"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. 11 Registered Australia Post - Publication PP343214 / 00016 November 2022

CONTENTS

Restoring the Spiritual Commons *(continued)* by M. Oliver Heydorn 1
Restoring the Constitutional Commons by Philip Benwell MBE 4
Address for 2022 New Times dinner by Michael Watson 6

RESTORING THE SPIRITUAL COMMONS (PART 2 OF 2) by M. Oliver Heydorn

Delivered at the Australian League of Rights National Seminar, Adelaide SA Australia 8 October 2022

1. In the first place, it would be the end of the purely secular state.

Whatever the principle of the separation of Church and state might mean, it cannot mean or ought not to mean that the state has no obligations to God, or that it has the natural right to remain neutral with respect to fundamental questions of morality or religion. Instead, it would be widely recognised that the state has responsibilities in these matters and that it has an obligation to conform itself in its operations to the Kingship of Christ. Even those laws which are currently in force and which are sound and would therefore be retained would have to be re-conceptualized. Immoral acts, for example, that destroy our capacity to live together peacefully and prosperously in society, such as murder, theft, etc., would continue to be prohibited, but not merely because the majority might wish for them to be prohibited. They would be prohibited first and foremost because they are at odds with Christian principles, because they violate the law of Christ the King.

2. In the second place, if Christ ruled as King, it would be the end of the notion that authority resides in or comes from the people (i.e., the masses).

This follows directly from the first consequence: if the state has to answer to something above and beyond itself as the ultimate authority in reality, i.e., to Christ, then clearly any social theory which asserts that authority in society somehow originates from below, from the people, must be in error. Indeed, the constant teaching of the Church is that "All authority comes from God" *(Omnis potestas a Deo)* and that if any person or any group (including 'the people') exercises any kind of authority or power in a society it's because it has been delegated to them by God. They are therefore responsible for the uses that they make of it and will be answerable to God if they abuse that authority. No one is morally free to do with social power whatever he or she pleases.

As Pope Leo XIII explained in his encyclical *Immortale Dei:*

> "Every civilized community must have a ruling authority, and this authority, no less than society itself, has its source in nature, and has, consequently, God for its author. Hence it follows that all public power must proceed from God. FOR GOD ALONE IS THE TRUE AND SUPREME LORD OF THE WORLD. Everything without exception must be subject to Him, and must serve Him, so that whosoever holds the right to govern, holds it from one sole and single source, namely, God, the Sovereign Ruler of all. "There is no power but from God." [Rom. 13:1].[5]

3. In the third and final place, and as a direct consequence of the 2nd point I just made, if Christ ruled as King, it would also be the end of any theory or practice of political democracy that is built on the supposition that power comes from the people.

The popular idea of democracy, i.e., that government is based on the alleged power or authority of the people, can be traced back to the "Declaration of the Rights of Man" that was part and parcel of the French Revolution. Within its historical context, *"Omnis potestas a populo"* was, in fact, a deliberate repudiation of the Social Kingship of Christ. It was the cry of a true revolution, i.e., the forcible overthrow of an established and, in this case, rightful conception and system of government. The world has been revolving and devolving in a particularly brutal way ever since. For her part, the Church is totally opposed to any concept of democracy in which authority is said to reside in the people and/or in which those who govern are said to receive their authority from the people. Pope Leo XIII insisted in *Immortale Dei* that:

"In a society grounded upon such maxims, all government is nothing more nor less than the will of the people; and the people, being under the power of itself alone, is alone its own ruler . . . The authority of God is passed over in silence, just as if there were no God; or as if He cared nothing for human society; or as if men, in their individual capacity or bound together in social relations, owed nothing to God; or as if there could be a government of which the whole origin and power and authority did not reside in God Himself: Thus, as is evident, a state becomes nothing but a multitude, which is its own master and ruler."[6]

