

"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. 10

Registered Australia Post - Publication PP343214 / 00016

October 2022

### CONTENTS

Restoring the Intellectual Commons by Robert Balzola	1
Restoring the Spiritual Commons (Part 1 of 2) by M. Oliver Heydorn	6

## RESTORING THE INTELLECTUAL COMMONS by Robert Balzola

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

### Introduction

On the occasion of the 2022 Australian League of Rights Conference held 8 October 2022 in Adelaide South Australia, I am privileged to present this occasional paper on the first of three papers presented. This first paper is titled *Restoring the Intellectual Commons*. Following, are the second paper presented by Professor Oliver Heydorn on *Restoring the Spiritual Commons*, and the third paper titled *Restoring the Constitutional Commons* presented by Phillip Benwell MBE.

This paper addresses the entymology of Commons properly understood, the distinction in ideas between property and resource, ontology of Intellectual Commons and Commons per se, dialectics of the Commons, the two ends of Commodification and Commonification, participation in the Great Debate on Commons, the Modern Era, defined as post Modernism also described as the *Arrogance of the Modern*<sup>[1]</sup> being consumed by hubris and contempt for participation in the Great Conversation, thus ushering the present Neo Dark Ages of intellectual illiteracy, pollution of Intellectual Commons erupting as a result, the commons of language and culture, the Genesian parable of the Tower of Babel and the Gift of Insensibility, and remedy against Commodification, double blindness of ignorance and sin and restoration of participation in the Great Debate.

### Entymology

Commons is a concatenation of two Latin words: (1) 'Com' meaning 'together' and 'Munis' meaning 'duties' or 'under obligation'. The history of duty obligation finds its origins in Genesis and the public revelation of Imago Dei:

*'Let us make mankind in our image, in our likeness, so that they may rule over the fish in the sea and the birds in the sky, over the livestock and all the wild animals, and over all the creature that move along the ground'.<sup>[2]</sup>*

From this Public Revelation, mankind is endowed with inalienability of the attributes of God. This includes inalienability of rights and obligations. Inalienability means these rights and obligations cannot be separated by Man, by laws of Man and by any other means. The inalienability of rights and duties are pre-ordained in Nature and no human law can make or unmake this preordination. No State can take away these rights and duties by enactment of law or otherwise. It is impossible to do so.

### Participation in the Great Conversation

The rhetoric of David Hall's collection of essays in his text *The Arrogance of the Modern* centres on the point being the deliberate severance in the Modern Era being from the Industrial Revolutionary period commencing circa 1750 to the present day. During this time, systemic attack has been perpetrated by the enemies of Right Reason for its demise in substitution with perverted ideologies in the name of science. These perverted ideologies include the rise of modern Statism including Nazism, Fascism, Socialism and Communism. More recent examples include neo-Gaian environmentalism and feminism and the rise of same-sex ideologies being given equivalence to the Institution of Marriage. This has been done for their own penultimate political, financial ends and ultimately the higher final end for the propagation of Evil. In doing so, commencing with German philosophers such as Woolf, followed in France by the Revolutionary philosophers of Auguste Comte, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Francois-Marie Arouet (Voltaire), Maximilien Robespierre etc. thence in turn followed by the English "enlightenment" philosophers of John Locke, Thomas Hobbes, Smith, Jeremy Bentham and John Austin amongst others, and thence reflected in the United States by Washington and the band of Freemasons

there as architects of the modern United States. These have deliberately sought to erase from the minds of the living the contiguous line of philosophy in the Great Conversation over several thousand years and specifically in the last 2,000 years from the Birth of Jesus. The accumulated wisdom in the Commons and philosophy and theology per se has been erased from the minds of the living as history is erased and with it knowledge and wisdom.

Indeed, philosophy and theology in all their principal and subordinate sciences have been systematically removed from the body of science in favour of a new sequence of pseudoscience couched in terms of 'science' with informal evaluatives to deceive the uneducated and those not immersed in classical education. Such informal evaluatives as 'exact science', 'natural science', 'medical science' and just 'science' have come to be studies disalced of philosophy and theology. This is why logic is not taught in the exercitants within universities until at least post-graduate level along with classical education model which is defined below in this paper.

