelessly for 18 days to achieve this goal. What brought them together was hope, a metaphysical belief that they could be part of a successful rescue effort.

As we looked on, (especially towards the cave divers, a group of perhaps 20 men) we considered them as heroes. But this is not necessarily the whole picture. There were about 1000 people involved in the rescue effort. The cave divers were supported logistically by people preparing meals, drivers of emergency vehicles, machine operators, police, labour to facilitate moving equipment in and out of the caves, coordinators, and administrators, and even toilet and accommodation cleaners. Every single one of them working towards the goal of saving the lives of the soccer team and their coach.

The similarity between a war campaign, natural disaster and this situation was enhanced by also being cross cultural, cross national, and cross religions in full view and reported realtime by the main stream media. This really was a demonstration of the brotherhood of man (kind). Prayers from all corners and faiths was a vital part of this success, calling to a higher power for assistance.

In our heart of hearts, we all wish during times such as this, that we had been there to participate and play our vital part. The fact is, it was the other 980 people working together for the same common objective, who are now the 'unsung' heroes. They performed routine tasks reliably enough to support the 20 lead cave divers. Not everyone can be the lead diver in a cave rescue. Someone needs to make lunches, provide labour to shift equipment and clean the ablution blocks and dormitories in order for everything to continue to work.

'He who would be greatest must be the servant of all'. (continued next page)
A LONG TERM CAMPAIGN

The Charter of Liberties 1100 AD (as forerunner of Magna Carta 1215 AD), also called the Coronation Charter, was a written proclamation of 14 declarations by King of England Henry I, seeking to bind himself to certain laws regarding the treatment of nobles, church officials, and individuals. The document addressed abuses of royal power by his predecessor William II (his brother William Rufus), as perceived by the nobility, specifically the over-taxation of the barons, the abuse of vacant 'sees', and the practices of 'simony' and 'pluralism'. The purpose of this charter was to limit the power of the King and any officer of the King. From this limiting document, what is left that is not written into the common law, is to be taken for granted as to the freeman's 'freedoms and rights'.

Magna Carta 1215 was reluctantly agreed to by King John placing his seal upon it. Magna Carta was soon after annulled by Pope Innocent III. After John's death in 1216, the regency government of his young son Henry III reissued Magna Carta. Henry III again reissued the Charter in 1225 in exchange for a grant of new taxes. His son, John's grandson, Edward I repeatedly the exercise in 1297, this time confirming it as part of England's Statute Law. 1100-1297, an extended campaign across nearly two hundred years to finally achieve these 'Rights' enshrined into the common law.

What is important to note about the evolution of liberties into England's Statute Law, is that any victory only ever achieved a fragile outcome.

The 'freedom of the church inviolable', was again lost from 1531, until at least the present day, with Henry VIII bringing the church under the control of the state, clearly against the first article of both charters.

PRACTICAL EVANGELISM, WHERE LESS IS MORE

I was directed to a small section of Arthur Bryant's book "Set In A Silver Sea", to learn that when the Dominican and Franciscan monks first evangelised England, (they arrived about 10 years after Magna Carta was first sealed by John 1215 AD), they were bound by vows of poverty and chastity, shunning the static and comfortable life of the older orders, taking the world as their parish and the street and marketplace as their cloister. The monks made their habitation in strongholds of poverty, vice and misery, whose very names - the Greyfriars in Stinking Lane, Sheer Hogg and Scalding Lane - a testament to their lives of dedication.

Working out of the spotlight, the Friars gave an immense stimulus to works of charity and spreading the Good News of the Gospel by reminding all that Christ lived among the poor, thus starting to deflect alms-giving and legacies from the over-endowed monasteries, to institutions which relieved want, sickness and suffering.

They also introduced into the vernacular-speech words of faith like mercy, pity, patience, comfort, conscience and salvation.

BAIT AND SWITCH - WORLD GOVERNMENT AGENDA BY ALL POLITICAL PARTIES

Theresa May as Prime Minister of Britain, was never elected by her party members, but selected by the media magnate Rupert Murdoch and skulkingly approved by Conservative politicians. Her task appears to have been achieved, to 'bait and switch': to offer a BREXIT, but in effect no BREXIT at all.

