

A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Vol. 60 No. 21

7th June 2024

IN THIS ISSUE

| | |
|--|----|
| We Must Push for Truth! By Neville Archibald | 21 |
| Live Not By Lies by Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn | 24 |
| The Freedom of Association By Will Waite | 28 |

We Must Push for Truth! By Neville Archibald

Ever sat in on an argument, where the two sides ended up agreeing to disagree? Then the combatants went back to the bar and ordered another drink and continued on with another discussion on another subject or went back to work doing together whatever it was before. Seldom have I seen it so bad that they become lifelong enemies over a disagreement neither can solve.

What do we have in place in society today, when one group of people disagree with another? Has it changed that much from the past?

Of the many different reasons for this conflict, some are more serious than others. If it is trivial, very few take it serious enough to let it influence their lives, and rightly so.

On the other hand, when it is potentially life threatening or could lead to long term consequences, both sides need to consider their arguments and replies. Each point of contention needs to be examined and accepted or dismissed on the basis of truth. If the truth is not known, investigation must take place, both sides must insist on fair and coherent research, unbiased.

There are several things we are facing at the moment that are not among these amicable rules of discovery. Active forces exist that stifle debate on topics ranging from economics and health to personal freedom. Who is it out there that would stifle such discussion? Who is it that is saying, quite often these days, that we cannot refute it, “the science is settled!”?.

More and more our media plays a significant part in this one-sided story. Once a bastion of investigation, with mottos on headers that said things in Latin, like “Without Fear or Favour”, or our own *Herald Sun* that used to read, “Impartial-but not neutral”, which now reads, “We’re for you.” My own Local paper had, “Truth without Fear”, and now has nothing.

Where did these lofty sounding ideals go? Have they been relegated to the past? In the new form of media, electronic, instant and wide ranging, what safeguards are there? What comeback do we have?

Right of reply, in the form of letters to the editor were published in the very papers that printed the article. A serious question usually carried a series of articles from both sides. Our Constitutional amendments (referendums) were always preceded by presenting both sides of the debate, in a basically balanced format. For it was up to us to make the final decision, given all the facts. There was always a lead up time for this period of consideration. Considered thought is far better than hasty conclusions. History has always condemned mob rule for that reason, an inflamed and passionate mob can be driven in any direction given the right dogs to round them up. The German people are a testament to this under Hitler. The French, storming the Bastille, during the “glorious revolution”, The English attacking the meeting houses of Quakers during the Cromwell years.

The calming influence of a fair and free press, a developing story that was allowed paper space or airtime, gave time for this defusing of mob opinion. A fantastic story, that was too fantastic was found out eventually. Claims of the sky falling, were slowly rebuffed as each point was allowed its natural demise.

The recent Pandemic and its response was one indicator of the collapse of our systems for debate. As a country we had prepared plans to follow, these were thrown out! Careful and well considered thought went into that program, over years, for just such an occurrence, yet it was thrown out. Replaced with a hasty set of controls that saw large deaths in the elderly and hotel quarantine deaths, that a glance by anyone with reasonable knowledge could have foreseen. Untrained and ill-equipped guards with no real oversight of their training were just expected to appear. The lowest bidder or business considerations more important than medical experience it seems. Other mishandling and restrictions that made no sense from an epidemiological viewpoint were also carried out. True medical knowledge was thrown out of the window along with those prior preparations. Stories about this have rarely included a mention of the previously developed preparations, that were ignored. It is almost like they didn't exist.

Selective reporting of the truth or just accidental omission? Was it deemed too inflammatory, too likely to cause disobedience of the orders in place? If so, who deemed it and under what considered medical advice? Why is this still not available to us? If we are to do it better next time, we need to be able to examine the failings of this recent past and its mistakes.

The next indication of our loss of reasoned argument was the Voice referendum. With little or no real long-term indication of how such a major change would impact us, we were supposed to make a decision based on “the feel of it”. Anyone raising questions was immediately considered racist or uninformed, a hard thing to be when there was very little information to actually inform us. The press again produced little of any content, either due to their lack of information or their desire to be seen as in the populist camp, “woke”. So much for, “without fear or favour”!

Discussions on Broadcast media rarely had two sides and mostly relied on slandering or denigrating any opposition rather than answering properly, the questions asked. Internet content more often than not carried a misinformation/disinformation disclaimer, despite many being legitimate content. Whose oversight led this charge? Are we going to see more of this every time an argument over something occurs? Hold on to your hats!

Climate Change policy, another area of debate, or is it? Many policy decisions are being rammed through parliament with little or no debate. The “Science” on much of this is not settled and the reactions to appease these doomsday adherents is certainly not considered. The impact of many of these appeasements will be far greater than the supposed problem itself. If you cannot afford to live, it matters little if it is a degree or two warmer. In order to meet these zero carbon standards we are creating a pollution time bomb that our children will have to clean up.

