



- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Print Post Publication Number 100000815

Vol. 52 No. 30

29th July 2016

IN THIS ISSUE

Turning Multiculturalism On Its Head by Joseph Pearce	1
Poorer Than Their Parents	2
Our Nation's Constitution and Legal System	3
Target for the Week	4

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK:

What is Social Credit?

I have often been asked to explain it in a nutshell. So, as far as the **purely economic aspects of Social Credit** are concerned, here it goes:

Social Credit is a proposal for a) the public regulation of the financial system (i.e., the banking and cost accountancy system), in conformity with b) the objective truth of the economy's physical potential and actual performance, for the sake of c) enhancing the common good of the individual citizens who make up a nation.

The necessary implication of this definition is, of course, that the existing financial system is not designed to adequately reflect or mirror the facts of the real economy, nor is it designed to serve the common good. Instead, it limits and distorts the real economy and serves the interests of an oligarchic elite. - *M. Oliver Heydorn*

TURNING MULTICULTURALISM ON ITS HEAD by Joseph Pearce

G.K. Chesterton believed that we all needed to stand on our heads so that we could see things the right way up. This topsy-turvydom is not mere Chestertonian madness or "paradox" but a practical way of reorienting our perspective. We often believe that we see things the right way up and we, therefore, take our perception of things for granted. If, however, we are seeing things askew without knowing it, standing on our heads will allow us to see them from the new angle necessary to see them correctly. Solzhenitsyn's words are a case in point. They show us that true multiculturalism in the form of a plurality of thriving national cultures is a good thing. The problem is not that multiculturalism is bad but that the form of it we are being sold by the globalists is not really multiculturalism at all.

How often are we told that those who oppose the Islamization of Europe, or who want limits on immigration levels, or who demand the restitution of national sovereignty are thereby opposed to multiculturalism? Indeed the headlines are currently full of such accusations, fueled by the globalist reaction to Brexit and to the rise of the so-called New Right across Europe. Are the ethnocentric parties throughout Europe opposed to multiculturalism, as the globalists proclaim, or are they the true multiculturalists?

Let's compare the two forms of multiculturalism. The globalist variety does not want a multiplicity of multifarious national cultures; they want a melting pot in which all cultures meld into a global culture in which everyone wears the same global brands of clothing, shops at the same global chains, watches the same global movies and TV programs, plays the same global games, and listens to the same global music. What they want, in fact, is not any real form of multiculturalism but a worldwide monoculture of standardized people, reduced to being mere consumers of the bread and circuses that the global plutocracy provides for them. This mad and manic monoculture is what the globalists call multiculturalism.

In contrast, the subsidiarist view of multiculturalism as envisaged by Solzhenitsyn and those of kindred ilk calls for the thriving of independent national, regional, and local cultures. It calls for a Europe of the Nations and not a European Union. It seeks a patchwork-quilt cultural landscape in which local customs and cuisines flourish and are not mown down by the globalist insistence on standardization by a low standard in which the global brand is invariably bland.

(continued on next page)

When all is said and done, the globalists only seek temporary multiculturalism as a means to a global monoculture. Theirs is a false and sinister multiculturalism designed to destroy the authentic multiplicity of cultures, the latter of which have grown organically from the soil and soul of their peoples.

The globalist form of multiculturalism is in reality nothing less than cultural imperialism in which a global plutocracy imposes its will on the people, selling them the products that it produces and poisoning the roots of all cultures in which it comes into contact. The goal of the globalists is to plough down nations and their cultures in the same manner in which agribusiness ploughs down hedgerows, turning the richness of the patchwork landscape into a prairie wasteland in which only one brand of bland mass-produced culture is permitted. Such willful destruction of the cultural environment can be called many things but it is really Orwellian newspeak and doublethink of the most outrageous sort, worthy of the chutzpah of Big Brother himself, to have the temerity to call it “multiculturalism.”

Books by Joseph Pearce may be found in The Imaginative Conservative Bookstore.

Ref: theimaginativeconservative.org/2016/07/turning-multiculturalism-head.html

POORER THAN THEIR PARENTS

According to Chris Matthews of *Fortune* magazine: “The Death of the Middle Class Is Worse Than You Think”: From Brexit to Donald Trump, if there’s anything that current events tell us, it’s that the man on the street is angry and wants change.

A new report from the McKinsey Global Institute, with the chilling title: “Poorer than their Parents: Flat or Falling Incomes in Advanced Economies,” shows just why this is the case. According to the paper, the trend in stagnating or declining incomes for middle class workers is not just confined to the United States, but is a global phenomenon hurting workers across the wealthy world. The report found that as much as 70 percent of the households in 25 advanced economies saw their earnings drop in the past decade ...

