



- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



IN THIS ISSUE

A Universal Basic Income to 'Safeguard' Against Automation? by Betty Luks	2
Once More Back to William Blake by Betty Luks	3
In 1937 Norman Webb Wrote of the Downfall of Beauty	4
Wallace Klinck Brings Us Up To Date	5
On Advocating Genocide in the Privacy of One's Own Home by Ian Wilson LL.B.	6
Safe Schools Coalition: Sexual Politics in the Classroom by Natasha Bitá	7

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK:

Full Employment and Materialism: There is not a large newspaper in the world which has not misrepresented the technological increase of production per man-hour as "unemployment", and as a failure of statesmanship. Not because things which ought to have been made, were not made, which may be true, but because of the determination, conscious and vicious, to keep unemployment and poverty synonymous. And that this misrepresentation is part of the Big Idea, is, I think, demonstrated conclusively by the dangerous nonsense being circulated by all the machinery of propaganda at this critical time in regard to the Russian Social and Economic Systems.

- - C.H. Douglas, *The Big Idea*, p.38, 1942.

The Basic Guiding Principle:

Certain sedulously propagated theories simply must be cleared out of the way. The first, of course, is that it is the business of the Government to "put the people to work". Perhaps the shortest way in which to deal with this is to say that, if the facts of the case require that an individual must work before it is possible for him to obtain those things of which he has the need or desire, then he shall in no case be prevented from working by artificial restrictions. But if, without injury to others, he can be provided with these things without working, the fact that he has not worked for them shall be recognised as a matter of no consequence whatever.

- - C.H. Douglas, "*The Land for the (Chosen) People Racket*", Chap. 6, 1943.

Power Production and Its Effects:

The physical effects of this replacement (of human labour by machine labour) are not difficult to apprehend. If one unit of human labour with the aid of mechanical power and machinery will produce ten times as much as the same unit working without such aids, it is obvious that there will either be ten times as much production or only one-tenth the amount of labour will be required.

- - C.H. Douglas, "*Monopoly of Credit*", p. 25, 1931 Edit.

The productivity of a unit of human labour has increased somewhat irregularly over the whole field of production. In some cases the increase in a hundred years has amounted to thousands per cent, in some cases the increase of output per unit has become much less. *Ibid.*

It is, however; broadly true to say that general economic production which may be defined as the conversion of existing materials into a form suitable for human use, is proportional to the rate at which energy of any description is used in the process, and this line of attack is probably closer to reality than any method in which financial units are employed. *Ibid.*

On this basis it is safe to say that one unit of human labour can on the average produce at least forty times as much as was the case up to the beginning of the nineteenth century. *Ibid.*

The following examples are some indication of the progress made in the past few years alone. The rate of production of pig iron is three times as great per man as it was in 1914. A workman using automatic machines can make 4,000 glass bottles as quickly as he could have made 100 by hand twenty-five years ago. In 1919 the index of factory output (based upon 1914 as 100) was 1146, and the index of factory employment was 129. By 1927 output had risen to 170, but employment had sunk to 115.

(continued on next page)

(continued from previous page)

In 1928 American farmers were using 45,000 harvesting and threshing machines and with them had displaced 130,000 farm hands. In automobiles, output per man has increased to 310 per cent. An increase of 210 per cent. *Ibid.*

Now, if you will consider the fact that the general output of goods of all descriptions per unit of mechanical labour employed, is, at least, proportional to the total energy put into the productive system, and that this energy has increased in the last 100 years by at least 3,000 to 4,000 per cent., you will see that one of three things must happen.

A UNIVERSAL BASIC INCOME TO 'SAFEGUARD' AGAINST AUTOMATION? by Betty Luks

As you read the following article, keep in mind what was obvious to C.H. Douglas nearly ninety years ago.

“Power Production and Its Effects:

The physical effects of this replacement (of human labour by machine labour) are not difficult to apprehend. If one unit of human labour with the aid of mechanical power and machinery will produce ten times as much as the same unit working without such aids, it is obvious that there will either be ten times as much production or only one-tenth the amount of labour will be required.”

The question was recently asked by Nick Whigman : “Should Australia seriously consider a universal basic income?” (news.com.au, 10 February, 2016) and followed up with another “How do you feel about a guaranteed, unconditional monthly wage?”

