

"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. 24 No. 02

Registered Australia Post - Publication PP343214 / 00016

February 2023

## CONTENTS

<i>Vidimus Stellam Eius In Oriente</i> By Archbishop Viganò	1
The Realistic Position of the Church of England By Major C. H. Douglas	3
The Way You Design the World By Vandana Shiva	5
The Moral Implications of Centralised Power By E. D. Butler	6

## VIDIMUS STELLAM EIUS IN ORIENTE

*Homily of Archbishop Carlo Maria Viganò on the Epiphany of Our Lord Jesus Christ*

### PRAISED BE JESUS CHRIST

This solemn day is sanctified by three miracles: the adoration of the Magi, the changing of water into wine at the wedding at Cana, and the Baptism of Christ in the Jordan. These miraculous signs show us the divinity of Our Lord and His universal Lordship over the cosmos, over nature and over us. It is no longer only the shepherds who are called by the Angels to recognize the *Verbum caro factum*, but it is the whole human race, it is all creation that the voice of God himself calls to adore Him, to listen to Him, to obey Him. A Lordship that some recognize with humble Faith and that others reject out of pride.

In the Martyrology on Christmas Eve, we heard sung the announcement of the Birth of the Saviour *secundum carnem*, placed in history with a multiplicity of precise and detailed chronological references. The *Toto orbe in pace composito* that the cantor solemnly pronounces shortly before raising the tone of his voice to mark the historical reality of the salvific event of Christ's Birth refers to the triple triumph of Augustus, author and peacemaker of the Roman Empire. A human and pagan triumph, certainly; but which was intended to prepare the eternal triumph of the *Rex pacificus*, the immortal Emperor, the unconquered Sun. For this reason, January 6, established as a civil holiday to celebrate the human glory of Rome, was chosen by the Church to celebrate the undying glory of Christ, King of kings and Lord of lords.

In this age of apostasy, marked by wars and conflicts caused by rebellion against God, it is difficult to understand how the earthly authority of the Emperor could constitute in the plan of Providence the necessary prerequisite for the coming of the Lord. What seems to us more "normal" – so to speak – is the ferocious and ruthless response of Herod, who in his mad attempt to kill the Child King exterminated the children of Bethlehem whom we recalled a few days ago in the Liturgy. Life and death, peace and war, light and darkness, grace and damnation: we constantly have before our eyes the two great alternatives for ourselves, for our families, for civil society. And it is Christ who stands as a point of reference, as a stumbling block, asking us to make our moral choice, recognizing Him as our Life, our Peace, our Light, our everything. If not, that is, if we renounce this choice, if we wanted to declare ourselves *neutral* in the face of the battle fought by the angelic hosts against the infernal powers, we would still be making a choice on which our salvation and that of the whole world depends. We see it today: those who do not take the field under the banners of Christ inexorably end up being allies of His enemies, stand by watching as the innocents are killed by Herod, and before the manger refuse to adore the Lord, all in the name of a perverted concept of freedom and secularism in which the sovereign rights of God are denied or silenced.

And yet, precisely in contemplating the mysteries of this Most Holy Day, the Church shows us the need for the Epiphany, the manifestation of the divinity of Jesus Christ; a necessity for which Providence does not hesitate to move the stars, if a star can lead pagan scholars towards the light of Grace and conversion to the true God. In fact, the simple and faithful adoration of the shepherds, made up of a humble and poor interiority, was not enough: it recalls the act of faith of the individual, of each one of us, but remains incomplete for the fate of the world if it is not accompanied by the public and official adoration of those who hold authority on earth, since this authority is a reflection of the authority of God, the Supreme Legislator and Judge. As the Psalm prophesies: *Et adorabunt eum omnes reges terræ; omnes gentes servient ei.*

It is surprising, somehow, that it is wise men from the East who pay homage to the Child God, while the representatives of the imperial authority are absent, just as neither the king of Israel nor the High Priests appear; who also played a decisive role in trying and condemning the Lord to death. Present at the moment of death, but absent at the moment of life. Why do we not see the Roman Procurator, Herod, Annas and Caiaphas, the officials of the Sanhedrin and the scribes of the people around the manger, as we contemplate Caspar, Melchior, and Balthazar kneeling before the Child intent on offering their gifts?