### Resources vs Property

The Ideas of Resources is distinguished from Property. Resources and Property are not the same. Resources are separated into things or 'choses' [French] being (1) things capable of private property, (2) public property or (3) resource incapable of inherent property.

As noted above, Property is a philosophical notion that a resource is capable of private or public ownership. It is a thesis of this paper to identify resources that are capable of being possessed of private property, public property or no property. It is then a principle point in this paper that there are resources or 'goods' that are not capable of private or public property. Those goods that are neither capable of public or private property are nonetheless resources and goods, but they are incapable of property rights therein. Two examples in point are *language* you speak and the *culture* you possess. These are resources you possess and use every day. They are not owned by anyone; there is no property in either of these by anyone. No one has legal title over them. This will be discussed in further detail below.

### Property

As intimated above, the genus property has three species:

1. *Res Privatae*
2. *Res Publicae*
3. *Res Communis Omnium*

*Res Privatae* is private property and use. *Res Publicae* is public property and use. *Res Communis Omnium* are those resources that belong to all in common but in which there cannot be either private and/or public property rights.

Not all resources and goods are capable of private or public property rights. As noted above, language and culture are two public resources that are *Res Communis*

*Omnium*. Language and Culture are resources belonging to all in common.

### Commons

Commons derives its origin as an Ideas from *Res Communis Omnium*. The Commons are those resources incapable of public or private property rights.

### Positive Law

Positive law is a deceptive word because of the vernacular usage and meaning of 'positive' meaning something good, or hopeful or right e.g. 'that's a positive attitude' use of word 'positive' against its opposite 'negative' which in the vernacular comes to mean 'bad' or negative thoughts or feelings.

In the Great Conversation, the idea 'positive' is possessed of none of these meanings as expressed in the above vernacular. The word 'positive' derives from the Latin root *positum* meaning 'to lay down'. In law, 'positive law' means nothing more than laws 'laid down'. Hence the term '*laying down the law*' is derived. Legislatures, Executives and Judicatures *lay down the law*, but in doing so hold no authority in those laws other than the act of laying down the law by enactment by a Legislature, promulgation by an Executive or ratio by a Judicature. English philosopher John Austin advocates legal positivism, law being nothing more than a sequence of commands from a Sovereign backed by threat of sanction should those laws be disobeyed.

### Hierarchy of Laws

To state the error of legal positivism is to have recourse to the clarification of law per se by St Thomas Aquinas in his Treatise on Law in the Summa Theologica at Questio 90++. The short point is that law per se is a hierarchy of laws. There is the highest law, the Divine Law, followed by the Moral Law, then the Natural Law then the Human law. What is called 'law' in the vernacular refers what Aquinas calls the Human Law. Human Law is the posited law. However, the accident of justice in law is that law which is consistent with the natural, moral and divine laws. As Aquinas states: A posited law that defies any or all of the Natural, Moral and Divine Law is a 'lawless law'. As stated at Nuremburg, an enacted human law that reaches such 'unendurable proportions' that the human law becomes a lawless law and must yield to justice, justice being the mutual Good End in law, economics and politics.

The Divine Law or Eternal Law is *Do Good an Shun Evil*. This evasively simple categorical imperative is the 'law of laws' upon which all other law is written. Its dialectic is 'Good' versus 'Evil'. Moral law is that combination of public revelation supported by reason that determines what is licit versus illicit. Natural Law is that law which is named after the Latin 'natura' or Greek 'prudentia' meaning 'of reason'. The law of reason's dialectic is the discourse between what is True and False. Finally, Human Law is that dialectic in the discourse of

what is Legal versus Illegal. From this, a human law can make an act legal, whilst simultaneously being illicit, false and evil. There can be variances of these four laws, including an act which may be illegal, yet moral and reasonable and in conformance with the Divine Law. For example, a doctor refusing to perform an abortion under pain of committing breach of enacted health law, is nonetheless compliant with natural, moral and Divine law whilst simultaneously committing a breach of enacted health law.

### **Legal Theory: Property, Title, Ownership and Possession**

For completeness, the notion of property and proprietary interest in a resource or good is found in the fourfold metaphysical attributes:

- Property in...
- Title in...
- Ownership of...
- Possession of...

