

"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. 08

Registered Australia Post - Publication PP343214 / 00016

August 2023

## CONTENTS

A Change of Heart - the Reformers Cry by Neville Archibald	1
Welcome to Alternatives Exist by Will Waite	3
Can Banks Individually Create Money out of Nothing? – The Theories and the Empirical Evidence by Will Waite	4
Will Our Politicians Protect Us From the WHO Becoming a Global Health Legislator by Augusto Zimmermann	7

## A CHANGE OF HEART - THE REFORMERS CRY by Neville Archibald

Many commentators in what has become the "alternative" media are seeing parallels to the nineteen thirties and the rise of a totalitarian state under Hitler.

That they are really only being heard in the alternative media is testimony to the advanced state of the totalitarian control already over us.

Written in 1937, this article is well worth reading and could have been written about our current times. *Social Credit and the Christian Ethic*, By Norman F. Webb – June 1937 *Fig Tree*

<https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Webb%20N%20-%20Social%20Credit%20and%20the%20Christian%20Ethic.pdf>

I read the above article and felt a need to comment as it was discussing the very concept I was considering.

Those who wish to reform our "degenerate" society often use an imagined guilt (but of course ours, not theirs) to encourage us to change our ways.

Examining the change they are after means looking at where we are and where we've come from. Have we actually progressed? Are we still progressing? If so, why the cry?

Usually because the change they cry for is not the change they intend to achieve!

With the encouragement of press, politicians, and, in a smaller instance these days, the pulpit, we are to believe we are all "naughty children" and are guilty of whatever it is that they wish to reform.

If we deny this we are supposed to look outward and assume it is our fellow man who are these scoundrels and they need restricting/reforming.

The push for reform to better social conditions, whether it take the form of a "Voice" to parliament or "Vax" for health, becomes one of imposition rather than encouraging something to be done regardless of the reality of the situation.

In these two cases, the history of what has gone on before is not being considered and improved upon, with the mistakes being fixed. We are told we must start anew and resist the call for analysis or accountability.

With the "Voice", we are not to look for the problems within an industry that has taken huge sums of money to fix acknowledged problems, yet has failed to do so. We are expected to claim the guilt of this mismanagement and take it as our own. In doing so, we are to allow yet another body (made up largely of those very mismanagers) to begin again, this time with unspelled-out, far reaching powers. We are to naively believe this to be the solution. "Absolve your guilt and comply!"

In regards to the vaccine for health, we are to believe the very opposite of the many things taught to us over past decades. We must reform our health system to listen to an unelected outside body (the UN in its WHO guise) who made many mistakes with the initial handling and encouraged inaccurate actions for control.

The fact that you never attempt to vaccinate during an outbreak, as it hastens the rise of new variants was totally ignored; we then saw the evolution of many variants over a short time span. Exactly as the accepted wisdom predicted.

The use of a mask as one of the best defences, also turned on its head the notion that particulate size was important. Any industrial user of masks knows that to be effective, the correct type is to be worn properly. The masks that we were forced to comply with were neither effective nor appropriate. They were akin to putting weld mesh over your windows instead of fly screen and hoping it works.

I could go on with the simple contradictions of these enforcements, but it would serve no real purpose in the context of this commentary.

The push for both of these reforms have been couched in terms of advancing or protecting society in some way. The only real advancement that is being achieved is the further loss of liberty and individualism. It is more about control than cultural advancement.

One of Mr Webb's comments, "it seems to me the weak point in the argument is always the fact that so few of those who hold the view appear themselves to have experienced the change they recommend."

Rather an apt comment when you consider that many of the proposed reforms for society's betterment never seem to apply to those pushing for it, rather it is someone else that must be reformed. So instead of uniting us in a purpose, they are dividing us further. Creating not the equality they desire, but desiring to be "more equal" than others.