The answer is evident in all its simplicity. The shepherds adored Christ with the trusting abandonment of the simple, who has nothing to offer but himself and the poor things of daily life and his humble work. The Magi adored Christ thanks to His miraculous manifestation in the course of the stars, and their human wisdom, their ability to peer into the cosmos, led them to the timeless Sun, because they too, with humility, knew how to recognize the birth of God in the world. Both were illuminated by Grace, the former through the announcement of the Angel, the latter through the signs of heaven. Instead, Herod and the High Priests, who should have known very well the Messianic prophecies preserved by Israel, could neither see nor believe, because their first concern was power. On the one hand, the temporal power, exercised under the domination of pagan Rome and forgetting that the Jewish Sovereigns were vicars of the only King of Israel, the Lord God of hosts; on the other, spiritual power, exercised in what today we would call “self-referentiality,” that is, concerned to preserve itself and keep the people in ignorance. This is confirmed by the harsh rebukes and severe warnings of the prophets, by the mouth of which the Lord reminded His priests of their duties, while they were busy lengthening the prongs of the forks with which they held part of the sacrificial flesh for themselves, or while profiting from the trades of the money changers and merchants brought into the Temple. Deaf to Grace! Deaf is Herod, who should have seen in the little Jesus the ratifying of his own authority; deaf are the High Priests, who should have recognized in Him the promised Messiah, the Desired One of all peoples. Both, significantly, had preferred to submit to the invader, rather than bow to the One who holds in His hand the fate of the world and time. *Non habemus regem nisi Cæsarem.*

The present situation is not very different in this regard from that time. Even today the civil and ecclesiastical authorities refuse to worship Jesus Christ, or do so only in words plotting for His killing, for fear of losing their power. Even today we see the simple and the leaders of distant nations recognizing the Saviour, and conforming their private and public lives to Him, while world leaders prefer to gather in Davos for their globalist

agenda, and the prelates of the Bergoglian sect think only of hiding their scandals, propagating synodality and encouraging the most unmentionable vices. Both support each other and recognize each other’s legitimacy. Both see Jesus Christ as an uncomfortable obstacle to the pursuit of their plans for power and domination. Yet, as we sing in the hymn of the Epiphany, *non eripit mortalia qui regna dat caelestia. He who gives us heavenly kingdoms does not ravish earthly ones.*

But if on the one hand the Magi, with their tribute of Faith, have been able to publicly adore the King of kings, having nothing to fear for their authority; on the other hand, the rulers who are rebellious and indocile to God, not recognizing the divine origin of the power they exercise, place themselves against His Lordship and also against their subjects, transforming wise and just government into an instrument of hateful tyranny. This is how the prophet Jeremiah expresses himself against them:

<sup>26</sup>For among my people there are wicked people who spy like lurking hunters, they set traps for men. <sup>27</sup>Like a cage full of birds, so their houses are full of deceit; therefore, they become great and rich. <sup>28</sup>They are fat and wicked, they go beyond the limits of evil; they do not defend justice, they do not care for the cause of the orphan, they do not do justice to the poor. <sup>29</sup>Should I not punish these sins? Oracle of the Lord. Should I not take revenge on a people like this? <sup>30</sup>Terrifying and horrible things take place in the land. <sup>31</sup>The prophets foretell in the name of lies, and the priests rule at their behest; yet my people are pleased with this. What will you do when the end comes?

Listening to these words of Sacred Scripture, we wonder if they are not addressed to the powerful of this world, to the members of the globalist elite and to those who serve them out of cowardice, self-interest, and obsequious complicity. And to those who, established in authority in the Church to feed the flock entrusted to them by the Lord, abuse their power to govern at the nod of the prophets of the New World Order, who prophesy pandemics and emergencies of which they are ruthless architects.

*What will you do when the end comes?*, the Lord asks. Will you create new emergencies, new crises, new pandemics, new wars with which to keep the people subjugated? Will you continue to exterminate innocent children, to render fathers and mothers sterile, to defraud the worker of his reward, to corrupt the young, to kill the sick and the elderly because they are considered useless for your own vile interests? Will you barricade yourselves in your fortresses, hoping to escape God’s wrath and your just chastisement? What will you do, servants of the *Great Reset*, when your masters have to flee into their lairs and hide in the bowels of the earth? Do you think you can sell yourself to a new owner as you have done so far? Poor, miserable, deluded ones.