While the gentleman goes on to explain what is meant by a Universal Basic Income (UBI), he does not consider the question of how to fund such a scheme – so I am assuming he thinks it will be paid out of our taxes. After all, he goes on to write “TAX reform has taken centre stage in Australian politics at the moment, and in the background a radical idea is quietly gaining momentum”. Others see UBI as a ‘Safeguard’ Against Automation “For many of those championing the introduction of a UBI, they view it as a necessary safeguard against the disruption caused to the job market by artificial intelligence and robotic automation.

According to a 2015 report by the Committee for Economic Development of Australia, almost 40 per cent of Australian jobs that exist today, have a moderate to high likelihood of disappearing in the next 10 to 15 years. For advocates, a functioning system of basic income could soften the blow for low skilled Aussie workers as Australia’s economy adjusts away from the mining boom and towards new technologies. “Bottom line is we don’t have a predictable model for the kinds of changes these innovations will make to the workforce,” Mr Douglas said.

(1) Either everyone must consume thirty or forty times as much as he did before, and increase the amount as the amount of energy put into production increases, or
(2), we must get rid, by exportation or otherwise, of an increasing amount of production (in competition with every other industrialised country) in the remaining markets of the world, which are decreasing in size owing to continued industrialisation, or
(3) we must recognise that the so-called unemployment problem is something that arises out of the advancement of science applied to industry, and we must modify profoundly our system of distribution.

-C.H. Douglas, “Warning Democracy” Ch. 7, 1931 edition

Read further here ...

<http://www.news.com.au/finance/economy/australian-economy/should-australia-seriously-consider-a-universal-basic-income/news-story/d35635c64bd5f089c92ebba54852bd3d>

Nick Whigman asked:

“Should Australia seriously consider a universal basic income?” **and**

“How do you feel about a guaranteed, unconditional monthly wage?”

I think he used two inappropriate words in that article: *income* and *wage*. According to Dictionary.com:

A wage (n.): c. 1300, “a payment for services rendered, reward, just deserts;” mid-14c., “salary paid to a provider of service,” from Anglo-French and Old North French wage (Old French gage)...

And as for **Income**: (n.) c. 1300, “entrance, arrival,” literally “a coming in;” see in (adv.) + come (v.). Perhaps a noun use of the late Old English verb incuman “come in, enter.” Meaning “money made through business or labour” (i.e., “that which ‘comes in’ as payment for work or business”) first recorded c. 1600...”

We would consider a more appropriate word is *Dividend* – again at Dictionary.com.

Dividend (n.) late 15c., from Middle French dividende “a number divided by another,” from Latin dividendum “thing to be divided,” neuter gerundive of dividere (see divide). Mathematical sense is from 1540s. Meaning “portion of interest on a loan, stock, etc.” is from 1620s. Related: Dividends.”

Let CH Douglas Explain It In More Detail:

“The early Victorian political economists agreed in ascribing all “values” to three essentials: land, labour, and capital ... But it is rapidly receiving recognition that, while there might be a rough truth in this argument during the centuries prior to the industrial revolution consequent on the inventive period following the Renaissance, and culminating

(continued on next page)

(continued from previous page) in the steam engine, the spinning-jenny, and so forth, there is now a fourth factor in wealth production, the multiplying power of which far exceeds that of the other three, which may be expressed in the words of Mr. Thorstein Veblen "The Engineers and the Price System", (although he does not appear to have grasped its full implications) as the "process of the industrial arts".

The National Dividend

Quite clearly no one person can be said to have a monopoly share in this, it is a legacy of countless numbers of men and women, many of whose names are forgotten and the majority of whom are dead. And since it is a cultural legacy, it seems difficult to deny that the general community as a whole, and not by any qualification of land, labour, or capital, are the proper legatees".

But if the ownership of wealth produced vests in the owners of the factors contributed to its production, and the owners of the legacy of the industrial arts are the general community, it seems equally difficult to deny that

ONCE MORE BACK TO WILLIAM BLAKE by Betty Luks

According to Malcolm Muggeridge in "A Third Testament" (1974) William Blake 1757– 1827:

"In the most widely known of Blake's poems (that is, the lines in the preface to his Milton, beginning: "And did those feet in ancient time / Walk upon England's mountains green?"), the phrase "dark Satanic Mills" is generally taken as referring to the abominations of the Industrial Revolution. As a result, the poem has become a sort of political hymn to be used at the more solemn, revivalistic Labor party occasions, such as the funeral of a leader, or the closing session of a party conference.

