

"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. 20 No. 12

Registered Australia Post - Publication PP343214 / 00016

December 2019

## CONTENTS

Is there a Preternatural and/or Off-Planet Component to the New World Order? by John Burton	1
book report - A Secret History of Christianity By Mark Vernon	4
First Things First by Hewlett Edwards	6

At this time of year it is appropriate to reflect on the significance of the Incarnation, having taken place as 'an actual event in history' two millennia ago —God becoming Man and dwelling amongst us —as the guide for how men are to live. The parables, the spoken words and answers, the personal example set, the miracles performed, are for each to reflect, and then do likewise. This great love is unique to the Christian Religion, with a reciprocal opportunity for every man to love one another —the two great commandments.

The journal On Target, now having completed its 55th year of publication, while presenting an analysis of the current events, through the archives of it and other documents, steps the reader back in time to similar events of history and how those of their day responded to the events of their time. Understanding history is vital if we are to move forward successfully. The journal NewTimes Survey continues as the instrument to teach of the Social Credit for our time. Fortunately there have been thinking Christian men who have shone a bright light on the way forward, Douglas being one of those. Not a utopia, but a world where, if thinking and action is orientated correctly, a world of plenty, if we would but "seek first the kingdom of God", then all these things would be added. And this really is the purpose or policy of the League, to take civilisation forward.

**God Bless and Keep You All**

- Arnis Luks

## IS THERE A PRETERNATURAL AND/OR OFF-PLANET COMPONENT TO THE NEW WORLD ORDER? by John Burton

The worldwide movement towards an ever-intensifying centralization of power, i.e., the concentration of financial, economic, cultural/social and political power in the hands of an international plutocratic elite, has often been dubbed, both by its champions as well as by its proponents, as the 'New World Order'. But what drives this movement? Is it a natural outgrowth of blind facts grounded in human psychology or technological development? Or, does it have a conscious driver involving human policy and *ad hoc* decision-making, i.e., the supremacy of vested interests over the common good? Or, is there something even more sinister at play? C.H. Douglas, the founder of Social Credit, had various things to say on this particular subject as well, things which are perhaps not as well-known as they ought to be.

In deference to those who find it difficult to believe that the material and human factors are sufficient to account for the existence and nature of the New World Order, Douglas readily admitted that the strength, insidiousness, longevity and sheer evil of the oligarchic principle in political affairs was difficult to explain in purely human terms:

**"It appears to be indisputable that there is some definite, conscious, design operating to pervert the efforts of men to their own destruction. Many people have dealt with it – it is an idea as old as recorded history."** <sup>1</sup>

When one begins one's study of Social Credit, it is easy to believe that humanity's perennial discontents are primarily economic in nature. When one is subsequently faced with the repeated failure of the authorities to right what is wrong with the economic system, even or especially after the fundamental errors which characterize the current financial system have been pointed out to them, one generally becomes convinced that our difficulties are really political rather than economic in nature. That is, the rotten system is maintained because certain elite elements benefit from the dysfunction which it generates. Eventually, however, even this explanation is seen to be lacking. Once confronted in all of its details with the starkly diabolical nature of the political plan that is steadily being implemented throughout the world, one invariably comes to the conclusion that the core cause of the various, interrelated problems that are threatening humanity is not chiefly economic, nor political; it is spiritual in nature. <sup>2</sup> The political is but a means to a spiritual objective. (continued next page)

(continued from previous page)

Has humanity been 'programmed' for self-destruction by some external, intelligent agency? If so, in what does this programming consist, who is doing it, and for what purpose? At the time of the insanity of the Second World War, Douglas began to seriously entertain the possibility that the intervention of a malevolent preternatural or off-planet agency of superior intelligence and power actually needs to be posited in order to account for all of the known facts:

**"I have suggested that there is an attempt in operation, to impose a World Policy. That is to say, somewhere there is a body of men claiming to be a World Government. ... It is of course evident that this World Dominion is not yet absolute. Even if one believes, as I am coming to believe, that its apex transcends normal human activity, it is by no means necessary to accept the view that it is invincible and inevitable."** <sup>3</sup>

Such a hypothesis, arrived at independently by natural reason, is certainly in keeping with the revealed truths of the Christian religion:

**"For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood; but against principalities and powers, against the rulers of the world of this darkness, against the spirit of wickedness in the high places."** <sup>4</sup>

Indeed, Douglas suggested that this preternatural force may very well be what the Churches have traditionally referred to as 'Satan':

