

"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. 23 No. 02

Registered Australia Post - Publication PP343214 / 00016

February 2022

CONTENTS

We Need a Constitutional Convention! by M. Oliver Heydorn	1
(Douglas style) Social Credit & the Four Day Work Week by Arindam Basu	4
Australia's New Digital Identity System Would Give Tyrannical Politicians 'Total Control' by Monica Smit	7
Social Credit and Usury by M. Oliver Heydorn	8

WE NEED A CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION! by M. Oliver Heydorn

Recently, Brian Peckford, former Premier of Newfoundland and Labrador and the only remaining drafter and signatory of the 1982 Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms, appeared on Jordan Peterson's youtube show and explained why he is now initiating a lawsuit against the federal government for how it has handled, or rather mishandled, the Covid-19 'pandemic': <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EdhFuMDLBDM>

It is Peckford's considered judgement that the Covid restrictions and mandates that have been introduced by the federal and provincial governments over the course of the last two years have violated several key sections of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, namely sections 2, 6, 7 and 15. The Charter guarantees: rights to the freedoms of association, expression, religion, conscience, and assembly (section 2); mobility rights (the right to travel anywhere in Canada or to leave Canada – section 6); rights to life, liberty, and the security of the person (section 7); and the right to equal treatment before the law (section 15). The full text of the Charter can be read here: https://www.mcgill.ca/dise/files/dise/cdn_rights.pdf

It is true that section 1 of the Charter does allow for the possibility that, in the case of unusual circumstances, the government could override the charter by limiting the rights and freedoms of citizens. But what sort of circumstances would legitimize any such government intervention? Peckford says that when the Charter was being written, it was thought that the circumstances in question would have to be dire, such as a war or an insurrection, i.e., when the state itself is in peril. In other words, as Peterson puts it, the first ministers who drafted the Charter did not envision that its provisions could be violated under conditions that were not a fundamental threat to the integrity of the country itself. In Peckford's view, the Sars-Cov2 virus with its 99%+ survival rate does not constitute a situation in which the country is in peril. Thus, section 1 does not even apply and can't be used to justify the government overreach.

Even if we were to consider, for the sake of playing the devil's advocate, that section 1 could be invoked in reference to the Sars-Cov2 'pandemic', Peckford points out that the powers acknowledged in section 1 have themselves been made subject to a variety of conditions and constraints. The relevant text of the Charter reads as follows: "The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms guarantees the rights and freedoms set out in it subject only to such reasonable limits prescribed by law as can be demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society." Thus, any government imposed limit must meet four tests: it must be a) reasonable, b) prescribed by law, c) demonstrably justified (*via* a cost-benefit analysis) and d) compatible with the context of a free and democratic society (i.e., *via* they must be sanctioned after due consideration and debate by the representatives of the people in parliamentary democracy). Peckford goes on to argue that none of these four conditions have been met, nor has the federal government made any attempt to meet these conditions in order to justify their covid-related restrictions and mandates. So even the process itself by which exceptions to the charter could be imposed has itself been disregarded. These two facts alone should be sufficient to plunge Canada into a constitutional crisis, but it gets even worse...

Not only is none of the criteria positively fulfilled, but the restrictions and mandates have actually showed themselves to meet the opposing criteria of being unreasonable and demonstrably unjustified. There were many competing interests and views (economic, social, even health-based) which, when they are taken into due consideration, show that the health measures and mandates would not deliver a net benefit on balance to society as a whole, even if they did work.

(continued next page)

Such interferences with personal liberty and rights are therefore unreasonable and should have been discarded in favour of the sort of targeted or focused protection measures and herd-immunity approach championed by the ‘Great Barrington Declaration’: <https://gbdeclaration.org>. Furthermore, there is also plenty of evidence that the restrictions and mandates were demonstrably unjustifiable as methods for controlling the ‘pandemic’ and would fail any cost-benefit analysis even on their own terms: masks don’t work, social distancing doesn’t work, lockdowns don’t work, the PCR tests don’t work (they are not reliable diagnostic tools), nor do the experimental ‘vaccines’ work to prevent infection and transmission, but all of these can and do cause various kinds and degrees of harm for individuals and society.¹ Measures that involve or incur greater costs than the benefits they deliver are obviously non-starters.