These four attributes can have legal expression. But the positing of such legal expression does not create the attribute. It is one of the great deceits of the Modern Era that a 'god' is made of the positum of laws thus creating the supremacy of the Legislature. It was Nuremburg trials in 1945 – 1946 which is the great rewrite of history that disalced the ratio of Nuremburg by ignoring the dual jurisprudential principles of (1) Public International Law and (2) Natural Law in the sweeping aside of Defences by former Nazi operatives on grounds that they were applying enacted German laws passed (posited) by Legislatures of sovereign jurisdiction. The current history is that since 1946, the 'textbooks' and emergence of the United Nations by General Assembly resolution in 1948 in the making of the UN Declaration of Human Rights, ignore the application of Natural Law in the determinations at Nuremburg whilst giving supremacy of Public International Law alone. It is this phenomenon by deliberate design that has brainwashed successive generations of the current so-called human rights law which does all things necessary to alienate that which is inalienable by philosophy of *individualism* whilst obliterating *personalism* as prescribed in 1963 Encyclical *Pacem In Terris* which rebuts the philosophy of the 1948 UN Declaration of Human Rights.

This travesty is part addressed by the reawakening of the Natural Law as a formal and essential part of the jurisprudence of law making and application of laws in our Modern Era. In the United State of America for example, the Natural Law Commission<sup>[3]</sup> is now 'retouching the touchstone' in the rediscovery of Natural Law based jurisprudence in the enactment and application of laws in the United States of America. The future is not beset with despair.

### **Restoring the Intellectual Commons**

This paper therefore posits that the Great Conversation of giving due recognition of resources that are Res Communis Omnium, possessed by all but of none. These resources that are incapable of private or public ownership. The Intellectual Commons are those thoughts, ideas, culture, language and practices that are common to all but possessed, owned, have title in or property by none.

### **Intellectual Pollution and Destruction**

Simply because a resource is not capable of private or public possession, ownership, property or title, does not mean that resource cannot be polluted, diluted or destroyed. This paper posits that an intellectual commons such as language or culture can be polluted, diluted or destroyed. This paper posits that the restoration and conservation of the Intellectual Commons is an exercise in restoring the links with the Great Conversations and being intellectually honest in the progression of philosophical and theological certitude based upon right scientific reason towards intellectual honesty. The current trend in force since at least 1750 has been the systematic destruction of that link in intellectual honesty in participation and promulgation of the Great Conversation.

### **The Great Conversation**

For completeness, participation in the 'Great Conversation' is a term taken from Great Books of the Western World published shortly after the end of World War 2. The term means participation in dialogue in the dialectic on an Idea by formal participation. It is not mere banter, but the formal scientific discovery of truth and wisdom towards understanding the Idea and by application of speculative theology and philosophy discover new truths from previously discovered former truths.

### **Synopticon**

The Great Books of the Western World is a synopticon, not an encyclopedia. A synopticon means 'with one eye', meaning to focus on the unitary object by recourse to those intellects that have contributed to the discovery and discernment of the particular idea that is the object of inquiry.

### **Universals**

The purpose of restoring the Intellectual Commons is to re-connect in a new Renaissance with classical and right thinking. This is accomplished by rediscovery of Classical Education and restoring right reason to the minds of a populace disalced of right reason. Universals are the thoughts possessed individually but cannot be transferred to another person. Your thoughts, your ideas and your knowledge is possessed in your mind only. These universals cannot be transferred to another. They cannot be bottled or stored on a memory chip.



Intellectual Commons cannot be exclusively owned or predisposed [Benkler 2006]. Intellectual commons are better understood as to the construct relation between resources rather than the resource itself [Dardot 2016].

### **Orwellian NewSpeak, NewThink and DoubleThink**

The directive of the modern is to remove the capacity to think and speak. This is the Orwellian political fiction main theme of 1984. By manipulation of words, dictionary and thought, the prole is incapable of right reason, thereby denied capacity to participate or apply the natural, moral and Divine laws. The purpose of destruction of philosophy and theology is to make impossible the capacity to think, reason and express those ideas. In particular, the capacity to be possessed by thought of those Intellectual Commons that are culture, language and right reason. This includes knowledge of philosophical and theological truths, knowledge of logic and classical education.