The British people have been given 'everything but' what they want, nor regained any of their lost freedoms from the EU. This battle must be fought again, and again until a freedom is won and held. Some politicians are correctly calling for a second BREXIT referendum.

We see another 'bait and switch' with Australian MP Tony Abbott (conservative) presenting an alternative climate policy (coal fired energy). Abbott is acting as spoiler for the conservative party, while the party machine has no intention of changing the current centralising policy to usher in world government using the green god as pretext for this huge transfer of power to the UN technocrats.

Another Tony Abbott 'bait and switch' is his media call to cut 'total' migration numbers. It appears the recently reported reduction in immigration numbers, is simply a rearrangement of the total numbers into different categories with no overall real reduction. Increased student numbers and reduced other numbers. He makes soothing sounds two weeks out from multiple by-elections but the party leadership controlling 'policy' is mute.

In our SA electorate of Mayo; Greens, Labor and Centre Alliance are united in backing the Centre Alliance candidate and the green centralising policies. The supposed only viable alternative is conservative, with no effective change in policy direction, centralising more power towards world government - 'bait and switch'. There is no 'right' to choose or refuse one thing at a time.

These policies will not change one iota until sufficient 'political will' is energised within the electorate by people like you and me, (one finger pointing at you and four fingers pointing at myself).

CONTINUOUS CIVICS ENGAGEMENT

In the June New Times Survey, mention is made to petition the Governors and Governor General every quarter as part of an ongoing campaign to energise and inspire the electorate.

I remember Jeremy Lee and the Hasco group holding petitions on market days in Toowoomba. When you hold your first petitioning day, it will be the hardest, as the ice will need to be broken. However after that it will be a routine task that is your commitment to your community for the good.

(continued next page)
Local communities can take the initiative to process the pressing social issues. Their own independent actions would encourage others to follow suit.

Civics, or our engagement with the political process, needs to be relentless and dynamic; not static. We must engage regularly and consistently, or be subject to the vagaries and interests of those who are able to generate more political pressure. Politicians only ever yield to political pressure. We must exert and be that pressure, in fact everyone can go into that 'archetypal cave and rescue that pearl of great price' which is our Freedoms and Rights.

You can do other things of your own choosing instead of petitions, so long as you do it regularly and consistently. But the first question, which is so important to answer is: "Under What Basis Are We to Determine and Pursue Our Freedoms and Rights?"

Do freedoms derive from the state or are they innate and originate from God alone?

NATURAL LAW

It is a natural law, that our rulers will usurp power if they are left 'unattended'. We can observe this today and we can review the same outcomes throughout history, and it will also continue to occur in the future. It is a natural law.

Power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely

This is provable and observable. The choice of outcomes is entirely in our court. The natural law is not going to change by us wishing for a utopia that is unrealistic.

Human consciousness can be perpetually evolving, or regressing. We hold the seeds of our civilisational evolution or demise in our own hands. The choice is ours. Observing natural law and adhering to the lessons from it are our way through this dilemma of the existing failing religious, political and economic order.

Recently the Marshall Conservative Government of South Australia scrapped the Shine SA 'Safe Schools Program' in State Schools. They are to be congratulated for this, however the process of pushing back this insidious program in its entirety must continue. The DECD policies (Division of Early Childhood Development), exposes immature and vulnerable young minds (prior to them being mature enough to work through these issues themselves), that is based on and promote radical gender theory, supporting same sex attractions, intersex and gender diversity and similar programs. All need to be defunded and removed from the early-learning and educational process.

Primary school teachers are reporting the tragic need to train their young charges in the use, identification and meaning of facial expressions. This developmental skillset begins with the breastfed child looking into the mothers face and continues on during toddlerhood into early learning. By placing the developmental responsibility over to the state our children are sadly missing out on this and other vital communication skills.

METHODS OF PROCESSING INFORMATION WITHIN THE BRAIN

What is ironic is that our own children in Australia are constantly under attack from many directions. Even a more dangerous environment than the Thailand Cave is a mother's womb; 15% of children do not make it out alive. Nor, what appears to be in epidemic proportions, autism spectrum disorder, as high as 25% of all children are effected to some degree.

