"All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing . . ." — EDMUND BURKE.

THE AUSTRALIAN LEAGUE OF RIGHTS

THE NEW TIMES SURVEY

Vol. 23 No. 05 Registered Australia Post - Publication PP343214 / 00016 May 2022

CONTENTS

"BIBLE BILL" ABERHART: MONETARY POPULIST OF THE ALBERTA PRAIRIE by Mark Anderson

The man known as "Bible Bill" in Alberta, Canada in the pre-World War II years—who was widely lauded by the public but suffered severely at the hand of crass critics in the press and elsewhere—managed to go from teacher and administrator at several schools to the position of Alberta's provincial premier *via* a new political party that targeted the banking cartel and achieved the winningest election in Alberta's history, and among the most successful in Canada's history.

His unrelenting efforts at monetary reform as premier for eight years gave him a notoriety that approximated that of the great American radio priest Charles E. Coughlin of Royal Oak, Mich. Indeed, Aberhart's remarkable journey in life left a lasting imprint which showcases the power of the Christian faith combined with civic initiative—Coughlin called it "Christian Americanism"—versus the wretched underhandedness and godlessness of the banking fraternity.

One thing's for certain. The period of the mid-1920s to the years just before World War II saw a massive challenge mounted against the monetary mattoids whose quill pens, even before the advent of computers, created massive interest-bearing debts with a mere stroke; meanwhile, the "journalistic" printing presses they suborned launched shrill screeds like missiles against anyone who dared question the policies of the lords who rent money to governments at punishing and permanent interest. This massive showdown was made possible in large part by radio, which was then in its infancy and hadn't yet yielded to the total control of the banking-media axis.

A YOUTH OF MANY TALENTS

William Aberhart Jr. was born Dec. 30, 1878 in Kippen, now part of Bluewater, Ontario to William and Louisa (Pepper) Aberhart. William Sr. had emigrated from Germany to Canada at the age of seven with his family. His wife was born in Perth County, Ontario. The fourth of eight children, William Jr. delivered milk to his father's customers daily before school, where the young Aberhart excelled in mathematics and soccer, while also enjoying solitary pursuits such as teaching himself to play musical instruments and copious reading.

At the age of 18 in 1896, Aberhart enrolled in business college in Chatham, Ontario but withdrew after a short stint there. In 1897–98, Aberhart went on to attend Seaforth Collegiate Institute, where he was nicknamed "Whitey" for his blond hair. There, he broadened his athletic prowess to include the long jump, shot put, 100-yard dash, high jump, cycling, and football. In this sense and other vital ways, Aberhart mirrored Father Coughlin, who also excelled in collegiate athletics. Clearly, it took more than intellect alone to take on the financial cabal: It also required an indomitable spirit which, in the lives of Protestant Aberhart and Catholic Coughlin, manifested itself in various ways, including their passionate preaching of God's Word and in meeting the rough-and-tumble challenges of the athletic field.

In 1901 Aberhart met his bride-to-be, Jessie Flat, at a football game. They were married on July 29, 1902. A daughter, Khona Louise Aberhart, was born in the winter of 1903, followed by Ola Janet Aberhart in August 1905. While those were happy days, William Jr. saw his share of tragedy. On July 20, 1910, his father died in an accident at a pharmacy owned by William Jr.'s brother, Charles. Although prohibition was in effect, pharmacists were permitted to provide alcohol for medicinal purposes. Charles apparently kept a bottle of whiskey for William Sr. to occasionally drink whenever he came by the store. According to most accounts, one day a store clerk unthinkingly rearranged the bottles, and William Sr., who was said to be illiterate, took a swallow of carbolic acid and died within minutes.

(continued next page)

(continued from previous page)

By that time, William Jr. had moved to Calgary and did not make the trip east to his father's funeral. Notably, his mother Louisa didn't die until February 20, 1944; yet she outlived William Jr., though only by less than a year. In Junior's 64 years—he passed away on May 23, 1943—he took on epic challenges, experienced hard-won victories and endured a cacophony of public scorn and ridicule as he endeavored to enlighten his fellow man without regard to personal reward. Much like Coughlin—he and the persecuted priest eventually met in person to compare notes on challenging the banking establishment—Aberhart was a genuine Christian soldier who would carry on, no matter what.