### **Tower of Babel**

Again we refer to Genesis at 11:1-9. Here, God smites the human post flood rebellion seeking to build their 'stairway to heaven' and in doing so be equal to God. Rather than destroy the tower, only to see another tower built, God 'confounds' the language and scatters humans 'upon the face of all the earth [Gen 11:9]. The analogy is that God 'gifts' the people with the 'spirit of insensibility'. He makes us stupid, unable to understand one another. This means taking the Intellectual Commons away from humanity. Hence, our sin and pride requires humanity to learn from arduous toil having been disalced from Adam and Eve's preternatural wisdom that made them all but God in wisdom after the Great Fall where they eat of the forbidden fruit and are stripped of that preternatural knowledge as they are cast from Paradise. The spiritual effect of the Gift of Insensibility is that the Intellectual Commons is taken from Man. Man becomes spiritually 'stupid' and cannot ever again be naturally possessed of the intellectual commons of preternatural wisdom originally given to First Man and First Woman and lost by commission of eating of the forbidden fruit. For completeness making Man stupid is described as a spiritual gift, because it is the spiritual doping of man. You feel under 'Cloud Nine' when under sedation. It is easier to live the life of an idiot than an enlightened person. God makes life easy for those who are spiritually doped. By comparison, those possessed with enlightenment live life in constant pain, acutely aware of that which is lost. A stupid person is eternally happy, living in their microcosm of splendid idiocy. Life is easier when you don't have to think or can't think. It is not opium of the Masses as Marx describes religion. The spirit of insensibility is far worse. Being Fat, Stupid and Happy is analogous to being in a constant catatonic drugged state. Humanity in the whole yearns for its false peace devoid of thought or responsibility. It will do

anything for its food, money and 'bread and circuses'. It is much easier to be a herd animal than to be responsible and work at self-sufficiency. The general populace will happily succumb to slavery if it means being left largely alone to live a subsistence existence.

### **Dialectics of Intellectual Commons**

It is the error of Capitalism that always seeks to commodify then monopolise a resource. This is no exception to Intellectual Commons resources. Always capitalist forces seek to commodify common resources. The dialectic against commodification is commonification. The preservation, conservation and restoration of those intellectual commons that are rightly *Res Communis Omnium* must not be perceivedly given proprietary rights to a personal or public title. Nor must the *Res Communis Omnium* be destroyed or deliberately subjugated by expunging them from the living memory of the public. In short, intellectual commons must not be polluted, destroyed or subjugated. They must be preserved, conserved and brought into the public domain by reconnection with classical education. It is capitalism and socialist economics including collectivisation that forces upon intellectual commons by supposed market competition and monopolisation. The means to defy this capitalist and socialist trend towards commodification via private (capitalist) or public (socialist) commodification of resource ownership is pursuit of common-oriented relations of production. This policy requires pursuit of self-management of production in opposition to hierarchical production.<sup>[4]</sup>

Commodification is as old as time itself. Intellectual Commons including Ideas including God, Morality, Thought, Culture, Language and other intellectual commons have been attempted to be commodified. This is the perennial threat to intellectual commons and the object of self-management and not succumbing to capitalist or socialist ideologies that are by extension opposed to the Christocentric perspective being Anthropocentric in nature as they give primacy to Man and specifically the supremacy of ego and intellect over God. This in turn reinforces the parable in Genesis 11 Tower of Babel where Man seeks to be equal to God thus mimicking the one third of all Angels who Fell from Paradise and Michael whose name is a question "Who is like God?"

### **Does Intellectual Commons need restoring?**

Yes. The Era of the Modern is a post modernist nightmare where the intellectual commons is in a dire state of intellectual pollution. History has at least two epochs where the intellectual commons were heavily polluted and all but destroyed. The first was the Greek era and the end of the Golden Age of the Greeks circa 528 BC with rise of the Age of Tyranny in Athens. The Greek City States fell into illiteracy and social ruin, the direct result of destruction of the Intellectual Commons

of language, learning and culture. The second epoch of collapse of the intellectual commons was the collapse of Rome circa 400AD, the result of perpetual Germanic invasions, looting and sacking of Rome, followed by barbarism and ultimately destroying the intellectual commons of the Roman Era.