The medical fraternity will not even discuss this epidemic, let alone direct blame to the (developing-brain-affecting) heavy metals and toxic chemicals presence in medications, toiletries, agricultural chemicals and vaccines.

There is much vested interest in maintaining the existing paradigm.

And then finally to indoctrinate our children with a failed ideology, that is directly responsible for the slaughter of possibly 200 million souls last century, under the justification of this green environmental god to be administered by the UN Technocracy as 'the only hope for mankind'.

Why were these 12 boys and their coach more real or apparent to us than the 44 souls lost at sea near Thailand at the same time as the cave incident, or the 12 unborn children, who do not make it out alive of their mother's womb, every day in South Australia? Perhaps because we can see their smiling faces and are able to relate to that image as an actual human being and not just a statistic.

IMAGINATION

The power of imaging or imagining an outcome or result is very real. Can we imagine a world, where our political representatives are constantly holding public meetings and other forums to garner understanding and determine the will of the electorate in any given situation? Yes, if they are compelled into complying with an active electorate. Can we imagine a world where the bureaucrat actually provides a service and is not the tyrant in charge? Yes, if every time any one of them steps out of line, then pursued until they yield.

Can we imagine a world where the robots and machines are put to work in order that we, as inheritors of this technological grace, are allowed leisure to pursue higher callings? Yes, if sufficient political pressure is exerted by a sufficient number of active individuals until the political process yields to the demand that: 'We must be financially able to purchase what we are physically able and willing to produce'.

INSPIRATION

Inspiration comes from somewhere else (other than self). Can our society provide the right environment for continued self-education of all ages, not just the young,
in the arts, philosophy, history and culture, so all willing individuals could pursue activities that inspire the young to emulate? Can our society so promote the creative spark (the real divine attribute) to be following pursuits by all who are willing, so others would follow?

Can our society allow craftsman, engineers, creators of all sorts of things, musicians, artists, thinkers, philosophers, and even our religious leaders the opportunity to pursue more wondrous things, so as to place us all at the foot, in awe and wonder of He who made all of this?

INTUITION

Different from instinct as with the lower animals, intuition comes from within. Women are in the forefront of this skillset.

In ancient cultures there still exists this ability to answer difficult to understand questions. It is now almost a lost skill that only a few communities still retain. This intuition may allow the planting of the correct plant next to another that promotes symbiosis, or allow the choice of foods that compliment your individual bodily requirements, or guide the 'diviner' to the most likely place to drill for water or other minerals.

Iain McGilchrist's wonderful book 'The Master and His Emissary: The Divided Brain and the Making of the Western World' has helped me understand the vital need for us to concentrate my thinking in the right hemisphere of the brain. This important point has become apparent in our studies this month. That Romanticism (not romantic) appears to be wrested in the right hemisphere of the brain. Romanticism includes Imagination, Inspiration, Intuition, Perception, as we view our relationship with 'other than ourselves'. The right hemisphere does not appear to be influenced by numbers or statistics, but rather how we can or do get on with the world outside self and how things work together.

The left hemispheric processes differ by the emotional indifference towards statistics presented of lost souls in the Thailand boat incident and the aborted unborn children in SA every day.

We process that information without becoming connected to the tragedy of the lost souls.

Totalitarianism, in all its many different forms, gravitates this type of pathological indifference towards horrendous policies such as financial slavery, mass extermination and starvation in order to control whole populations with statistics or 5-10 year plans. To somehow bring about 'their utopia' for others, instead of limiting the goal of utopia (heaven on earth) to just self.

Only do unto others what you would have them do unto you.

THE DIVINE SPARK WITHIN US ALL

The most God like attribute we have is creating. It is an ongoing process. Last night my wife and I saw the most beautiful cabinet as backdrop to a setting. It was the work of art made by the craftsman.

As we watch our children develop and mature into responsible adulthood, we anticipate their evolving into parenthood. In fact the writing of this article causes me to ponder what my deepest thoughts are for them. What do I really hope for them and this world? Not what I parrot out of my mouth like a robot without thinking at all, but what do I actually, deeply hope? This is an evolving, searching process. I should not be idle, nor rest on my laurels. This life, if I use it wisely, is an evolution of thinking, developing, growing mentally, spiritually and intellectually. I am - 'In Becoming' When I was a child I thought as a child. Now I am a man and must think as a man.