DISCIPLINED TEACHER & PREACHER

Aberhart's first major job was secured in the autumn of his first year of marriage, at the Central Public School in Brantford, Ontario—where, as a teacher, he earned a reputation as a strict disciplinarian, even though the students, some of whom received "the strap" from Aberhart, gave him mixed reviews. Yet, the positive reviews he did receive soon boosted his career as an administrator-educator. For five years, starting in 1905, he served as Central's principal. His salary shot up from $60 per month as teacher to $1,000 per year in his new post. But what finally prompted this Ontarian to "go west" to Alberta was a principalship offer for $1,400 per year from the Calgary Board of Education.

After declining a counter-offer from the school in Brantford, Aberhart, who made it to Calgary by the spring of 1910, purchased a two-story home while daughter Khona finished her academic year back in Brantford. When that was complete, the family followed Aberhart to Calgary—a frontier town that reeked of horse droppings and public drunkenness. But Aberhart quickly adjusted to his new home and became the Alexandra Public School's principal when an initial job offer at the new Mount Royal school was shelved due to construction delays. He went on to serve as principal at the Victoria School and, by 1915, at Crescent Heights High School. His love of discipline and organization persisted, although he took a more easy-going approach at Crescent Heights. Still, his no-nonsense policies were cited by many as a key reason why Crescent Height's pupils scored exceedingly well on departmental exams. Aberhart soon created Calgary's first and largest parent-teachers organization. An average of 200 parents would attend the meetings, with whom Aberhart developed good relationships. Here was a dependable, well-spoken man of integrity who had wide appeal and could punctually get things done. What's more, he taught English and math amid his duties as principal and offered extensive tutoring while urging his students to adopt four axioms that he followed in his own life: Be enthusiastic; be ambitious; develop a distinctive personality; and find a hobby and ride it hard. All told, Aberhart exhibited an organizational prowess and compassion that would serve him well in his upcoming, but at this point unanticipated, foray into politics.

GODLY DISPOSITION

Aberhart's religious life developed in a more informal fashion. While his parents apparently weren't frequent churchgoers, as a child Aberhart attended a Presbyterian Sunday school. And, according to the 1987 book "Bible Bill: A Biography of William Aberhart," by David Elliot and Iris Miller, "Under circumstances that are not clear to history, in high school [in the latter 1800s], he became a devout Christian." His studies at Brantford's Zion Presbyterian Church piqued his interest in biblical prophecy, which led him to dispensationalism (which held that history was divided into seven dispensations; God made a covenant with man in each of them, but man broke all the covenants). Aberhart's evolving Christian worldview also encountered the corrosive meanderings of dispensationalist change-agent Cyrus Scofield, whose infamous Scofield Bible persuaded many Christians, to their everlasting detriment, to stay out of the organic and political affairs of the temporal world altogether, and instead "pack their bags" and wait for a rapturous end of the world according to the Book of Revelation.

Thankfully, Aberhart ultimately did not take such admonitions to heart, since the proposed monetary and financial reforms that soon would define his tenure as Alberta's premier for the new Social Credit Party were based on the opposite notion that civic officials could and should seek to establish a system of "practical Christianity" suited to everyday life—via financial reforms that would disarm the Satanic monetary-slavery system imposed with an iron fist by the banking class and their minions.

Upon his above-noted arrival in Calgary for school-principal jobs, the ambitious Mr. Aberhart, as a lay preacher, also taught the Young Men's Bible Class at the Grace Presbyterian Church. Within a few weeks, attendance topped 100 but his teaching privileges were nixed when the church's senior minister, a Mr. Esler, disagreed with some of Aberhart's prophetic views. Aberhart, while he carried with him the seeds of the Baptist faith from growing up in Ontario, went on to teach successfully at the Wesley and Trinity Methodist churches. The baptism of he and his wife in the Baptist faith was consummated upon his involvement with Calgary's Westbourne Baptist Church as a lay preacher. The Bible study that he began there in 1918 grew steadily. By 1923, the local Palace Theater had to be rented to provide adequate space for Aberhart's followers.

But the year 1925 brought with it a highly pivotal change when radio station CFCN began broadcasting his Sunday sermons for the first time.