The terrible day of the Lord will come for everyone, and also for you: first with the particular Judgment, and then with the universal Judgment. If earthly justice stands idly by and watches your crimes passively because it is subservient to you, Divine Justice will instead be inexorable and terrible, so that your public sins against the Majesty of God and against the man whom He created in His image and likeness, and whom He redeemed with His own Blood, do not go unpunished. And if our poor strength fails to overcome your conspiracies, know that each one of us, every faithful one of the Holy Church, every single good soul is praying, fasting, and doing penance, asking for the intervention of the Lord, the King of the Nations, whom you refuse to recognize, adore, and serve. What will you do when the end comes?

On this day of the Epiphany, when we celebrate the public manifestation of the divine kingship of Our Lord Jesus Christ and the public tribute of the Magi to His universal and eternal Lordship, let us also renew our offering. It is a poor and miserable offering, because it comes from us who have nothing but what Providence

has granted us. And yet it is a precious offering, if presented by Our Lady, Mary Most Holy, the Queen Mother who is our Advocate at the Throne of the Son. It is an infinite offering when it rises to the Majesty of the Father through the hands of the pure and holy Victim, the High Priest, the Eternal Pontiff who renews the Sacrifice of the Cross in the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. Let us place our penances at the foot of the altar, so that they may become the gold of kings; our prayers, that they may ascend to heaven like the incense that priests burn to God; and our fasts, so that the Holy Mass may convert them into the myrrh of sacrifice. And we ask the Child King to convert those who hold authority both in civil society and in the Church, who find themselves today having to choose whether to follow the star to Bethlehem to worship Him, or to ignore His Birth in order to avoid His will and wage war against Him.

And so may it be.

\*\*\*

+ Carlo Maria, *Archbishop*

January 6, 2023

*Epiphany of Our Lord Jesus Christ*

## THE REALISTIC POSITION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

By Major C. H. DOUGLAS (circa 1930s)

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

But as an individual of, I hope, ordinary common sense, as well as a member of the Church of England, I feel that I am justified in asking that its politics shall be coherent and not in conflict with Christian philosophy as I understand it, when it is put forward under the prestige of high office in the Christian Church.”

“This is, I think, much what most people feel about the Church of England as a whole; they love its exquisite liturgy, the mirror of a nobler day, and they would agree that it holds many good and able men; but it simply does not register. It is so tolerant that it is difficult to name anything to which it objects; its clergy in the main purr with satisfaction at every fresh robbery by taxation, it is so democratic that if you don't like its principles, and can get a majority vote, more particularly of the people, it will change them; and its only slight aversion appears to be from England and the English.

There is a reason for this, and it is this reason which I feel brings the subject within the orbit of constitutionalism - a subject which must have attention, if we are to survive, as a preliminary to better things.

To indicate what I have in mind, consider the famous First Clause of Magna Carta : "*Quod Ecclesia Anglicana libera sit et habeat omnia sua jura integra*" which is translated by Mr. Ashton:

**"That the Church of England shall be free, and enjoy her whole rights and liberties inviolable."**

It has been claimed that this clause, the importance of which must be realised as something basic to social life was a claim for independence of the Pope which is just plain nonsense. It was imposed upon King John, not upon the Pope who is expressly stated to have confirmed it, and was a declaration of independence in certain well-defined areas from interference by the King or any other power in matters proper to the Church and religion - matters which are more familiarly known as Canon, and also to some extent Common, or Natural Law.

**We have here, in fact, an unequivocal declaration against monocracy.**

It should be noticed that three partial sovereignties were present on that little island of Runnymede on a June morning in A.D. 1215, and it is important that Magna Carta strengthens and confirms all of them - the Church, the King, and a much more real democracy than anything we have nowadays.

It is patently false to suggest that the barons acted only for the nobility. They were the spearhead; but the preamble to the document states that it is framed by the advice of the Archbishops of Canterbury and Dublin, *inter alia*.