A huge swath of the world’s population, one that had been taught to expect their material wealth to grow through their lifetimes and across generations, has learned that this promise was a lie...

Read further here: <http://fortune.com/2016/07/13/middle-class-death/>

Generational Warfare and the (false) Scarcity of Wealth by Arnis Luks

I came across another article about the poor financial status of the younger generation here:
<http://theconversation.com/stark-divide-between-young-and-old-as-australian-household-incomes-and-wealth-stall-62534>

The article subliminally attempts to divide the young and the old, pitting the generations against each other, as if one generation’s financial position is in some way the fault that causes the other generation to miss out. This is the Marxist dialectic - the Marxist philosophical view, their reality. It is not my reality of an abundant world, a world where there is more than enough and ‘*my cup runneth over*’.

The article fails to realistically look at the abundance of the material world. The author presents using (lies, damn lies and statistics), their point of view (philosophy) that

there is a shortage, that there is a scarcity, (of which there is not enough building materials, land, initiative and of course finance) so these young may never own their own home, and it is the fault of the older generation.

This is a religious point of view, dialectical materialism or puritanism. Both capitalist and communist have this same point of view.

The article does not look at finance as a ‘policy of a philosophy’, but that is what it is. The existing financial policy is formulated to always present a shortage, a scarcity to the community, to ensure they are always kept poor in order to control them.

Had the financial policy been based on a philosophy of abundance, there would be sufficient finance to purchase what each community is capable of producing. The material wealth of each generation would be based on what is physically possible by that generation.

The wages of the younger generation have stagnated and not followed the increased cost of houses. But have houses really cost more to produce (materials and energy), or is that an outcome of financial policy? There is especially no question of the disparity of wages (income) and final costs of production - (A & B theorem). Only of charts and trends.

With automation, advanced control technology, robotics, computer science and the like, we are able to set machines to do the tasks of many, many men. The curse of Adam has been lifted.

We must open our eyes to see it, to place our Faith (our outworking of our philosophy) into a ‘new financial system’ that reflects the abundance, the wonderful provision that is before us.

In a previously posted article I presented the case against poor manufacture, in that case chainsaws, but it is the same for all manufacture of products including houses.

(continued from previous page)

For new houses in Australia, we use the 'light building code'. They are produced with 'designed flaws' to fail at a given life-cycle. Had the product (house) been manufactured to a quality standard, to ensure the life-cycle of the product was 'as long as possible', there would only be the need to manufacture once. This is the real environmental vandalism and it is driven by financial policy. The producer is financially forced to always look at expanding markets rather than only produce the best quality item once.

The global warming religion, which is what it is, a set of beliefs, also presents a scarcity, a shortage of energy that too must be rationed out. It is based on the same philosophy of scarcity. I have only heard from a few scientists about the stripping of carbon from the soil by the use of agri-chemicals and monoculture. I have read articles by only one scientist (Christine Jones) on carbon sequestration back to the soil by planting different grasses in unison, working together, complimenting each other as a cohesive whole.

OUR NATION'S CONSTITUTION AND LEGAL SYSTEMS

In the following article, written quite a number of years ago, Hewlett Edwards takes us back into British history where the direction of the British peoples was dramatically altered and the foundational Constitutional concepts were being lost to sight.

I WENT AND HID THY TALENT IN THE EARTH by Hewlett Edwards

Martin of Patteshull, Dean of St. Paul's; William of Raleigh, Bishop of Winchester; Henry of Bracton, Archdeacon of Exeter Cathedral. These and those around them (1154-1272) were the formulators of Common Law, unique and of England.

Continuing over generations this formulation did not consist merely in the redrafting of something which existed, or the devising of something new. Such men were not isolated intellectuals detached from their own time and generation but were the outcome of age-long Christendom.

First, what they had behind them in their great work was Christian tradition and its interpretation in Canon Law, second immemorial custom, slowly acquiring the weight of law; and third Natural Law which, as Stephen Langton said, is binding on Princes and Bishops alike, there being no escape from it.

Dealing with problems as they arose:

Around them was present change, in the gradual acceptance elsewhere of Roman Law, with its compact organisation and its tendency towards abstractionism. Custom slowly generated the principles of Common Law with Canon Law as a natural bridge connecting legal ideas with interpretation of the New Testament, and

This working together as a 'cohesive whole' compliments the diversity within each community. The observed real world is a 'unity in diversity', not monotheistic. Our philosophy, as stated in the Athanasian Creed, reinforces this; not the other way around.

The older generation has the wisdom of years. The younger generation has the enthusiasm and energy. Both generations compliment each other. They both have much to give.

Let us not allow a division, when working together we can achieve so much and there being an increment of association it will take all generations even further.

Finance must become 'a policy of a philosophy' and that philosophy is one of abundance - Christian.