**"We have no reasonable doubt that ... the state of the world at the present time can be broadly, but with approximate accuracy, attributed to: ULTIMATELY, a compact organisation, almost impossible to identify completely, possibly controlled at the top by something the Churches call Satan. Freemasonry appears to be the Church of this Body."** <sup>5</sup>

If the demonic is ultimately behind the New World Order, then it is clear that the war between Social Credit political policy and the financial plutocracy is just another manifestation of the age-old war between God and Lucifer, between Good and Evil. This was certainly the opinion of one of Douglas' closest collaborators, L.D. Byrne. In his preface to one of Douglas' books, *The Big Idea*, he described the 'big idea' as:

**"... a deeply rooted conspiracy, Satanic in conception and nature, for the destruction of what once promised to be a developing Christian Civilisation, and the enslavement of mankind under a ruthless dictatorship. It is, therefore, not surprising that this attack should have as its focus the Christian Church, Christian doctrine and Christian influence in human affairs, and that it should emanate from traditional anti-Christian sources."** <sup>6</sup>

Indeed, it would appear that Douglas eventually came to fully embrace this position himself. Towards the end of *The Big Idea* he wrote:

**"Collectivism, economic and political, is the policy of the Supernatural Forces. Its fundamental objective is the Slave World, ruled by a Praetorian Guard in the employ of a Ruling Race. It has no chance whatever of success, but it has a real chance of setting back the clock of human happiness by hundreds of years."** <sup>7</sup>

This sort of narrative, that the political must be understood through the spiritual, allows us to go one step further in our quest to properly understand the nature of the political situation in which we find ourselves. It is of the greatest strategic importance for those who would wish to neutralize oligarchic finance to obtain as much accurate information about our political situation as possible. In a very practical sense, it is true that 'knowledge is power'. Lack of knowledge therefore means lack of power. In reference to the earliest stages of his own theorizing, Douglas once acknowledged the danger inherent in a less than comprehensive approach when dealing with these matters: "... an incomplete case always affords an opportunity to those who are in possession of one more comprehensive." <sup>8</sup>

Considering reality from the point of view of a putative divine revelation, one that provides us with information that goes beyond what we could ever decipher simply on the basis of our natural experience and cognitive abilities, could, if it truly comes from a supernatural source, enable us to develop a more complete and accurate picture of all of the relevant states of affairs. <sup>9</sup> By expanding our understanding of reality, divinely revealed states of affairs would also place naturally accessible truths in a somewhat different and more intelligible light. Since the science of Social Credit confirms many of the elements of Christianity that are accessible to natural cognition, the Christian deposit of faith is the most obvious revelation to consider in attempting to acquire this sort of broader perspective. What additional information concerning world politics might we obtain if we were to examine this datum from the point of view of the Christian revelation in general and its more properly supernatural aspects in particular?

According to what can be gathered from a variety of Christian revelations, both public and private, God created finite entities in order to share His infinite goodness with them. The act of creation was an act of unconditional love. The most ontologically perfect of these entities was an angel called Lucifer. Created with free will, he, along with the rest of the angels, had to choose whether he would embrace the good or whether he would refuse to conform to the divine will. Although they would be inferior by nature,

(continued next page)

(continued from previous page)

God revealed his plan to create human beings who would be elevated by grace above the angels by His decision to become one of them in the person of Jesus Christ. For Lucifer this was an intolerable injustice. He thought he knew better than God what ought to be done and that this rendered him worthy of usurping God's place as the supreme being (hence the worship of autonomous reason as a distinguishing feature of Satanism). Lucifer did not have full understanding, but did not wish to admit this, as it would have required him to submit his intellect to God in an act of faith and trust. Such submission was incompatible with his self-chosen position of metaphysical pride.

After committing the sin of pride, Lucifer became the fallen entity known as Satan. Alongside one third of the angels he was cast out from the divine presence and relegated to that state of separation from God called hell. St. Michael, head of those angels who remained faithful to God, is said to have exiled him with the cry 'Quis ut Deus?' – 'Who is like unto God? Who is like unto God? ... God can do as He pleases.'