Actually, of course, it was much more the Loom of Locke that Blake had in mind than any Lancashire mill. Blake's imagination told him that all evil things begin with lies and false teaching and lead to conflagration, conflict and despair.

The feet that in his poem walked upon England's mountains green – *the Countenance Divine that shone forth upon our clouded hills* – did not belong to Karl Marx, but to the risen Christ.

With his imaginative insight, however, Blake also understood that the whole nature of man's productive process for meeting his needs was changing:

*And all the Arts of Life they chang'd into the Arts of Death
in Albion.*

*The hour-glass contemn'd because its simple workmanship
Was like the workmanship of the plowman, & the water
wheel*

That raises water into cisterns, broken & burn'd with fire

the chief owners and rightful beneficiaries of the modern productive system, can be shown to be the individuals composing the community, as such.

C.H. Douglas, "Social Credit", Part 1, Chap. 5, 1920 Edition.

The Dividend is the Logical Successor:

...the dividend is the logical successor to the wage, carrying with it privileges which the wage never had and never can have, whether it be rechristened pay, salary, or any other alias; because the nature of all these is a dole of purchasing-power revocable by authority, whereas a dividend is a payment, absolute and unconditional, of something due. The first is servitude, however disguised, the second is the primary step to economic emancipation.

C.H. Douglas, "Credit-Power and Democracy", 1920 Edition

Source: "Thought of C.H. Douglas" Part VI

<http://alor.org/Library/Douglas%20CH%20-%20Thoughts%20of%20Douglas.htm>

*Because its workmanship was like the workmanship of the
shepherd;*

*And in their stead, intricate wheels invented, wheel
without wheel,*

*To perplex youth in their outgoings & to bind to labours in
Albion*

*Of day & night the myriads of eternity: that they may
grind*

*And polish brass & iron hour after hour, laborious task,
Kept ignorant of its use: that they might spend the days of
wisdom*

*In sorrowful drudgery to obtain a scanty pittance of bread,
In ignorance to view a small portion & think that All,
And call it Demonstration, blind to all the simple rules of
life.*

So beginning with Bacon, a great transformation was taking place in the human condition. The machine, first seemingly a servant, would infallibly become a demonic master, poisoning our air, polluting our rivers and lakes, flattening our landscape, destroying our handicrafts and our art, and smothering the imagination whereby man's creativity could relate itself to God..."

Yes, a great transformation was taking place in the human condition but not all saw the 'problem' as the Productive Machine.

C.H. Douglas said it was not the Productive Machine as such that was the problem but the Money System which 'drove' the Productive Machine.

“If thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light.”

In the first half of the 19th century that event took place which we call the industrial revolution, the turnover from man-power to solar energy in the productive system. During the same period something else happened - no less than the total loss by man of his natural faculty of producing ordered beauty.*

We can see the whole course of history as the progressive subjection of nature by man to his own economic ends; and in this survey it is to be observed that until a comparatively short time ago everything he did in pursuit of these ends was aesthetically satisfactory. Human activities did not deface nature : on the contrary they produced positive beauty. One has only to contrast primeval forest with agriculture, or undrained fens with a medieval township, to acknowledge that.

It was quite abruptly that man ceased to adorn his planet and that its defacement appeared to become his natural function. And synchronising with this startling change, the defence and preservation of beauty became the anxious concern of an aesthetic minority. The suddenness of this change-over - and in terms of evolution it was astonishingly, one might say crudely, sudden - makes it quite easy to fix the period in which it took place, between 1830 and 1860...

Now it is to be noted that it was in just those thirty feverish years that industrialism really gripped the country, and in them also that taste, both instinctive and instructed, withered and died. The period coincides with the development of the steam engine and the progress of applied science: with every stage in the downfall of beauty the machine has been so intimately and incriminatingly identified that it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the coming of power-production, with the consequent decline of handicraft, was the root cause of the tragedy.

And, speaking generally, it has been the assumption of artists (along with William Blake) for the last eighty years that the machine was the enemy of beauty - of art. So thought William Morris and Ruskin and all the 19th century writers and painters... To them it appeared that society had quite certainly taken the wrong turning with the invention of the steam engine.