(Notably, Father Coughlin's first radio sermon happened just one year later when the priest was assigned to the Royal Oak parish near Detroit). Thus, with Aberhart's inspiring voice leaving the theater's confines and rolling across the Alberta prairie, the stage was set for him to endear himself with a population that soon would feel the frightening squeeze of the economic jackals that engineered a "Great Depression," driving scores of Americans and Canadians to destitution and suicide. Something had to be done by someone. And Aberhart would soon realize that someone was him.

DEPRESSION SPURS POLITICAL TURN

With the financial octopus that intentionally spawned the Great Depression extending its tentacles into western Canada, Aberhart's observation of its harsh effects on Albertan and Saskatchewan farmers quickly propelled him into the harsh world of politics. Amid his studious efforts to understand underlying causes and seek solutions, Aberhart discovered the "Social Credit" monetary-reform writings of Major Clifford Hugh Douglas, a British engineer of considerable renown who documented precise inadequacies in the British monetary system and devised remedies.

From 1932 to 1935, Aberhart thought he could persuade existing political parties, particularly the United Farmers of Alberta (UFA), to adopt Douglas's prescribed economic reforms—which included dumping the debt-based monetary system so that governments could directly create, interest-free, the necessary medium of exchange for a fully functioning society. Douglas's early books, "Social Credit" and "Economic Democracy," among others, also called for a "national dividend," periodically paid to individuals regardless of employment status, to offset what Douglas showed was a "gap" between the comparatively paltry supply of citizen income on the one hand, and the increasingly prodigious output of goods and services (thanks to a growing reliance on automation, even back then) on the other. However, while Western society's bountiful production technically made it richer, the inverted economic system registered "progress" as a perpetually growing debt. Douglas abhorred this insane situation. His call for infusing extra (dividend) money into society—in carefully calculated amounts to seek parity with GDP data, distributing newly created money, not redistributed funds from the tax till—would enable the people to get off the proverbial treadmill and comfortably buy what's produced in order to liquidate production in each production cycle, thereby avoiding the paradox of having to rely on loans and credit extensions in the present to pay for past production.

Social Credit as outlined by Douglas also was based on decentralization and broad ownership across all classes—basically populism—thus it was not centralized state socialism as many wrongly assumed, nor was it the top-down, predatory monopoly capitalism that fostered the Great Depression and still runs much of the world today. Those still employed, however feebly, could quickly recover with such a supplemental dividend and those currently unemployed could survive, pay off old debts, and weigh their options. Yet for all the potential benefits that "Douglas Social Credit," as it's known today, might bring, the refusal of the UFA and other similar entities to adopt it prompted Aberhart to found the Social Credit Party of Alberta. The party won the 1935 provincial election by a landslide with more than 54% of the popular vote and all but seven of the 63 legislative seats. The winners, who came to be known as the "socreds," didn't actually expect to win the Aug. 22 election, at least not so resoundingly. Yet when the party was tasked with picking its leader, Aberhart—who didn't want the job, at first—was persuaded into accepting it, as he was the party's guiding light. He was formally sworn in as Alberta's 7th premier on Sept. 3, 1935.

Although Aberhart had become premier, he was not yet a member of the Legislature. A fellow "social crediter," Assembly member William Morrison, gave up his seat for Aberhart—a standard Westminster system practice when a leader or cabinet minister doesn't have a seat. Aberhart, in a system where one can wear many hats, served as his own education minister and, starting in 1937, attorney general. And his government did indeed implement some social credit policies as promised in the party's platform, amid Alberta's poor financial status in the depths of the Depression. But the federal government's opposition to social credit was a major obstacle, especially due to the federal government's jurisdiction over Canadian currency and banks. But since there was no rule against Alberta producing its own currency, Aberhart's government produced "prosperity certificates" to boost purchasing power. Moreover, he threatened private banking power through extension of a measure to halt foreclosures and enact mandatory debt adjustments. The Alberta government even started its own banks, the Alberta Treasury Branch (ATB Financial), which still exist but operate along more conventional lines.