Now, this opposition to the popular theory of democracy on the part of the Church does not imply anything about democracy itself. There are, of course, different political systems, different forms of government that can be envisaged, and the merits and demerits of these would have to form the subject of a separate discussion altogether. As far as democracy is concerned, the Church is not opposed to democracy in and of itself, i.e., as a system of government, so long as all that we mean by democracy is that those who govern are chosen by means of a vote (whether that vote be based on a system of limited or universal suffrage). The crucial point is that even in a democracy it must be understood that those who govern derive their authority ultimately from God and are therefore responsible to Him, in the same way that an absolute monarch would hold his authority from God and be responsible to Him. If the people in a democracy somehow govern, let's say in a direct democracy of some kind, they govern as God's legates, and cannot or ought not to be permitted to pass any legislation which is contrary to the law of God (even if the passing of that legislation is the demonstrated will of the majority of people in a democratic society). In other words, the social Kingship of Christ means that there are definite limits to what the people can authorize in any democracy that has previously chosen to accept the Kingship of Christ as its corner stone.

C.H. Douglas, Social Credit, and the Social Kingship of Christ

Now, as far as CH. Douglas is concerned, it is true that he never wrote explicitly on the topic of the Social Kingship of Christ. It is likewise true that He never used the term and was quite possibly not even familiar with it. However, when one considers what the 'Social Kingship of Christ' would mean in practical terms, namely, a well-defined role for a responsible Church in the spiritual, cultural, political and economic life of a nation, it is clear that Douglas was in favour of a lived application of the doctrine. In defending this interpretation of Douglas' thinking, I will rely heavily on two speeches which Douglas made in the latter part of his life: *"Realistic Constitutionalism"* and *"The Realistic Position of the Church of England"*. For example, in his speech, *"The Realistic Position of the Church of England",* Douglas wrote in support of a "... general policy which appears to lead to a re-incorporation of the Church as a living and vital element in daily life, ..."[7] But what exactly would that entail?

1) To begin with, Douglas was also opposed to the purely secular state. For example, in The Realistic Position of the Church of England, he writes:

> "Before the Church of England can become what it should be, an integral, primary, and effective part of the Constitution, so that the phrase 'Christianity is part of the Law of England' may have real meaning, it is faced with the problem of restoring its *locus standi.*
>
> "It must be insisted that Christianity is either something inherent in the very warp and woof of the Universe, or it is just a set of interesting opinions, largely discredited, and thus doubtfully on a par with many other sets of opinions, and having neither more nor less claim to consideration.
>
> "The Roman Catholic Church has always recognised this, and has never wavered in its claims. It may be (and here I write with diffidence and proper humility) that the most direct path to an effective Church, is at least, close rapproachement, and at the most re-union of all the Churches making claims to Catholicity."[8]

2) Likewise, Douglas disparaged the Rousseaunesque notion that the consensus of the mob or the masses has any special claim to consideration, or that the masses are equipped to set the correct parameters for political activity. In Realistic Constitutionalism he writes: *"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*."[9]
In other words, the alleged 'voice of the people', that is to say 'the mob', is not only not the voice of God, but it is more likely to be the voice of the devil.

3) Finally, Douglas also rejected the popular notion of and justification for democracy. In *Realistic Constitutionalism* he writes:

> "To an audience of this character, I do not need to enter into a discussion of the merits or otherwise of democracy, because whatever else it may be, Great Britain is not, and never has been, an effective democracy, and was never less so than at present. Nevertheless, short of a *coup d'etat,* I do not think that the idea of democracy, which is of course very nebulous, can be abruptly abandoned. It has been too much propagandised, and means too many things to too many men. But whether by the strengthening and elevation of Common Law, and its repository in the

care of an effective Second, non-elective, Chamber, or by some other method, clearly defined limits must be placed on the power of a House of Commons elected on a majority principle. It ought to be clear to any unprejudiced individual that a majority is always wrong in its reasons for a given situation, and cannot, therefore, possibly be right in its remedies, although a homogeneous, native-born majority is often instinctively right in its judgment of the nature of a situation."[10]