The enactors of the mandates excused themselves from it first. Only the "dirty unwashed" or the servants, required compulsion. As for advancement in social terms, the experimental roll out of a novel "vaccine" should have been the subject of a massive data collection program. Analysed every which way, the results of so unique an experiment would provide information for years of study. Sadly, this data is either missing, not collected or so completely flawed in its collection as to be completely useless. Even the existence of a control group (a must in any legitimate study) no longer mentioned, instead, the unvaccinated are still being treated as pariahs and dismissed as conspiracy nuts. Where they should be praised for their being willing to accept the consequences of foregoing such a wonderful life saving miracle drug.

Oh, the sacrifice we made in the name of science – it will never be recognised!

Thus the potential to learn from such an experiment has been lost.

Back in 1937 Mr Webb remarked on the scientific mind being a type of modern religious mind. For "science is knowledge. In action it is research and documentation of natural law".

These days the limiting factor of religion or the Christian influence on the stability of society has largely been overtaken by science. The thought of many is that of Mr Webb's in that by "true" science we can understand and apply it for our benefit.

Again, sadly, the result of the past few years has shown it is not as simple as that. Science has been captured by greed and controlled by essentially totalitarian corporations, including big pharma.

Any pretence of science for its pure essence of understanding has been corrupted by the pursuit of profit alone in industry followed by the corruption of Universities by industry funding, subject to grants for directed research. The purist who may have had a type of god in his outlook has been weeded out. When they have poked their heads up to protest the direction science is

taking, they are defunded or, as in the case of the last few years with COVID, labelled as crackpots or jealous competitors.

The Christian ethic (and by this I mean the words of Christ alone) has been the basis of the great flowering of our current civilisation. This Christianity carryover is beginning to be exhausted, as seen by the limited ability of many of the celebrated thinkers of our time. Perhaps better labelled, celebrity thinkers!

Many of these no longer recognise the individual so much as the collective, it is for this group or that group that the individual must be limited.

Again Mr Webb, "Christ's short life was spent in the defence of the individual, and nearly two thousand years later Social Crediters find themselves waging much the same battle. He clearly saw the danger of the elevation of means into ends, which has culminated in the collectivist state and suppression of the individual to the group."

He goes on to talk of the rise to power of puritanism, essentially the rise of the will to power. To fix what ails us we push to limit others and begin to believe that all will be well if we can only stop or limit others, who are doing the wrong thing.

The proponents of totalitarianism use this to its absolute end. Convincing us that we are divided, and that by limiting others we will fix the problem.

Going back to the reason for this dive into 1937 and Mr Webb's article, it was a conversation between Tucker Carlson and Naomi Wolf that inspired my reading.

At opposite ends of the political spectrum, these two agreed to collaborate in a discussion that we are in an eerily similar situation to 1930's Germany and the parallels that arise.

Naomi Wolf, a celebrated feminist, and, while not in absolute favour with the powers that be, she was involved with the Clinton administration and is anti-Trump. Having spent her lifetime in leftist democrat territory, she still appears to firmly believe in the rightness of her convictions, despite the direction she can see it has taken its followers.

She can see the danger ahead, but still doesn't appear to believe it has anything to do with the road she was driving on.

In many ways this is the burden we all carry. To move forward we must recognise that sometimes our previous beliefs and actions are what has led us to this point. The hatred for one group or other can blind us to the possibility of the need to reform our own outlook.

With this in mind, I believe much of what we face is a spiritual battle! Before some of you think that the emphasis is on religion and its impact, I am in fact talking about the spirit that leads mankind to establish a functional civilization, with civilized underlined.

If we are to live in harmony with each other, there needs to be some sort of principle for those civilizing

factors to make it work. While I am all for free thinking and a free market, they have to be just that, i.e., not manipulated, not ridden over by those who would turn a society into their own slaves.

At that point restrictions must come from within!

The usurper who arrives in our midst and pits person against person for his own ultimate gain, lies outside of our civil society. We must not be afraid to call them out, to remove them!

They are the troublemakers in a crowded bar, the person who shouts fire in a theatre when there is none. They are not welcome.