Satan's only satisfaction at this point, his only way of attempting to dethrone God, was to try to bring the purpose of God's creation to naught. This goal of cosmic sabotage would be achieved by entrapping men through deception so that they would more or less willingly deviate from the divine order, what Douglas called the Canon, i.e., the order which things assume when they work best (in accordance with their God-given natures). In the book of Genesis, for example, God told Adam and Eve that they were free to eat of any fruit except the fruit of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. In other words, they were free to do whatever they wished, but they were not free to change the Canon, the natural laws which govern reality.<sup>10</sup> If Satan can convince humanity to deviate from the divine will, then has he not succeeded in proving his superiority, i.e., that his power, the power of evil, is greater than the power of goodness and that the almighty God can be thwarted by one of his creatures?

Now it would seem that the most effective way of ensuring that the greatest number of human beings would be compelled to live in opposition to God and His law would be to enslave them under a totalitarian dictatorship that rejected the laws of God in its very structure and functioning. The centralization of power would allow the plutocratic elite to impose Kabbalism as the governing philosophy of the world and to thus ensure that human disobedience to the divine order would attain its maximum possible degree. The resulting 'hell on earth' would effectively prevent human beings from elevating themselves towards God by freely and gladly conforming their actions to the Canon in all spheres of activity.

The perversion of worldly politics thus serves an occult preternatural purpose: the satisfaction of a cosmic grudge. If enough people invert the due order in the

'right' way, evil will reign over the good in a kingdom of dysfunction. By constructing the social world on the basis of Kabbalistic, idealistic oughts, the dynamic potential for what is truly good (i.e., what is in keeping with the divinely established order in nature) will be imprisoned rather than released. In consequence, God's purpose in creating finite persons, i.e., the desire to share His goodness with creatures made in His image, will be thwarted. Instead of making its divine *rendez-vous*, humanity will be enslaved in the service of self-destructive ends. Being thrown into the anguish of endless and meaningless frustration they may come to curse God, even while the plan of God is foiled by their own behaviour.

Successfully ruining God's creation by preventing it from fulfilling the divine intention would presumably demonstrate that evil is more powerful than the good and hence that Satan is more powerful than God. If that which we normally think of as evil can eventually achieve metaphysical dominion over the good, will not Satan, the patron of evil, have thereby demonstrated his ontological superiority vis-à-vis the Godhead? In Kabbalism the eschaton as expressed in the Sephiroth or 'tree of life' is conceived as the serpent, the 'god' of what we commonly take to be evil, rising from below and executing a metaphysical *coup d'état*.

On this view, it follows that Kabbalism is not merely the 'philosophy' underlying a particular kind of politics, it is also (and this is of much greater importance), the 'philosophy' underlying a particular kind of religion, a religion that is devoted to a power that is opposed to God.<sup>11</sup> By equating 'good' with 'evil', Kabbalism implies the basic ontological equality of God and Lucifer; i.e., both are eternal, both are divine. By insisting on axiological inversion, i.e., that we should pursue evil as the true 'good' and despise the true good as 'evil,' Kabbalism embraces and forwards the goal of Satan who wishes to achieve superiority over God by defeating Him and replacing Him.<sup>12</sup>

Accordingly, the worldly powers-that-be at the highest levels are not merely self-absorbed megalomaniacs or useful idiots; instead, they are consciously in league with preternatural evil. Satan is the prince of this world because the money system that has been put into place is Satanic in its very essence: it inverts the due economic order by subordinating the real credit to the financial credit.<sup>13</sup> In exchange for their assistance in running such a system, the financial elite derive illegitimate and obscene degrees of wealth, prestige, and power. Such tremendous benefits undoubtedly nourish and reinforce in their recipients a profound sense of superiority. They would appear to confirm that Kabbalism is actually true and yields the results it promises (at least as far as the elite are concerned)...

(continued next page)

(continued from previous page) ...and that those who follow the Light-bearer are indeed enlightened and liberated. Interestingly enough, the substance of this religiously grounded interpretation of our discontents has been confirmed by various statements that have been made over the years by the Kabbalists themselves. Some of them describe their religion as Illuminism, or the idea that man can liberate himself from his creaturehood; i.e., that he can become like unto God by redefining reality for himself. It is for this reason that the elite practitioners of this religion have sometimes been referred to as the Illuminati, or the so-called 'enlightened ones'.

#### REFERENCES:

<sup>1</sup> C.H. Douglas, *The Big Idea* (Bullsbrook, Australia: Veritas Publishing Company, 1983), 65.