TRINITARIANISM

Aristotle and his problem with 'Achilles and the Tortoise' only thought in two dimensions - Space and Matter. It was only when 'time' as the third factor to be taken into account was considered that the riddle could be solved. Their thinking had to evolve. This Trinitarian association is in the nature of everything if we look hard enough. We neglect this discipline to our peril. Economics/Finance are currently only thought of in two dimensions, production and consumption.

'Says Law', (distribution) presents the case that the current financial system is in equilibrium which it is not. The 'Debt Clock' illustrates that the rate of flow of finance (distribution) is causing irredeemable debt. The 'Debt Clock' is never decreasing in numbers.

We must change our thinking to incorporate time. The flow of 'spending power' is not in equilibrium with the flow of 'prices', so we can never purchase what we have already produced. We must always work tomorrow to purchase what we have already produced yesterday and today. The brilliance of Douglas's thinking is that this 5000 year old riddle of 'distribution' is answered with the National Dividend and Compensated Price, so we are then able to purchase what we are capable of producing.

SOCIETAL REGENERATION

Christianity is now referred to as a 'cause'. I believe that in every cell of our body, and every atom in the universe lays witness to God as Creator of all. This fact permeates, or should, every thought we have.

God is every second of every day 'In Becoming' There was a time when our political leaders (temporal) would seek guidance from our ecclesiastical leaders (spiritual). This may not be the case at the moment, but all that means is that the fields are ripe for us to harvest. We have this opportunity to work behind the scenes for the good of our communities.
SOCIAL CREDIT AND DEMOCRACY: THE PROBLEM by M. Oliver Heydorn

Social Credit political theory readily grants what lies, perhaps, at the root of the democratic urge and which accounts, in large measure, for the popular appeal of ‘democracy’: firstly, that governments should serve the common good of the people and secondly, if governments don’t serve the common good of the people in an effective, efficient, and fair manner, the people who are affected should have the ability to sanction the government so that the quality of government might immediately improve.

At the same time, Douglas was highly critical of the conventional ‘democracies’ that have come to characterize the Liberal West, often describing them as ‘ineffective’. Not only did they fail to serve the common good to the extent that this was physically possible and desirable, they also failed to provide the people with an effective vehicle for remedying this sorry state of affairs. To make matters worse, it was not uncommon for ‘democratic’ governments to impose policies on the population which were contrary to the general will of the population. That is to say, we have been regularly treated to the spectacle of ‘democratic’ governments, so-called, introducing policies that are ‘anti-democratic’ in the deepest and truest sense of that word.

Writing in reference to the British ‘democracy’ of his time, Douglas commented:

“If Macaulay’s New Zealander, after musing on the more material remains of our social system as exemplified in the Houses of Parliament and the secretariats of Whitehall, should be driven to investigate the concepts of national organisation symbolised by them, it is fairly certain that nothing will astonish him more than the evidences he will find on every hand of the persistent and touching faith of this queer old people in what they call ‘representation.’ ... He would note that at irregular and inappropriate intervals queer ceremonies called elections took place at which persons for the most part personally unknown to the electors were ‘returned’ for the ostensible purpose of carrying out ‘reforms’ which most of the electors neither understood nor cared about one fig. And he would further observe that these elected ones, once safely through the ceremony, at once became very superior persons, full of dignity and importance, and for the most part concerned with very intricate relations between the State and Borioboola-Gha. It seemed very clear that these same electors never derived any benefit from these negotiations, or in fact and on the whole from more than the very minutest fraction of the activities of their representatives, while further it was quite plain that a small number of very opulent gentry of international sympathies, who were not elected, and represented no one but themselves, did in fact sway the whole deliberations of the elected assembly. Still this touching faith that some day they would elect the right men and all would be well seemed to sustain the people through a series of disappointments which would have daunted a less stubborn race. The New Zealander, who we must suppose to be an intelligent man, would, we think, conclude that this was a matter outside logic and reason, and only comparable to collective hypnotism. And he would be right.”

