

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

THE AUSTRALIAN

THE NEW TIMES

SURVEY

LEAGUE OF RIGHTS

Vol. 23 No. 09

Registered Australia Post - Publication PP343214 / 00016

September 2022

CONTENTS

Christian Roots of the Australian Commonwealth by Augusto Zimmerman	1
“Bible Bill” Aberhart: Monetary Populist of the Alberta Prairie by Mark Anderson	2
Form Tribes Yesterday by Laramie Hirsch	6
Dividends for All by C.H. Douglas	8

CHRISTIAN ROOTS OF THE AUSTRALIAN COMMONWEALTH by Augusto Zimmerman

Australia is in the process of disentangling the law from its Judeo-Christian roots [“Christian roots” would be a better way of putting it – editor].

In contemporary Australia, writes Michael Quinlan, dean of law at the University of Notre Dame Australia, “an observation that a particular law is consistent with or that it has been derived from Christian morality is more likely to be raised as a source of complaint and derision by persons seeking to change the law than recognised as a grounds for maintaining a traditional position.”

The last census indicates that most Australians associate Christianity with intolerance and bigotry. They tend to consider Christian beliefs outdated and ultimately a negative influence on society.

Curiously, however, Christianity remains infused in both the legal and governmental institutions and customs of Australia. These religious influences started with the first British fleet departing for Australia in 1787 when Captain Arthur Phillip was instructed to enforce due observance of the Christian religion and to take such steps as were necessary for the celebration of public worship.

Held between 1891 and 1899, representatives of every colony in Australia attended conventions that agreed on the elaboration of a federal Constitution. Upon the request of these colonies, the UK Parliament passed the Constitution of Australia Bill, on July 5, 1900. Queen Victoria assented four days later and proclaimed in September that the Commonwealth of Australia would come into existence on the first day of the 20th century (Jan. 1, 1901).

On that occasion, one of the Constitution’s leading authors, Sir John Downer of South Australia, stated: “The Commonwealth of Australia will be, from its first stage, a Christian Commonwealth.”

According to law professor Helen Irving:

“During the 1897 Convention, delegates have been inundated with petitions in which the recognition of God in the Constitution was demanded ... The essence of their petition was that the Constitution should include a statement of spiritual—specifically Christian—identity for the new nation.”

The overwhelming public support at the time for a religious statement reflected the view that the validity and success of the endeavour ultimately depended on the providence of God.

As stated by Dyson Heydon QC, a former High Court justice of Australia, reference to God in the constitution “reflected what the elite of the Federation generation saw as fundamental.” This was based on the idea that the new nation should be “moved by spiritual impulse towards one mighty destiny.”

The opening of the first Parliament of Australia suggests a society that was entirely comfortable with the role of religion in the public square. The first elected Members of Parliament filed in and proceedings commenced with the “Old Hundredth,” a song based on Psalm 100.

The first governor-general of Australia, Lord Hopetoun, then delivered the prayers for their Majesties, the King and Queen, and for the new Parliament of Australia. He bowed his head, and the multitude joined in the Lord’s Prayer.

These proceedings suggest a Christian society that understood the new nation in religious terms.

Of course, things have dramatically changed, and now Australia is no longer a particularly religious society. However, religious practices still permeate some of our legal-institutional traditions. For example, prayers are still conducted prior to opening proceedings at the federal Parliament.

(continued next page)

(continued from previous page)

So whether or not our system of constitutional monarchy is a “blessing of God” or an “invention of the devil,” it is quite undeniable that Christian principles and traditions played a fundamental role in the development of Australia’s legal-political institutions.

To state this historical fact is not to be intolerant of other religions but to stress an undeniable truth.

“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, Michigan. 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

But the nation’s impressive Christian heritage is increasingly doubted, suppressed, and even denied as our contemporary society moves away from Christianity toward radical secularism.

Article Source: https://www.theepochtimes.com/christian-roots-of-the-australian-commonwealth_4682116.html?fbclid=IwAR2s5R8U1HK1WrJvusBzGEDveI8qHRDzGo2v6bufM70wYy3-eBv38FqE1m4

THE ALBERTA PRAIRIE by Mark Anderson

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. 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.

(continued next page)

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.
- 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 Pulitzer 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.’” (2018)

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:

(continued next page)

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.

FORM TRIBES YESTERDAY by Laramie Hirsch

As faithful readers are aware, I came back to my blog after being AWOL for over a month. This was due to a serious blackpilling from the Oklahoma Republican primary elections. True, actual right-wing candidates were defeated by a big, dirty wad of cash spent by Democrats pretending to be Oklahoma Republicans. Most Okies don't know about any of this, and most don't care. And this is because there is no such thing as Oklahomans.

Now, hear me out on this.