So why is all of this happening? Why are such tyrannical and irrational prescriptions being imposed on the population of the world? Though neither Peterson nor Peckford address the matter directly, it is my conviction and that of many other commentators that what we are witnessing is, in fact, the initial stages of a globalist *coup d’état*. That is, there are rich and powerful international vested interests who are in a position to impose policy on nation-states and to even override their constitutions. These vested interests may be identified as the world’s Central Bankers and their associated corporate entities and fronts, including the investment holding companies known as Blackrock and Vanguard (which, in turn, own controlling shares in most other multinational and transnational corporations), as well as individuals and organisations such as Klaus Schwab and his World Economic Forum.² It is this occult ‘Money Power’ which, directly or indirectly is responsible for co-opting politicians, the mainstream media, the health system, and the courts, etc.

The Achilles’ heel of these globalist ‘planners’, however, is that they don’t tend to handle unrehearsed developments well. The emergence of ivermectin and many other drugs as effective therapeutics for COVID-19 were one such development. The Canadian Freedom Convoys organized by Canadian truckers and which are now gridlocking the capital, blocking borders and bridges, is another. The truckers have galvanized those large segments of the Canadian population who have had their rights and freedoms violated by the covid measures and who are not at all happy about it. Canadians are coming out of their hiding places and standing up *en masse* for a restoration of the Charter. Let us hope and pray that this freedom movement will be hugely successful. However, this type of gumption, while necessary, is not enough. To be successful, we must marry courage with appropriate and intelligent

action. So far the truckers and Canadians in general have shown tremendous restraint and prudence in refusing to be baited into violence or ‘extremist’ rhetoric. That’s smart. But we must go further!

The Chinese use the same character to designate both crisis and opportunity, and, sure enough, there is, in this aftermath of the ‘pandemic’ and its accompanying threat of medical tyranny, a great opportunity for the Canadian people, for their honest and competent experts, and for any Canadian leaders of integrity who might remain, i.e., statesmen, to use the pushback against all of the irrational Covid restrictions and mandates to strike a mighty blow against the global plutocracy that rules us and that is largely responsible for the covid-19 phenomenon in the first place. How might this be achieved?

Well, let us begin with the observation that it’s not enough to restore the Charter (and to hold the people who have violated it accountable in a court of law), we need to upgrade it, so that this sort of egregious government overreach and indeed tyranny can never happen ever again. To that end, we should *eventually* organize a constitutional convention, spearheaded by true patriots and statesmen who stand for Canadian sovereignty and for the defence and enhancement of the existing constitution, which will hear the concerns and attend to the true interests of ordinary Canadians.

Note well, this can only take place AFTER the public and private individuals and organizations behind the current *coup d’état* that is in progress are identified and properly held responsible for their lawless actions. We cannot take any risks of a constitutional convention being hijacked by the very people who have brought us to this present state of degradation.

The following outline provides a list of amendments or additions to the Charter that is intended to secure and to further expand the rights and freedoms of Canadians, while simultaneously disempowering the plutocratic globalist elites who are oppressing us.

In the first place, we need to ensure that this type of medical tyranny and medical apartheid never be allowed ever again, by strictly prohibiting the following threats to the Canadian nation and to the inalienable liberties and rights of the Canadian people:

“In order to further safeguard and enhance the rights and freedoms of all Canadians, any introduction or application of the following measures and innovations are strictly prohibited as *ultra vires* in perpetuity:

1. Mandatory or otherwise coerced medical treatments, testing, and/or interventions (including masks and ‘vaccines’)
2. Medical lockdowns of healthy populations (as opposed to the quarantining of the sick), including ‘social distancing’.