Aberhart also:

- Sought in 1937, via two bills, to put all the province's banks under provincial control, but royal assent was refused. Another bill would have required the already hostile newspapers to print government rebuttals to stories deemed "inaccurate" by the provincial cabinet. All three of these bills were later declared "unconstitutional" by the Supreme Court of Canada.
- Instituted several relief programs to help people out of poverty, as well as public works projects and a program that halted some mortgage foreclosures and debt collections.

(continued next page)

(continued from previous page)

- Brought in legislation under which members of the Legislature could be recalled by a portion of their constituents.

The newspapers of the day were by and large shameless toadies for the moneyed class and their political prostitutes. Many of the papers printed highly insulting political cartoons against Aberhart and his policies. And while no sitting government is beyond reproach—Aberhart's recall bill generated a recall against him, so he repealed the law—the Pultizer Prize Committee awarded a special citation, the first one awarded outside the U.S., to the Edmonton Journal, the Calgary Herald and several other daily and weekly newspapers for their "leadership" in the fight against Aberhart's editorial-rebuttal act. But these and other news outlets were hostile to virtually everything else that the Aberhart government proposed as well.

KLINCK FAMILY CONNECTION

Wallace Klinck, who was born in Medicine Hat, Alberta in 1934, is among the world's top experts on social credit. Much the same could be said of his brother Robert, who worked for the Social Credit national party in the 1970's and 1980s, and of another brother, Donald. They are proud of a special family keepsake, a class picture of their father, Raymond, when he was a member of William Aberhart's debate team at Crescent High School, 1921-22. Raymond later became quite knowledgeable about social credit.

Thus, Raymond's sons are, in a strong sense, the intellectual descendants of social credit's bold entry into the Depression-era political scene. Wallace will be the first to tell you, however, that the corrupting nature of party politics likely doomed the Social Credit Party from the start, since much more public education about social credit was needed for related political action to succeed over the long haul; still, the Alberta Social Credit party lasted until 1971. Wallace, in the post-Aberhart party years, immersed himself in social credit, distributed books and gave talks on the subject to the Canadian League of Rights (CLOR) and other groups. He gave a great oratory in his own right at the Jubilee Auditorium in Edmonton at a CLOR function in the 1970s. The audio address is posted on You Tube.

"Alfred Hooke, or 'Alf,' a teacher and preeminent cabinet minister in the Social Credit government, kept promoting social credit right till the end, but I think he was under duress to promote it the wrong way. I knew Alf quite well," Wallace told TBR. "He was a powerful speaker. But Ernest Manning, who talked a good talk but ultimately betrayed Aberhart's social credit legacy—especially when Manning took over as premier upon Aberhart's passing under suspicious circumstances—kept Alfred around, due to his competence and abilities." "[Aberhart told 'Alf' that he had been feeling very tired over the last couple months.] When Aberhart died, he had just departed to British Columbia. Many felt he was murdered. I spoke to Tom Taylor, who was formerly dean of industrial arts at the University of Saskatoon college. I spent a lot of time with Tom. He told me in no uncertain terms that Aberhart had had salad on the train to B.C. and that he may have died from it; that it was possibly poisoned," Wallace added.

He continued: "Manning, who ultimately controlled Alf, had an 8th grade education when he joined Aberhart's social credit movement. Manning always 'professed' to stand for social credit, but if you even mentioned Douglas under his iron rule after Aberhart passed away, you were almost certain to be expelled from the party. Orvis Kennedy was the party strongman and protected Manning. Several social credit parliament members rebelled and managed to get reelected, but they were neutralized and discredited by the party machinery run by Kennedy and Manning who, together, captained a counterfeit organization. They even literally incinerated Douglas's books and deemed Douglas an 'anti-Semite' while Manning declared the Jews 'were the chosen people of God.'" (3018)

ABERHART'S LEGACY

In the 30 years from the time Alberta was formed in 1905 to 1935 when the socreds came to power, the provincial public debt soared from zero to $167 million, a vast sum at the time. Liberal party and UFA party governments shared in the responsibility for such profligacy. According to H.E. Nichols' insightful book about the Aberhart era, "Alberta's Fight for Freedom," this also included "municipal debt of $70 million, farm mortgage debt of $162 million, other rural private debt of $233 million and urban private debt of $100 million. This made a private debt burden alone of $495 million, on which the average interest charge was 7%, amounting to $35 million a year; and a total public and private debt structure of $726 million. But this was not all. The Dominion of Canada had incurred a public debt of [just over $3.2 billion] in [its] 68 years since confederation, and Albertans shouldered a proportionate share of this burden too."