Here we are, so many decades after Douglas’ passing, and nothing has substantially changed. Indeed, the situation has steadily deteriorated. That people in the Western world are greatly dissatisfied with their governments is so generally true as a statement that it might be regarded as an axiom of political life. And yet, in spite of this dissatisfaction, there are many who remain convinced that ‘conventional’ parliamentary or republican ‘democratic’ government is the best system of government for which we can hope.

Douglas’ assessment of the situation, and hence his vision for the future, is quite different.

Social Credit political theory provides an explanation both for why conventional democracies fail and what can be done to reorder the political system so that governments might deliver more satisfactory results in view of the common good of individual citizens.

In this present article, I will begin with an examination of some of the structural faults with the current system that Douglas identified. A deeper discussion of the problems which afflict us, as well as a survey of Douglas’ suggestions for fixing the system, will have to form the subject of future articles.

If conventional ‘democracy’ fails to secure the correct aim of political association: the maximization of the individual’s effective sovereignty over his own affairs with the least amount of trouble to everyone, the question must be posed: why does it fail?

The short answer to this question from a Social Credit perspective is that conventional ‘democracy’ is not an effective democracy and is thus no real democracy at all:

“It is not too much to say that the practical aspect of all modern social problems is bound up with the overriding problem of an effective democracy. If we cannot face the issue squarely, we cannot hope for anything but the succession and multiplication of crises, which now are almost our normal existence.” (continued next page)
Stated in another way, conventional ‘democracy’ does not allow, to a greater or lesser extent, for the successful uniting of the real demand of citizens for effective sovereignty over their own affairs with the real, objective capacity of the political association to satisfy those demands. Douglas held that this failure is primarily a structural failure; i.e., conventional ‘democracies’ are not properly designed to effect, in the easiest possible manner, the true purpose of political association. Just as the financial and economic systems that are operative in our contemporary world are fundamentally ill-conceived, so too are its political systems.

So what are some of these failures of design? Well, according to Douglas’ analysis, there are problems with conventional ‘democracy’ both at the level of policy and at the level of administration.

Failures of Design – Incorrect Objectives at the Level of General Policy

Political theorists often claim that, in liberal democracies, the objective of government is to adjudicate or to strike a balance between competing group interests in the state which have incompatible ends: ‘politics is the art of compromise’. On the basis of this conception, it is inconceivable that there should be a unanimous general or common will in favour of an overriding general objective, such as the maximization of effective, individual sovereignty over one’s own affairs to the extent that this is objectively possible and with the least amount of trouble to everyone. The possibility of there being a truly common policy is discounted from the very beginning. As a result, such ‘democracies’ do not even aim at fulfilling the true purpose of political association, even though many ordinary citizens take for granted that in a democracy the will of the government should reflect the general will of the common people:

“It is common to assume, at any rate as a convention, that British Policy is the greatest-common-measure of what would be the policy of individual Britons. One of the first points I wish to make to you is that this is not true, that it probably never was true, that it is probably less true now than it ever was. The same argument can be applied to the politics of other countries, ...”

In passing it must be noted that the absence of a common political philosophy and a consistent universal political policy derived from that philosophy also leave the path open, however, to the imposition of a policy on the public by those elite groups who control, directly, or indirectly, the power of money.

Failures of Design – Incorrect Means at the Level of Administration

The false conception of the true end of government as lying primarily in the peaceful (i.e., non-violent) balancing of competing interests naturally gives birth to a set of administrative means which are supposed to deliver that equilibrium.

Chief amongst these means is the introduction of an alternate-party system. The existence of two or more political parties is meant to serve as a brokerage mechanism by means of which the variety of competing interests in the nation can be brought together into a smaller number of groups (this already involves some level of compromise) and as a supposed safeguard against dictatorship by always allowing for an alternative group of people who are available to occupy the seats of political power. This party system is then combined with universal suffrage within the context of anonymous ballot-box ‘democracy’; i.e., all adult citizens vote secretly for the party (or leader/representative associated with a particular party) which seems best placed to forward their particular interests.