(continued next page)

3. Digital ID's
4. Central bank digital currency as a replacement for the existing money system
5. Any form of a CCP-inspired 'social credit' totalitarian surveillance, reward and punishment, scoring social system
6. Any WEF-style 'Great Reset' worldwide economic reformatting by means of which it is intended that the people of the world should 'own nothing' and yet be 'happy'.
7. Any surrendering of Canadian National Sovereignty to a World or International Government

In addition, we need to commit to the introduction of radical political and monetary reforms which will more fully enfranchise Canadian citizens with political and economic power. Monetary reform, in particular, is crucial. Leave finance in the hands of the global oligarchy and we will have to be fighting these sorts of battles over and over and over again. We need a money system that will serve Canadian citizens and not exploit in the interests of international plutocrats. While the range of needed political and monetary changes will extend far beyond what might be included in the constitution at this stage and will have to be debated and worked out both theoretically and practically, the following rights in both spheres should be guaranteed to every Canadian citizen:

Political Rights

1. The ability to sanction any existing politician through the right to recall, which may be exercised if 50%+1 of eligible voters decided to cancel a MP's representative role and to trigger a by-election at any time in-between elections.
2. The requirement that any invocation of the emergency's act be approved by 50%+1 of eligible voters *via* referendum within 30 days of its proclamation.

Financial and Economic Rights

1. Every citizen has the right to acquire, own, and sell private property, whether productive or non-productive in character.
2. Every citizen has the right to be regarded and indeed registered as an economic shareholder in Canada conceived as a corporate economic unit, to derive financial benefits on the basis of that

status as shareholder, and to have those benefits objectively determined on the basis of the relevant statistics as maintained by an impartial organ of the state: the National Credit Authority. The role of the National Credit Authority (Office or a Commission) is to a) assert the sovereignty of the Canadian state on behalf of the Canadian people over the Canadian financial system, b) establish and maintain a National Set of Accounts composed of a National Balance Sheet and a National Profit & Loss Account, and c) to distribute to the citizen-shareholders, *via* the creation and issuance of debt-free credit, any surplus disclosed by the National Profit & Loss Account in the forms of a National Dividend and/or a National Discount.³

The truckers have given us new hope, let us use the social energy which they have generated to achieve what otherwise would have been impossible: a constitutional reboot which will make Canada as financially and politically independent of globalist interference as possible. ***

References:

1. See, for example, the recent study on lockdowns from John Hopkins University: <https://www.news.com.au/world/coronavirus/global/johns-hopkins-institute-study-reveals-covid19-lockdowns-had-little-to-no-effect-on-mortality-rate/news-story/31fa124e5d00b54015d302d62379464d>
2. See Tim Gielen's recent documentary: *Monopoly: Who Owns the World?*
3. The monetary reform proposals outlined here are based on Douglas Social Credit – not to be confused with the fake CCP counterfeit 'social credit'. You can learn more about Douglas Social Credit here: <https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLFVz60315IiUeWnFdrC9RIVEiCaG-OskY>

Addendum:

The above article, also available at socred.org: we need not only to restore but to eventually upgrade the Charter so as to ensure that this type of tyranny never happens again in Canada. Naturally, that upgrade must include radical monetary reform. Leave the power of finance and all that it can buy (i.e., the media, the healthcare system, the governments, etc.) in the hands of the global plutocrats who oppress us and we will just have to fight this fight over and over again on different fronts.

"The Chinese use the same character to designate both crisis and opportunity, and, sure enough, there is, in this aftermath of the 'pandemic' and its accompanying threat of medical tyranny, a great opportunity for the Canadian people, for their honest and competent experts, and for any Canadian leaders of integrity who might remain, i.e., statesmen, to use the pushback against all of the irrational Covid restrictions and mandates to strike a mighty blow against the global plutocracy that rules us and that is largely responsible for the covid-19 phenomenon in the first place. How might this be achieved?" ***

(DOUGLAS STYLE) SOCIAL CREDIT & THE FOUR DAY WORK WEEK by Arindam Basu

I.) Introduction: The Radical Prediction of Richard Milhous (Millhouse) Nixon

Long before the Industrial Revolution, man had managed to secure for himself the necessities of life without consuming all his waking hours in the process of doing so.