We are seeing now the results of their actions, and of our inactions in controlling them.

Each person's integrity has to be grounded in something. Being true to yourself necessitates having a set of moral precepts concerning what is right and what is wrong. Without those any care for your fellow humans is just an expectation others may have of you. Not necessarily one you will follow if no one is watching you. It is the inner part of you, your soul, that should feel it is being watched, by your better self!

These questions have been dealt with before, many

times. The creation of a country usually deals with these notions and attempts to set up a framework to deal with them.

This framework is called a CONSTITUTION, it is a limiting document. Limiting power and its ability to corrupt a society, a civilization. That is its basic duty.

When anyone proposes an alteration (especially when they have already shown themselves to be power hungry) it's not just enough to look at the emotional aspect they are claiming for it. As we have seen, reformers usually want you to vote with emotion.

Ask yourself: do you trust them, have they shown any indication that they are respectful of the individual? The use of words to emotionally slander anyone who disagrees with them is a red flag. Grouping entire sections of a population together and pitting them against each other to get their way, is, in my opinion, a clear indication that they do not believe in the individual.

We must limit those who would corrupt our society and call put those who use emotion to get their way. They are no better than the image of Hitler and his emotional propaganda, shouting at the masses of the German people. \*\*\*

## WELCOME TO ALTERNATIVES EXIST by Will Waite

A commentary providing news and views concerned with exposing and offering alternatives to state, corporate and financial centralisation.

<https://alternativesx.substack.com/p/welcome-to-alternatives-exist>

It all started in December 1918 when a Scottish engineer, C.H. Douglas, wrote an article for *The English Review* called *The Delusion of Super Production*. It was the first public utterance of what would in the coming decades develop into an international movement.

*The Delusion of Super Production* made a vital observation that remains a central cause of economic and social dysfunction to this day. As production methods streamline and become more automated a decreasing part of production costs are made available to consumers as wages, salaries and profits.

On the one hand, wages, salaries and profits are a measure of human participation in the production of goods and services. On the other, prices are an accumulation of total costs, which, as human participation declines, are increasingly costs incurred by the development, use and replacement of machinery and technology. Since diminishing wages and profits cannot hope to cover the total cost of production, the consumer market is plagued by a shortage of purchasing power. Consumers must pay for all costs generated in the production process through prices charged for finished products, but they are only provided with the part of costs covered under wages, salaries and profits.

The result is that the market cannot clear. *Prices must outrun our ability to pay them.*

*New Times Survey*

This problem of insufficient purchasing power means we are continually having to borrow money. Since nearly all money is loan credit, we find at every level our economic vitality sapped by absurd levels of debt obligations to banks. Surely it is time to seriously challenge the legitimacy of this convention.

Alternatives Exist believe the world's most intractable difficulties are connected with these two inter-related problems.

Douglas' writings stimulated an enormous literature including books, articles, pamphlets and speeches. For me personally it started with some of these old books and pamphlets on my parents' bookshelves.

In my late teens when I started reading Douglas I could hardly grasp what I was looking at, but the ideas must have held some allure for me because I persisted. Gradually, I came to be able to critique economic and financial policy through a realistic lens that held the purpose of economic activity as the delivery of authentically demanded goods and services with a minimum of labour and resource expenditure. An economy designed to deliver human satisfaction rather than one orientated for the purpose of maximising output, statistical abstractions like GDP, debt and bullshit jobs.

The economy optimised for the provision of human satisfaction contrasts starkly with the kind of economics we find everywhere in the world today. National, business and personal debt has reached absurd proportions, the cost of living is out of control, automation promises a deepening of the employment

crisis and the production system is always failing to produce the kind and quality of goods genuinely demanded by the community at a price we can afford.

