



- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

IN THIS ISSUE

We Need to Pause Awhile and Check Our Bearings by Betty Luks	1
Socialism, Social Being, Social Credit and the League of Rights	3
Centralising Control Over Initiative by Wallace Klinck	3
An Example of the Betrayal by Politicians by Wallace Klinck	5
Word Games are Weapons of the Bureaucrats from Joanne Nova's website	6
Most Australians Clueless about Immigration and Population	7
Putin Fights the War Party on All Fronts by Pepe Escobar	8

**THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: Parliament: House of Commons: June 26, 1950. Schuman Plan.**

Major Legge-Bourke (Isle of Ely): The Hon. Member for Attercliffe (Mr. J. Hynd) said in the course of his remarks that what he wanted was some form of federalism in Europe because he believed that to be based on democratic lines. He said also that there has been a certain amount of party play in the debate today; I would remind him that perhaps one of the reasons for that is that now the House is fundamentally opposed as a matter of principle so far as foreign affairs, as well as home affairs, are concerned. That used not to be the case, and if the speech which I make today could be devoid of any party feeling at all, I should be only too glad; but if the Labour Party choose to say the sort of thing which they have said in their document European Unity, I think that they must be answered...

The United Nations organisation, as was the League (of Nations) before it, was set up to restrict the operation of national sovereignty. That in itself may or may not have been desirable at the time it was done. But what has happened? As did Germany in the League, so Russia in U.N.O. has used an organisation set up to limit all national sovereignties in order to increase her own. Let no one imagine that Russia would remain a member for one moment longer than it served her purpose to do so. Let no one fail to see that the purpose of Russia since the Revolution has been to increase her national sovereignty until she becomes the ruler of the world. It is that organisation which the French desire to see sending an accredited representative to the high authority, the supra-national authority.

What, then, must other members of the United Nations do? They have but one safe course, and that is to increase their own national sovereignty as rapidly as possible...

- *The Social Crediter*, Saturday, July 8, 1950

**WE NEED TO PAUSE AWHILE AND ‘CHECK OUR BEARINGS’ by Betty Luks**

Every now and then it is important to reorientate ourselves to ensure we are headed in the right direction. Over the holidays I had much pleasure in rereading some of Eric D. Butler’s works, in particular portions of his response to the attacks on him by Philip Adams (remember him?) in “*The Truth About the Australian League of Rights*” 1985.

Eric, from a very young man was a keen student of history and politics and I believe he left us directions for the way forward in the final chapter headed “The Future of the League”: “It is true that the League of Rights has always drawn relatively greater support from members of the rural community, engineers and smaller business men. There is a good reason for this. When debt finance, crushing taxation, monetary inflation and centralised power destroyed the independence of the sturdy Roman peasantry, the backbone of the Roman Empire was broken.

Stalin knew he could never impose complete totalitarianism until he destroyed the Russian farmers. The future of Australia requires an independent rural Australia. I have always been struck in considering the development of Christian influences on the English social structure, that England combined a tradition of liberty in close association with a deep passion for the land. It was the great lover of rural England, William Cobbett of the 18th century, a man who attacked the debt system, who drew attention to the philosophic cleavage which resulted in the surrender of traditional Christian standards to pure economics. The new philosophy divided God from nature and man from both. (emphasis added...ed)

I think of the great Shakespeare as an authentic voice of the countryside. Shakespeare was both regional and universal. Shakespeare’s concrete rural warmth of expression, with which his writings abound, are completely different from the abstract, although majestic imagery of his contemporary Christopher Marlowe. Christ’s ministry was in a predominantly rural setting and most of his parables related to matters rural. (continued on next page)

(continued from previous page)

The League of Rights offers no blueprints or plans for the cure of the evils afflicting mankind. It does not believe that any party or organisation as such can prevent the progressive disintegration of Civilisation in the face of a growing centralisation of all power. Regeneration can only start with individuals of sufficient faith and understanding. Regeneration can only develop from individuals through local groups in an organic manner.