'In his book, [Stone Age Economics] Marshall Sahlins quotes a 1960 study by Frederick D. McCarthy and Margaret McArthur of aboriginal communities in Western Arnhem Land, Australia. The researchers added up all the time spent in all economic activities - plant collecting, food preparation, and weapon repair - over a span of several months, finding that the average male worked three hours and forty-five minutes per day, while the average female worked three hours and fifty minutes per day.'

- Jerry Mander, *In the Absence of the Sacred*, page 248.

Such leisure was by no means unknown in the Middle Ages either.

'...Before capitalism, most people did not work very long hours at all. The tempo of life was slow, even leisurely; the pace of work relaxed. Our ancestors may not have been rich, but they had an abundance of leisure. When capitalism raised their incomes, it also took away their time...

All told, holiday leisure time in medieval England took up probably about one-third of the year. And the English were apparently working harder than their neighbours...'

- Juliet B. Schor quoted in K. Bolton, *The Banking Swindle*, page 168.

Memories of the leisure ages of the past lingered among the factory workers who suffered hideously long work weeks in the nineteenth century, and spurred resistance to conditions that are almost unimaginable today:

'Some of the worst working conditions revealed by the various factory investigations existed among these "apprenticed" pauper children. Hours of work in the factories were excessive, and the wages paid ridiculously low. Sixteen- and eighteen-hour days were not uncommon for children under fourteen years of age. From fourteen to sixteen hours constituted a normal working day.'

- Harry Elmer Barnes, *Living in the Twentieth Century*, page 142.

Miners faced similar hours:

'Labor conditions in the mines of England at this time were even worse than those which prevailed in the factories. Women and children were extensively

employed in underground pits from twelve to sixteen hours per day.' - *ibid*, page 145

Perhaps reflecting their attachment to the pre-industrial age - but more likely as a measure against their liberal rivals, Conservative governments acted to curb the worst of the abuses:

'At the outset, really significant factory legislation in England was born of economic, class and political rivalry. The new industrialists, by their efforts to secure fair political representation and free trade for their new commerce, challenged the interests and class pride of the Tory landlords. The free-trade movement, beginning in the 'twenties of the nineteenth century, and the Reform Bill of 1832 illustrate this bourgeois trend. The Tories retaliated by attacking the industrialists at their weakest point, namely, the factory conditions. They launched a movement for factory reform, enforced by adequate legislation, that by 1847 had borne fruit to the extent of a ten-hour bill. The leaders of this "Tory socialism" were Anthony Ashley Cooper, seventh Earl of Shaftesbury, Michael T. Sadler, Richard Oastler and John Fielden, the latter an enlightened manufacturer. We would not deny altruistic motives to these reformers, but their support grew chiefly out of class rivalry.' - *ibid*, page 148

Furthermore, workers themselves banded into unions and pressed for shorter hours. Such campaigns were not limited to Europe: across the Atlantic, it was one such protest for an eight-hour work day that culminated in Chicago's Haymarket riot of 1886 - the origin of May 1st as a labour holiday. Their efforts would soon be assisted by technical change.

In the early twentieth century, the increasing use of inanimate sources of power, facilitated by the Electrical Revolution - reduced the need for human labour in production, and increasingly make it possible to generate more in less time. Reductions in working time reflecting this development followed, with Henry Ford pioneering the forty-hour work week, and French legislation in the 1930s mandating a five-day work week. With technological advance even more in evidence after the Second World War, even a stolid conservative like Richard Milhous Nixon predicted a further shortening of the work week:

'Our third goal is to promote a new way of life in the United States- better than we have ever had before. We will do this by unleashing the research facilities of our scientists and technicians so that new forms of production will evolve. Back-breaking toil and mind-wearying tension will be left to machines and electronic devices.

(continued next page)

(continued from previous page) *We want man's work to be pleasant so that he can go home each day with abundant energy for enjoying the comfort and friendliness of his family. We see the time not too far distant when we can have a four-day week and family life will be even more fully enjoyed by every American.'*

- Richard Nixon, Speech on September 22, 1956.
John Maynard Keynes went even further:

'For many ages to come the old Adam will be so strong in us that everybody will need to do some work if he is to be contented. We shall do more things for ourselves than is usual with the rich to-day, only too glad to have small duties and tasks and routines. But beyond this, we shall endeavour to spread the bread thin on the butter - to make what work there is still to be done to be as widely shared as possible. Three-hour shifts or a fifteen-hour week may put off the problem for a great while. For three hours a day is quite enough to satisfy the old Adam in most of us!'