In the same speech, Douglas went on to emphasise that, in his view, the foundational principles of our society should be, in a sense, pre-democratic and therefore should not be regarded as changeable by any democratic vote:

"Speaking, not of course as a lawyer, but as a student of history and organisation, it is my opinion that the restoration of the supremacy of Common Law, the removal of encroachments upon it, and the establishment of the principle that legislation by the House of Commons impinging upon it is *ultra vires,* is an urgent necessity. The locus of sovereignty over Common Law is not in the electorate, because Common Law did not derive from the electorate and indeed ante-dated any electorate in the modem sense. In the main, it derived from the Mediaeval Church, perhaps not directly, but from the climate of opinion which the Church disseminated."[11]

One of the roles for the Church in Douglas' constitutional schema would be, in conjunction with the aristocracy, to safeguard these unchangeable preambles of the regime:

"Common Law is something which, if it changes at all, ought to change very slowly indeed, and the greatest difficulty should be placed in the path of an attack upon it, both by insisting on its supremacy over House of Commons enactment, and by making it subject only to something at least as arduous as an Amendment to the United States Constitution. It appears to me that a properly empowered and constituted House of Lords, Spiritual and Temporal, is the natural guardian of Common Law, as the Barons demonstrated at Runnymede."[12]

According to Douglas, the Church, on behalf of Christ the King, is to have a politics and also a distinct role in politics:

"not only should I not object to the interest of the Church dignitaries in the matters of the everyday life of this world, but it appears to me to be axiomatic that a religion must have a politics, although not a technical politics."[13]

But this is to be distinguished from any kind of theocracy because the nuts and bolts of legislation would be beyond the jurisdiction of the Church: "It does not appear that legislation is a proper function for the Church, ..."[14]

In fact, what Douglas is basically arguing for is a re-establishment of the tri-partite or Trinitarian constitution which characteristic of the Middle Ages. Consider the following two passages from his work:

"To summarise, so far as it is possible with so wide a subject, the ideas I have endeavoured to present to you, it is firstly necessary to recognise that we have allowed ourselves to accept a false theory of sovereignty, false not merely politically but structurally; a theory which is a departure from our own Constitution.
To a very considerable extent, we must retrace our steps, in the face of many false guides, to the fork in the road somewhere about the time of the so-called Reformation."[15]

8: "... we are to-day fighting a war which began in England in 1644, and has broken out sporadically at intervals. The real Britain, and the real America, have sustained one defeat after another. But the final battle is still to come.
... Detached investigation has convinced me, firstly that the real line of demarcation in the world is cultural, not economic, and that economic inequality is consciously produced and employed to provide troops for an attack on Anglo-Saxon culture. And secondly, that sooner or later the spurious Whig culture of New York and London, equally with that of Stalin, Hitler, and Mussolini, which are mere derivatives of it, must crash in ruins, because of the fundamental weakness of absentee management.
To hasten that desirable end, a rapprochement between the pre-Civil War spirit of both England and America, which, if care is taken to avoid too narrow an application of the word, is Catholic, is the most urgent need."[16]

So we see here that Douglas implicitly recognises that the doctrine of the social Kingship of Christ would serve as the linchpin of the whole system. It was the lived application of this doctrine which made Christendom what it was and it is only by restoring the social Kingship that we have any hope of recovering our spiritual inheritance as Western peoples and of restoring the spiritual commons.

Thank you. ***

References Available Online

RESTORING THE CONSTITUTIONAL COMMONS by Philip Benwell MBE

Delivered at the Australian League of Rights National Seminar, Adelaide SA Australia 8 October 2022

It is indeed a great honour to be invited to address this conference today. The Australian League of Rights have supported the Crown throughout and the Australian Monarchist League for several decades and we are tremendously grateful to you and to all those who have gone before.