It is a legitimate question whether or not such a governmental system is even adequate for the attainment of the general policy-objective which conventional Liberal ‘democracies’ ostensibly envisage. It should go without saying that such a system is not suitable for fulfilling the true purpose of political association. Contrary to many popular assumptions, an honest examination of the matter reveals that the standard ‘democratic’ devices are structurally and functionally faulty in practice; i.e., they actually constitute obstacles which prevent individuals from obtaining effective control over their governments:

“Now I am entirely convinced by my own investigation and experiences, not merely in this country but in many parts of the world, that while democracy in policy is absolutely essential to the functioning of the modern world, there is at the present time no such thing as a genuine democracy anywhere, and probably less in this country than anywhere else.”

Let us proceed to an examination of the voting system employed in contemporary ‘democracies’ in greater depth. In general, the purpose of a voting or electoral system is to stipulate who can vote, when, by which mechanisms, and for which ends. The sort of voting system which is typically in place in conventional ‘democracies’ we might refer to as ‘ballot-box democracy’. At regular and, in some cases, fixed intervals, the adult population is asked to vote behind closed doors for a set of candidates, some of whom will, should they obtain sufficient support, form part of the government.

(continued next page)
Ballot-box ‘democracy’ fails as a suitable mechanism for establishing an effective democracy for a number of reasons.

In the first place, it only permits the citizenry to have some sort of say once every couple of years; it does not allow individuals to exercise such pressure continuously on the government so that the results which they intend can be actualized. This means, in effect, that the government in such a system quite easily becomes a temporary dictatorship. How many times has a government in so-called ‘democratic’ countries managed to impose policies which are opposed by the majority of the population because they were safely in-between elections? Since nature abhors a vacuum, the absence of a suitable mechanism which would allow the citizens to sanction governments at any and all moments, leaves the government officials subject to those more hidden forces which are in a position to exert continuous pressure through monetary or other means:

“There is an idea that when you have an election, the implications of which, in nine cases out of ten, you do not understand, you have disposed of the matter of government. That is unworkable democracy. It sets the government mechanism at the mercy of those people who apply pressure all the time. One leading Social Crediter in the United States who had many talks with President Roosevelt, complained bitterly that – what is perfectly true – President Roosevelt had all along the line given way to the pressure of the financial interests. President Roosevelt made the correct and proper reply. He said, ‘It is my business to yield to pressure.’

Unless you have a dictatorship, it is the business of government to yield to pressure. Either a government is supreme over the people or else it must yield to pressure, and it is your business to exercise that pressure.”

A second problem with ballot-box ‘democracy’ is that it does not recognize its due limits. For example, it forces political minorities to acquiesce to the decision of the majority, or, in many cases, to the decision of the largest or most influential minority. Apart from certain stipulations that may form a part of a Bill of Rights or Constitution, there is no mechanism in place by means of which minorities can contract out of majority decisions.

A closely related difficulty is that there is no mechanism by means of which the majority can be prevented from supporting government decisions to infringe on the relevant prescriptions of natural law where political functionality are concerned, i.e., the objective principles which must be respected if a political system is to function optimally in facilitating the fulfillment of the true purpose of political association. In the words of Douglas:

“‘Any gang which gets a majority, by a fallacious ballot and a manipulated agenda, can upset all the rules, sell or give way all the assets, and liquidate the Company, all in the sacred name of d’markrazi. It is not a question of ‘Party’, but it is beyond question that the less scrupulous the gang, the less it is handicapped either in the achievement of power, or the use of it.’

If one permits, or to the extent that one permits, the fundamental rights and obligations of individuals in a functional society to be overturned on the basis of the claim that ‘the will of the majority must prevail’, one is in fact affirming a principle of lawlessness, i.e., one is affirming that the ‘majority’ have the right to break the fundamental social contract unilaterally. In view of these considerations, it must be admitted that any kind or degree of unrestricted majority rule is simply another manifestation of dictatorship and is therefore incompatible with authentic democracy:

“... a human collectivity, still less an electoral majority is not the proper focus of unitary sovereignty. That is not simply a statement of opinion; it is a statement of the same nature as to say that a cricket bat doesn’t make a good agricultural machine – it does not produce the results which are expected of an agricultural machine.”