What follows is a sequence of Dark Ages. There are more than one Dark Ages. Greece had its Dark Ages upon the fall of the Greek City States to tyranny. Equally, Europe descended to a Dark Ages that prevailed till the Renaissance, a period from about 476AD to 1000AD. During this time, the Intellectual Commons collapsed particularly with demise of learning, language and culture. In fact it was the recognition by the intelligentsia of the Day noting the demise of the Latin language sparked the Renaissance. It was impossible to teach and impart knowledge anymore. The Italicum Peninsula descended into speaking what began as Proto-Italian, being the Tuscan dialect. This phenomenon compelled the Intelligentsia to realise civilisation was not possible without codification of language (a key intellectual commons) as Europe descended into disaggregated bastardised dialects of Latin hence making communication more and more difficult.

In short, modern European languages with the exception of Albanian, Basque, Sardinian and certain other minority languages in Europe which possess no Latin roots, are essentially bastardised Latin the direct result of the Dark Ages of illiteracy, a key Intellectual Commons resource.

### **Contemporary illiteracy**

Contemporary illiteracy takes its form in the technological realm and in the realm of media manipulated by sectional interest stakeholders pursuing power for power's sake. As Orwell writes of O'Brien in Room 101 the end is 'Power! Power! Power!' The utilisation of mass media including Internet is the creation of pseudo intellectual terminology compounded with disaggregation of right intellectual formation, intellectually weakening the population and predisposing it to any thought the puppeteers desire. In 1981 Alvin Toffler wrote the text *The Third Wave*. Everyone becomes a publisher, but they publish 'rubbish'. There is more publication than ever before, but less intellectual honesty than ever before.

### **Classical Education**

The remedy to restore the intellectual commons is the same remedy as with the fall of the Golden Age of Greece or the Roman Empire, through classical education and rediscovery of the Great Conversation and participation within it and application of truths never rebuked and as valid today as 3000 years ago.

Classical education involves inculcation in the Trivium and Quadrivium. The Trivium is the threefold path in Grammar, Logic and Rhetoric. The Quadrivium

is the fourfold path in arithmetic, geometry, music and astronomy. The advent of technology with rhetoric has brought with it the rapid proliferation of intellectual pollution with near zero financial costs of promulgation of that pollution and poison. Restoration of Right Reason requires individuated inculcation. It is akin to restoring a zombie to human normalcy.

### **Newspeak pollution**

Orwell's newspeak is the confounding of meaning by super concatenation of words to meaningless gibberish. Examples in the Modern include all of the following as but some examples:

- People smuggling
- Economic rationalism
- Covid vaccine
- Voluntary euthanasia
- Same sex marriage
- Climate change
- Family law
- Religious freedom
- Pro choice

Upon examination, these words are meaningless and deceptive. They sound sophisticated but are really sophistry.

### **Conclusion**

G Hardin's text *The Tragedy of the Commons* (in) T O'Riordan and R K Turner's text *An annotated Reader in Environmental Planning and Management*<sup>[5]</sup> describes the 'tragedy' as 'the day of reckoning, that is the day when the long-desired goal of social stability becomes a reality'. This is nothing more than a restatement of Pareto optimisation; the point where diseconomies of scale of a resource reaches or exceeds its carrying capacity, whether a plot of farming ground or a factory line.

This is not a true representation of intellectual commons. Restoration of the Intellectual Commons is not the self-defeating end of a factory floor or farmland that reaches its Pareto optimum production, beyond which diseconomies erupt with falling production.

Rather, intellectual commons is an indestructible resource that has being in the minds of the people. Unlike a finite resource such as iron ore, intellectual commons are infinitely reproduceable. Language can be restored and conserved, as can culture. It is not a case that once a resource like an iron ore mine is depleted, it cannot be replaced. Intellectual commons are infinite. It is always possible to restore culture or language or other commons resource. The task is to make that happen. This task is accomplished by individuated education of polity through restoration of right reason and the shunning of evil of the proliferation of ignorance through medium of communications through partaking in the Great Conversation of Ideas by application of right reason and recourse to the truths discovered by those participants in the Great Conversations.