The title of my comments is: "Restoring the Constitutional Commons." The word 'Commons' has several interpretations. There is a legal meaning, as explained by Robert Bazola, and then there is the general interpretation basically signifying 'available to all', 'to be shared by all' and above all 'for the good of the people'. In this regard one could say that the Australian Constitution was 'of the people, by the people and for the people'. This is because it was drafted by Australians, not just to create the Australian Federation of States, but also to protect the interests of the people. Furthermore, change to the Constitution was placed in the hands of the people, something that our Founding Fathers had to fight for in their negotiations with the British government.

Having said that, I am afraid that I have to inform you that for many years the Australian constitution has been subverted by politicians to take power away from the people – away from the Commons - to empower themselves.

Now this is not the fault of the Founding Fathers. They did everything they could to ensure that the voice of the people would always be heard and that the democracy of and for 'the Commons' they established under the Crown would survive.

However, it did not take long for the federal parliament to deflect the intent of the Founding Fathers and establish political control. This began with elected representatives of the lower house joining into political groups, mainly into the Protectionist Party, the Free Trade Party and the Labour (later spelt Labor) Party (established in 1901). The National Party had been formed in 1920 as the Country Party. In 1944 most non-Labor parties and movements morphed into the Liberal Party which formed a coalition with the National Party.

Today the two main political parties, Labor and Liberal control the political scene. The election of the supposed independent climate group called the Teals will most likely be an aberration and the voter as usual will go back to the two main parties. This is probably to be expected, politicians being politicians. However, the worst devastation of the intent of the Founding Fathers has been in the senate. The Australian senate was established as the 'States House'. Its purpose was to be both a house of review and to represent the interests of the states they represent in the Parliament.

This is why the smaller states have an equal number of senators as the larger states: something now viewed as unfair under current circumstances. However, the control of the political parties in the senate means that the interest of the states is rarely relevant nowadays having been overridden by the interests of the political party each senator represents.

Of course, added to the enormous damage done by the subversion of the constitution from always acting in the interests of the people to being subsumed into party-political interests, are the often-unsuitable candidates put forward by political parties who are then blindly elected by an apathetic, uninterested, voting public.

Surely, any Australian of thought and integrity would never, ever cast a vote for a political party that would elect some of the radical anarchists now sitting in the senate.

Similarly, how is it that the constitutional requirement to formally swear allegiance to the sovereign of Australia is treated with such casual abandonment by the parliamentary and law officers of the country whose duty it is to ensure that the decrees of the constitution are maintained. If our lawmakers have no regard for the oath or affirmation they have taken, how can any of them have the integrity required to serve the people and the country in the positions of trust they have been elected to? Of course, other than blatant attempts to remove the symbols and the traditions of our monarchical system of governance as well as pushing aside, whenever possible, any mention of the sovereign, there have been a number of other incursions into the constitution to remove power from the people, or 'the Commons', to empower the parliament. The 1986 Australia Acts are one case in point. Whilst the Acts did not change one word of the constitution, they opened the door to completely undermine and even remove the constitution. At the time they were going through the state parliaments, there were warnings about this, but the legislators on both sides took no notice. Joh Bjelke-Petersen, then premier of Queensland stood against it, but to his later shame, gave in.

In 1999 the Howard government arranged for two bills to be presented into each of the six state parliaments using clauses of the Australia Acts. The first bill would allow the state to become a republic in its own right with no need for a commonwealth referendum and the second bill enabled the removal of the existing preamble. In 1999 there was a mix of labor and coalition governments in the states and yet they all came together to pass legislation making each state into a republic if the referendum passed. Because it failed, the legislation was allowed to lapse in each of the states.

However, it remains a very great danger that if one political party controls the six states plus the commonwealth parliament, they can bypass the constitution or even, as I have said, remove it.

It is likely that next year Labor will control five of the six states. Fortunately, the Tasmanian election will not be until 2025, but there are elements in the Liberal government of Tasmania that are ultra-left, including, I believe, its premier. These are matters on which we need to keep a close watch. The earlier Labor prime ministers of this century never ventured into such dangerous territory but I do not believe that the current prime minister would be so considerate.