Racing headlong into new technology without working out what happens to these vast material roll outs after their lifespan has been reached. It is worse than doing nothing if it means we will have wastelands where heavy metal residues contaminate the land they are buried in. Like the plastic recycling debacle or used-tyre situation, we are no longer able to deal with it, much is being sent overseas to be burnt, out of sight out of mind. Costs to truly deal with it will mean debts that will never be able to be repaid. Where are the investigations to look at these essential questions?

Then we come to the latest, the digital ID. Being touted as, well I’m not too sure actually? There has been so little debate about it, the media has been quiet comparatively, the roll out seems to be favouring the, “don’t say anything”, other than, it makes it easier to do government things. They are hoping our love affairs with our phones and tap and go technology will just make it a foregone conclusion that no one really questions it. Rammed through both houses of parliament without any real debate, no real outside discussion about it at all in papers, TV or online other than a few opposing it, who are being shut down. This identity information grab is passing through with no debate just days after another big scandal about the hacking of personal data, one of many in the recent past. Assurances made by all the so called secure holders of our information and activities, are very vague when it comes to explaining these breaches of security. Do they forget that hackers and professional data miners also advance in their abilities at the same rate? Sometimes they advance faster as they don’t need to go through the bureaucratic two step to make changes.

The House of Representatives and the Senate chambers that make up our government are the last of my list, both of these grand debating chambers are the culmination of centuries of development. Based on the idea that reasoned debate over the matters of the day will lead to the settlement on the best and most accurate reflection of a problem before it. HA! Watch it. Take a moment out of your busy lives to reflect on where we are and who is making these godawful decisions we have to live with. Debate is a back-and-forth discussion, sometimes heated, often with back up information or raised concerns that require more investigation and further debate, especially when serious

matters concerning a whole country is on the table. Go to the broadcast, look to the internet and Hansard live:

<https://www.parliament.vic.gov.au/watch?page=1&pageSize=9&pageSizeMode=3&sorting=10as>

Watch as your favourite puppets dance on their strings. What, your favourite Pinocchio wasn't there?!

Yes indeed, when you view it for a while, all those empty seats are the usual occurrence, the debate you watch is really one or two supporting people making an impassioned speech to an otherwise empty chamber. One or two token opposition must attend, but I'm afraid, unless they think the media might be watching or that somehow, they will be held to account, they are off elsewhere. Maybe they have something better to do, maybe they are listening from their office. I cannot imagine that virtually a whole chamber has more important things to do than take part in our future. Possibly they've been briefed by their minders or the party whip on the case and think they are right, there can be no other side to an argument but theirs. Am I wrong to think this is Arrogant? Am I wrong to expect my representative to listen equally to all the relevant points before coming to a decision? What do you expect?

This continued lack of real discussion, unbiased or not, will never help society evolve onto a better version of itself if it is stifled. Learning requires mistakes and the examination of them. To examine them you must look at all the angles and outcomes. You must be prepared to throw out ideas that are false or don't lead to a satisfactory outcome.

I don't know who is at fault here ultimately. Us for allowing it to get to this point or those herding us like sheep into narrower and narrower races, emasculating us before the final fattening for the slaughter. Reasoned debate is the most useful tool we have as a society to get to the truth. The truth is important, for going against the truth only ever leads to sorrow and a wish that we'd done it right the first time.

*Speak the truth, for the truth will set you free! ****

Live Not By Lies by Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn

12th February 1974

<https://ia800808.us.archive.org/6/items/LiveNotByLies/Live%20Not%20By%20Lies.pdf>

At one time we dared not even to whisper. Now we write and read *samizdat**, and sometimes when we gather in the smoke room at the Science Institute we complain frankly to one another: What kind of tricks are they playing on us, and where are they dragging us. * *reproduced underground publications passed from reader to reader*

Gratuitous boasting of cosmic achievements while there is poverty and destruction at home. Propping up remote, uncivilized regimes. Fanning up civil war. And we recklessly fostered Mao Tse-tung at our expense – and it will be we who are sent to war against him, and will have to go. Is there any way out?

And they put on trial anybody they want, and they put sane people in asylums – always they, and we are powerless. Things have almost reached rock bottom.

A universal spiritual death has already touched us all, and physical death will soon

flare up and consume us both and our children – but as before we still smile in a cowardly way and mumble with our tongues tied. But what can we do to stop it? We haven't the strength? We have been so hopelessly dehumanized that for today's modest ration of food we are willing to abandon all our principles, our souls, and all the efforts of our predecessors and all opportunities for our descendants – but just don't disturb our fragile existence.