This was the largely hidden but terrible economic context in which Aberhart, who perhaps did not fully grasp all aspects of social credit himself, tried with all his might to address. "What William Aberhart inherited was an administrative machine in the last stages of decay," Nichols noted.

But what Aberhart lacked in precise economic knowledge, he made up for with wall-to-wall moxie; his regular radio addresses during his years in office from 1935 to 1943 continued largely unabated, even as he and his fellow socreds did everything they could policy-wise, against vicious opposition in the press, some pulpits and the bankers, to level the playing field, un-rig

the system and bring relief to an injured and bewildered populace which, like most populations today, has been led to believe that foreign governments and other cultures are their unremitting sworn enemies, when its largely the predatory financial mandarins who, perched in the shadows, constitute the only intractable enemy actually worth challenging and defeating.

Speaking of bonded debt, Aberhart himself announced to the people:

> **Now I want you to listen carefully for I am most anxious that you should understand just how vicious and inequitable is this type of debt . . . . every dollar of money which is issued under our present system creates a debt . . . and is owed by the people to the banking institutions. It will be obvious then, the people can never get out of debt . . . did you get that? [I]magine that I alone have the monopoly right to issue money in Canada and I also have the full protection of the law. Anyone else who dares to issue money will very quickly be hustled into jail. Coupled with this authority I would have the power as much or as little money as I liked, and by that means I would be able to control all production . . . . I would be able to decide what standard of living the people would be allowed to have . . . . you can readily see, I am sure, the tremendous power that would be mine under such a set-up. I would be absolute master . . .**

In summary, while Douglas sent advisers to Alberta from time to time, and personally visited Aberhart, these forces that Aberhart so well described eventually prevailed through hook or crook. McKenzie King became the federal prime minister and, as an apparent Rockefeller agent, denounced Aberhart's efforts, among other widespread opprobrium. So, the presumption that he may have been taking out by his enemies is not hard to believe. Ironically, Major Douglas himself met a similarly untimely and mysterious end when, upon entering a Scottish hospital in 1952 for a rather routine leg problem, he emerged dead. Douglas himself wrote a eulogy for Aberhart. In the June 5, 1943 edition of his "Social Crediter" newsletter, he indicated that Aberhart appeared to be on track to becoming the prime minister of all of Canada, which would have terrified his enemies. Douglas wrote:

> **A recent Gallup Poll recorded a doubling of support for Social Credit ideas over Canada as a whole . . . . Whether it was humanly possible for a man of Aberhart's age and localised experience to have succeeded in the more complex problems of the Federal Government it is hard to say, but there is little doubt that he was beginning to appear as a coming Prime Minister of Canada. While drastically remodeling and purifying the day-to-day administration of the Province, [Aberhart] uncovered his enemies' hand by a series of bills which forced Mr. Mackenzie King—returned to power in Ottawa on a speech [called] "Hands of Alberta," to forswear himself by disallowing [those bills]."**

It was during a 1943 visit to his daughters in British Columbia that Aberhart's death on May 23 came about under murky circumstances—what the media usually calls his "unexpected" death. The man who nearly saved Alberta from banker rule and could have saved Canada, and perhaps beyond, was interred at Forest Lawn Memorial Park in Burnaby, B.C. May his example of the only war really worth fighting never be forgotten. ***

THE CHURCH IS TO BLAME FOR THE DESTRUCTIVE EXTENT OF THE MANDATES by Matthew Littlefield

Sat. 16th of April, 2022

"Let not any one pacify his conscience by the delusion that he can do no harm if he takes no part, and forms no opinion. Bad men need nothing more to compass their ends, than that good men should look on and do nothing. He is not a good man who, without a protest, allows wrong to be committed in his name, and with the means which he helps to supply, because he will not trouble himself to use his mind on the subject."

John Stuart Mill

I sat in a room full of pastors once and the discussion made me more furious than perhaps any other discussion I have had with a group of leaders in my life. This was a room filled with pastors of all ages, young one's like myself and older pastors too, but most of the men were older and experienced pastors, men who had been around in life and ministry for some time.