We have therefore been building up a support group of MPs and Senators in the Federal Parliament and have been reaching out to non-Liberal & National politicians to create an alliance in opposition to any move by the federal government to bypass the referendum process. However, with politicians being party-political, one can never tell what will happen, particularly since most nowadays are not there for the Commons, or the common good of the people with many there solely to enrich and empower themselves.

Over the past 2 years what was once called the free world has been subjugated by forced imprisonment of the people said to be for their own protection. In 2020 the announcement that a dangerous virus originating in Wuhan, China, was spreading around the world was made and soon Australia was in different stages of lockdown. The Bio Security Acts gave an enormous power to health ministers and officials to determine the free movement of the individual. Most parliaments did not meet and we were all subjected to a daily barrage of detail and unverified advice by health officials.

Contrary to the Constitution and federation itself, state borders were closed. No one was allowed to cross borders, children could not visit parents and vice versa, families were not allowed to attend funerals and even the sick living close to borders were forbidden to seek help from the closest hospital if it was in another State. The words of the Queensland premier, Annastacia Palaszczuk in October 2021, should probably be engraved on her tombstone "Queensland hospitals are for Queenslanders." With those words the Queensland premier hammered a nail straight into the heart of the Australian constitution.

In the lead up to Federation Edmund Barton, later to become Australia's first Prime Minister had stated that they were working towards "a nation for a continent and a continent for a nation." It took our state premiers using Acts of their state parliaments to destroy that dream that had once been a reality in this country. Where was the High Court, where was the Governor-General and the state Governors and where was the leadership from the federal government to maintain Australia as one nation?

Mind you, it is an absolute disgrace that most of the King's viceroys in this country support a republic. This is despite the special oath of allegiance they give. As one had said to me "what is the oath but mere words."

Now, having delivered the bad news, what, you may ask, must we do to restore the equilibrium to our constitutional arrangements.

I am afraid that I have no rational answer and neither do most clear-thinking people. If barriers were to be put into place, they should have been done in the earlier years of the last century when the state and federal parliaments predominantly comprised men of integrity unlike the rabble that recently cheered the antics of Lidia Thorpe.

In earlier days until more recent times there were no high salaries, but instead a minimal allowance of £400 plus expenses. Most politicians lived hand-to-mouth existences. Career politicians of the time either wanted to serve their state or were there because they loved politics, or generally both. Most members and senators were business people, lawyers, farmers or independently wealthy. They were there to play their part, whatever their motivation.

Section 48 of the Constitution provides that all members of the Parliament would receive an 'allowance' of 400 pounds per annum until, that is, the Parliament decided otherwise and, of course, decide otherwise they did. Today the base salary of a member of Parliament is $211,250 which is 3.2 times real wages.

Initially, parliamentarians had small offices and a small staff who also oversee volunteers working in the electorate offices. However, as of last year, there were a total of 2,020 staff employed with four electorate staff allocated to each MP or senator. Other arrangements generally increase the number. MPs have taxpayer funded offices in their electorates and senators in their states. Added to this are quite substantial offices provided in parliament house.

And yet, despite high salaries and large offices and staffing, so many of today's politicians insulate themselves in what I call the mausoleum in Canberra or hide away in their multi-staffed electoral offices rarely mixing with the people until they need their vote. Letters and certainly emails are rarely answered and very few phone calls get through to the member or senator but are deflected by staff.

Most contact is second or third hand via Facebook, Twitter or other social media means. I am afraid that it is a sign of modern politics today and is not going to change. Some say that becoming a republic is the answer, but I can assure you that it is not. In fact change to our Constitution will make the situation far worse as it will further empower politicians, who are at the root of our problems. Have not politicians been meddling for decades to take power away from the people to assume it for themselves?