The catalyst for our efforts at this time is the startling slap in the face that was the Covid response. I admit to being caught by surprise. I was aware of the lack of accountability in government and big business, but it would not have previously occurred to me that vaccine mandates, curfews, censorship, forced business closures, border checkpoints and the list goes on, were things that could just be switched on as they were. The reckless indifference of the controllers was shockingly brought home to many of us by the insistence that children be treated with an untried, unnecessary gene therapy.

Whatever the Corona Virus was, the response of political and corporate actors brought the existence of the design for global government into the open. Increasingly people are waking up to the dangers of a coordinated, centralising policy of international government, corporations and finance, and therein might lie an opportunity for resistance.

The purpose of *Alternatives Exist* is twofold. Firstly,

we set our sights generally on all centralising power that seeks to remove choices that should properly rest with the individual. We have a preference for small government, small business, small farms and local production and distribution networks which provision and strengthen local communities and families. These small things are being dissolved into the big, and it isn't good for people or the planet.

More specifically we contend that the problems with economics and finance identified by Douglas remain unresolved, which means that dysfunctional cost/price accounting and debt economics remains a threat to national and individual freedom. We aim to draw attention to these critical problems and propose solutions.

There may be a chance for redemption before we assume our status as disowned peasants in some sort of dystopian techno feudalism. We join the ranks of people and organisations coming forward to face down the myriad threats to freedom emerging from concentrated power. \*\*\*

## CAN BANKS INDIVIDUALLY CREATE MONEY OUT OF NOTHING? – THE THEORIES AND THE EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE by Will Waite

*A look at Werner's 2014 paper on where our money comes from and what it means.*

<https://alternativesx.substack.com/p/can-banks-individually-create-money>

Professor Richard Werner is the economist and researcher behind a 2014 paper looking at whether or not banks can individually create money out of nothing.

The first section deals with the three theories of money creation which have dominated the controversy since the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. These three theories are the *financial intermediation theory*, the *fractional reserve theory* and the *credit creation theory*.

The *financial intermediation theory* is presently the dominant explanation for how banks create money. This theory holds that banks merely act as intermediaries between creditors and debtors. The idea is that “Banks and the banking system, like other financial intermediaries, need to first gather deposits, and then are able to lend these out.”

The *fractional reserve theory* of banking asserts that individual banks cannot create credit but the banking industry as a whole is able to do so. When a deposit is made at a bank the bank is required by regulation to retain some of that deposit in reserve, say 10%. The remainder it is free to loan on. Once loaned, the 90% is then deposited in another bank which holds onto the 10% reserve requirement and loans on the remainder. The initial deposit is the seed money for additional deposits and borrowings that increase the money supply as the process plays out. So, one bank's loan becomes

another bank's deposit which, less reserves, can again be loaned, so on and so forth. It is for this reason that the *fractional reserve theory* of banking is sometimes referred to as the ‘money multiplier.’

The final theory is the simplest to understand and is called the *credit creation theory of banking*. This view states that individual banks create money when they make loans. Loan credit is deposited in the borrower's account. No reserve limit checks, no transfers.

Having completed his historical survey of the three main contenders, Werner explains how he set up an empirical test with a bank in order to determine which of the theories in reality holds. The method is described:

The design of the empirical test takes the form of a researcher entering into a live loan contract with the bank, and the bank extending a loan, while its relevant accounting is disclosed... It was agreed that the researcher would personally borrow €200,000 from the bank. The transaction was undertaken on the 7<sup>th</sup> August 2013 in the offices of the bank in Wildenberg in Bavaria. Apart from the two (sole) directors, also the head (and sole staff) of the credit department, Mr. Ludwig Keil was present. The directors were bystanders not engaging in any action. Mr Keil was the only representative involved in processing the loan from the start of the customer documentation, to the signing of the loan contract and finally paying out the loan into the borrower's account.

The paper provides a detailed description of the process involved. In this instance the granting of the loan took about 35 minutes and was slowed by the requirements of the study for close monitoring and filming.