The contrast in the spirit of the law with that of current legislation is fundamental. The over-riding intention is to establish every man, of whatever degree, in his rights, not to take them away. Clause 69 states that:



*"All the aforesaid custom, privileges and liberties... as much as it belongs to us towards our people, all our subjects, as well clergy as laity shall observe as far as they are concerned towards their dependents."*

The entire document may be searched without success in identifying a portion of the population which does not matter a tinker's cuss; the names of spivs and drones are happily omitted; and even the Jews, while mentioned without enthusiasm, are by implication confirmed in their rights where they have not encroached upon excess.

And it will be noticed that these rights and liberties are not contingent on the success of the export drive.

Now, in order to constitute a sovereignty there must be present form, substance and sanction. To say that the Church of England is the same church, and has the same kind of sovereignty, as the Church in England at the time of King John, is simply to ignore history.

I am not at the moment discussing doctrinal matters which are clearly outside my competence. It is the constitution and its nature with which we must come to grips.

And the post-Reformation Anglican Church owes its origin and existence to a series of Statutes which clearly indicate that it is a State institution and a State vassal. It has no sovereignty.

It should be fairly clear from the argument of the preceding paragraphs that the question which I believe is technically known as *"the validity of Anglican Orders"* has a highly practical aspect for the ordinary man.

The basis of the claim to a particular kind of sovereignty by the Christian Church must depend upon its origin and its allegiance; to say that a church which is established by statute, can be disestablished by statute, and has its higher officials, archbishops, bishops and principal deans, appointed by the secular government of the day, is the same thing as a Church which assists in forcing a king to sign a document declaring it to be free and inviolable from himself or any secular authority, and appoints its officials from outside and without reference to his jurisdiction, is infantile.

With some hesitation, I suggest that the question arising out of the Christian Church, is not the same, either in nature or degree, as that involved in the acceptance of what is vaguely called Christianity which for the most part is merely Liberal Judaism.

### **It is the Doctrine of the Incarnation.**

At bottom, what we have to make up our minds upon is whether human political action is subject to the same kind, or some kind, of compulsion to be "right" as we accept in doing a multiplication sum, and if so, whether the Christian Church, the Mystical Body of Christ, is the living incarnation of that "right"-ness.

Magna Carta remains as a witness that this conception was inherent in English life seven hundred years ago.

*Tern pora rnutantur, mutamur nos in illis.*

In 1917, Lord Sumner in the House of Lords said *"My Lords, with all respect to the great names of the lawyers who have used the phrase 'Christianity is part of the law of England' it is really not law, it is rhetoric."*

And in the same connection, Professor Holdsworth *"But, like many other parts of the law and Constitution of England, these are survivals of an older order, from which all real meaning has departed with the abandonment of that mediaeval theory of the relationship of Church to State, to which they owed their origin"* (Holdsworth, vol. 8, p. 403).

And so we arrive at Professor Laski *"The core of the British Constitution is the supremacy of Parliament."*

King, Church and Commons have all gone, although their ghosts remain, and we have monocratic government by what Mr. Laski quite incorrectly calls *"a Committee of the Legislature."*

The nature and gravity of the situation with which we are confronted will be almost wholly missed if we do not give full recognition to the essential falsity of our current institutions. The average U.S. citizen cannot be persuaded that England is not a mediaeval feudalism because we still retain the titles of King, Lords and Commons, and the Horse Guards, to his great delight, still wear armour.

If he could understand it, he would be astounded to learn that it is because this country ceased to be a feudalism more than four hundred years ago that the American Colonists revolted against the British Parliament.

For convenience, perhaps I may repeat here the quotation from *"Origins of the American Revolution"* John C. Miller, p. 216: *"In rejecting natural law, Englishmen" (i.e., the post-Reformation Englishman) "also denied the colonists' contention that there were metes and bounds to the authority of Parliament. The authority of Parliament was, in their opinion, unlimited; the supremacy of Parliament had come to mean to Englishmen an uncontrolled and uncontrollable authority. Indeed the Divine right of Kings had been succeeded by the Divine Right of Parliament . . ."*

This unlimited and undivided supremacy is expressly excluded from the United States Constitution. The Colonists were in fact contending for one of the fundamentals of feudalism, which, as Professor Holdsworth points out, *"has departed with the abandonment of that mediaeval theory of the relationship of Church and State to which they owed their origin."*

If there is one thing more than another which history teaches, it is that Governmental systems do not change

human nature, but they can, and do foster various aspects of it.