The Constitution itself needs little reform. Obviously it does need to be updated but any attempt to do so would lead to demands for it to be emasculated.

What does need to be countered is control of governments by political parties. How this is to be done I really don't know. Some people think a revolution is the answer, but it's not. Revolutions lead to dictatorship and dictatorship leads to anarchy.

Our democracy under the Crown remains intact despite these political incursions. Politicians come and go but the Crown remains to both protect the Commons and be responsible to the Commons.

It is therefore up to the people to stand up and demand proper governance and the end of politicking. They must demand that the Constitution be returned to them for the common good.

The solution lies with the people and it is the people who must be educated as to their rights and their responsibilities in holding their representatives in their electorates to account and likewise their Senators in their states. As we all know, education on civics is now virtually non-existent in schools and elsewhere, having been consistently and purposefully removed by successive governments from the curricula.

The Australian Monarchist League has set up an independent educational foundation to properly educate all Australians and intending Australians on the Australian Constitution and our system of governance. You can see details on our website at:
www.nationhood.org.au

The Foundation will be formally launched in the New Year. Accordingly, in a democracy such as ours, the answer will always lie with the people themselves. Politicians only managed to get away with their manoeuvrings due to the apathy of the individual voter. It is that apathy that must be countered with patriotism, something politicians have done their best for many years to undermine and now, perhaps, we can see their purpose in so doing.

May I end, as I often do, with the 1951 words of Ben Chifley the last 'old' labor prime minister:
'*but if I think a thing is worth fighting for, no matter what the penalty is, I will fight for the right, and truth and justice will prevail'.*
Thank you.

Philip Benwell
(National Chair – Australian Monarchist League)
www.monarchist.org.au

ADDRESS FOR 2022 NEW TIMES DINNER by Michael Watson

Delivered at the Australian League of Rights National Seminar, Adelaide SA Australia 8 October 2022

Good evening ladies and gentlemen. It is a great privilege to be invited by Mr. Ken Grundy, Mr. Chris Ashton, Mr. Arnis Luks and the other organisers of the 76th New Times dinner. I will be speaking to you about a subject that has been of much public interest of late and that subject is monarchy. In this modern age we live in, when many people think of monarchy or at least monarchy with real and active power and not just a mere ceremonial figurehead, they think of a malevolent and oppressive totalitarian dictator hell bent upon world domination through military conquest and a hoarder of wealth and power for him and his crony's own selfish aggrandisement at the great expense of the population under their rule. This popular narrative has been expounded by the philosophies of the American, French and English Glorious revolutions, the ideology of Karl Marx or by fictional story narratives like Star Wars. But what if this popularised narrative isn't true or at least not quite so true?

Well according to the Anglo-French writer and historian Hilaire Belloc in his marvelous book he first published in 1938 titled *"Monarchy, A Study of Louis XIV",* he turns this modern narrative on its head and instead argues that monarchy is the best system of government to protect and maintain the people's freedoms, rights, livelihoods and civilized society against the cancerous, subversive and oppressive machinations of oligarchical powers such as banks, high finance, corporations, militant groups or other avaricious powers that would wish to devour the nation and its people. Belloc states in his aforesaid book:

> *"Monarchy is the sole effective protection, in a large state, of the common citizen against the mastery of wealth. Napoleon summarised that truth in lapidary fashion. Monarchy, he said, is the one device discovered by man for the curbing of the money-power.*
> *Age after age has proved this truth not only by reason but by experiment. Seeing what wealth can do, nothing can check its control of society save the presence of a master too rich to be bribed and too strong to be beaten down."*[i]

Referring to example of the *Ancien Regime* monarchy of France, Belloc continues:

> *"It was the very object of the French monarchy, the cause of its being, to curb and check every separate function which should allocate to itself sovereign powers. It was the business of the king to defend the common man and the nation against not only the money-power— though that was its principal function— but also against the lawyers (as in the*

lawyers of that time who were opposing monarchical rule). Therefore the lawyers were, in times when they dared to be so, natural opponents of the crown, just as the money- power was the natural opponent of the crown."[ii]

But of course with modern revolutionary, republican and liberal democratic thought becoming the triumphant philosophy in the last 200 years, history is written by the victors so this ingenious philosophies over monarchy as defender against money-power and arbitrary oligarchy, which Belloc has expounded, has been suppressed and ignored by modern historians and political movements.