In Appendix 2 Werner provides a Letter of Confirmation from the Director of the bank:

In connection with the extension of credit to you in August 2014 I am pleased to confirm that neither I as director of Raiffeisenbank Wildenberg eG, nor our staff checked either before or during the granting of the loan to you, whether we keep sufficient funds with our central bank, DZ Bank AG, or the Bundesbank. We also did not engage in any such related transaction, nor did we undertake any transfers or account bookings in order to finance the credit balance in your account. Therefore, we did not engage in any checks or transactions in order to provide liquidity.

Werner's conclusive results:

...thus it can now be said with confidence for the first time – possibly in the 5000 years' history of banking – that it has been empirically demonstrated that each individual bank creates credit and money out of nothing, when it extends what is called a 'bank loan', the bank does not loan any existing money, but instead creates new money. The money supply is created as 'fairy dust' produced by the banks out of thin air. The implications are far reaching

Werner continues in the section on implications:

It is sobering to realise that since the 1930s, economists have moved further and further away from the truth, instead of coming closer to it. This happened first via the half-truth of the fractional reserve theory and then reached the completely false and misleading financial intermediation theory that today is so dominant...

The known facts were unlearned and have become unknown.

There are far-reaching implications for not recognising the truth about money creation. Werner points out that a faulty view of the role of banks in the economy means we cannot accurately model economies, nor is it possible to ensure sensible regulation of banking and the credit which is their exclusive stock in trade.

But the problem runs deeper still. Since we require money to operate, and practically all of our money is created as debt, it is unavoidable that the community becomes progressively mortgaged to banks. A good and increasing part of the world's wealth is covered by debt obligations to the banking industry. Servicing this debt is a prime motive force for economic activity and, in the light of the true source and method of money creation, there arises serious doubt as to whether or not these obligations are legitimate. Where is the sense of

proportion when a bank takes 35 minutes to create from nothing something that it then takes the 'borrower' 30 years of labour to repay?

Another consideration is the power of the banking monopoly to radically effect social change. Let's look at real estate for a moment.

Let's say banks in Sydney decide it is acceptable to lend \$800,000 to low-income borrowers where previously that category of borrower was only allowed \$500,000. Ten anxious couples now arrive at the same auction with the idea they can afford to pay \$800,000 – an idea planted in their minds by a loans officer. What will the house sell for? Similarly, what was the effect when banks started lending to double income households or extending loan terms to 30 years?

The housing affordability crisis can be largely attributed to the policy of the monopoly of credit. An article in *The Australian* by Robert Gottlieb declares

"Aussie Home Dream Dying" and warns "we need to prepare for a very different future." Part of this future will include making "a decision as to whether we want to reserve home ownership to the affluent." The scenario is roughly sketched; "first overseas institutions and later our local institutions will build large complexes on a build-for-rent basis, so creating a very different society to anything we have seen post-WWII." Sounds like a you-will-own-nothing-and-be-happy plan. Gottlieb goes on to warn that an Australian citizenry who abandon the dream of owning their home will be far less aspirational and "don't be surprised by rises in the sort of community upheavals we are now starting to see, particularly among males."

The Globalists are now pursuing a social agenda in the open. The centerpiece of their strategy is the power to create and direct the money supply. *If we break up the banking monopoly we deprive central planners of their power to get things done.*

Werner ends by providing an alternative to the status quo. A combination of small, not-for-profit local banks complemented "by a local public money issued by local authorities **that has not come about by creating debt**, but that is created for services rendered to local authorities or the community." Emphasis mine.

Innovation is needed.

Alternatives exist.

\*\*\*

## **DOUGLAS SOCIAL CREDIT TRAINING**

Douglas Social Credit is the disciplined science of social engineering measured in terms of human satisfaction.

**Available Online or from our Head Office**

**PO Box 27, Happy Valley, SA 5159.**

# A GLOBAL 'EMERGENCY PLATFORM' COULD BE THE UN'S NEXT TOOL TO ESTABLISH GLOBAL TYRANNY by Augusto Zimmermann

In September 2022, the U.N. General Assembly adopted Resolution 75/1, which contains a declaration emphasising “the need to improve ... preparedness for not only health-related crises but also other challenges and crises.”