<sup>2</sup> Even at earlier stages in the development of his ideas Douglas had intimations of this reality: "There is an old saying in Latin which reads: *Daemon est deus inversus*, which I will translate very freely as "Governments are the very devil." and when I say Governments I mean not only political, but financial governments, and perhaps more financial than political. I believe that this is a matter of very great importance; in fact it runs into very obscure metaphysics into which I don't propose to enter to-night." C.H. Douglas, "Wanted – Political Consciousness" Social Credit July 26th, 1935, 383 [emphasis mine].

<sup>3</sup> C.H. Douglas, *The Big Idea* (Bullsbrook, Australia: Veritas Publishing Company, 1983), 23. [emphasis mine] Cf. C.H. Douglas, *The Development of World Dominion* (Sydney: Tidal Publications, 1969), 11: "A mysterious Power which can manifest, as it is manifesting, on every plane of human, and perhaps superhuman, activity, is not going to take a ballot-box very seriously except so far as it is helpful to the Big Idea."

<sup>4</sup> Ephesians 6:12

<sup>5</sup> C.H. Douglas, *The Development of World Dominion* (Sydney: Tidal Publications, 1969), 104. Cf. Ibid., 40: "... we are satisfied (as the result of observation, information, and experience covering a period of thirty years devoted to attention to the state of the world as unbiased by pre-occupations as is humanly possible) that there is something operative at such high levels that it corresponds to the doctrinal concept of Anti-Christ ..."

<sup>6</sup> C.H. Douglas, *The Big Idea* (Bullsbrook, Australia: Veritas Publishing Company, 1983), v.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., 62. [emphasis mine]

<sup>8</sup> C.H. Douglas, *The Development of World Dominion* (Sydney: Tidal Publications, 1969), 5.

<sup>9</sup> If one admits the existence of a personal God, the ontological possibility and epistemological advantages of a divine revelation ought not to be dismissed. Even on a natural level there are truths that could only be known if they were intentionally disclosed to us by another conscious mind. That is the very meaning and importance of *revelation*.

<sup>10</sup> God's prohibition on eating that fruit was a symbolic way of stating a simple fact: we cannot change the natural laws of the universe; we can only adapt ourselves to them. True, we do remain free to engage in the futile

### book report - A SECRET HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY —

#### Jesus, the Last Inkling, and the Evolution of Consciousness By Mark Vernon

##### From the introduction

Something is going wrong with Christianity. In the western world, it's not hard to make the case that something's gone terminally wrong. People are abandoning churches in their droves or, more commonly, simply steering clear of the services that nourished their forebears. In spite of sustained attempts to reverse the decline, and notable exceptions to the rule, nothing seems able to stop it.

This book (*A Secret History of Christianity*) is a response to the crisis, though it differs from others. It focuses on the inward aspect of Christianity's troubles.

**To summarize:** according to the novel perspective that the Christian revelation affords on the subject, it must be understood that the 'New World Order' is not the policy of a conspiracy immanent to this world; rather, it is part and parcel of more fundamental cosmic plot against both God and humanity. The purpose of centralizing so much power is to re-make the world in conformity with the precepts of Kabbalism. Since Illuminism is nothing other than Satanism, the New World Order can be nothing other than the attempt to establish an occult 'theocracy':

**"Most of us, because we have been conditioned to think that way, have a natural reluctance to accept 'occultism' as a considerable force in world affairs. There could hardly be a greater error – it is the primary adversary of Christian civilisation. The forces of which it disposes are probably amoral; but the intention of those most evidently in possession of them is Satanic. The Jewish Cabala is one of its main roots."** <sup>14</sup> \*\*\*

attempt to change the laws by acting in keeping with how we think the laws ought to be ... but even then, we are not free to avoid the consequences that must invariably ensue.

<sup>11</sup> Please read my article in full on Kabbalism published in the January 2019 issue of *The New Times Survey*.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Isaiah 14:12-15:

"How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, who didst rise in the morning? How are thou fallen to the earth, that didst wound the nations?"

And thou sadist in thy heart: I will ascend into heaven, I will exalt my throne above the stars of God, I will sit in the mountain of the covenant, in the sides of the north.

I will ascend above the height of the clouds, I will be like the most High.

But yet thou shalt be brought down to hell, into the depth of the pit."

<sup>13</sup> Social Credit also sheds light on the Christian Revelation. In Luke's Gospel we read: "And the devil led him into a high mountain, and shewed him all the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time;

And he said to him: To thee will I give all this power, and the glory of them; for to me they are delivered, and to whom I will, I give them.

If thou therefore wilt adore before me, all shall be thine.