Yet the more Morris lectured, and the more Ruskin fulminated, and the more that earnest and conscientious

people listened and tried to put into practice what appeared to be their advice - erecting Romanesque Warehouses and Gothic railway-stations and Renaissance pubs - the worse everything became.

Perhaps it is because of his very greatness that Ruskin's failure seems to have been so signal. Judged by results he did far more harm than good, adding fuel to the fire he wished to put out. In his titanic efforts to improve the general Victorian taste and wake England up to a realisation of the slag-heap she was making of herself, Ruskin produced some fine literature; but that was not his aim.

It is tragic that the mind which in the midst of the sanctimonious blackguardism of his day could produce such statements as “The wealth of a nation is only to be measured by what it consumes,” was unable to make the necessary and further deductions. His generation - if not He - were sentimentalists, with their eyes fixed not curiously but longingly on the past.

They conceived of beauty as an absolute quality, an adornment, instead of the outward evidence of sound structure - all those who look backward make this fundamental mistake - and, in spite of them and their efforts, the majority that was really England continued madly on its industrial way...

There is no Canon today other than that of finance - a static, bookkeeping theory, related at no point to the spiritual, dynamic facts of existence. The lover of beauty looks at the pre-industrial world and recognises that in some particular denied to us it was good; it was right.

The present industrialised world has forfeited all this, (*this was 1937...ed*) not because it has been mechanised, as artists have thought, but for the single, simple reason that it has been beguiled by an artificially imposed condition into desiring an abstraction - money - in place of the substantial things it can make.

Realism and beauty are one, and the age that has lost the sense of what it wants to such a degree that it mistakes the shadow for the substance, is incapable of creating real beauty.

*Almost the sole exceptions to this statement are in the domain of engineering, where a high degree of functional beauty has been achieved. ***

"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.

All electoral comment written and authorised by Ken Grundy, Level 9, Suite 8, 118-120 Queen Street, Melbourne, 3000

WALLACE KLINCK BRINGS US ALL 'UP-TO-DATE'

I have received an enquiry from Stephen Goodson, a South African politician, author and former non-executive director of the South African Reserve Bank and have replied accordingly:

“With regard to Douglas and Social Credit, I would emphasize that Douglas’s policy was to build up from the individual and not down from the State. He was opposed to placing the creation of credit solely in the hands of the State, saying that this would ensconce the power-centralizing policy of the Money Power in an almost impregnable fortress.

His intent was to break the monopoly of credit by assigning to the State the responsibility of constructing a National (real) Credit Account of its actual or real resources or productive assets which if used might produce price-values. This would be an accounting of the nation’s real credit or potential ability to deliver goods and services.

The NCA would be constantly augmented by the value of all new real capital assets. The State would be responsible for statistically determining the periodic deficiency of available consumer purchasing-power and providing additional consumer credit (drawn down from this National Credit Account) in the form of National Dividends paid to all citizens as an inalienable birthright and payments to retailers on condition that they reduce their prices at point of sale (i.e., establish Compensated Prices) in accordance with a variable ratio determined by the changing relationship between national consumption and production, representing the real as opposed to the financial costs of production.

The new “debt-free” consumer credits would replace

NEITHER LEFT – NOR RIGHT ! CAUTIONS WALLACE KLINCK

“My concern is that Social Credit must not be drawn or lured into or associated with the sterile and destructive false dialectic of Left-Right politics. Both alleged alternate sides of the political spectrum, “conservative” and “socialist”, are Puritanically inspired and so elevate the State or Established Authority above the individual. So long as the debate is confined within these parameters the insidious process of power-centralization can be maintained and advanced.

The opposition to Social Credit arises from a direct or indirect consciousness of both Left and Right political entities. It constitutes a challenge to the existing ostensibly two-sided but essentially one-policy political power structure. Contemporary politics - or politics *per se* - are not so much a competition of opposite policies but primarily a struggle as to who is going to wield and administer power to implement predetermined policy, which latter is dictated and controlled by Finance in any

the vast amount of bank-issued consumer credits created currently. These new credits would pass back through the price-system and be cancelled as available purchasing-power in the usual way. They would not, however, leave a trail of inflationary financial debt as a mortgage against future production cycles. Upon being spent they would allow industry fully to recover its financial costs and permanently liquidate these costs without carrying them forward as outstanding debt as is currently practiced.