That being so, in September 2024, the organisation will be hosting “The Summit of the Future,” where member states will be invited to adopt an agreement that further consolidates globalist policy reforms offered over the past two years, including the notorious U.N. 2030 Agenda and the Paris Climate Agreement.

“Our Common Agenda” is the United Nations’ vision for “strengthening global governance for present and future generations.”

Many radical proposals are contained in this important document, but the most important is the plan for a new “emergency platform” to respond to “complex global shocks.”

“A complex global shock” is vaguely described in this document as “an event with severely disruptive consequences for a significant proportion of the global population that leads to secondary impacts across multiple sectors.”

Hence, arrangements are proposed that should activate such an “emergency platform” in the event of any type of “complex global shock.”

Details of the “emergency platform” are laid down in a March 2023 [policy paper](#). Curiously, this document manifests the understanding that the “global response” to COVID-19 was insufficient due to the lack of “mechanisms” to ensure that all countries have “access to vaccines.”

It also proposes that the U.N. secretary-general be endowed with “authority to convene and operationalise automatically an Emergency Platform in the event of a future complex global shock of sufficient scale, severity and reach.”

The range of risks that could lead to activation of “the emergency platform” is described as “broad and diverse,” although “future pandemic risks,” “global digital connectivity disruption,” and climate change are mentioned as examples of “global shocks” that could require the emergency platform.

## Where Are the Checks and Balances?

The emergency platform could initially be instituted for a finite period to respond to a specific shock but could be extended “if required” by the secretary-general. “Seconded staff would constitute a task team responsible for operationalising the Emergency Platform and would provide all necessary forms of support for the duration of an Emergency Platform.”

This basically means that the U.N. secretary-

general would receive extraordinary powers that are, in principle, devoid of any legal-institutional limits, all without authorisation from the member states, to an emergency platform in place indefinitely.

The late Austrian-British economist and philosopher Friedrich Hayek, a Nobel Prize laureate, once offered this sobering reflection about the unending use of emergency powers:

“‘Emergencies’ have always been the pretext on which the safeguards of individual liberty have been eroded—and once they are suspended, it is not difficult for anyone who has assumed such emergency powers to see to it that the emergency will persist.”

We may therefore be witnessing the constitution of a tyrannical form of global governance.

Detailed protocols would be developed so as to make sure that the secretary-general is endowed with an ongoing mandate “to convene and operationalize an Emergency Platform” outlining “specific steps that cover a range of scenarios.”

## What’s the Purpose

It goes without saying that Antonio Guterres, the U.N. secretary-general since 2017, is an active member of the Portuguese Socialist Party.

Writing in *The Spectator* Australia, Graham Pinn [comments](#) that:

“Guterres seems more interested in saving the planet from climate change than war; he is also leading the organisation in its wealth redistribution agenda, with the Great Reset of capitalism (no mention of communism). ... As this is, fading climate change will regain its role as the new world threat.”

The implementation by the U.N. secretary-general of the emergency protocol could suspend any basic human right, thus granting a few global oligarchs the absolute power to do whatever they might deem necessary in response to “complex global shocks.”

Such suspension of basic human rights could be interpreted as perfectly valid in the face of “the type and nature of the crisis involved.”

In *Political Theology*, a book published in 1922, German legal philosopher Carl Schmitt contended that once such use of emergency power is deemed necessary, “the decision exempts the authority from every normative restraint and renders it absolute in the true sense of the word. In a state of emergency, the constituted authority suspends the law on the basis of the right to protect its own existence.”

The ‘legalised arbitrariness’ of global oligarchs would be entirely justified on the ground of the necessity to re-enact the described platform. What could follow is the complete loss of *any* fundamental legal right at a global

scale, as these rights could be suspended until further notice by the secretary-general.