\*\*\*

## RESTORING THE SPIRITUAL COMMONS (Part 1 of 2) by M. Oliver Heydorn

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

Today, I will be speaking about the restoration of ‘the spiritual commons’ in our Western civilisation, i.e., the restoration of the specific spiritual heritage – broadly conceived – upon which our Western civilisation and culture are built. Graeco-Roman philosophy, law, and government, on the one hand, in combination with the belief in and the practice of the Christian religion, on the other, are the two single greatest factors that were responsible for the emergence of Europe as we know it. The universal truths that were transmitted to us, from these two sources, while never perfectly embodied in the course of our history, nonetheless provided us with certain guiding lights. These metaphysical, epistemological, ethical, and political touchstones were the means by which both individuals and society as a whole sought to navigate their way through the course of time; they provided a template for the correct orientation of beliefs, attitudes, and behaviours.

Unfortunately, for various historical reasons which I won’t go into here, our civilisation has deviated more and more as the centuries have passed from that cultural highpoint that had been attained in the Middle Ages ... when, England, for example, had been described as ‘Merrie’. As it has deviated, and in spite of the exceptional technical progress that simultaneously accompanied this process of devolution and that has, to some degree at least, masked its effects, there has been a growing entropy, disease, or disorder that has increasingly threatened the very stability of society itself. Indeed, this entropy or disorder has continually grown to the point that, at the present time, in 2022, it is now so great as to threaten the long-term longevity of our civilisation on a variety of fronts.

The object lesson, or, as we say in modern ‘parlance’, the ‘take away’ from this experience of progressive degeneration, both for individuals and for society as a whole, is that we do indeed need boundaries – provided that they are the right boundaries – because it is only within the correct boundaries that we can function optimally. It is only within the boundaries that we can flourish. As it says in the Gospel according to St. Matthew: “And you shall know the truth and the truth shall set you free”.

In other words, there is something out there in the make-up of reality – call it X – that we MUST obey, both because obedience is right and just (*dignum et justum est*) in and of itself, but also because it is only through that obedience, that alignment, that we can flourish, that we can release the superabundant goodness with which reality is impregnated at the level of sheer potentiality. And then there is this third matter: either we willingly ‘bend the knee’ and co-operate with this numinous

reality and receive the corresponding blessings, or else it will eventually compel us to bend our knees before it and without the receipt of said blessings. As we read in the book of Deuteronomy, 30:19:

“I call heaven and earth to witness this day, that I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing.

Choose therefore life, that both thou and thy seed may live.”

There is no escape from reality. The principle, that X, which constitutes the very heart of being will dominate, by necessity, all the other parts of reality. That supremacy can be experienced by us in either a pleasant or an unpleasant manner, depending on whether we willingly submit to its rule or choose – in a futile way – to rebel against it.

So what are the correct boundaries? What are the true guiding lights? What are the proper orienting principles? What is this ‘X’ which must be obeyed?

There is, of course, the datum which C.H. Douglas, the founder of the original Social Credit, referred to as ‘the Canon’, and what others have termed the Platonic theory of forms and/or the natural law. The basic idea here is that the universe, or more broadly ‘reality’, has been created according to a certain set of blueprints, and if we wish to flourish, both as individuals and as a society, then we must discern what those blueprints are in every field of human life and of human endeavour. Once discovered, it is then our duty to find ways and means of embodying or applying the truths that are found in those blueprints through effective mechanisms. Douglas expressed it this way in his essay “The Pursuit of Truth”:

[T]here is running through the nature of the Universe something that we may call a “canon”. It is the thing which is referred to in the Gospel of St. John as the “Logos,” the “Word” (Logos: “The Word” or “Reason”). [St. John 1:1, “The Word (Logos) was with God, and the Word was God.” ...] It has an infinite variety of names. The engineer and the artist refer to it when they say that they have got something “right”. Other people mean the same thing when they talk about absolute truth, or reality. By whatever name you wish to refer to this idea, it does not matter very much; we all instinctively recognise its existence whether we meet it in something like architectural proportions as, say, the cenotaph, or even in the grim lines of a battleship.”[2]<sup>[1]</sup>

As the quote from Douglas intimates, there is a great deal of overlap between the Graeco-Roman root of Western civilisation and Christianity with respect to this notion of eidetic blueprints. There is one dimension, however, in which Christianity surpasses the



Graeco-Roman approach to the nature of things and that has to do with its positioning of the person of Christ, of God made man, as the Word through whom God made the universe. Ultimately, in Christianity, that which must be known and obeyed is not an abstract principle, but a concrete and indeed incarnated divine person who stands at the origin of all of those aforementioned principles. What is now known in Catholic doctrine as the 'Social Kingship' of Christ served historically as both the foundation and the pinnacle, or the Alpha and the Omega, of Christian civilisation, i.e., Christendom.