Unrestricted majority rule, or what we might refer to as ‘the dictatorship of the mob’, is facilitated by two additional factors that characterize ‘ballot-box democracy’. The first is universal adult suffrage. Under the present set-up, the universal extension of the right to vote must result in the disenfranchisement of the intelligent voter (with, let it be noted, a consequent loss to the whole community). If all adults are given one vote, i.e., everyone’s vote is of equal worth, unrestricted majority rule means that the mediocre majority can easily lord it over more astute minorities in the service of vested interests:

“It is a fact inherent in the nature of the case that ownership must vest in an individual, and any attempt to get away from this law of nature results as a practical consequence in the appointment of an administrator whose power increases as the number of his appointers increases. This is, of course, the idea which is contained in the continuous extension of the voting franchise, and, a very Machiavellian policy it is, resulting as it does in the intelligent voter being completely disfranchised.”

The lack of genuine democracy inherent in unrestricted majority rule is thus only intensified to the extent that the ‘right to vote’ has been continually expanded under prevailing conditions: “the fact, of course, is that a parliamentary vote gives no effective control, and the more widespread the vote, the less the control.”

(continued next page)
The second factor that encourages the tendency toward mob-rule has to do with the anonymity of the voting process. The secret ballot allows for the separation of power from responsibility. Individuals can vote for parties and hence policies which may benefit themselves or their class at the expense of the common good and these individuals cannot be held accountable for their anti-social behaviour. This lessens, in turn, the control which well-meaning individuals can exercise over the political process:

“The degradation of British politics can almost be identified with the introduction of the secret ballot. A man who is ashamed or afraid to let it be known how he votes, is afraid to take responsibility for the consequence of his voting, and has no right to a vote.”

But why, exactly, does Douglas suggest that the ‘dictatorship of the majority’ can be reduced to the ‘dictatorship of the mob”? It is because the whole conventional ‘democratic’ system imposes a psychology that leaves the way open to mass manipulation by astute wire-pullers:

“A mandate is a recruiting device, and its morality is neither greater nor less than that of war of any description. *Vox populi* is not only not *vox Dei*, but such empirical psychologists as Gustave le Bon have demonstrated beyond all reasonable doubt that in itself it is far more likely to be *vox diaboli*. ... a mandate obtained from a political majority can, more especially in wartime, be manipulated for purposes which, while not understood by the electorate, will be passively accepted if they can be put into words suitable to a negro revivalist orgy.”

But you see, the mob can only function in a politically constructive way; i.e., in a way that results in the implementation of new policies, if it has a leader:

“It is obvious that a majority is only a specialised and deceptive word for the “Führerprinzip”. No majority can act without a Leader. When an individual resigns power to a leader, he resigns it primarily to be used against him. To the extent that the “Führerprinzip” has been effective, the present state of the world is the result of the “Führerprinzip”. You can’t have it both ways – either the device is ineffective, or the results are catastrophic.”

As we shall discover in future articles, the ostensible leader of the mob in modern, ‘democratic’ countries is, all too often, nothing more than the puppet of the hidden oligarchic elites who put him there. It would be bad enough if unrestricted majority rule meant that the majorities were dictating to the minority for the benefit of the majority. In a large number of cases what is actually happening is that the majority is being manipulated to penalize a minority in order to advance the interests of the same oligarchic elites:

“So-called democracy, therefore, is a ballot-box device for despoiling minorities, not, it should be carefully noted, for the benefit of majorities, but for the benefit of third parties. Motor taxes do not distribute motor cars, wine taxes do not distribute wine, and expropriated estates do not go to the landless.”

This manipulation of the masses by the elites at the expense of the individual is most easily achieved by bribing the more uncritical and self-absorbed segments of the electorate:

“It is quite certain that this subtle misuse of words, in combination with the equally subtle misuse of fraudulent majorities as a device for centralising power, is neither accidental nor unconscious, although the actual users may think that they understand their import. It has been grasped by our Masters that majorities will always accept a label as an explanation; that the short road to power is to popularise a label, which can always be done by an appeal to greed, and then to fill the bottle which carries it with any noxious rubbish which will achieve the downfall of the purchaser. By the aid of two or three labels, you can sell the same poison indefinitely.”

For all of these reasons, Douglas held that any sort of unrestricted majority rule must, even with the limitations that are placed upon it in liberal ‘democracies’, be rejected: “A majority ceases to have any validity when it is led to an objective its component individuals do not understand, or when a dissentient minority is forced to accompany it.”
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