They were talking about the *National Redress Scheme* and how it would work, and why it was better for Churches to sign on to the program offered, rather than go it alone. The *National Redress Scheme* is a system set up to compensate the victims of institutional abuse. It is an attempt to reassert justice for the victims of abuse and it is necessary. So, it was not this which angered me.

What angered me was something the pastors said. I asked a question about why so many pastors did not report abuse to the police at the time. One of the worst aspects of these abuse scandals is not that the laws at the time did not have the ability to punish offenders, it was that the laws at the time were often not applied, because things were kept, hush hush, on the down low, quiet. One of the older pastors said to me, "You have to understand Matt, it was not the done thing at the time to report this sort of thing." *(continued next page)*

(continued from previous page)
Other pastors in the room nodded, as if to say this settled the issue.

This is what made me furious and I let them know it. I asked them why did they need to be told that they should seek justice for harmed children. There was no excuse for not taking this stuff to the police. This is part of a shepherd's role; when made aware of danger we need to protect the littlest lambs from wolves and devouring lions. Why did the government need to make a law for mandatory reporting? Should not pastors have led the way in this? I was furious at those men, and they were rightly chagrined. But their reason stuck with me: it wasn't the done thing. In other words, they couldn't bring themselves to go against the culture of society in that day.

Society is now punishing the Church for this neglect and complicity in many ways. There is the financial compensation, which is the least that the victims deserve. There is the decline of the Church in Australia. And there is a social denigration of the Church's reputation. Even though some of the secular authorities were just as culpable in many abuse situations themselves, many people, rightly, hold the Church to a higher standard. Christians and non-Christians alike in Australia believe the Church should be a place of justice that seeks to advocate for true justice in society as well. They are right to hate the Church's failure in this regard and to wave it in the Church's face.

But God in his grace gave the Church a chance to redeem itself: Covid. In the last two years, society was faced with a time of rampant anxiety, and as people do when they are anxious they lose sight of what is right and find themselves willing to do or support things they would not normally do or support. Out of fear for a virus that was shown from very early to have a very mild effect on the majority of people, a malady hyped up around the world by terrified and often dishonest leaders and media personalities, the nations of the West began to employ unjust mandates in an attempt to control the virus – mandates which really controlled the populations who had been terrified by what their leaders said about the virus. These mandates required Western people to override long held views on human rights, and just basic decency, all in an effort to cajole the population to accept certain measures; like coerced vaccination. Fear was propagated at every level of society, and voices of reason were quashed and labelled as trouble-makers, anti-vaxxers and more.

This situation handed an easy win to the Church. All the Church had to do was step up and say clearly that mandated medical care is evil and no one should lose their job or be coerced to have a vaccine. They should be free to choose and freedom to choose requires that they are not pressured in anyway. To help it stand in such a way, the Church simply had to draw on its deep tradition of advocating for liberty of conscience, its long tradition of standing in the way of tyranny, and simply say: we do not agree with mandatory vaccines.

In the height of the hysteria secular leaders and media personalities would have attacked the Church, but eventually once people calmed down, they would have appreciated the fact that the Church did not lose its cool in a moment of anxiety. It was a softball throw, an easy win for the church. Take the momentary unpopularity but do the right thing for the nation in the long term. The response was a no-brainer: mandates must be condemned. And yet, the Church dropped the ball utterly. Very few spoke up, and those that did were rebuked by loud voices in the Church's media arms. Why didn't many speak up? Well as they may say in the future, "You have to understand Matt, it was not the done thing at the time to speak up about this sort of thing."

Now the narrative is breaking and secular authorities are starting to say the right thing:

> "According to the Australian Human Rights Commission, it can be unlawful to require an employee to be vaccinated and that '*the need for vaccination should be assessed on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the nature of the workplace and the individual circumstances of each employee'*. It goes on to say that the Commonwealth *Sex Discrimination Act 1984*, the *Disability Discrimination Act 1992*, and *Age Discrimination Act 2004* makes it unlawful to discriminate on the grounds of pregnancy, disability, and age, including employment – with disability broadly defined as including past, present, and future disabilities. Strict rules or conditions that impose mandates on these groups may result in 'indirect discrimination'. One key test to reasonableness about imposing mandates is whether alternative methods can be used to achieve the same goal. It also seeks to determine whether an 'unjustifiable hardship' would be placed on the employer."[i]