What I want to suggest for your consideration, in the course of this presentation, is the following claim: If we wish to restore the spiritual commons, our spiritual heritage, we have to restore, before all else, the social reign of Christ the King, both in theory and, more particularly, in practice. In what follows, I intend to expound on the doctrine itself, to provide its theological justification to, examine some of the broad political implications that ensue if the doctrine were taken seriously, and then, finally, to highlight some of the points of contact between the Social Kingship of Christ and the political theory developed by C.H. Douglas, the founder of the original Social Credit movement.

Perhaps the clearest articulation of this doctrine as the theological, metaphysical, and indeed political centrepiece of the Western project of civilisation – what used to be called Christendom – can be found in Pope Pius XI's 1925 encyclical *Quas Primas*. The use of the word 'King' in reference to Christ is, of course, metaphorical. The idea is that Christ possesses a special kind authority, indeed a supreme sovereignty, over the whole of the created world. In the words of St. John in 18:17 of the Apocalypse, Christ is "the ruler of the kings of the earth".

According to Pope Pius XI in *Quas Primas*, the chief cause – not the only cause – but the chief cause for the many difficulties, the many evils under which mankind have been labouring, more particularly in recent centuries, has to do with the fact that the majority of men have "thrust Jesus Christ and His holy law out of their lives". That is to say that Christ and His commandments are not accepted as they should be, either in private life or in public life. The Pope goes on to claim that so long as individuals and states adamantly refuse to submit themselves to the rule of Christ the King, there will be no deep and meaningful or lasting peace amongst the nations. Men must seek and yearn for the peace of Christ, which can only be found in the Kingdom of Christ - Pax Christi in Regno Christi. This follows the teaching of Saint Augustine that peace can only come as the fruit of order.

The first thing to note about this doctrine is that, as it is conceived by the Church, it applies to all men, both Catholic and non-Catholic, both Christian and

non-Christian. In the words of Pope Leo XIII in his encyclical *Annum sacrum*:

His empire [that is, Christ's empire - MOH] includes not only Catholic nations, not only baptized persons who, though of right belonging to the Church, have been led astray by error, or have been cut off from her by schism, but also all those who are outside the Christian faith; so that truly the whole of mankind is subject to the power of Jesus Christ."<sup>[2]</sup> The second thing to note about this doctrine is that it applies to both individuals in their private lives as well as to nations in their public lives. In other words, it is not enough for individuals to recognise, adore, and obey Christ as their individual King, it is incumbent on the state to do the same on behalf of the nation. The responsible public authority, in the name of the nation, is called on, through its institutions, laws, and public pronouncements, etc., to embody that same recognition, adoration, and obedience in the exercise of its various responsibilities. In sum, the obedience that we owe to that which I referred to earlier as 'the big X' is not just individual or private in nature, but is also communal and public.

Quoting once again from the encyclical *Quas Primas*, "Nor is there any difference in this matter between the individual and the family or the State; for all men, whether collectively or individually, are under the dominion of Christ. In him is the salvation of the individual, in him is the salvation of society. "Neither is there salvation in any other, for there is no other name under heaven given to men whereby we must be saved."<sup>[29]</sup> He is the author of happiness and true prosperity for every man and for every nation. "For a nation is happy when its citizens are happy. What else is a nation but a number of men living in concord?"<sup>[30]</sup><sup>[3]</sup>

In the interest of being ecumenical and of demonstrating that the gist of this principle is not restricted to Catholicism, but can also be found amongst Protestants, consider the following words of the 19th century British Baptist preacher Charles Spurgeon:

"I long for the day when the precepts of the Christian religion shall be the rule among all classes of men, in all transactions. I often hear it said 'Do not bring religion into politics.' This is precisely where it ought to be brought, and set there in the face of all men as on a candlestick. I would have the Cabinet and the Members of Parliament do the work of the nation as before the Lord, and I would have the nation, either in making war or peace, consider the matter by the light of righteousness. We are to deal with other nations about this or that upon the principles of the New Testament.