The League teaches that the problems of mankind cannot be solved by reason or logic. Logic, like Algebra or any other form of mathematics, is only a mechanism, an instrument. Like the slide rule, it can only produce the result of all the factors fed into it. Truth must be discovered. This requires genuine humility. The laws of the Universe, what the early philosophers called the Natural Law, transcend human thinking and if man wishes to live in genuine harmony he should first make every endeavour to discover and to understand those laws, and then to apply them in all spheres - personal, social, government, economic and racial."

**Eric Butler finished with these words:** "Mr Phillip Adams has challenged me to outline Truths which otherwise might not have been revealed. I thank Mr Adams for his invitation to do some recollecting and remind him of Edmund Burke's observation that our strength is increased by those we wrestle against."

### **Shakespeare on Mercy**

*"The quality of mercy is not strain'd.*

*It droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven Upon the place beneath.*

*It is twice blest: It blesseth him that gives and him that takes.*

*Tis mightiest in the mightiest; it becomes The throned monarch better than his crown.*

*His sceptre shows the force of temporal power, The attribute to awe and majesty,*

*Wherein doth sit the dread and fear of kings; But mercy is above the sceptred sway;*

*It is enthroned in the hearts of kings; It is an attribute to God himself;*

*And earthly power doth then show likest God's When mercy seasons justice.*

*Therefore, Jew, Though justice be thy plea, consider this,*

*That, in the course of justice, none of us Should see*

*salvation, We do pray for mercy,*

*And that same prayer doth teach us all to render The deeds of mercy."*

- - Portia's immortal speech from Shakespeare's *Merchant of Venice*, when she confronts the unrepentant Shylock.

### **LETTER OF THE LAW AS OPPOSED TO THE SPIRIT**

Technically Shylock is right according to the letter of the law. But he is like those who want to set up global legal systems to control every action of our lives. Shakespeare's God, and the God of those who

bequeathed us the ancient English common law is the opposite of the savage, revengeful, legalistic false god of the Shylocks. A reading of Portia's Mercy speech in Shakespeare's *Merchant of Venice*, no doubt explains why. The purely legalistic mind cannot comprehend Shakespeare, nor can it comprehend Christianity.

Here is C.S. Lewis' advice:

"Christianity thinks of human individuals not as mere members of a group or items in a list, but as organs in a body - different from one another and each contributing what no other could. When you find yourself wanting to turn your children, or pupils, or even your neighbours, into people exactly like yourself, remember that God probably never meant them to be that. You and they are different organs, intended to do different things. On the other hand, when you are tempted not to bother about someone else's troubles because they are 'no business of yours', remember that though he is different from you he is part of the same organism as you.

If you forget that he belongs to the same organism as yourself you will become an Individualist. If you forget that he is a different organ from you, if you want to suppress differences and make people all alike, you will become a Totalitarian. But a Christian must not be either a Totalitarian or an Individualist.

I feel a strong desire to tell you - and I expect you feel a strong desire to tell me - which of these two errors is the worse. That is the Devil getting at us. He always sends errors into the world in pairs - pairs of opposites. And he always encourages us to spend a lot of time thinking which is the worse. He relies on your extra dislike of the one error to draw you gradually into the opposite one. But do not let us be fooled. We have to keep our eyes on the goal and go straight through between both errors."

- - *On Target*, New Zealand, July-August 2001

<http://www.alor.org/NewZealand/Capitalists%20and%20Socialists%20United%20for%20Global%20Governance.htm>

### **Common Market and Common Law**

In a letter to *The Times* (February 15, 1962), Sir Henry Slesser, a former Lord Justice of Appeal, points out a consequence of the proposed Federation of Europe (to include Great Britain) which appeared to have received little public consideration.

He refers to the great difference there has always been between the system of Jurisprudence prevailing on the Continent, which is founded upon the Byzantine Roman Law, and the customary Common Law of England (a distinction less clear, admittedly, in Scotland). He instances several attempts in the past to influence English Law by assumptions deriving from the *Civilians*, but says, "they were always countered by the native instinct: *Nolumus Leges Angliae mutare.*" (We will not change the laws of England)

- - *The Social Creditor*, Saturday March 1962

## SOCIALISM, SOCIAL BEING, SOCIAL CREDIT AND THE LEAGUE OF RIGHTS

Chris Knight's *On Target*, 14 January 2011 article bears repeating. It contains a thoughtful discussion on the question of whether or not the League of Rights is a socialist movement. "Social Credit, for example, a core part of the League philosophy, is concerned with a just distribution of the fruits of human labour in a world where technology has largely solved the problem of production. And in its own weird way, so is Socialism.