There would be no macroeconomic or overall need for consumer debt whatsoever. When any manufactured good is completed the physical costs of the process have fully been met and the financial system should reflect this irrefutable fact. Douglas was irrevocably opposed to any government policy of promoting human employment and sought a consumer-motivated economy which operates at maximum efficiency by displacing human energy as a factor of production by the utmost implementation of automation, robotization and artificial intelligence.

Social Credit stands for a genuinely consumer-motivated economy and for maximized leisure. It’s policy is the decentralization of control of policy to individuals and is, therefore, opposed to institutionalized “Statism” of any kind, such as fascism, communism, socialism, Technocracy, Keynesian centralized credit administration, etc. I am attaching in PDF format a letter which Douglas sent to Hitler warning him of the catastrophe he risked precipitating through the National Socialist rigid Puritanical adherence to a policy of “full-employment.”

case.

Being usually unaware of Social Credit, so-called “Conservative” elements tend all too often to be drawn toward fascism in their desire to escape from socialism or communism - all of which are, of course, an expression of the will-to-power over the individual.

Regardless of what government is “in power”, Finance always emerges triumphant in its inexorable drive to perpetuate and strengthen its universal sovereignty over the earth. This is why Social Credit historically has been subject to such rigorous official censorship - because it would upset the established prevalent general policy directed toward increasing concentration of power in the hands of the State, the latter being subservient always to the policy of Finance.

I believe that it is absolutely essential that we make an appeal

(continued on next page)

(continued from previous page) to any sincere and/or disaffected elements to be found at all points in the political and social spectrums so as to disintegrate the existing false political dichotomy. Social Credit seeks a realistic integration of ends and means in the interest of social stability, which can never emerge from dialectic conflict politics. The existing defective financial system frustrates legitimate human aspirations so as to create disharmony among all people and nations.

Thinking people will always have different opinions but a polity that is founded intrinsically by principle upon conflict can never be stable so as to maximize the positive increments of human association in the best interests of society at large. Somehow we have to expose and defeat the current futile and destructive "Right-Left" false dichotomy.

In order to accomplish this we need a realistic integration of economics and politics which can be achieved only in the context of sound financial accountancy. In order to achieve this, however, we must first emancipate ourselves from the artificial strictures, falsehoods and tyranny of philosophical Puritanism.

Philosophy always precedes policy and policy always

derives from its antecedent philosophy. Our survival depends upon understanding the pedigree of ideas and the ascendant Powers have done everything within their capability to prevent us from thinking independently regarding such matters.

Independent thought, constituting as it does the greatest threat to irresponsible and illegitimate power, is labelled as "controversial" and therefore portrayed as "lacking credibility" and therefore suspect. The independent thinker, or "upstart from the masses" who remains unbowed and unintimidated by such tactics is then likely to be branded as a disseminator of not only error but of "intolerance" or even of "hatred".

In this manner great effort has been directed through the controlled instruments of public opinion to maintain creative minds in isolation and fragmentation with the intent of preventing any widespread and co-ordinated social awareness and action directed toward genuinely constructive change. Fortunately, increasing numbers of citizens are becoming aware of the existence and nature of such reprehensible totalitarian tactics which, because of their increasingly transparent duplicity, are themselves rapidly declining in credibility. ***

ON ADVOCATING GENOCIDE IN THE PRIVACY OF ONE'S OWN HOME by Ian Wilson LL.B.

A "high-powered parliamentary committee" has proposed that advocating genocide in private should be a crime punishable by a gaol term of up to 7 years (*The Sydney Morning Herald*, February 15, 2016). The recommendation comes from a cross-party group of MPs assigned the task of scrutinising the government's latest counter-terrorism Bill.

The proposal to add genocide advocacy in private goes beyond the International Genocide Convention, which refers to "direct and public incitement to commit genocide".

The committee recommended that a condition be added that the advocate be "reckless" as to the consequences of their speech, being aware that someone may actually attempt to commit genocide.

All this is very odd. "Genocide" at international law, as in Articles II and III of the 1948 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide, describes two elements of genocide, a mental and a physical element (the physical elements being of five acts). The mental element, which concerns us here, is the "intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such". This may be done by (a) killing, members of the group; (b) causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; (c) deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; (d) imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; (e) forcibly transferring children of the group

to another group.