This is what those of us who have been opposing the mandates have said all along. The same article notes:

> "The Courier Mail has reported that the Human Rights Commission (Commission) has sensationally intervened in the Supreme Court challenge brought by educators – believing the CHO has gone too far. According to reports, the Commission claimed the vaccine mandate for teachers and childcare workers was outside the Chief Health Officer (CHO) John Gerrard's powers under the *Public Health Act 2005*. The Commission further stated that the right of the CHO to give such directions was conditional based on reasonable and demonstrably justifiable limits upon human rights and that based on the present evidence, the CHO's mandates were not justified."

This has been obvious to many of us for a long time now, but finally the narrative is breaking and secular authorities are starting to admit that things have gone way too far.

Where was the Human Rights Commission all along? Doing the same thing Church leaders were doing: hiding from the obvious truth that the mandates were unjust, wicked, and needed to be opposed. But at least now the Human Rights Commission has spoken up. The majority of Church leaders in Australia are still silent. Instead of being at the front of this issue, having roundly condemned evil from the start, the Church sat on its haunches and cuddled up to the world, submitted itself to the mandates, stayed quiet about their injustice, and in some instances even enforced them in their spheres of influence. The Church did what it had done in the past with the abuse scandals: shown it was no better than the culture of society around it. And the saddest thing is this did not have to be.

It was the Church that taught the concepts of liberty of conscience to the West. Early Anabaptists and Baptists had already fought the battle for freedom of conscience on disputable matters and won. Hence such Christian teachings can be found in secular Australia laws, such as this example from the Queensland Human Rights Act 2019:

> **"20Freedom of thought, conscience, religion and belief**
> (1)Every person has the right to freedom of thought, conscience, religion and belief, including—
> (a)the freedom to have or to adopt a religion or belief of the person's choice; and
> (b)the freedom to demonstrate the person's religion or belief in worship, observance, practice and teaching, either individually or as part of a community, in public or in private.
> (2)A person must not be coerced or restrained in a way that limits the person's freedom to have or adopt a religion or belief."[ii]

This has also had an impact on medical human rights laws, the same act tells us:

> **"17Protection from torture and cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment**
> A person must not be—
> (a)subjected to torture; or
> (b)treated or punished in a cruel, inhuman or degrading way; or
> (c)subjected to medical or scientific experimentation or treatment without the person's full, free and informed consent."[iii]

This was not rocket science. There were clear injustices being perpetrated on society, and the Church already had a grand tradition of having stood against similar injustices in the past. The Church of the past had opposed slavery, spoken out against one man owning the body of another, worked for safer working environments, spoken against child labour and more. Early Baptists paved the way in the English speaking world for liberty of conscience; they had influenced and taught other denominations to take up the cause, and such teachings were eventually set into the laws of countries like Australia.

This was a battle that had already been fought, won and settled on the right side; no one has to right to coerce another on matters of conscience. History had already chosen the side of liberty of conscience in disputable issues, and all the Church had to do was remind people that this was the case and stand firm against mandates. The government likely would have still gone too far, but at least we would have had clean hands. And there is the likelihood that the unified voice of the Church would have had an amazing chilling effect on tyranny.

The Church failed on this issue massively. But not all of the Church. There were voices that spoke up. Writers at *Caldronpool*, *The Canberra Declaration*, Bill Meuhlenberg at *Culture Watch*, Bob Cotton at *Maitland Christian Church* in NSW and others were speaking. They were marginalized, attacked by the majority of Christian media, called all sorts of names, but there were people who did not forget the Church's role in a time of crisis is partly to challenge authoritarians from going too far. Because of these bold Christian leaders no one will be able to seriously say in the future that "it just wasn't the done thing to speak up about it at that time" because brave men and women did speak up.

God gives kings authority to rule and he gives the Church the authority to call kings, that go too far, to account. It has been the balance of these two biblical teachings that have helped make the West so great in the past. A balance of powers. The Church and State both taking an active role in society are necessary for a just land.