- J. M. Keynes, *Economic Possibilities of our Grandchildren*, 1930.

Yet for the most part, by the early 21st century, these predictions had not come to fruition. An explanation is required.

II.) Natural Versus Artificial Work

'Work, in its economic meaning, is really a very ambiguous term. For when we have defined it as involuntary or forced activity (hence requiring "inducement" in the form of wages or goods to evoke), we have still to distinguish between an activity forced on men by Nature and an activity forced on men by other men. There are, in fact, two kinds of forced work; that is to say, of activity not freely chosen. There is the work forced on Man by Nature—the work God referred to when he told Adam that, outside of Paradise, Nature would yield him bread only in the sweat of his brow. And there is the work forced on man by other men—slaveowners and bankers, for example—who declare from their high throne that men shall not eat, not without Nature's consent, but without their consent. Let us call them respectively Natural Work and Artificial Work, and understand that both forms of work are forced—that is to say, neither is the voluntary, freely chosen, self-initiated activity of which complete Leisure is the condition and state.'

- A. R. Orage, *The Fear of Leisure*.

Given that the word 'work' covers a wide variety of activities, it is most useful to distinguish between different types - such as between manual and mental work, subsistence labour and surplus labour, or indeed, compulsory and voluntary toil. However, for the purpose of understanding the evolution of working hours, it is

Orage's distinction between natural and artificial work that provides the key. For whilst technological and organizational progress reduces natural work, it need not have the same effect on artificial work, since the latter, by its very nature, is arbitrary.

The implication of this is stark. If natural work is decreasing (as it must due to technical progress), yet the work week remains unchanged - or decreases at a slower rate - then it follows that artificial work is rising. Orage went on to make another crucial distinction:

'Liberty we can define as freedom from Servile Labour [the performance of artificial work]; and it is obviously mainly individual. Progress, on the other hand, we can define as increasing freedom from Nature forced Labour; and this, equally obviously, is mainly a collective affair.'

- A. R. Orage, *ibid*.

Thus, the implication of the static work week in an age of technical progress is increased servile labour - i.e. the denial of liberty. In other words, the growth of meaningless work, performed not for the sake of meeting genuine social and personal needs or desires, but merely for securing an income by serving those who have been selected by the monopolists of financial credit as best suited to further their own interests. The psychological consequences of such activities are, unsurprisingly, entirely negative:

"For the many there is hardly concealed discontent... 'I'm a machine,' says the spot welder. 'I'm caged,' says the bank teller, and echoes the hotel clerk. 'I'm a mule,' says the steel worker. 'A monkey can do what I do,' says the receptionist. 'I'm less than a farm implement,' says the migrant worker.... Blue collar and white call upon the identical phrase: 'I'm a robot.'"

- S. Terkel, quoted in J. Weizenbaum, *Computer Power and Human Reason*, pages 258-9.

We shall now consider how Social Credit addresses this issue.

III.) Social Credit as the Liberator of Time.

'I know, not from theory but from practice, that you can live infinitely better with a very little money and a lot of spare time, than with more money and less time. Time is not money, but it is almost everything else.'

- Ezra Pound, *The ABC of Economics*.

The increased provision of leisure is one of the key aims of Social Credit - with Major Douglas regarding it as both necessary and desirable for the further development of both society and the individual. It is a tribute to the internal consistency between the core philosophy and key proposals of Douglas Social Credit that the latter - namely the Three Fundamentals, all facilitate increased leisure. The first of the Three Fundamentals, the National Dividend increases both the quantity and quality of leisure. (continued next page)

(continued from previous page)

It does so by not only raising the scope for leisure by reducing financial stress, but also by amplifying the bargaining power of the workforce, since the provision of an income outside work, enables them to push harder for fewer hours. This in turn is likely to propel firms to accelerate mechanization and automation, thereby further shifting work from men to machines, thus paving the way for even more leisure. The second of the fundamentals, the National Discount, by reducing prices and upholding purchasing power, reinforces the National Dividend and thereby consolidates its effects.