To conclude, the implementation of the emergency platform would constitute the biggest step towards the establishment of a global tyranny based on the principles of international socialism. This would confer to a few individuals the extraordinary power to exercise absolute

control over the lives of every person living in this world.

Above all, if the use of the “emergency platform” by the U.N. secretary-general becomes a reality, the world as we know it will cease to exist. We either stand for our basic rights and freedoms or risk losing everything come September 2024. \*\*\*

## **WILL OUR POLITICIANS PROTECT US FROM THE WHO BECOMING A GLOBAL HEALTH LEGISLATOR by Augusto Zimmermann**

A discussion is taking place at the moment about amending the International Health Regulations (2005) (IHR) in order to give the Director-General of the World Health Organization (WHO) legislative health emergency powers in the event of any potential suspected pandemic.

The 307 proposed changes include amending the very nature of the organization, from providing non-binding recommendations to becoming a governing body that makes legally binding and enforceable proclamations with a simple majority vote among its member states. According to Dr Silvia Behrendt, who holds a PhD in international health regulations from Georgetown University, and Professor Amrei Müller, who teaches international humanitarian law at University College Dublin, the changes have the potential to affect the livelihoods and rights of everyone around the world by granting the WHO director-general “emergency” powers.

They said this would “securitise” the approach to managing infectious disease outbreaks. The policies and strategies developed by WHO are naturally influenced by pharmaceutical corporations because between an estimated 75 to 88 percent of all the organization’s funding comes from the “voluntary contributions” by corporations and foundations like The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and GAVI—The Vaccine Alliance.

The theory that the COVID-19 virus originated from the notorious lab at the Wuhan Institute of Virology has been circulating since the start of the pandemic. In May 2020, then Secretary of State Mike Pompeo said there was “enormous evidence” the virus outbreak began in that lab.

However, the WHO has been tied with the Chinese Communist Party (CCP). In fact, COVID-19 was declared by the organization a “global pandemic” only after its Director-General Tedros Adhanom met with Chinese leader Xi Jinping, in Beijing, on March 11, 2020.

In their February 2020 report ([pdf](#)), WHO congratulated the Chinese communist regime for its “uncompromising and rigorous use of non-pharmaceutical measures” during the pandemic, including vaccine mandates and lockdown techniques that, to a great extent, were also adopted in other countries with serious consequences to human rights and

the global economy.

According to [Steve Tsang](#), director of the China Institute at SOAS University of London, the promotion of CCP propaganda by the WHO enabled the Chinese regime to “appear credible and to ignore the human, societal, and economic costs of its responses.”

The organization went to the lengths of even praising the people in China for reacting to the CCP’s responses to COVID-19 “with courage and conviction,” claiming in the report that the Chinese people “largely accepted” and “fully” participated in the CCP’s totalitarian measures.

Of course, not mentioned in this report is the fact that a Chinese person who ignored these measures would face jail terms ranging from three to 10 years if the consequences are not very “serious.” Otherwise, this person would face a “life sentence or death.”

According to Mareike Ohlberg from the Berlin-based Mercator Institute for China Studies, instead of acknowledging this, WHO “preached” its confidence in the Chinese communist regime, “which does not want to make transparent how the population suffered.”

### **Guidelines Didn't Protect Health**

It is undeniable that many nations across the globe faithfully followed WHO’s guidelines from the start of the “pandemic.” This included strictly following the “advice” about the supposed safety and effectiveness of mRNA vaccines.

Yet, it is now patently clear that these COVID-19 “vaccines” prevent neither infection nor transmission of the virus.

Given WHO’s notorious history of close ties to the pharmaceutical industry, such organisations even suppressed the relevant information about the safety of mRNA vaccines as well as the negative effects of lockdowns.

To make it worse, scientists have now discovered that these experimental vaccines, not the COVID-19 infection itself, may cause some very serious health issues.