And Jesus answering said to him: It is written: Thou shalt dore the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." Luke 4:4-8. (Douay-Rheims) How is it that to Satan the kingdoms of the world have been delivered if not through the application of an inverted financial mechanism that allows the financial 'tail' to wag the 'dog' of the real economy? The mechanism of the current financial system is the means to the realization of a policy, and that policy is the policy of a philosophy that is anything but Christian.

<sup>14</sup> C.H. Douglas, *The Development of World Dominion* (Sydney: Tidal Publications, 1969), 17. \*\*\*

*(continued from previous page)* ...and sometimes actively rejected. The upshot is that the working assumption of many western people is that Christianity will curtail your options, not expand your life, let alone affirm the truth about yourself. The people whom sociologists call “spiritual but not religious” and “nones” shrink from it. It’s tragic and, in my view, most Christian apologetics haven’t really understood the nature of the problem. It’s why more evangelical writers try to sell or prove, not learn and grow. It’s why more liberal writers tend to cut Christianity back, feeling they must conform to, not test, contemporary secular assumptions. Both wings whittle away the secret sense of life to which the historical Jesus was clearly supremely alert.

By “secret,” I don’t mean a Dan Brown-ish reference to an occult code, let alone a conspiracy theory, but to a truth that seems obscure or hidden only because it’s tricky to grasp. It’s secret in the sense of being hard to see even when plainly spelt out. It’s secret in the way that a buried hoard is secret though is, in truth, simply resting beneath your feet, waiting to be found. It’s a perception that can be known like the quiet constancy of your breath. It’s that your life springs from God’s life and that this truth is yours to be discovered. It can be known directly, not on the basis of someone else’s report, someone else’s authority, someone else’s rhetoric, but inwardly and reliably – though it’s the work of a lifetime fully to align with it.

This is, in fact, standard mystical theology. It follows from the discernment that God is not another being, like you and me, but is the ground of being itself. God is known implicitly as the poetry in the poem, the fire in the equations, the life in the living, the pulse of the cosmos. And it’s a truth that must be inhabited to be understood.

The situation has become critical for Christianity because over the last four or five hundred years churches have been losing touch with this inner element, which is crucial for any path that would call itself spiritual. That’s happened for various reasons – the rise of science, the impact of the Reformation, the separation of psychology from spirituality. Nonetheless, it is possible to rediscover. Like the goodly pearl of great value, it’s waiting to be uncovered.

I was lucky enough to find a guide in this task. He’s the Oxford Inkling, Owen Barfield. He is sometimes known as the “last Inkling” because he was the last of the celebrated group to die, in 1997. A close friend of C.S. Lewis and J.R.R. Tolkien, they both thought he had the most penetrating ideas. However, he wasn’t as good a writer, particularly when it comes to blockbuster fiction, and so is not nearly so well known. That said, his core idea is readily understood, and radical. He has an account of our spiritual predicament that is illuminating. It arose from a discovery. Barfield realized that the human experience of life shifts fundamentally over periods of cultural time. Our awareness of things evolves.

Our consciousness changes dramatically across history.

He proposed that it happens in three phases. The first, he called “original participation” – the word “participation” referring to the felt experience of participating in life. Original participation dominates when there is little distinction between what’s felt to be inside someone and what’s outside because the boundaries of individual self-consciousness, which today we take for granted, are not in place. Life is therefore lived at the level of the collective. It’s experienced as a continuous flow of vitality between what is “me” and “not me,” between mortals and immortals, between past and present, and also between other creatures and the human creature. The inner life of the cosmos is the inner life of the people. “Early man did not observe nature in our detached way,” Barfield writes. “He participated mentally and physically in her inner and outer processes.”

It determined life in ancient times and can sometimes be glimpsed today. It’s in the waves of emotion that sweep across a crowd as, then, there’s a temporary dissolution of the boundaries between the individual and others. It’s an experience that’s akin to stepping back in time.

A second phase away from original participation is marked by what he called a “withdrawal of participation.” It happens when there’s a shift from the sense of being immersed in the life of others, nature and the gods. An awareness of separation, even isolation, is felt. A person will begin to sense that they have an inner life that is, relatively speaking, their own.