<http://alor.org/Library/Murray%20HM%20-%20The%20A%20B%20Theorem.pdf>

<http://alor.org/Library/Douglas%20CH%20-%20The%20Policy%20of%20a%20Philosophy.pdf> ***

theology based upon it. The synthesis of these varying strands of thought and practice embodied the structure of the Constitution; a synthesis consonant with growth, for the technique was in the heart of life and day to day affairs, dealing with problems as they arose; each decision constituting another link to take the stress which caused the problem to arise, much as the budding of new leaves requires a greater strength to carry them, which is supplied by growth. Magna Carta itself was a case, and that decision a precedent, not a completion.

This continuity of growth received articulation in the *Year Books*; "a matchless record of the dealings of the King's Courts with free men and women of England and of their relations with one another as this appeared in evidence before the Court."

Power, Authority and the Just Price

From out of this practice of the principles of Christian philosophy, England became a society of free and reasonable men and women, living in a free and responsible community. As part of the same process emerged the solution of the primary problem of society: the disposition of power.

Christian theology converged with the nature of reality in the trinitarian constitution; the three Estates of the Realm. **The King**- "the fountain of honour and justice"- was executive as to the power entrusted to him by his subjects the Commons, and Lords Temporal. Authority was represented by **The Lords Spiritual**; the Lord Chancellor, invariably a Churchman, was recognised as "**the King's Conscience**." So far as humanity has yet experienced, it is this balance between Authority, Power, and the Executive...

(continued on next page)

(continued from previous page)

...which alone can stand against relapse by human frailty, into pagan totalitarianism.

A clear distinction was drawn between matters mundane dealt with by the King's Courts and those spiritual which fell to the Courts Christian. Among the latter was usury, "the taking from a borrower of a payment solely for the use of money lent to him to be applied by him in the normal way as a means of exchange." This was prohibited.

In this sphere Church law was met by enactment in the King's Court concerning the "just price."

Whereas Roman law sanctioned the idea that each man had the right to outreach others as far as he could, a Statute of Edward III clearly envisaged the conception that price should be reasonably related to cost.

The wrong use of money was recognised as a source of corruption and these measures had a profound effect upon the whole range of economic life, embodying the injunction "whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye also unto them"...

Read the full article here: <http://alor.org/The%20Social%20Creditor/Volume%2023/The%20Social%20Creditor%20Vol%2023%20No%2023%20Feb%204%201950.pdf>

CORRECTION

OnTarget Vol.52 No.28 made mention of a change to the format of OnTarget and NewTimes Survey; for both to be reduced to 4 pages.

This is incorrect.

NewTimes Survey will continue with the 8 page format.

TARGET FOR THE WEEK

Support Pauline Hanson and Sonia Kruger for their courageous stand on immigration and the problems of inter-racial violence confronting Australia. We are all entitled to feel safe in our streets. Calling for a halt to Islamic immigration 'only' is seen as discriminatory and hence divisive which invites attacks from many under 18 C. Let us remove that piece of ammo from them! Encourage them to seek a halt to 'all' immigration. We do not need more migrants when unemployment is rising. The jobs are continually being replaced by robots and of course many industries have now re-located overseas. These two ladies are alone in offering a different policy from other mainstream parties which only offer more of the same. **We have never been offered an opportunity to have a say on immigration policy from either of the major parties. It is time we did!**

If we do not change, we will continue down the road to be like France, Belgium, the UK, Sweden and Germany.

Postal addresses:

Pauline Hanson, PO Box 96, Lutwyche. Qld 4030

Sonia Kruger, Channel Nine, PO Box 27, Willoughby. NSW 2068



THE LEAGUE'S WEBSITE: — alor.org
blog.alor.org news.alor.org

OnTarget Subscription \$45.00 p.a.

NewTimes Survey Subscription \$30.00 p.a.

Subscriptions for 'On Target' and 'NewTimes Survey' and **Donations** can be performed on the Veritas Books website. **URL:** veritasbooks.com.au/subscriptions
or by direct bank transfer:

Bank Transfer Account details are:

BSB 083-004

A/c No. 51-511-5296

A/c Title Victorian League of Rights

contact details emailed to hubalor@live.com.au

or by cheques directed to:

'ALOR Journals' or 'ALOR'

c/o Heritage Bookshop,

Level 9, Suite 8, 118-120 Queen Street,
Melbourne, 3000 Victoria

(G.P.O. Box 1052, Melbourne, 3001 Victoria)

Phone: (03) 9600 0677

"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

All League Books are carried by Veritasbooks.com.au

League Books are also available at meetings or from:

Heritage Book Mailing Service

P.O. Box 27, Happy Valley,

5159 South Australia

Phone: (08) 7123 7131

heritagebooks@adam.com.au

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

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.