The third fundamental, the National Credit Commission, provides a means to eliminate artificial work by penalizing organizations that engage in it, by denying them the National Discount on their goods and services. Thus, firms that are wasteful of their employees' time can be forced to function at a disadvantage - thereby providing them with a strong incentive to curb needless toil.

Hence, the ultimate outcome of the Three Fundamentals is a virtuous cycle of rising leisure impelling further technological and organizational progress, which in turn frees more time: in short, the incessant extension of liberty and progress.

IV.) Conclusion: The Underlying Purpose of Full Employment.

'...the absence of full-time employment tends to increase the participation level in social movements.'

- K.Schwab & T. Malleret, *COVID-19: The Great Reset*, page 87.

Richard Nixon tempered his position on the four-day week, arguing in 1960 that the time was not yet ripe for it, though proclaiming that he would promote automation so as to facilitate the shift eventually. No serious progress on this matter took place in the United States in the following decades, though in Europe, France introduced a 35-hour week in February 2000, and other countries have witnessed a steady decrease in working hours towards that level and sometimes a little beyond it. Nonetheless, given the economic advances of the last six decades, it is evident that even the reduction in the work week by 12.5% (from 40 to 35 hours) is very meagre in comparison to what modern technology should make possible. In short, it is not the lack of automation or computerization that is keeping men at work, but something else.

It is most convenient for a tyranny if people pay little or no attention to public affairs. To this end, various spectacles are arranged and/or promoted by the authorities - such as the famous gladiatorial games of Ancient Rome, the month-long religious festivities of the Middle Ages - or the various sporting extravaganzas of our own time. However, one cannot wholly rely on such

events to keep men permanently distracted - not least because many, if not most, of them will regard public issues as much more important than such recreations.

It is here that work plays a crucial role, for it is one activity that men are wont to regard more seriously than politics. (Ironically, this is almost invariably because, consciously or unconsciously, they regard their (usually artificial) work as natural work, and therefore, as necessary for the well-being of society as well as, of course, necessary for their own well-being as a steady source of income.) Thus, work is ideal for keeping men distracted, and ultimately, enslaved. This is the real reason why the expansion of artificial work to compensate for the decrease in natural work has received so little attention.

Seen from this perspective, the persistence of the five-day work week, while ostensibly due to economic reasons, is actually the outcome of the political imperative of vested interests that understand all too well the threat increased free time poses to them. Put differently, the four-day work week is a truly revolutionary proposal in more ways than one - and it is a tribute to the radical nature of Social Credit that its measures are altogether supportive of it. ***

Article Source:

<https://www.socred.org/s-c-action/social-credit-views/social-credit-and-the-four-day-work-week>

(continued from *Social Credit and Usury* by M. Oliver Heydorn, p8.):

(continued from page 8)

At the end of the day, private banks (which would continue to operate as the community's financial book-keepers and as regulators of private production under Social Credit) must be able to cover their legitimate costs and to make a profit in exchange for successfully promoting the real interests of the community by financing desirable (i.e., remunerable) production. They must therefore be entitled to levy fees in one form or another for their services. ***

Addendum: The fundamental crime of the present banking system does not consist in the charging of interest on monies created out of nothing as such, but rather in the fact that the recurring gap between consumer prices and consumer incomes (which would not exist if the financial system were an honest system, i.e., if it accurately reflected reality) allows the banks to lay an illegitimate claim to the beneficial ownership of real capital.

To summarize: the debt-system has allowed the banks to indirectly appropriate the real capital for their own benefit since they are, given their monopoly on credit creation, the only ones who can compensate for the gap. In truth, the beneficial ownership of real capital actually rests with the aggregate of individuals who compose society, are what have made the real capital possible.