A cost-benefit analysis by Stephanie Seneff, a senior research scientist at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and independent researcher Kathy Dopp, demonstrate that mRNA vaccines may be much deadlier than COVID-19 ([pdf](#)). Their analysis looked at publicly available official data from the UK and the U.S. for all age groups and compared all-cause mortality to the risk

of dying from COVID-19.

“All age groups under 50 years old are at greater risk of fatality after receiving a COVID vaccination than an unvaccinated person is at risk of a COVID death,” they concluded.

### **Nor Did It Protect Australians**

According to the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), Australia’s excess deaths rose to 12.3 percent above baseline in April 2023. There were 56,863 deaths that occurred by April 30, which is 6,220 deaths more than the average over the same period.

We must ask why, in such a highly vaccinated population, so many people have died over the last two years. Surely, it is remiss of the ABS not to report how many people, who might have died due to COVID-19, had received the injections?

If it is the case that many Australians who have died from COVID-19 over the last two years were “fully vaccinated,” then there is something really wrong with the efficacy of these vaccines.

Further, there has been a sudden and unexpected surge of age-inappropriate deaths in at least 30 countries in the industrialized world.

Ed Dowd, in his book *Cause Unknown: The Epidemic of Sudden Deaths*, believes that “the sudden deaths in young people in industrialized countries are due to mRNA vaccines.” However, the cause and effect of this hypothesis is not yet easily verifiable from data sources.

What is objectively verifiable from the ABS data is that, over and above the deaths from COVID-19, a lot more Australians died in 2022 and 2023 than usual and that by the end of 2021, 80 percent of the nation was vaccinated.

Deaths due to cardiac conditions were nine percent above the baseline average in April 2023. Other cardiac deaths from January to April 2023 were 15.4 percent higher than the baseline average. These findings are based on doctor-certified deaths.

Government authorities tend to conceal these figures, and even when they are revealed in press conferences, news outlets generally do not report them, or report them in passing halfway through an article.

Still, the numerous existing accounts are entirely credible and expose the potential dangers associated with these vaccines.

The enactment of global legislative health policies would transform WHO’s Director-General into a global emergency legislator. This could have disastrous influences on human rights, among them the right to bodily autonomy and the right to safe and effective medical products.

Fortunately, the state members, Australia included, have the authority under Article 61 of the IHR to reject these amendments that would allow WHO’s

Director-General to become a global legislator on the advent of another global health emergency derived from a perceived pandemic. It needs to be explicitly made within 18 months of the adoption of the relevant amendments.

These amendments to the IHR were adopted on May 27, 2022, and will become legally binding proclamations if our politicians do not explicitly reject them by November 2023.

Since the “health recommendations” provided by WHO during the pandemic have shown not just to be unreliable but also an instigator of gross violations of fundamental human rights, we would be wise to demand our politicians reject all the proposed amendments and leave this discredited organization as soon as possible.

\*\*\*

### **TRAINING**

To become an effective Actionist, training is essential. Eric constantly reinforced this point. Utilize the online '**Actionist Corner**' with many links to *pro forma* letter templates, pamphlets and other important training and unique research resources.

Our ongoing training initiatives now include — '**Science of the Social Credit Measured in Terms of Human Satisfaction**' — in three work-packs, steadily developing the individual actionist in their area of particular interest to release freedom of choice.

'**Introducing Social Credit by Betty Luks**' is built around five modules, as well as Video and Podcast lessons, other reading material and on completion, examination to achieve a basic **Science of the Social Credit** understanding.

'**Intermediate Social Credit by ED Butler**' includes eight written assignments, Video and Podcast lessons and other important developmental reading material.

'**Advanced Social Credit**' is conducted with the assistance of experts in this science, included is the historical '*Elements of Social Credit by Tudor Jones*', (originally published by The Social Credit Secretariat), two courses including texts, Video and Podcast lessons and other reading material and on examination to ensure an advanced ability of effective action in the Science of Social Credit measured in terms of human satisfaction.

**Start your Training Today.**

**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.**