Barfield argued that a momentous withdrawal of participation began to unfold in the middle of the first millennium BCE. It’s the period during which quasi-scientific ideas about the cosmos began to be formed. Some humans turned away from an exclusive reliance on myths as their interests changed from sharing in life to explaining life. Questions such as the meaning of life started to appear because meaning no longer spontaneously revealed itself to such enquirers. It was a troubling time, though, with the withdrawal of participation came an astonishing gain. The concentration of inner life that the separation from outer life brought came hand in hand with an intensification of the sense of being an individual, and with that came all manner of novel possibilities. Moral responsibility emerged, as did new relationships with deities. In the West, this moment is identified with the birth of philosophy in ancient Greece and the emergence of new religious imperatives from the Hebrew prophets. (I’m going to focus on these developments from a western perspective, though a comparable story could be told of the East.)

It’s a time of awakening and rebirth and results in what Barfield called “reciprocal participation,” a third phase. Now, the inner life of the individual is felt to belong to him- or herself – ... *(continued on page 8)*

## FIRST THINGS FIRST by Hewlett Edwards

(The substance of an address: by Mr. Hewlett Edwards to the Brantley Group of the *Housewives League*, February 28, 1947.)

The first thing to make clear is that in my opinion the dangers which beset the provision of food are only a part of the danger which confronts us. I do not think that anything effective can be done on the surface. If the landslide is to be stopped it can be done only by work at a deeper level, not merely by altering the position of the stones and debris which threaten to overwhelm us.

To begin, however, with food; the objective is, of course, the meal on the table. The farmer grows it, and the house-wife prepares it. All else is secondary. The stability of society depends on the preservation of those two factors. The farmer and the housewife: the land and the home. You will not be overmuch concerned about the farmer unless your supplies fall off. They have fallen off. Therefore you may well ask yourself the question:

“What has happened to the source of my supplies?”

It is not difficult for the housewife to have a pretty good understanding of the farmer and his work, for both he and she specialise in the service of the growth and care of living things. You know about children; how each is different from the other, what small alterations of this or that will help or hinder straight growth, how you and they grow together — on different planes — in understanding.

It is very much the same with the farmer. He knows such things about plants and animals. The soil, and how it varies from field to field; of what it will grow and what it will not; of weeds and their curious habits; of animals, their pedigrees and personal peculiarities; of sowing, reaping, hedging, thatching and all the work that goes on around a farm. The real farmer has an immense store of such observation and practice. It is this which links him to the land.

This link is being broken, in favour of quite another idea. For there are two irreconcilable ideas in conflict:-

“The first of these is that the world we live in is an organism, and that men and animals have intricate relationships with the earth, not amorphous but specific and infinitely varied, which can only be disregarded at the peril of both men and that earth they live on. The second and antithetic idea is that the world is merely raw material for a factory, and that the nearer agriculture approximates to Mr. Ford’s conveyor-belt principles, the better we shall be.”

There is only one sound guide in the choice between these alternatives; and that is an unwavering determination to secure the quantity and quality of food required for the family table. Which way shall we get that? From compulsory cultivation according to rule and regulation enforced by penalty? , Or from free cultivation by those who have an intimate understanding of the soil?

There is not much doubt about that: in fact there is proof. The soil itself has all the characteristics of a living medium. And wherever it has been treated as raw material for factory use; wherever mechanisation, artificial manures, standardised methods, and so forth have become the accustomed rule — the result has been to kill the soil. Within the last fifty years, vast areas of what was once fertile land have, by such treatment, been reduced to sterile desert.

England is now in process of adopting these methods. Many of our farmers are still of that tradition which has produced the best farming in the world. Their intimate understanding is to be scrapped, and they must become factory managers or get out of farming. The link between the farmer and his land —between us and our food — is being broken.

A system of land ownership which leaves the farmer free to work the land according to his tradition is the very bedrock or civilisation. Our land system was not destroyed by either landlords or tenants. Nor was that sabotage an English conception. At bottom it was forced upon us by international plotters, aided by “British” (I will not call them English) planners. The power used was that of finance, brought to bear upon the land, through the Treasury, —by taxation. Income tax plus other current taxation is beyond what the land can sustain. Death Duties are a deliberate weapon to break up ownership, for they cannot be paid out of what the land produces. This attack has broken the continuity which is vital. This process is to be completed by the Bill (1947-*ed*) now before Parliament. The principle of this is clearly stated:

“In return for a guaranteed price level, all owners and occupiers of rural land must accept an obligation to maintain a reasonable standard of good husbandry and estate management, and submit to the necessary measure of direction and guidance, subject to provisions for appeal to an impartial tribunal”.