AUSTRALIA'S NEW DIGITAL IDENTITY SYSTEM WOULD GIVE TYRANNICAL POLITICIANS 'TOTAL CONTROL' by Monica Smit

It sounds bland enough. According to the Australian federal government, the proposed bill to have a Digital Identity system, which is to apply to everyone, is necessary because “effective governance of the system is essential to the efficient operation of, and instilling public trust and confidence in, the system.”

Problem is, the Australian government has lost all credibility. Over the last two years of the “pandemic,” Australian governments have shown that they cannot be trusted even to protect fundamental democratic institutions, basic human rights – especially the right to health privacy – and the independent rule of law.

For a large part of the population, confidence in government has evaporated – and rightly so. Politicians and government bureaucrats have demonstrated repeatedly that they do not serve the people. Instead, they issue orders and punish anyone who disobeys. In most parts of the country, failure to accede to mandates to get injected with an experimental gene therapy means being locked out of society and losing employment. In what sense is this “effective governance”?

The digital ID concept is not new. In the 1980s, Bob Hawke's Labor Government pushed hard to introduce Identity Card legislation but it was defeated. It is more important to resist it this time around. Digital systems can allow total control over everything a citizen does. In the first instance it would include healthcare and extend the use of the already appalling Covid-19 digital certificates that are needed to get into venues and most workplaces.

It will not stop there. A digital identity will allow all telecommunications to be monitored and control access to government services, social media, financial services, and travel. Total power, in other words.

The proposal would be bad enough if Australian governments and the public service more or less served the public most of the time. Creating a digital ID system that has the potential to be abused at some point would still not be a risk worth taking. The government's claims that it would lead to more “efficient operation”, or allow it to crack down on black market activity, are, at best, benefits that do not outweigh the risks. The benefits are minor, couched in the usual meaningless management jargon used by governments to hide more insidious intentions. The truth is that digital IDs offer more control, and that is what governments find impossible to resist.

The proposal is even more dangerous when Australia's federal and state politicians and bureaucracies have revealed beyond any reasonable doubt that they are willing to attack citizens' rights when it suits their purposes. Most public servants have followed the tyrannical orders without empathy or flexibility.

Apparently ordinary, decent people have tolerated a medical apartheid that resembles the social divisions in Nazi Germany. The courts offer no protection, the media parrots propaganda, and academia has been for the most part an enthusiastic participant in the despotism. There is hardly a democratic institution in the country that has not been profoundly damaged.

So in that situation what could possibly be the argument for giving governments even more power to control the lives of ordinary Australians? Currently, the federal government is going through the farce of appearing to consult with the community to maintain the pretence that we still live in a democracy. That process should not be trusted. Public protests against this legislation should be wider; it is crucial for the future of the country.

The evidence that governments do not have our best interests at heart is everywhere. Free speech is being aggressively squashed. People, including myself, who speak out have been charged with incitement, accused of a crime for wanting to get together with others of like mind to express a political view. Churchgoers have at various points been either banned outright or threatened with huge penalties if they did not follow the dictates of health bureaucrats.

Australians are being forced to show their “papers” if they want to enter a cafe, go to a workplace, or attend a sporting event. Failure to do so can attract massive fines. That this contravenes Federal Privacy law, a criminal statute, seems to bother no-one. It means we are no longer a nation of laws, and the democratic checks and balances have failed.

The potential evils of government have been revealed to anyone who is paying attention. Those people now need to focus on this proposed bill—because, if passed, it has the potential to open the door to even worse atrocities.

I have experienced the heavy hand of the government and am facing criminal charges for being an advocate of human rights. My phone and communications are likely being monitored daily; I can't hide from them. If they're willing to enforce their powers on me, I'm sure they are willing to do it to any law-abiding, tax-paying citizen.

Australia needs to keep a close eye on all legislations being passed. These types of legislations are turning Australia into a police-state. They are constantly trying to extend their powers to control our every move, and we won't stand for it!