Liberalism operates with a social ontology (philosophy of being and existence) of social atomism or individualism. Society, as Margaret Thatcher once said, does not exist. Communism and Socialism exists at the opposite extreme and adopts an ontology of social holism – the only reality are collective entities such as societies and cultures. This view of the Left is characteristic of postmodernism and social constructionism that denies that external truth exists. The Jewish philosopher Jacques Derrida has said that nothing exists outside of the "text". This is the extreme expression of a dogma that has gripped philosophy since the time of Kant – that we are cut off from the world by our concepts, language and theories and can only know the world through this conceptual veil.

Social Credit, through the writings of C.H. Douglas, has a much saner philosophy. Individuals exist and so does society. Society is a social product of the association and interaction of individuals. Older individuals create and maintain the social institutions, e.g., language, which newer individuals are born into. There is no Kantian veil hiding us from the world because we are not isolated atoms as individuals.

Individuals are, among other things, biological beings. Sociality is part of man's human nature, but it is by no means the sole defining characteristic as the Communists and Socialists believe. Their ontology is very much an "over-socialised conception of man". Modern sociology is largely flawed as a cognitive discipline because of this fundamental error.

It is because individuals transcend social structures and are never reducible to them, that is, because they have a transcendental essence re sociality, that the political philosophy of Communism and Leftism in all its forms (e.g., feminism) is wrong. The necessity of individuals to have private property is a part of human nature because it is an ecological condition of individual freedom. Thus, the political philosophy and ethos of Leftism is also fundamentally wrong because it ignores this fundamental aspect of human nature.

For this reason, even though Social Credit and Leftism, are both critical of Global Capitalism, these philosophies do so from an entirely incommensurable ontological position. The Australian League of Rights therefore cannot be correctly viewed as a 'Socialism'.

Essential viewing in relation to the above article is the Eric D. Butler 1989 DVD "*The Planned Surrender of Australia*".

Such matters are discussed from a historical/philosophical position. History has taught man there are fundamental truths about human associations that are just as absolute as the Law of Gravity – which we have ignored to our own peril.

Source: <http://www.alor.org/Volume47/Vol47No3.htm>

\*\*\*

### CENTRALISING CONTROL OVER INITIATIVE by Wallace Klinck

I think the important thing is to remember that creativity resides in individuals and we want to facilitate this rich resource to the benefit of the individual and to the general good wherever it may reside.

When I was in the Soviet Union during the Brezhnev (later communist) period our guide, Luba, a young Russian woman, very fluent in English, asked during a tourist orientation session for my opinion of Tikhonov's latest Central Plan which had just been announced. I was there to keep my eyes and ears open and my mouth shut so I declined. But she would not accept this and repeatedly stated that they would like to have my opinion. So finally I asked, "Do you really want to know what I think of the plan?"

She responded, "Yes, please - we would like to have your opinion." So I said, "Luba, if I want to get out that door (the main entrance to the large Cosmos Hotel built in Moscow by the French for the Olympics) and I cannot go out the door until you give me permission to exit, and you cannot give me permission until you go to the 'top of the mountain' to get permission to give me permission to exit, when am I going to get out the door?" She looked at me and said, "I understand what you mean."

When I attended a class in comparative economics a guest professor who had been in charge of the mining industry in Communist Czechoslovakia presented a week of lectures on central planning.

(continued on next page)

"ON TARGET" is printed and published by The Australian League of Rights,  
Level 9, Suite 8, 118-120 Queen Street, Melbourne, 3000

Postal Address: GPO Box 1052, Melbourne, 3001. Telephone: (03) 9600 0677

Subscription \$45.00 p.a.

(continued from previous page) After discussing the hopeless complexity of using input-output tables assuming what everyone should produce and consume the planners decided to resort to differential equations.

After writing these equations from one side of the blackboard to the other he suddenly turned to the class and exclaimed, "You see, it is impossible!"