Mediaeval systems may not have eliminated robbery and oppression; but it is certain that they did not legalise it.

**Had a fourteenth century English King seized land as our contemporary Government seizes land through Agricultural Committees, and otherwise, on any flimsy pretext, or extorted taxes without representation (our contemporary Parliament is neither representative nor possessed of authority), the country would have been aflame with revolution in much less time than the American Colonists required to organise their resistance.**

Now, it is obvious that while the authority of "Parliament" (really, the Cabinet) may in one sense, as the mid-Victorian Liberal, Lord Courtney of Penwith, proclaimed it to be, "*absolutely unqualified, embodying the supreme will of the State*" to which "*every partial authority must yield*" (Working Constitution 01 the

United Kingdom, 1901), it should be recognised just what that means.

For all practical purposes, a man has "unqualified supremacy" to jump off Beachy Head; but he cannot avoid the consequences. A Cabinet can pass laws confiscating, under the name of taxation, the work of that man's lifetime or the land his family has dignified for centuries; but it cannot avoid the consequences.

The crucial issue is, what will those consequences be? Or to put the matter slightly otherwise, is there a moral "law" connecting political transgression with national punishment?

Contemporary Governments clearly think that there is not; that they are free to legislate in a moral vacuum. Can anyone point to a pronouncement of the Church of England, as such, which contests that idea? Assuming that so-called nationalisation of this or that has any virtues, which is far from self-evident, has the Church ever criticised the methods by which it has been achieved?" \*\*\*

## THE WAY YOU DESIGN THE WORLD By Vandana Shiva

"The way you design the world in your mind, is the way you relate to it in the real world. And when you design it as dead matter, just to be exploited, you will exploit it.

When you design it without any understanding of limits, you will violate the planetary limits.

When you design it with deep recognition of interconnectedness you will nurture those relationships. And this basic recognition is what I drew from my learnings in quantum theory; the non-locality, non-separation, interconnectedness - that is the nature of reality.

But we have a design in the paradigm of mechanistic thought, which didn't evolve; it was imposed. That mechanistic thought is based first on the assumption, that we are separate from nature, and nature is constituted of discrete particles, separate from each other, that can only relate through violence, through force, through action, by contact.

In the quantum world, there is no separability. My thesis was on non-locality in quantum theory, there everything is interconnected, there are no fixed essentialized qualities, that have been built into the way people are looked at, nature is looked at.

Potential is the defining quality in the quantum world and because it's about potential, it's also about uncertainty.

The mechanical world is based on a false illusion of determinateness eternity.

In the quantum world, we know, we cannot get rid of uncertainty (the uncertainty principle of Heisenberg). To this is linked the fourth principle: no excluded middle, no duality, no either/or. In the quantum world it's 'and'.

In the mechanistic world you can either be a wave or a particle. In the quantum world you have potential to be both and they're complementary.

When you realize, that the world is one interconnected whole, you also realize that, what appears different, is actually different expressions of an interconnected reality.

For the first time in human history, technology in the hands of the billionaires becomes the new civilizing mission for humanity.

The illusions about the big technology firms is that they "create". They extract, they don't create anything. You know software programmers create the platforms that they use. Even Bill Gates didn't really write his basic program, it was some professors, two math professors in Dartmouth College, who did the basic program. They have posited themselves as inventors ...

We've done a new report, it's...because Bill Gates announced a new project called 'ag one' All agriculture will be one agriculture controlled by him. Where does he set up the office of ag one, in Missouri, Monsanto headquarters, but we watch what's going on in India and we pieced it all together. He's basically financing a lot of data mining from farmers, which will then be packaged back as big data and sold back to farmers.

But this is exactly what's happened in your 2016 elections. Facebook sold data to Cambridge Analytica so when you think of why are the kind of leaders, we have been getting "created" it's very important to remember that in the last 25 years of corporate deregulation of commerce you basically have a lot of money in the hands of very few people and they then are the ones investing in all the companies.

The companies are not independent companies anymore, they're basically billionaire money managed by the investment funds like Blackrock and Vanguard, etc."