“I thank God that I have lived to see the attempt made in one or two instances, and I pray that the principle may become dominant and permanent. We have had enough of clever men without conscience, let us now see what honest, God-fearing men will do. But we are told that we must study ‘British interests,’ as if it were not always to a nation’s truest interest to do righteousness. ‘But we must follow out our policy.’ I say, No! Let the policies which are founded on wrong be cast like idols to the moles and to the bats. Stand to that most admirable of policies,—‘As ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise.’ Whether we are kings, or queens, or prime ministers, or members of parliament, or crossing sweepers, this is our rule if we are Christians.

“Yes, and bring, religion into your business, and let the light shine in the factory and in the counting-house. Then we shall not have quite so much china clay in the calicoes wherewith to cheat the foreigner, nor shall we see cheap and nasty articles described as of best quality, nor any other of the dodges in trade that everybody seems to practice now-a-days. You tradespeople and manufacturers are very much one like the other in this: there are tricks in all trades, and one sees it everywhere. I believe everybody to be honest in all England, Scotland, and Ireland until he is found out; but whether there are any so incorruptible that they will never be found wanting this deponent sayeth not, for I am not a judge.

“Do not put your candle under a bushel, but let it shine, for it was intended that it should be seen. Religion ought to be as much seen at our own table as at the Lord’s table. Godliness should as much influence the House of Commons as the Assembly of Divines. God grant that the day may come when the mischievous division between secular and religious things shall no more be heard of, for in all things Christians are to glorify God, according to the precept, “Whether ye eat or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God.”<sup>[4]</sup>

### **The Justification of the Obligation**

So, if there is this obligation to recognise Christ as King on the part of every individual and on the part of society as a whole, why does it exist? Why does it bind? According to the teaching laid out in Quas Primas, we are to recognise Christ as King in both private and public life quite simply because it is the correct or due relationship which should obtain between God and ourselves. God is the uncreated principle in reality that is responsible for the existence of everything else. That is, He is the Creator and we are His Creatures. Since God made us out of nothing; since He sustains us at every moment in existence; since every good thing that we have comes directly or indirectly from Him, since we therefore owe Him everything, whereas He owes

us nothing, we creatures have an absolute obligation in justice to give God the response that is due to Him as the source of all being, as the supreme being, as the Alpha and the Omega of all that there is, of all that there ever could be. No human being or society has any legitimate metaphysical or moral right to refuse to recognise God’s dominion.

The second reason or justification laid out by Pius XI for our duty to recognise the social reign of Christ the King has to do with the doctrine of the redemption. That doctrine teaches that Christ, by willingly embracing the suffering and death that was unjustly inflicted upon him out of love for His Father and indeed for us, made up for all the moral evil, for all the disobedience, that would ever occur in the world. In the words of Pius XI: “Would that those who forget what they have cost Our Savior, might recall the words: ‘You were not redeemed with corruptible things, but with the precious Blood of Christ, as of a Lamb unspotted and undefiled. We are no longer our own, for Christ has purchased us ‘with a great price;’ our very bodies are the ‘members of Christ.’ Thus, through the act of redemption, Christ has acquired an additional right to be regarded as the supreme Sovereign of the human race. By sacrificing Himself, His life and welfare, in order to secure our temporal and eternal well-being, He is likewise deserving to be recognized as our King.

So Christ can make a double claim on our allegiance. As God, as our Creator, He has a natural right to be recognised as our King. As God-made-man, as our Redeemer, He has an acquired right to be recognised as our King.

### **The Practical Meaning/Application of the Doctrine:**

Now, if this doctrine were taken seriously, in the way that Pope Pius XI and the constant teaching of the Catholic Church would intend for it to be taken seriously, the social reign of Christ the King, His right to rule over societies as well as over individuals, would constitute the very foundation of our society moving forward. In a country where Christ ruled as King, many things would have to change, both concretely and in more general or theoretical terms. In what follows, I will limit myself to three broad changes involving the re-orientation of the political regime under which we live. Afterwards, I also wish to show that, in his political writings, C.H. Douglas was in general agreement with these three fundamental changes as part and parcel of a functional societal order that is based on Christian principles.

So if Christ were to rule as King – which, as I have said, is the necessary means for restoring the spiritual commons – what would have to change?...

*(Article continues in November issue of New Times Survey)*

**NewTimes Survey is printed and authorised by  
A. J. Luks, 13 Carsten Court, Happy Valley, SA.**