I asked him later, "Prof. (Skoda) does it not seem the ultimate arrogance for some people to ascend to the top of the mountain and dictate what everyone else should produce and consume?" To which, he replied, "Yes, when you think about it, it certainly is."

I talked to a young Russian male teacher who having come to Canada, mused "I don't know - we work, but nothing seems to happen."

There you have the answer to what happens when you attempt to centralize control over initiative. You suppress creativity - in Christian theological terms, you stop up the Abundance of the Kingdom.

In the modern world, money is the key to human activity in both production and consumption. The point is that if you centralize its creation in the hands of the State you allow the State to preside over human creativity and restrict it to the extent allowed by an ideological, incompetent or self-interested bureaucracy.

The only effective solution to this artificial containment of human creativity is to ensure that consumers are the last and final arbiters of production policy. As C. H. Douglas astutely observed, this they can do most effectively with adequate and unattached monetary demand. As the final purpose of production, consumption must be served by ensuring that consumers are always provided with sufficient effective incomes to provide access to all consumer wealth as it flows from the production line. The existing system of finance and cost-accountancy makes this desideratum increasingly impossible as, consequent to advances in technological efficiency, the costs of real capital, as a component of price, increase relative to those of human labour.

Total costs and prices increasingly exceed consumer incomes and we foolishly and futilely attempt to overcome this growing financial deficiency by living today by the artifice of increasingly mortgaging the future. The price-system is fundamentally unbalanced and increasingly non-self-liquidating. It is veering evermore off-course at a tangent toward some unknown but predictably ominous destination.

### **THE PUSH FOR WORLD GOVERNMENT IS OLDER THAN YOU THINK**

As Dr. Bryan W. Monahan explains in *The Social Creditor* July 16, 1966 "The Art of the Possible":  
The conspiracy we are concerned with goes back centuries, but its first real outbreak was the French Revolution in 1789. That revolution was in preparation for many years, so that the attempt through revolution to bring about world government goes back about a quarter of a millennium. What we have to do is to see events from the perspective of that length of time...There you can discern the pattern from which these events derive their significance. They are the highlights of a continuous policy designed to secure world government..."

**Further reading:** "World Revolution" by Nesta Webster "The French Revolution" by Nesta Webster

Money for production should be created as repayable loans. However, production releases inadequate income for the end product to be bought and to the extent that a deficiency, always increasing as things are, exists, money should be created also and distributed freely to consumers without obligation of future repayment. This is necessary for consumers to access completed production awaiting sale and also to ensure that producers can recover their costs so as to remain viable sources of goods and services.

The banks are creating vast amounts of credit "money" all the time as consumer loans, without which sales would falter and the economy would lapse into general malaise and bankruptcy. Of course this bank-created purchasing-power is not given away.

The banks claim ownership of it and demand its repayment. This is the fundamental flaw in the system. When this new consumer loan money is used to purchase the products of industry it is repaid when handed over to the retailer who repays his outstanding bank loan and the bank cancels it as effective demand.

Yet the indebted consumer is required to pay it over a second time during the future repayment of an outstanding bank loan. This absurd imposition is tolerated because people in general simply do not understand that our money is not some permanent supply but comes into existence through banks creating and lending it. The deposit follows the loan and does not precede it.

People think of money as some permanently circulating medium and do not realize that it is cancelled when paid to a retailer who repays his bank loan at which time the banker cancels it. If the businessman places any of his receipts from sales to reserve it is cancelled as effective demand and can only become effective again if issued for new production which creates a whole new set of goods with additional costs and prices.

In this way, as Douglas, stated, the consumer is forced to "re-invest" in industry. In final analysis, costs and prices increase rapidly, as has been said, "by the lift"- while incomes go up "by the stairs" and the difference must be financed by a growing mortgage on the future.

Incidentally, the term "social credit" refers to the actual ability of humans in association to generate increments of efficiency and satisfaction through association - whereas "Social Credit" refers to the subject as a formal subject of study. \*\*\*

In Jeremy Lee's 1991 booklet "The New World Order – and the Destruction of Australian Industry" are the following details:

"In March 1978 the Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and Defence advertised for submissions on the following matter:

**The Implications for Australia's Foreign Policy and National Security of Proposals for a New International Economic Order...**"

(found here...<http://alor.org/Library/Lee%20J%20%20-%20New%20World%20Order.pdf>)

So, it is not as though the Australian people were not warned earlier about the threats to their freedoms and democracy and The Plans to control the world's food,

fibres and minerals by the United Nations' One World Government. Well such a dire threat is now staring them in the face and they can't ignore it any longer.