The system of government of monarchy; that is a single ruler with at least some substantial and active executive power and is either hereditary or elected by a small voting franchise of nobles, princes or magistrates, is the most common mode of government throughout the history of mankind. These monarchies in most cases, started off as successful military commanders who rose to power and pre-eminence in times of civil crisis and strife eventually morphing into the royal and imperial dynasties and states that have lasted for several centuries. And again, contrary to modern historical revisionists, the monarchical system is the political tradition of almost every western and European nation of old Christendom as Belloc again puts so eloquently:

"In order to bring out ancient institutions long forgotten or hidden or overlaid, recourse must be had to history wherein the lively examples of the thing in its fullness may be found. Here, in Christendom, Monarchy has stood throughout our centuries in many forms, but especially in one typical form: the king who is king by Hereditary right of primogeniture which guarantees continuity. The prime example of such monarchy is that of Louis XIV. Louis XIV of France, and his reign, give the main picture of an effective Monarchy in modern civilisation. His court, his victories, his defeats, policies, failures and permanent effects are all so many tests of Monarchy alive and in action."[iii]

In fact, European monarchy and its governmental structure and external pomp, ceremony and symbolism is modeled more or less after the biblical Kingdom of Israel ruled by Kings David and Solomon in the Old Testament times and later by that of Jesus Christ in the new. The many external trappings of monarchy such as crowns, thrones, lions, harps, scepters, titles, officers, castles, palaces and the sacred ceremonies of coronation and anointing undertaken by ecclesiastical bishops in some monarchies, including in our own British monarchy, all trace their origins and inspiration from the ancient Kingdom of Israel. When nations became fully Christianised, they adopted the system of government of monarchy and its biblical traditions as their own.

One such example is the glorious psalm turned anthem and hymn composed by George Frederic Handel and sung at the royal coronations of the British monarchs beginning with:

"Zadok the priest and Nathan the prophet anointed Solomon king."[iv]

The battle of David and Goliath and King David's triumphant victory over that of Goliath and the Philistines is a prime biblical example of the battle and success of monarchy against malevolent oligarchy. Psalm 71:1-5 explains the model of Christian royal governance that monarchs and rulers are called to follow:

"A psalm on Solomon. Give to the king thy judgment, O God: and to the king's son thy justice: To judge thy people with justice, and thy poor with judgment. Let the mountains receive peace for the people: and the hills justice. He shall judge the poor of the people, and he shall save the children of the poor: and he shall humble the oppressor. And he shall continue with the sun, and before the moon, throughout all generations."[v]

Apart from monarchy's biblical and Christian origins, it also find its very basis in the natural order of things and mankind's natural desire for security, singular leadership, community and hierarchy. Belloc again explains this perfectly:

"This prevalence of Monarchy through the ages is due to two forces: first that men think of themselves, at heart, as equals in right; next, that men armed for battle or organised for civil action can best achieve their objects under a leader. Filled with an obscure resentment against the power of mere wealth, or even caste, men will applaud and follow One who shall be master of their masters. The Monarch incarnates the common man, in his multitude, as well as the whole society over which he himself presides. Also, men can only act if they are embrigaded under a hierarchy of command leading up to one Commander: nearly all great common enterprises must be ordered so, and in the supreme test of war armies are led and battles won by a single will and brain. "Two good generals are no match for one mediocre general." Men demand a name to lead them, and in victory they worship one successful captain."[vi]

By common man is meant the peasant, the farmer, the working man, the small business owner and entrepreneur, the artisan, the breadwinner, the housewife, the poor and disadvantaged. So thus there is this natural desire and need for an exalted leader, principle ruler and communal chief that ensures peace, freedom and security for all common folk and shields them against malicious oligarchical forces.