You may not think that sounds so unreasonable. Well, the composition of the Committees which will control the farmer is laid down; and I suggest that you consider how such an arrangement would work in your own affairs. It is as if you were offered what someone else thought was a satisfactory housekeeping income for you, in return for which you would have to submit to what someone else considered the “necessary measure of direction and guidance” —to preserve what someone else considered a “reasonable standard” of good housekeeping. This someone else would be a Committee consisting of five young women from the Ministry of Housekeeping: three from the Country Womens’ Institute; two from the House Agents Association: and two from the Chairwomens’ Union. (*continued next page*)

(continued from previous page)

This committee would have, and use, drastic powers to enforce their directions. You may think this an exaggeration, but it is not: on the contrary, it may still happen to you. It sounds impossible that anyone should accept such a bargain, but I dare say you have known women so harassed and ridden by monetary worries that they might think “I would sell my soul for regular housekeeping money that I knew would always be there.” That is exactly the position of most farmers.

Very well. The farmer’s soul is his own concern. But the food which the land produces is our concern and as the Farmer loses this tradition, so the land will lose its fertility. And what will become of us? One of the specific objectives of the French Revolution was the reduction, by some millions, of the population, in the Russian Revolution the population was reduced by 30 millions. Now we hear persistent rumours that the proper population for this country is twenty—not forty-six millions.

However that may be, there is one exceedingly useful fact which is revealed by the passing of the Bill. It is approved by all Parties. No one made any attempt to dispute the principle stated above. No one. So we know where we stand with the Parties.

So much for farming and Food, which, as I have said, is only a part of the landslide which is overtaking us. For the fact is that by the same process of order and penalty concerning our food, clothing, houses, health, children, work, insurance, and so through every department of life—we are being reduced to graded material for the new conveyor-belt society. Whereas within ourselves we know human beings are personal, each is unique and cannot so be standardised: we know the growth of the human spirit—for we do not live only by eating—to be our true objective. It needs no argument to show that Rule and Regulation will not serve that end.

How has this come about? Well, these things are imposed upon us by Law: by Regulations which have the force of law: and by “Instructions” which are presumed to carry the weight of Regulations.

These Laws and Regulations are enforced by penalties. And these are put into effect by the Police who, if or when it comes to it, have all the armed forces of the realm behind them. It is those who control Parliament who control these forces. So much is fact. Theory adds that it is “The People” who control Parliament.

So we have this extraordinary fiction in which ‘the people’—and that means you and me—are envisaged as imposing upon themselves conditions which we loathe; threatening ourselves with degrading penalties; sending each other to prison for such trivialities . . . and so on. How do ordinary English people come to act like this? Or don’t they?

I should say they don’t; but that the political system

has been and is manipulated so that someone else can do these things. This manipulation permeates the system, but there are three major centres around which all revolves. The first is the Law. The second is the assumption of limitless sovereignty by Parliament: and the third is the electoral system.

Just as English Farming was proverbial, so is, or was, English Common Law respected and envied the world over. It was not based upon abstract ideas but upon practice. That is to say, that individuals worked out, in their lives and by long experience, what was proper and what was not proper to be done. Only after long established usage was this given the effect of law. This formal confirmation of the closely knit growth of experience—this natural law—is the human counterpart of physical ‘laws’. It forms a framework, which might be called “the rules of the game” within which the individual is (or rather was) free to pursue his personal ends and desires. Its essence is the preservation of freedom.

“English Common Law embodies certain Rights and Liberties, established by the natives of these islands by long custom; Rights not subject either to the whim of Parliament or to the conspiracy of politicians. The King was the supreme Defender of these Personal Rights.

Most of the legislation which now proceeds from Parliament is in flagrant breach of these rights and liberties. It is not based upon experience, but upon an abstract idea. . . the idea that man’s place in society is subservient to the State, and that his personal inclinations are of small importance and must be controlled. For this a man must be told what to do and made to do it: hence the multiplicity of orders and penalties to enforce them. No doubt those who devise such law believe in it: for it is they who *are* ‘the State,’ and it is their ideas which are to be so served. Common Law states the Rules, and stands aside. This *other* and newer sort of law tells you *how* you must play the game—and it’s their game you *must* play.