**Bringing the matter up-to-date is Christopher Monkton's 2014 address**

"Our Last Year of Freedom?" to a Brisbane audience in which he warns "about the possible loss of our hard-won freedoms and democracies to unelected bureaucrats at the UN in the upcoming Paris COP21 meeting." (*Dec 2015-ed*)

**Watch here:** <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=n32x19fy0Wo>  
For those who find it too difficult to download internet videos – ask Doug Holmes for help. Ph 08-8289 0049

### AN EXAMPLE OF THE BETRAYAL BY POLITICIANS – Wallace Klinck

In response to an email urging him to watch some videos Wallace responded:

"The Greeks have been betrayed. I never trusted Tsipras and believe that he is probably an internationalist, in collaboration with people like Merkel, who led the Greek people on in pretence and betrayed them as might be predicted. I see that his real name is reported to be Axel Cipra so this is probably not surprising.

The financial system is one of continuous expropriation and the assets of Greece have been targeted without mercy for the people of that nation. I sent some Social Credit literature to quite a number of Greek parliamentarians some time ago. I guess the message did not sink in! We should be bombarding them with additional material. The captive nations of Europe should recognize their own real credit and take steps to actualize it so they can once again claim their independence from the Eurocrat tyranny in Brussels. It is both saddening and infuriating to see people suffer for no other reason than the deceptions and

depredations of a corrupt and/or defective system of financial cost-accountancy that fails to credit them with their real capital and accounts it as a debt rather than an asset, compelling them into ever greater dependence upon financial debt in order that they might live. They resist, rebel and struggle to no avail as they sink ever into the depths of the bottomless pit and never know why.

Only truth can save them and that depends upon knowledge which has been denied to them by the prevailing institutions of a corrupt Establishment. The wall of deception is being penetrated but whether or not this will result in a demand for and implementation of realistic policy before the World is again plunged into a crisis, of cataclysmic consequences, we do not yet know. Let us pray and work to ensure that this does not happen and that humanity can emerge into the light of a New Day."

**Ref:** <http://www.zerohedge.com/news/2015-12-20/%E2%80%9C-coup%E2%80%9D-%E2%80%93-story-how-greece-lost-its-democracy> \*\*\*

### THE DECLINE AND FALL OF ANCIENT GREECE

One may define the Welfare State as extensive expenditure of public funds to provide free or below-cost services and subsidies to selected groups of citizens.

The idea is at least as old as Pericles, outstanding Athenian statesman of the Fifth Century B.C. Pericles had been running behind a candidate for public office who possessed more private means. Then, as Plutarch tells the story:

'He turned to the distribution of the public moneys; and in a short time having bought the people over, what with moneys allowed for shows and for service on juries, and what with other forms of pay and largess, he

made use of them against the council of Areopagus of which he himself was no member.' . . .

And it is not recorded that Pericles ever lost an election after he had hit on the ingenious device of buying up the people with their own money."

- W. H. Chamberlin, in *Human Events*

**Mr. Chamberlin doubtless knows, though he does not say, that the rise of Pericles ushered in the Decline and Fall of Greece.**

- - *The Social Crediter, Saturday July 8, 1950*

Paris was an enviro-fail, but a PR success, and political win — it's a non-binding, non-treaty, but real commitment.

Watch the pea. What does it mean to have a non-binding non-treaty, at the same time as a real "commitment"? It's all semantics, and, as usual, word games are the weapons of big-bureaucrats. Don't be fooled into thinking Paris was no threat to the free West.

As I keep saying, the climate conference in Paris was not trying to reduce CO2 or change the climate. The real aim is an endless free lunch for freeloaders. The Politicites didn't get the legally binding agreement they dream of, but what they got may turn out to be almost as good. Marlo Lewis explains it may yet be politically binding on the target rich Western nations, which is all that really matters. It's the best strategic review I've seen of what happened in Paris.