"The economy is, for me, a double violence, because the origin of the word, the meaning of the word economy comes from 'oikos' - our home, the Aristotelian, Tertullian name is 'economia' - the art of living.

And when you turn the art of living into the art of money-making, which Aristotle called 'chromatistics,' then you have to practice violence against the earth and violence against others, destroy their livelihoods, destroy their freedoms, take away their resources. So, the violence is multiple and I look into the future, I say, why are we building detention centres everywhere in India...

Because I feel that if we don't activate our sense of interconnectedness with all life, with all people, if we don't start sowing the seeds of what I have called 'earth democracy' we are going to see 99% of people as disposable, especially with the tech working on artificial

intelligence to make sure all the mechanical work is made redundant, whether it be in radiography, or law, or whatever, mechanical work will be substituted and if that's the case 99% people are disposable.

So, you can either share this beautiful planet with love and abundance and sustainability or say it's all mine, every bit of land, every seed, every mind, because what's being "mined" is our mind now. And if we don't defend the freedoms of all species and the freedoms of all human beings, we could foresee we're down within 20 to 30 years of level of disposability built into the structures that humanity will not be able to respond to. So, **this is the time to make oneness and interconnectedness as one humanity on one planet the political project of hard times.**

**We have to remember we are one humanity, we are part of one earth and whatever we do we will not let this basic recognition divide us either from the earth or from each other and together we are strong, inspired."** \*\*\*

## THE MORAL IMPLICATIONS OF CENTRALISED POWER By E. D. Butler (2003)

.....Lets be clear about this, Ladies and Gentlemen because we've got some strange voices raised today. We have got perversion of Christianity itself. We have even reached the stage where we have ministers of the Christian religion who can stand on the same platform with the most extreme and brutal exponents of the worship of Caesar namely the Marxists, and claim that there is some, perhaps association, which can be established. Instead of striving tirelessly to limit the power of the State, the power of Caesar, they are in fact appealing from God to Caesar.

And again without suggesting that I am any type of theologian, I would suggest that this seems to me to be some major form of heresy. Because every increase in the power of the State, in fact every increase in the power of the monopolistic groups whether it is in the big city, or big business, or big finance apart from big government, irrespective of the plausible arguments used to try and justify the increase, must inevitably take from the individual his right, his divine right, to personalise his life in the only way possible .. through exercising of free will.

Every retreat from freedom is a retreat from practical Christianity. And yet this retreat does not seem to concern large numbers of our clergy and fellow Christians. Real Christianity says one theologian (Dr. Carpenter) believes in complete freedom for everyone. A freedom for everyone to take his place in a free society. A freedom which brings the utmost happiness to everyone on this single condition, that his happiness shall not mean the unhappiness of others. And moreover, freedom to choose whether he will do this or that; there must be no compulsion, not even any social pressure.

Dr. Carpenter says "If I could convert a man to my way of thinking by pressing a button on his waistcoat, I ought not to do it".

A fundamental truth .. I ask you to consider it. If the essence of freedom is freedom of choice, that power to accept or reject one thing at a time, not some of those false package deals which the modern political parties present to you where you agree with one proposition out of ten and completely disagree with the nine others. It means in rejecting the nine you also reject the one you want. But real freedom is the freedom to accept or reject one thing at a time, one proposition at a time. That is, I suggest, something very important to think about as we work through this discussion, to some type of realistic political action.

This will of course be rejected by many who talk about the doctrine of something called inevitable progress. And that word progress with a capital P has been well overworked these days. Because we can get from point A to B in four hours less time than we previously could, that is automatically stated to be progress. But surely the real question is not that we have saved four hours in what we call time. The important thing is what we have done or what we are going to do, or what we are free to do with the time we have saved.

If primitive man in a primitive society invents a wheelbarrow one of the first developments in an elementary economy, so that instead of spending eight hours per day getting the basic requirements of life you can now obtain them in half that time, the fundamental question is "is he free to use the time he has saved to make the only real progress, which is moral progress", or has someone else got the power to say to him "I am



going to dictate how you are going to use the time that has been saved"?

In our economic arrangements today, instead of gaining access to the free time potential from our industrial progress, we increasingly see ourselves robbed of that freedom and the increased knowledge is simply used to increase our enslavement by compelling us to engage in the type of activity which has produced pollution and other problems.