Democrats, leftists, and libertarian-minded hedonists are ultimately globalists. They don't care where they live, just so long as they're in a healthy, lib-minded portion of the GAE—the Global American Empire. That's why it's so easy for all of these Californians and other blue-state people to leave their former haunts and come here to Oklahoma. This place is just another American metroplex, but it just so happens it hasn't been ruined yet. And so, they're filling up the Tulsa area pretty quick.

But Oklahoma is just as interchangeable as Kansas or Arkansas, is it not? Do we have a special language here? A particular religion? Any kind of culture

whatsoever that ties the people together? Do we all look to the same man for a hero? Do we have a king? Some sort of tribal leader? Absolutely not.

The men play PlayStation. The women grow fatter. People fill up their gas tanks. And the kids grow up and do meth. This is NOT a people. The only thing we have in common within the Oklahoma borders is that we all dwell in the same land and deal with the same weather extremes. (One day it's very hot, the next it can suddenly turn cold, and we get tornadoes in the Spring.). Yes, we have our sportsball teams, but football fandom is not a people.

Oklahoma is about to become a few degrees crappier thanks to the outcome of this last sham primary. "The people" did not show up to vote because there is no "the people."

Implications

What this fact boils down to is this: when the United States gets its head handed to it in the upcoming war with China and Russia, we're gonna have a little hoedown, here in North America. We are going to balkanize. We're going to have a civil war.

Civil War 2.0. And when this happens, everyone unattached to a group will be fresh meat.

So, that means if you're still alive in the US military at that time (you wave the rainbow flag, annually wear red heels, impregnate the local army private, etc.), then you'll be in that sphere, and you'll have a group. If you're an Amish man who builds barns, your wife makes butter, your kids help with the cattle, and you travel by carriage—if that's you, then you have a people. Or, if you're a second or third generation Mexican immigrant, you speak English and Spanish, happily do odd jobs for money under the table, your entire family and community has a well-established, underground grey market—if that's you, you have a people.

But if you go to your 8-hour-a-day job, clock in, work for corporate, clock out, go home and watch Netflix by yourself; if you have no friends; if your parent is an alcoholic, and parent A is divorced from parent B; if your spouse doesn't give a damn about how they look for you, they don't put in any effort in the relationship, you're carrying the marriage, and you can't get any close or extended family to help you watch the kids—if any of that applies to you, you probably have no people. Cat ladies have no people. Incels have no people. Sterile couples who told mommy and daddy to get lost have no people. And this is most Oklahomans.

If you have a people, then you have a community. You have extended family. You have close ties to your neighbours. Everyone you know is ideologically tied together for the same cause, the same goals, and the same outcome. This would be because you belong to each other. You'd all belong to the same group and feel comfortable with each other.

Most Oklahomans belong to no one. They do not belong to anything or anybody. Oklahomans feel no civic duty to each other because they do not look through any kind of a civic lens. They merely support those who deliver them hedonistic pleasure. Beyond that, in practice, they believe in nothing. They have no tribal mission. Instead, their creature comforts are their mission.

I suppose it could be said that the one thing Oklahomans have in common is their avoidance of reality. But is that truly a unifying characteristic? I think not.

I know there's exceptions to the rule in Oklahoma, but by and large, there will be no King Pharamond to come and save the people of Oklahoma when the Great American Collapse happens in mid-2024. No, instead, the atomized people of the American Empire will sink their teeth into each others' throats until all are dead.

Endgame Choices

When the GAE falls apart, the Eastern powers have finished annihilating our coasts, and the starving masses of American consumers are eating each other, you will

not be able to depend on Oklahoma to save you. There will be no Oklahoma militia to protect you. Our Okie borders will not be guarded against the newly-formed, dystopian mutants pouring in from other lands. No Oklahoman king, governor, or general will assure you of safe travel. This will not happen.

There is only ONE way that *any* kind of a coherent power structure will guarantee any kind of peace in your midst, and that is if you have your own tribe. Only by having a real, tangible community will you be able to assure yourselves of having any kind of a chance in the American genocide to come. The only way to ensure your children will have a future life is to have a tribe. Perhaps in the last century, one could freely travel from state to state, transplanting themselves from one city to another, noticing no real difference between any region in the GAE. College in Missouri, internship in Nebraska, career in Michigan—it's just moving, right? No big deal! But no. This is not going to last, and we are becoming locked into our regions. The World Economic Forum has worked very hard to sever our ability to have easy travel, and we are well on our way to being stuck right where we are.

Does this make sense right now? No. But I promise it will within the next few years.

Only tribes—started by you—will stand a chance in the Former United States of America. Only those who've taken the time to organize community gardens, dairy groups, homeschool co-ops, hunting clubs, and cattle communities—only these kinds of people will stand any kind of a chance with what is about to transpire. Only tribes will survive.

During the Great Depression, the majority of American families were farmers. Not so today. The farmers of the 1930s barely noticed the crashing American economy. But today's American is just another mindless eater.