**It was no accident that it was "non-binding". That was part of the plan.**

They were never going to get a legal treaty through the US Congress, so the aim became a deal that was "non-binding" and not a "treaty" because things that are overtly legal have to go through Congress. Instead, the bureaucrat class want to go around the voters. By simply declaring that Obama's promises mean something, with the help of a compliant patsy media they may become effectively binding — the promises enforced with political "name and shame" punishment and pressure instead of with legislation. This would be a new means of getting around Congress...Ominously, it involves an automatic ongoing ratchet mechanism to increase the aims every five years from now to perpetuity. A wolf in sheep's clothing.

**Marlo Lewis on the implications of this deceptive grab for power:**

Nor do we find "legally binding" among the State Department's eight factors for distinguishing treaties from other agreements not subject to the Senate's advice and consent (such as "sole executive agreements").

More importantly, where is it written that the president gets to decide unilaterally whether or not a particular agreement is a treaty? The executive and legislative branches are co-equal, and treaty making is a shared power. If the President can by his sole voice declare a treaty not to be treaty because acknowledging it is a treaty would effectively kill it, then he can gut Article 2, neuter the Senate, and enact almost any policy he wants just by negotiating a sole executive agreement with foreign leaders.

The US may have the only political system strong enough to withstand the relentless assault from the army of selfish big-gov dependent enviro-pretenders (the "EnviroPo's").

But it will take determination and effort. In Australia I'm not aware of any equivalent analysis like this, and given how different our political system is, we need one. Likewise, the UK, NZ, Germany and Canada. Start strategizing...

**Paris Agreement Is a Real Tiger: Lock and Load - Marlo Lewis**

**Summary:** The Paris climate agreement is "non-binding, underfunded, and unenforceable," as one conservative commentator put it. However, Paris is a "paper tiger" only on paper. The treaty's core purpose is not to impose legal obligations but to establish the multi-decade framework for a global political pressure campaign. The pressure will be directed chiefly at those who oppose EPA's unlawful Clean Power Plan and other elements of the President's climate agenda. Republicans will get rolled unless GOP leaders organize a political counter-offensive centered around a Byrd-Hagel 2.0 resolution.

**Key message point:** Contrary to President Obama, the Paris agreement is a treaty, hence it is not a policy of the United States until the Senate ratifies it. The Paris agreement is "politically" rather than "legally" binding in two ways. First, each country's core commitments are self-chosen ("nationally determined") rather than specified by the agreement itself. Second, commitments are to be enforced via political pressure ("naming and shaming") rather than through international tribunals or economic sanctions.

Obama wanted a politically-binding agreement for two reasons. First, he gets to pretend the Paris agreement is not a treaty, hence does not have to be submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent... Second, an agreement in which each country promises to implement its own "nationally determined contribution" (NDC) to limiting global emissions allows Obama to pretend EPA's Clean Power Plan (CPP) and other elements of his domestic climate agenda are "commitments" America has made to the world.

**The solution — pass a Byrd-Hagel 2.0**

...watershed event in that battle was the Senate's passage of the Byrd-Hagel Resolution in July 1997. Byrd-Hagel preemptively nixed any climate agreement, like Kyoto, that would either exempt developing countries from emission-reduction targets and timetables or harm the U.S. economy.

GOP leaders and their allies must mount their own campaign to undercut the global political pressure regime Obama plans to construct via the Paris treaty.

## PRESENT INTERNATIONAL POWER STRUCTURE

Global Research published Professor Michel Chossudovsky's, December 2015 summary of the present international power structures. He writes:

**Everything is interrelated:** war, terrorism, the police state, the global economy, economic austerity, financial fraud, corrupt governments, poverty and social inequality, police violence, Al Qaeda, ISIS, media disinformation, racism, war propaganda, weapons of mass destruction, the derogation of international law, the criminalization of politics, the CIA, the FBI, climate change, nuclear war, Fukushima, nuclear radiation, crimes against humanity, The China-Russia alliance, Syria, Ukraine, NATO, false flags, 9/11 Truth, ....