Article Source:

https://www.lifesitenews.com/blogs/australian-govt-proposal-for-digital-identity-system-dangerous-to-freedom/?fbclid=IwAR31R3tuE7J824ik_cR0g6MkWAoP6Ac_iOJQPG919NfJEICiade-5u8Od8

SOCIAL CREDIT AND USURY by M. Oliver Heydorn

One of the most common misunderstandings where Social Credit is concerned is the notion that the Social Credit diagnosis can be adequately summarized along the following lines: "The problem with the existing financial system is that the banks create money out of nothing in the form of bank credit and then proceed to charge interest on the money that they loan out. Unfortunately, they do not create the money to pay the interest and this leads to a continual build-up of unrepayable debts, etc., etc." This popularized interpretation of Social Credit is erroneous.

It is absolutely vital for people to understand that, in contradistinction to those monetary reformers who would focus all of our attention on the private creation of money and on the question of usury (however defined), the Social Credit diagnosis points in another and much deeper direction. While it is true that banks do indeed create the bulk of the money supply *ex nihilo* and in the form of interest-bearing debt, and while it is true that these practices can be problematic (largely on account of the *de facto* monopoly on money creation which the private banks, for all intents and purposes, currently possess), the financial system's most fundamental flaw has nothing to do with the private creation of the money supply nor with the charging of interest as such.

The core problem according to Douglas' analysis is that the financial system is inherently or structurally unbalanced; it generates prices at a faster rate than it distributes income. This difference in rates between total prices and total incomes typically manifests itself as a gap between consumer prices and consumer incomes, a gap that must be bridged in one way or another if the economy is to attain to a state of financial equilibrium and continue in operation.

The gap in question is not exclusively or even primarily caused by the charging of interest on bank credit. Indeed, if you were to restore the creation and issuance of all money to the state and forbid the charging of interest, the gap between consumer prices and incomes would still remain just so long as the standard conventions governing the financing of production and industrial cost accountancy were in place. While the charging of interest can exacerbate the gap between consumer prices and consumer incomes (insofar as bank profits may be held in reserve, re-invested, or used to pay down debts, or insofar as the money needed to pay the interest factor in bank profits cannot be easily or quickly redirected from other expense claims, etc.), the chief cause behind the gap has to do with real capital. The acquisition of real capital under existing financial conventions results in the building up of costs in the productive process for which no or an insufficient volume of consumer purchasing power has

been distributed. By the time these capital costs come forward to be liquidated by the consumer in the prices of consumer goods and services, he does not have sufficient income derived from their production to be able to pay for them.

Furthermore, while it is likewise true that under the existing system the charging of interest can be a) onerous (insofar as having to pay interest may divert so much of one's income that day-to-day living becomes burdensome and one's legitimate needs cannot be adequately or easily met), b) exploitative (insofar as being forced or heavily pressured to borrow money under asymmetrical terms would not even exist if the economy and hence individuals automatically enjoyed adequate levels of consumer purchasing power), and c) excessive (insofar as one may be required to pay large, even incredibly large sums in interest that may exceed the amounts originally borrowed should one be unable to pay off one's debts relatively quickly), it is also true that the restoration of an automatic and self-liquidating balance to the financial system along the lines that Social Credit proposes would do much towards eliminating these objectionable, i.e., usurious, aspects of the practice even if the charging of interest were to continue in a Social Credit economy. Distributing the compensatory flow of debt-free money to the consumer (via the National Dividend and the National Discount) would help to do away with the undue centralization of economic wealth and power that are associated with the present monopoly of credit by putting an end to this monopoly. In other words, in a balanced financial system, the charging of interest would cease to be the kind of issue that it is today. Since it would cease to be the same kind of issue and since it is not the underlying problem in any case, the focus of monetary reformers should be on restoring a due balance to the circular flow and not on eliminating usury. *(continued bottom of page 6)*

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 cheques to: 'Australian League of Rights (SA Branch)'

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

Telephone: 08 8322 8923 **eMail:** heritagebooks@alor.org

Online Bookstore : <https://veritasbooks.com.au/>

<https://alor.org/> our main website and repository of the **Douglas Social Credit** and Freedom Movement 'Archives'.

**NewTimes Survey is printed and authorised by
K. W. Grundy, 13 Carsten Court, Happy Valley, SA.**