There are two essential building blocks of a functioning civilization worthy of the name. The first is the natural human family unit of father, mother and their children which is the most basic communal unit, akin to a domestic kingdom, and the starting foundation of human society. The second is the establishment of an executive monarchical power to punish and prohibit the predatory and barbaric campaigns of the strong against the weak and their trampling over of the same. So thus the nuclear family unit becomes the model for the state and it is for this reason that Belloc recommends that monarchies should be hereditary saying:

> *"Monarchy should be hereditary to become a principle sacredly interwoven with the people. The succession had to be secured if the monarchy were to stand well founded and firm, and even in that very issue of life and death for the French people, and therefore for the House of France, the succession seemed among the most secure of mortal things."*[vii]

It also worth noting that one very essential component for maintaining the integrity of the family unit is the right to private ownership of property. To ensure this right to private property for all classes both rich and poor, an equitable arrangement must be maintained where as many of the low-income and middle class families have financial access to their own private homes on one breadwinner's income as possible but this is of course being monopolized and prohibited by both the twin towers of unfettered and monopolistic forms of capitalism and Marxist socialism & communism.

The empirical evidence of the benefits and advantages of strong and active monarchy today is proven self-evident by the fact that since the mass jettisoning and destruction of many monarchies and their replacement by republics or constitutional arrangements where the monarchy has been stripped of all power in the last two hundred years, the western world and old Christendom has been undergoing a moral, cultural and civilizational decline on the road towards its own self-destruction. The rise of private banking and corporate monopolies, Marxist socialism and communism, religious apostasy, the destruction of the institution of marriage and family unit, the destruction of the commons, the assault on fathers and manhood, the loss of respect for unborn human life, the proliferation of gross sexual immorality, the loss of respect for human rights, in particular, medical rights and bodily autonomy and the rise of totalitarian governance are all actions of oligarchical rule. And that rule is exercised via financial enslavement, mass mob intimidation and violence, manipulation by mass media, malice, greed, avarice and oppression of the weak by the strong. And how is all this iniquity made possible? By cadres of corrupt bought and paid for politicians in parliaments and congresses who hold absolute executive power and are anonymously and universally elected by the masses who are in turn manipulated and controlled by the same oligarchical money-powers because there is no longer any existing or active monarchical power to reign them in or keep them in check. Belloc believed that real democracy could only endure long term on the local level or in small states that are protected by exceptional moral or material defenses or by an active monarchy. Otherwise, they will crumble into decadence, devolve into plutocracy or be conquered and absorbed by greater powers. [vii][1][2]

So I shall conclude this address by stating that one of the real and main reasons why most of the illustrious monarchical regimes, which long reigned in the great nations of western Christendom, were overthrown or stripped of their power was that those monarchies, including our own British one until 1688, were obstacles to the expanding dominion of the oligarchical money-power. So therefore, they had to be rid of and replaced with either republican or exclusively parliamentary regimes which were easier for the oligarch's to control and manipulate for their own ends under the guise of so called liberal democracy. The question is where to go and what to do from here? The establishing or re-establishing of an empowered monarchy to save our civilisation seems an impossible and unrealistic goal at this current moment of history and alternative popular and covert methods must be sought instead to resist the oligarchy. That is true. But we must never forget these important lessons and deliberately untold aspects of history when it comes to politics, monarchy and who writes the history books so that we may one day recover active monarchy once again to break the oligarchy and restore our western Christian civilisation. We must always seek the truth in all things because as the biblical verse in John 8:32 says:
"the truth shall set you free."[3] Thank you ladies and gentlemen.

***

References Available Online

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
A. J. Luks, 13 Carsten Court, Happy Valley, SA.