An overall understanding of this Worldwide crisis is required: the last section (*of the article-ed*) deals briefly with reversing the tide of war, peace-making, instating social justice and real democracy.

This article includes a compendium of relevant citations (from my writings) pertaining to different dimensions of this global crisis. Citations from other authors are indicated in italics.

The hyperlinks in each of the paragraphs indicate the original source of the quotation.

**Continue reading here....**

War, Terrorism and the Global Economic Crisis in 2015: Ninety-nine Interrelated Concepts...

<http://www.globalresearch.ca/war-terrorism-and-the-global-economic-crisis-in-2015-ninety-nine-interrelated-concepts/5497812>  
\*\*\*

## MOST AUSTRALIANS CLUELESS ABOUT IMMIGRATION AND POPULATION

Crispin Hull, *Canberra Times*, December 25, 2015  
In the 2016 election year we will hear a lot more about one of Australia's hitherto practically unsung federal-state imbalances. The much sung one, of course, is the fact that the Federal Government raises the bulk of the taxes, but the states are the ones with the responsibility for spending them – schools, hospitals, police, most roads and so on. It goes by the rather ugly name of vertical fiscal imbalance.

The unsung one is that the Federal Government is responsible for Australia's high immigration rate but it is the poor states that have to provide the services and infrastructure for the extra people. It could be called vertical population policy imbalance. But it might be easier just to call it dumb policy.

Australians seem to have some idea about vertical fiscal imbalance because the Premiers and Chief Ministers are forever whingeing about being starved of funds by the Feds. It is a convenient excuse for long hospital waiting lists and the like.

But Australians have very little idea about population. A survey published this week by the Australian Population Research Institute reveals just how ignorant they are about it.

The survey asked four basic questions with multiple-choice answers. Only 2 per cent of respondents got all four questions right. That is worse than random guessing, which would have yielded one in 16 getting all four questions right, or about 6 per cent of respondents.

That suggests not just ignorance but the possession of misinformation, as if people have been victims of a slow-drip propaganda campaign.

The questions were: Is it True or False that without immigration, Australia's population would be shrinking? What is Australia's population? What portion of the immigration intake are refugees? And is it True or False that Australia has one of the highest

population growth rates in the developed world?

The best result was the present level of population, with just over half of respondents getting it right. The worst (19 per cent) was the fact Australia has one of the highest population (*growth-ed*) rates in the world. Only Israel and Luxembourg in the OECD have higher rates.

Overall, 12.6 per cent of respondents got all four questions wrong. Again, random guessing would have resulted in only 6 per cent of respondents getting them all wrong. The 12.6 per cent result can only be the result in some general pushing of misinformation – not just ignorance on its own. By the way, this is my conclusion, not that of the researchers.

If political leaders, business, the media and other providers of information and information were generally pushing the correct or no information – rather than an incorrect picture – you would expect a better than random result for all questions right and for no questions right. Instead, both are worse.

The survey backs up what a few people have long suspected: that the big end of town - a tiny, wealthy and powerful minority which gets benefit from high immigration - and the politicians they finance - have pushed the case for high immigration, generally against the overall public interest.

They do this by stressing imaginary benefits – economic growth, cure for an ageing population, cure for a falling birth rate etc. And they underplay how aberrant high population growth is, the strain it puts on infrastructure and the provision of services, and the strain it puts on the environment.

**Read more:**

<http://www.canberratimes.com.au/comment/most-aussies-are-clueless-about-immigration-and-population-survey-20151222-glt9nr.html>



## PUTIN FIGHTS THE WAR PARTY ON ALL FRONTS

by Pepe Escobar

Let's talk about "Russian aggression."

The fight to the death in Moscow's inner circles is really between the Eurasianists and the so-called Atlantic integrationists, a.k.a. the Western fifth column.

The crux of the battle is arguably the Russian Central Bank and the Finance Ministry – where some key liberalcon monetarist players are remote-controlled by the usual suspects, the Masters of the Universe.

The same mechanism applies, geopolitically, to any side, in any latitude, which has linked its own fiat money to Western central banks. The Masters of the Universe always seek to exercise hegemony by manipulating usury and fiat money control.