What does it look like when the vast majority of Americans are suddenly transformed into uncollected, atomized hunter-gatherers? It looks like World War Z. It looks like a zombie apocalypse. And what will be on the menu? *Other people*. At least, that's what The New York Times tells us. Maybe we'll have some freeze-dried cricket bars, too. Probably not, though.

Mankind saved itself and formed civilizations by going from hunter-gatherers to agricultural societies. We must prepare to do the same thing, while we still have the time to get ready for it. And to do this, we must form tribes. Now.

When America's next civil war starts, your states will not save you. Only tribes will survive. Find or start one immediately. You're almost out of time.

DIVIDENDS FOR ALL by C.H. Douglas

We have at the present time a thing we call an economic system, and I do not believe that we are at all clear, in many cases, as to what it is we are trying to achieve by means of that economic system, and by means of the conventions with which we surround it. For instance, we say at the present time [1936] that one of the troubles which assails the present economic system is what we call the problem of unemployment. If you wanted to run an economic system in order to provide employment, quite obviously the only sensible thing to do would be, as far as possible, to put the clock back about two or three hundred years. You would destroy as far as possible your labour-saving machines; you would cease to use the power which you have developed, and you would revert to handicraft. You would do everything as laboriously as possible, and you would undoubtedly solve the unemployment problem. Everyone would have to work very hard indeed to get a living.

Now, either unemployment is a privilege – in which case quite obviously you want to try and get as many people as possible unemployed – or else it is something requiring pity, in which case any parasitic class is an object of pity and not of contempt or of criticism. You cannot have it both ways. You must make up your mind whether you want to provide leisure, by an economic system, accompanied by goods and services producing what we call a high standard of living with an increasing amount of leisure, or, conversely, you must admit that what you want to do is to provide employment, in which case your policy is exactly the opposite.

We are accustomed to look on the productive and economic system as if it was the same thing that Adam Smith talked about one hundred years ago when individuals or small productive concerns – very small productive concerns, chiefly individuals – produced practically all the wealth of the world and exchanged it with each other, and it was probably fairly true to say at that time that “money was a medium of exchange.”

Now from the economic point of view in the modern world, an increasing number of people have got nothing to exchange. That increasing number of people are the people that we call the “unemployed”. Their labour is not wanted by the present economic system. It has changed from being an individualistic producing system to being what you might call a “pooled co-operative producing system.” The fact that we have not got what we call a “co-operative state” in the Socialist sense does not in the least mean that we have not got a co-operative State in the technical sense. We have got it now – we are all co-operating in making that thing which we call the standard of living. One man makes one thing; another man makes another thing, and those things are no use to these men unless they are pooled and drawn upon by something we call “effective demand.”

So that the modern economic system has completely changed from the system of exchange between individuals to a single wealth-producing system upon which we all require to draw. The creation of wealth at the present time is inevitably a co-operative matter. One man, by means of a most ingenious machine, makes a nut and a bolt. That nut and bolt is no good to him by itself – he does not live on nuts and bolts. Some other man has to make some other little bit of machinery, and together with a hundred or two of them, makes up what we call a motor-car. While a motor-car is useful, you cannot live on motor cars. Someone else has to make a lot of things through more ingenious machinery. We have steam-baked bread, machine-baked bread, plumbing and so on, all of which form the single pool of wealth from which we all draw. Now this single pool of wealth is produced primarily by power and by ingenious kinds of machines. It is not produced primarily by labour at all, and it requires less and less labour to produce it.

We have to recognise that there is an increasing number of people which will not be required, for any considerable length of time in their lives, in the economic and productive system at all. We have to arrange that those people can get goods without being employed. Our objective is not to employ those people but to dis-employ them and give them the goods. Now you can do that quite easily by something we know as the dividend system. If you have a dividend at the present time – if you are the owner of some of those very few shares existing in the world, still paying dividends – you are in fact getting a piece of paper which entitles you to a fraction of the production – not of the particular thing in which you have shares – but of the total production of the world.

We have this pool of wealth, and if we extend the dividend system so that all of us who are not employed can have our dividend warrants, and those who are employed can be paid in addition to being employed, then we should have a state of affairs which exactly parallels the physical facts of the case, and nothing else.

I can well realise that there is a great need of mental adjustment to agree to proceed along those lines. We have developed on the physical and productive sides to a stage which we can quite properly call middle twentieth century. We have not developed in our economic thinking processes, which are middle fourteenth century, and we have got to make up a great deal of lost time in a very short space; but the only way to do that is to clear your minds of any doubt whatever as to what it is you are trying to do.

Extract from Address delivered in St. James's Theatre, Christchurch, New Zealand, on February 13th, 1934. Here Douglas justifies payment of a ‘Dividend’, or ‘Basic Income’ to all, a far sounder idea than Universal Credit.

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