English constitutionalism was concerned with developing a framework of law, of government, which while enabling the individual to associate freely with his fellows to gain advantages which he could otherwise not have obtained. Nevertheless government (Caesar) was constitutionally so restricted that he was always kept in his correct position in relation to authority. In our so called educational system today, I find little or no reference to that fundamental truth that what we call English common law. The whole of our constitutional heritage, was in fact a heritage from our Christian past. It grew out of the climate of opinion created by Christianity.

We have the tireless efforts to ensure that the authority of God made its impact in society.

Government itself was limited. Government was a good servant but an extremely bad master. Today I think they still refer in passing to the Magna Carta. But how few grasp the significance of this great constitutional landmark! At the little island of Runnymede, here we had the exercising of proper authority to curb the threat of untrammelled power in the form of King John. The voice of authority was that of the great Stephen Langton, the man who claimed that John himself must obey those English customs and traditions which had grown out of the Christian concept of how Christian men and women should live together in society.

Mr. Chairman, we desperately need a modern Stephen Langton. We need the voice of authority to challenge Caesar today. But as I have said, so far from challenging Caesar, in many cases they are suggesting we can practice co-existence with him. And so the voice of authority is rather dimmed at the present time, and power has little to check it. But we must turn back and learn something from the Magna Carta.

Then we come down to that other famous incident in modern history when the British colonists from the North American continent revolted. They revolted again on the same question ... the excessive use of power. They claimed they were denied these rights, those liberties to which free born Englishmen and Scots were entitled as a right to enjoy. Read the American Constitution: What is this but an attempt by a group of men who understood the necessity of curbing power, attempting to frame a constitution that would do exactly that. And so of course in the opening words, who do they appeal to?

There is no reference to any appeal to that modern, amorphous thing called the majority. There is no reference to the state. They appeal to God. God was the source of higher power, that higher law. And as both that of those who evolve a society which was to be satisfactory, then that was to be the source. And I regret to say that in the U.S.A. today, we see the collapse of this great republic because it's turned it's back to a great extent upon those fundamental truths which the founding fathers used as their guide. They are paying the price of denying the authority of God and God's laws.

If I might just interrupt the major theme of this paper, it is historically of tremendous significance that only a few short years later, the British in the case of the founding provinces of that nation we today call Canada, reversed the policy which had produced such disaster in the U.S. Now they saw the necessity of decentralising power, providing those on the spot with the opportunity to govern themselves in accordance with their constitutional heritage.

I suppose one of the great classics in the history of the British colonialism is the report of Lord Durham, sent out to Quebec and Lower Canada. He prepared his great report on what could be done. As you read through that report, you are reading the views of a man whose mind was steeped in an understanding of these fundamental truths I am discussing. He said "so far, from the limited local sovereignty, which has been granted to the locals likely to produce any problems, my opinion is they should have an even greater local power, self government, and more freedom."

This was a turning point in British colonialism, with the result that a new type of Empire grew. Not an Empire based on force, not an Empire based on centralised power, but an Empire based upon the concept if power was decentralised, and if free men and women understanding their own historical heritage were to take that wherever they went, there you would find the growth of society in which freedom and security both flourished. This in my opinion has been the great contribution of the British to Western civilisation. And we in this country are heirs to it.

Wherever it has been taken this has produced the most satisfactory types of society we find at this very moment, when the example of this type of association is required, we are tempted with the modern threat of once again appealing to Caesar. We are told we have the Soviet Union, the centralised power we have the U.S., the western colossus. Now we need a third power, the power of the United States of Europe. And the temptation to the British is they should turn their backs on their heritage, on their very soul and surrender to this temptation of Caesar. Whereas, of course, in fact what we require more than ever in the world today, where the philosophy of bigness is being preached with such fervour, we need a

revitalisation of the old truths upon which the old British world was based. Because, this is the contribution which the world so desperately needs today.