The scrapping of the word "public" from the Bill was recommended by the MPs because they thought that the word "public" had not been defined clearly. Instead of defining it, as done elsewhere in "public law", they recommended dumping the word. I find all that hard to believe: there is an agenda at work here to further erode freedom of speech.

While one could rightly say: who would want to defend "genocide" anyway, the way it is defined, so broadly, could capture many doctrines, however crazy. Anti-nationalist greens/deep ecologists, who think that the entire human race is a biological disease which should be eliminated (one respectable scientist recommended an airborne form of Ebola) would surely be captured by the proposed law. I have no time for the nonsense of the deep ecologists, but I would object to imprisoning people who think like that. As well, it seems that critics of the proposed constitutional recognition of Aborigines would also be subject to prosecution following on from the Human Rights Commission, *Bringing Them Home* (1997) report, which took a very broad view of the idea of "genocide". It is arguable that opposing most aspects of the agenda of the existing regime could bring one under the law as proposed. Race vilification laws, for example, are now being used to attack any offensive comments made against non-Anglo minority groups - so who knows how the proposed genocide law will mutate over time. Be concerned; be very concerned! ***

THE GLOBAL AND LOCAL ELITES ARE WILLING TO SACRIFICE AUSTRALIA ON THE ALTAR OF RADIOACTIVITY by Tom North

The South Australian Royal commission into the nuclear fuel cycle has held that while the nuclear energy industry should not be expanded, outback South Australia could store for the next 4.46+ billion years (the half life of uranium 238 is 4.46 billion years), 138,000 tonnes or 13% of the world's spent nuclear fuel. The political and economic elites are falling over themselves to pocket billions of dollars.

The Royal commission accepted that the "safe" storage of hazardous radioactive material can be done, with "packaging and containers to prevent waste contaminating groundwater". But who can say what "safe storage" is over vast geological time periods and while South Australia has low seismic activity now, who knows what could happen in the future? Along with this, radioactive material from across the world needs to

be transported safely to Australia, without accident or terrorist attack. It is just not going to happen; Australia will become radioactive.

Clearly the political elites see Australia and its people as expendable, and are willing to sell us out for a few dollars more. Don't let it end this way - fight for our future generations! This is one battle where people from the Left and Right can fight on common ground. Remember, it is not solely a South Australian issue, as radioactive material needs to be transported and contamination means, contamination of all Australia to the end of time, effectively. Where are the greens and environmentalists on this issue? - the silence is deafening.

Write now to the SA Premiere, SA Opposition Leader and PM Turnbull expressing your opposition. ***

(Marxist Dialectic-ed) - SAFE SCHOOLS COALITION: Sexual Politics in the Classroom by Natasha Bita

A taxpayer-funded sexuality program that instructs 11-year-olds to role-play gay teenagers has been accused of crossing the line between education and advocacy in the classroom. The controversial Safe Schools Coalition program, which teaches high school students in years 7 and 8 about sexual diversity and inclusion, is pitting religious groups against gay rights advocates.

Ostensibly an anti-bullying program, it takes a politically correct approach to sex education. Teachers are told it is "heterosexist" to refer to students as "girls and boys". Prepubescent children are taught the meaning of terms such as "queer", "pansexual", "sister girl" and "trans guy".

Nearly 500 of Australia's schools are using the program and Victoria has ordered all government schools to sign on by 2019. The program's teaching guide, *All of Us*, includes a role-playing lesson plan in which kids as young as 11 are told to imagine they are 16 and going out with "someone they are really into".

Half the students pretend they are with someone of the same sex; the others have a partner of the opposite sex. Students have to answer 10 questions including: "When you go out with a group of friends to the movies, would you feel comfortable giving your partner a hug or a kiss?"

They also need to name four famous Australians "with the same kind of relationship as you". Children are even asked to imagine losing their genitalia, in a lesson on transgender experiences. "Indicate to your students that you are talking about gender and not sex by asking them to consider what makes them female or male," the teaching manual says.

"Most students will mention their genitalia. Extend the discussion by asking students what it would mean in terms of their gender if they were to lose that part of

themselves." The manual tells children to ask people if they prefer to be known as he, she, ze or they. It states that referring to "boys and girls" is a form of "heterosexism", which assumes that everyone is, or should be, heterosexual. "Phrases like 'ladies and gentlemen' or 'boys and girls' should be avoided," it says.