The Church was given a softball on this issue and on the whole it failed utterly. For many reasons, but partly because it has forgotten its own legacy. This is why myself and Tim Grant wrote *Defending Conscience: How Baptists Reminded the Church to Defy Tyranny*. We want to remind the Church in Australia of how the concept of liberty of conscience was developed, and the great things it achieved in Western society. The Baptists were central in this history, but it was not until they convinced other denominations to take up the cause that liberty of conscience started to become enshrined in Western law.

You can buy this book here at: https://lockepress.com/defending-conscience/. It can be pre-ordered now, and should be released soon. This book is part of our efforts to remind the Church of this legacy.

(continued next page)

(continued from previous page)

In my view the Church is largely to blame for what is happening in society, because the Church forgot its great calling: to command nations, including national leaders, to obey the teachings of Jesus, and these include not coercing people's bodies to accept something they do not want. For Christians we are taught in the Bible that Christ bought those bodies with a price, they are his, they are not Caesar's, and they are not the Premiers. And for all people, the human body carries the image of God, not the image of Caesar, so still it is owned by God and not the state.

The Church failed on this issue, as it had failed on the abuse issue. It better soon start lifting its game or God and society will have no need of it, because it will just fade into the society around it and become irrelevant. The Church is at its best when it fearlessly stands against the culture's sin, whatever it is, even when it is unpopular, especially when it is unpopular, because that is exactly the legacy our own Lord displays for us in the gospels. ***

List of references:

[i] Christin Carney 2022, "Queensland Human Rights Commission claims vaccine mandate outside CHO's power", Australian Free and Independent Press Network, https://afipn.com.au/queensland-human-rights-commission-claims-vaccine-mandate-outside-chos-power/?fbclid=IwAR2pE_e30j-HOCVTbxZRRVl8GK69cMQZLhcR_g-GWHfma7AJzJJbofpU9sc.
[ii] Queensland Legislation, Human Rights Act 2019, https://www.legislation.qld.gov.au/view/whole/html/asmade/act-2019-005.
[iii] Ibid.

WHAT YOU NEED TO KNOW ABOUT THE WHO PANDEMIC TREATY by Dr. Joseph Mercola

The globalists that brought us the wildly exaggerated COVID pandemic in an effort to cement a biosecurity grid into place is now hard at work on the next phase of this New World Order.

The World Health Organization has started drafting a global pandemic treaty on pandemic preparedness that would grant it absolute power over global biosecurity, such as the power to implement digital identities/vaccine passports, mandatory vaccinations, travel restrictions, standardized medical care and more.

In "The Corbett Report"1,2 above, independent journalist James Corbett reviews what this treaty is, how it will change the global landscape and strip you of some of your most basic rights and freedoms. Make no mistake, the WHO pandemic treaty is a direct attack on the sovereignty of its member states, as well as a direct attack on your bodily autonomy.

A Backdoor to Global Governance

As noted by anti-extremism activist Maajid Nawaz in an April 28, 2022, Twitter post,[3] the "WHO pandemic treaty serves as a backdoor to global empire." COVID-19, while potentially deadly to certain vulnerable groups, simply isn't a valid justification for handing over more power to the WHO, especially in light of its many inexplicable "mistakes" in this and previous pandemics.

As just one example, the WHO didn't publicly admit SARS-CoV-2 was airborne until the end of December 2021,[4] yet scientists knew the virus was airborne within weeks of the pandemic being declared.[5] The WHO also ignored early advice about airborne transmission.[6]
So, it seems clear that the effort to now hand over more power to the WHO is about something other than them being the most qualified to make health decisions that benefit and protect everyone.

It seems far more likely that the WHO is being installed as a de facto governing body for the global Deep State.[7] Through the WHO, under the guise of biosecurity, the globalist cabal who seek to own everything and control everyone, will then be able to implement their wishes across the whole world in one fell swoop.

With this treaty in place, all member nations will be subject to the WHO's dictates. If the WHO says every person on the planet needs to have a vaccine passport and digital identity to ensure vaccination compliance, then that's what every country will be forced to implement, even if the people have rejected such plans using local democratic processes.

As noted by Corbett, these negotiations are already well underway,[8] and the treaty is expected to be fully implemented in 2024 — that is, unless the people of the world wake up to what's happening and beat back this monstrosity. ***

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.