As I have said, the worship is of bigness. In this worship of bigness certain inevitable doubts take place. Power is drained from the individual and it is invested in the institution over which the individual progressively can exercise less control. As the institutions get bigger, and they are in turn amalgamated so the individual possesses even less power. Real freedom is impossible in this

## CIRCUMSTANCES DID NOT DEFINE THEM

This month has seen the passing of two ALOR stalwarts.  
**Vale Harry Dreckow and Betty Luks**

**Harry Dreckow** was a farmer from an early age. He was married to Lila. He was also a father of four sons, grandfather to 19, and great-grandfather to 13. Harry was a faithful member of his local Lutheran Church. He held a keen interest in the Soil Association, promoting natural and organic farming strategies. He also attended the Conservative Speakers Club meetings held in Adelaide, and faithfully recorded those speakers on audiotapes, thus establishing an audio library of nearly 500 tapes. Harry read extensively and often shared the books and booklets around the family and friends. As he retired from recording, he handed over the complete audio library, the storage desk and a significant cheque to ALOR from the sale of those audiotapes. This financial gift was instrumental in bringing out Frances Hutchinson from the UK to speak at the ALOR National Weekend Seminar across two successive weekends around 2012. Harry also presented a paper at that National Seminar, which is available within the ALOR Youtube library. The *'We Went The Organic Way'* video is another part of his complex and delightful personality that is available for posterity to enjoy. Harry was a faithful servant of Truth, a reflection of the incarnating of his Christian Faith, and will be missed by all those who knew him. He set an example of living a life more abundant in every way that he could. Circumstances did not define him. Harry's full life did.

Well done good and faithful servant. Rest in peace.

### **Betty Luks**

Betty's parents, James Percival and Minnie Elizabeth Dixon came out from England after the First World War. The family at one stage had decided to return again by ship, however, James fell ill and the family was placed back on to Australian soil in Fremantle, Western Australia. Eventually they settled in Geelong, Victoria. Daughter Betty was married in 1952 at the age of 19 to a young Latvian immigrant John Luks. The union was blessed with five children, 21 grandchildren and (currently) 16 great grandchildren.

Betty had an inquiring mind. In fact, investing in the development of her mind became her greatest asset.

situation, and here we get to the moral implications. Because, if only true progress can take place through moral growth, this means free individuals, not only making choices, but individuals who must accept personal responsibility for the choices they make. This is one of those fundamental truths that are being lost sight of today. It is the only way we grow in moral stature. By using our free will, by making choices, and standing by the choices we make. That is what differentiates the real free man from the slave. **(end of extract)** \*\*\*

Throughout her life she attended various denominational churches, and while remaining loyal to most administrators, she also challenged their interpretation of what being a Christian meant. This challenging of Christian leadership has continued across her lifetime.

Husband John had been introduced to the works and writings of Eric Butler in the early 1960s. The Luks family shifted from Geelong across to Adelaide, South Australia in 1970. Betty stepped out of any comfort into the challenges of *'Saving Australia'* while also fulfilling her many family obligations. It was not unusual for Betty to arise several hours before the family to pursue her study and research of this thing called 'Truth'. Across more than 60 years of her very full adult life, Betty never ceased this enquiry into the search for Truth.

In Adelaide she met the ALOR South Australian state director Frank Bawden and allocated time to support the League's 'heritage bookshop'. This deepening association with the League caused her to cross paths with many other unique individuals also pursuing this Truth. In her 'spare time' Betty completed her matriculation and an advanced course in writing. Eric Butler encouraged Betty to produce the *'Lady's Line'* Journal. She went on to become editor for the *'Heritage', OT & NTS*.

In 1999, the then ALOR national director resigned. Betty held a deep, personal loyalty towards ALOR and submitted her candidacy for the job. She was endorsed and held the position of National Director for the next 6 1/2 years. Her lead editorship continued until her passing. Circumstances did not define her. Betty's full life did. Well done good and faithful servant. \*\*\*

**Subscription to On Target \$45.00 p.a.**

**NewTimes Survey \$30.00 p.a.**

and **Donations** can be performed by **bank transfer:**

**A/c Title** Australian League of Rights (SA Branch)

**BSB** 105-044

**A/c No.** 188-040-840

**or cheques to:** 'Australian League of Rights (SA Branch)'

**Postal Address:** PO Box 27, Happy Valley, SA 5159.

**Telephone:** 08 8322 8923 **eMail:** heritagebooks@alor.org

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

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

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