So why President Putin does not fire the head of the Russian Central Bank, Elvira Nabiulina, and a great deal of his financial team - as they keep buying U.S. bonds and propping up the U.S. dollar instead of the ruble? What's really being aggressed here if not Russian interests?

### That Stab in the Back

It's clear by now which party profited from the downing of the Russian Su-24 by the Turkish Air Force – a graphic act of war. The immediate result was the suspension – which could lead to the cancelling – of a crucial Pipelineistan plank: Turkish Stream, which is a *bête noire* for the Masters of the Universe as Turkey was about to become the key alternative bypassing failed state Ukraine for supplying natural gas to southern Europe.

On top if it the EU paid Ankara 3 billion euros for its "indirect" services (the official excuse is to allow Turkey to control Syrian immigration to the EU.) And EU sanctions to Russia were extended for another six months.

A fitting Russian response would be Moscow defaulting on all debt to Western banks in retaliation for the sanctions. An extreme step would be blocking natural gas shipments to the EU. If Russia even floated one of these moves, not to mention both, sanctions would be lifted in a flash. So who's really being "aggressed" here?

Putin – and Russian intel – didn't see it coming: Sultan Erdogan's "stab in the back." So a case can be made that Russian intel seriously underestimated Erdogan's massive investment on regime change in Syria.

Whatever happens on the ground – much more than in the Vienna-Geneva charade now passing for a "peace process" – the future of Syria bears two stark options; a neo-Ottoman colony, but essentially subordinated to the whims of the Masters of the Universe; or a unitary sovereign nation, not partitioned, with a strong relationship to both Russia and Iran. The question, though, remains; how does Turkey get away with such a provocation, with Russia imposing just a few sanctions?

### That Fuzzy Agenda

The missing link in the puzzle is Israel.

Contradictions became glaringly obvious with the flattening of a building in Jaramana, in Damascus, by Israeli missiles, killing nine civilians as well as Hezbollah-linked Samir Kuntar. This could not have happened, in any way, without Russian acquiescence – considering Russian missile defense now protects Syrian territory. So the message is clear; Russia won't interfere with Israel's priorities in Syria/Lebanon – and vice-versa.

According to the Russian Defense Ministry – as well as independent Turkish investigations - most of the stolen Syrian/Iraqi oil Islamic State group scam ends up with the oil being bought by Israel. Tel Aviv happens to be the top buyer of the stolen-from-Baghdad Iraqi Kurdistan oil with which stolen Daesh oil is mixed.

And to top it off, Tel Aviv is a mortal enemy of both Iran and Hezbollah – which are essential nodes of the "4+1" coalition (Russia, Syria, Iran, Iraq, plus Hezbollah) fighting the Islamic State group. Not to mention that Tel Aviv – which favors a partitioned Syria - wants to gobble up the energy-rich Golan Heights for perpetuity.

So how does Israel get away with it?

That War Party "Offer"

The bottom line of these three scenarios – the Russian economy, Turkey and Israel – is that a lethal, devastating response is an easily available option for Putin on all three. Yet he refuses to be trapped by a war logic. Putin is the ultimate adversary of "Russian aggression."

**Read more:** <http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article43830.htm>

**THE LEAGUE'S BOOK SERVICES: — <http://alor.org/>**

**When ordering journals, 'On Target' and 'New Times Survey' – Please make Cheques/Money Orders payable to – 'ALOR Journals'**

**For educational books, videos and DVDs, etc. please make Cheques/Money Orders payable to -- Heritage Bookshop Services'**

**For donations to the League please make payments to-- 'Australian League of Rights' or 'ALOR'**

**Books are available at meetings, at our Melbourne bookshop or by mail order from the following addresses:**

**Victoria, Tasmania:  
Heritage Bookshop,  
Level 9, Suite 8, 118-120 Queen Street,  
Melbourne, 3000  
(G.P.O. Box 1052, Melbourne, 3001).  
Phone: (03) 9600 0677**

**South Australia  
Heritage Book Mailing Service,  
P.O. Box 27, Happy Valley, 5159.  
Phone: (08) 71237131;**

**All Other States:  
To either Victorian or South Australian addresses.**

**VERITASBOOKS ONLINE:  
<http://veritasbooks.com.au/>**