This position has been made possible by the embodiment of an idea—a ‘false idea—the doctrine of the limitless sovereignty of Parliament. This is a Whig conception which, pushed far in the eighteenth century was partially expelled during the nineteenth; but was revived, notably by Lloyd George, early in this century. Since then it has gained’ ground with every succeeding Administration. There still remains a link—once of great potency—between the King and his Subjects . . . the Petition of Rights. There is a Bill now before the House for its abolition.

It is possible that you may find this wholesale disregard and destruction of your rights hard to credit. So I will propose a test. It is possible that you do not wish to pay 4 /9 a week for the rest of your life in exchange for the sole certain benefit of £10 (or is it £20?) for your burial. (continued next page)

(continued from previous page)

If so, it was within your Rights (as a free member of a free society) to decline to take part in this National Insurance scheme. Do so now. The result will be a summons, and an injunction to pay. If you don't, £10 —and if you still resist £10 a day — until you give in.

It is not necessary to describe the electoral system by which Parliament maintains this supremacy of power. I suppose that in theory Parliament is the product of the fully informed and balanced appraisal by each voter of the issues presented. Do you think it is?

We all know that it cannot be, while such a vast complication of issues is presented in so deceptive a manner. Elections are 'run' on the most attractive 'slogans' the Party Managers can think of. Anything but the truth. What Party would 'go to the country' with a 'programme' setting forth that it is proposed to subordinate the individual to the State —that any Rights against this which the elector may think he has will be overruled or abolished —that a series of measures will be passed which, in all essential matters, will authorise that he be ordered what he must do, where before he had freedom of choice —that these measures will cost him — so much —per annum, for the rest of his life, in taxation —that if he tries to resist he will be heavily fined, or imprisoned, or both?

You may think that excessive. It is literally true of at least three recent measures— National Insurance, Education, and Agriculture. True, not merely of Socialists, but of all Parties in Parliament, for in principle, all Parties were agreed.

The keynote of the present political system is irresponsibility. The Government becomes irresponsible because there is no line set beyond which they must not trespass —no inviolable Constitution. The Parties are irresponsible because they can get away with it. The voters, too are irresponsible; partly because most of them have not the vaguest idea of what it is all about. And that understandable irresponsibility is encouraged by secrecy, the secrecy of the ballot. This is very far from the sound English tradition of the forthright and open expression of opinion. Therefore, I think that the solution of this enigma is for each part of the political system to be made answerable for its actions. The Government for the preservation of specific inviolable Rights. The Parties so tied to their programme that they cannot escape responsibility for the results they produce. And the voter?

Well, no one can really be responsible for what he does not understand. So it becomes a matter of putting the issues involved before the elector in a way he can understand. From, what I have said you may think I have little respect for his intelligence. But it is not intelligence which is required of him. It is common sense —and of that he has plenty —if matters are so presented that his common sense can grasp them. Try summing up a

proposition to him in this way: "This is the proposal. These are its consequences, to *you*. This is its cost, to *you*. Is that what you want? Are you willing to back it with —so much of your money? If the proposition is a success, you gain. If not, you must be prepared to lose more than those who have not voted for it. For if you vote for it, it is your proposition."

In your Statement of Policy you have a striking clause: "To provide the British Housewife with an effective voice" Yes. But the Voice which is effective now is that which demands ever more and more control of ordinary people —to push them on into this new conveyor-belt society. You can never counter that drive by the discussion of its details, that is, details of rationing and controls.

You would not wish me to advise you with anything less than full conviction. 'It is first necessary to appreciate the worst, and it is bad. The Parties are against you: all are determined on the mechanisation of humanity. Your individual Member of Parliament — even though he may wish —is powerless to help you. Petitions to the King are ruled out: and to Parliament, quite useless. Those byeways are closed. But there is still the highroad. The avowed purpose of the Electoral system is to make your Voice effective. But it turns in your hand, like a broken tin opener. Therefore, the first objective is to make it effective.

In my opinion that is the only manner in which you may make substantial headway towards the fulfillment of your policy. And on those lines there are many who will be with you. *H.E.* \*\*\*

(continued from page 5) ...the gain of the withdrawal – but also to reflect the inner life of nature, the cosmos and of God. The individual has a soul that is not cut off; an interiority that can reflect and reflect on life and its meaning. People of this age have a subjectivity that can forge purposes and intentions. The awareness of participating in life still involves shared rites and ceremonies, but ideally these will be undertaken freely and consensually, not simply because a priest or a king demands it. Inwardness as we can know it is born. \*\*\*

**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 8387 6574 **eMail:** heritagebooks@alor.org

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

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

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