The Safe Schools Coalition also promotes a book for children as young as four, *The Gender Fairy*, which author Jo Hirst explains is "about two transgender children who are not fluid and make the choice to socially transition."

Hirst wrote the book to help her young son describe his experience of being transgender...

Greg Donnelly, a Labor Party member of the NSW Legislative Council, has accused Safe Schools of "gender bending" in the classroom.

"We are talking about little boys and girls, who are in effect a captured audience, being presented with overt sexual and gender ideology that is being presented as a matter of fact," he tells *Inquirer*...

Taxpayers are funding the program, which the Safe Schools Coalition devised based on advice from a "curriculum consultant" and a group of Melbourne teachers, without input from psychiatrists or paediatricians.

Students' participation in the program does not require parental consent because it is not deemed to be sex education. ***

Read further: <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/inquirer/safe-schools-coalition-sexual-politics-in-the-classroom/news-story/bf58ff141ba0b08bf165e3d53cc8a055>

TO THE PREMIER OF SA

I gather some 120 schools in SA are involving the "Safe Schools" programme. I have been learning about this programme which authentically discourages bullying. Bullying has been around for a long time, even before you and I attended school. It will be difficult to eliminate but I support a commitment to attempt better behaviour. The Safe Schools programme unfortunately casts a much wider net and it is that aspect which I oppose and ask that it be eliminated from the programme.

The terms "Ladies and Gentlemen" and "Girls and Boys" are a most accurate description of the genders and ages applying in our society. To encourage such common-sense terms to be avoided is absolutely ridiculous.

Another part of the programme encourages students to "consider they are in a same-sex relationship" as part of an exercise. The extension of which is the promotion of same-sex marriages.

I ask you; where is this taking society? Do you really believe we will be better as a result of such stupidity? Why not promote decency? Society has enough social problems now without poisoning the minds of the young. It is little wonder we need so many Chaplains and Counsellors who try to help with the 'wreckage'. It is bad enough now without promotion in the schools.

Sincerely, *Ken Grundy*

CANCER SCREENING: The Controversy by Brian Simpson

The Australian National Review.com (January 28, 2016) reports on an article in the British Medical Journal entitled: "Why cancer screening has never been shown to 'save lives' - and what we can do about it". Cancer screening has apparently not 'saved lives' because disease-specific reductions in mortality do not mean that there are reductions in overall mortality, and in specific cases screening can increase overall mortality, such as mis-classification and over-diagnosis. For example, millions of men have been diagnosed with 'pre-cancers' and 'early-stage of the prostate cancers' that they did not have, the ANR article says, based on a 2013 National Cancer Institute report.

Further, regarding the prostate, 'prostate specific antigen' (PSA) testing yields numerous false positive results, which contribute to over 1 million prostate biopsies a year. Prostate biopsies are associated with serious harms, including admission to hospital and death. Moreover, men diagnosed with prostate cancer are more likely to have a heart attack or commit suicide in the year after diagnosis or to die of complications of treatment for cancer that may never have caused symptoms!

If that doesn't lead me to eating healthy anticancer food and herbs, nothing will!

ACTION TARGETS FOR THE WEEK

Safe Schools: refer to the article on Page 7 for points to write to your State and Federal MP because both are funding it. Ask them to stop funding such a depraved programme. There are important policies requiring funds elsewhere.

The Trans Pacific Partnership: Don't let up on this one which is about to be debated in Parliament. Write to cross-bench senators (Independent and minor parties) as well as selected coalition and ALP Senators.

Nuclear Waste: Note the article in this *On Target*. Let your State and Federal MP's know that we are not going to be a Nuclear Waste Dump for the rest of the world. The lack of revenue has caused a reversal in South Australian ALP ranks over this issue. They will accept anything if there is a dollar to be made. No doubt the Federal Coalition sees it as an opportunity to reduce the need for the State to go begging to Canberra.

Keep reporting to Head Office, those replies from MP's on any of these matters.

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 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 SA
Phone: (08) 7123 7131;

All Other States:

To either Victorian or South Australian addresses.

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

Note: The views expressed in these articles are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policy of the Australian League of Rights.