We lack staunchness, pride and enthusiasm. We don't even fear universal nuclear war death, and we don't fear a third world war. We have already taken refuge in crevices. We just fear acts of Civil courage. We fear only to lag behind the herd and to take a step alone, and suddenly find ourselves without white bread, without heating gas and without a Moscow registration.

We have been indoctrinated in political courses, and in just the same way was fostered the idea to live comfortably, and all will be well for the rest of our lives. You can't escape your environment and social conditions.

Everyday life defines consciousness. What does it have to do with us? We can't do anything about it? But we can – everything. But we lie to ourselves for assurance. And it is not they who are to blame for everything – we ourselves, only we.

One can object: Gags have been stuffed into our mouths. Nobody wants to listen to us and nobody asks us. How can we force them to listen? It is impossible to change their minds.

It would be natural to vote them out of office – but there are no elections in our country.

In the west people know about strikes and protest demonstrations – but we are too oppressed, and it is a horrible prospect for us: How can one suddenly renounce a job and take to the streets? Yet the other fatal paths probed during the past century by our bitter Russian history are, nevertheless, not for us and truly we don't need them.

Now that the axes have done their work, when everything which was sown has sprouted anew, we can see that the young and presumptuous people who thought they would make out country just and happy though terror, bloody rebellion and civil war were themselves misled. No thanks, fathers of education! Now we know that infamous methods breed infamous results. Let our hands be clean! The circle – is it closed?

And is there really no way out? And is there only one thing left for us to do, to wait without taking action? Maybe something will happen by itself? It will never happen as long as we daily do not sever ourselves from the most perceptible of its aspects: Lies.

When Violence intrudes into peaceful life, its face glows with self-confidence, as if it were carrying a banner and shouting: "I am violence. Run away, make way for me – I will crush you." But Violence Quickly grows old. And it has lost confidence within itself, and in order to maintain a respectable face it summons falsehoods as its ally- since violence lays its ponderous paw not every day and not on every shoulder. It demands from us only obedience to lies and daily participation in lies – all loyalty lies in that.

And the simplest and most accessible key to our self-neglected liberation lies right here: Personal non-participation in lies.

Though lies conceal everything, though lies embrace everything – not with any help from me. This opens a breach in the imaginary encirclement caused by our inaction. It is the easiest thing to do for us but the most devastating for the lies. Because when people renounce lies it simply cuts short their existence. Like an infection, they can exist only in a living organism.

We do not exhort ourselves. We have not sufficiently matured to march into the squares and shout the truth out loud or to express aloud what we think. It's not necessary. It's dangerous. But let us refuse to say that which we do not think. This is our path, the easiest and most accessible one, which takes into account our inherent cowardice, already well rooted. And it is much easier – it's dangerous even to say this – than the sort of civil disobedience which Gandhi advocated.

Our path is to walk away from the gangrenous boundary. If we did not paste together the dead bones and scales of ideology, if we did not sew together the rotting rags, we would be astonished how quickly the lies would be rendered helpless and subside. That which should be naked would then really appear naked before the whole world.

So, in our timidity, let each of us make a choice: Whether to remain a conscious servant of falsehood (of course, it is not out of inclination, but to feed one's family, that one raises his children in the spirit of lies). Or to shrug off the lies and become an honest man worthy of respect both by one's children and contemporaries.

And from that day onward he:

- Will not henceforth write, sign, or print in any way a single phrase which in his opinion distorts the truth.
- Will utter such a phrase neither in private conversation nor in the presence of many people, neither on his own behalf nor at the prompting of someone else, neither in the role of agitator, teacher or education nor in a theatrical role.
- Will not depict foster or broadcast a single idea which he can see is false or a distortion of the truth whether it be in painting, sculpture, photography technical science or music.
- Will not cite out of context, either orally or a written, a single quotation so as to please someone, to feather his own nest, to achieve success in his work, if he does not share completely the idea which is quoted, or if it does not accurately reflect the matter at issue.
- Will not allow himself to be compelled to attend demonstrations or meetings if they are contrary to his desire or will, will neither take into hand nor raise into the air a poster or slogan which he does not completely accept.
- Will not raise hand to vote for a proposal with which he does not sincerely sympathize.
- Will vote neither openly nor secretly for a person whom he considers unworthy or doubtful abilities.
- Will not allow himself to be dragged to a meeting where there can be expected a force of distorted discussion of a question.
- Will immediately walk out of a meeting, session, lecture, performance or film

showing if he hears a speaker tell lies, or purvey ideological nonsense or shameless propaganda.

- Will not subscribe or buy a newspaper or magazine in which information is distorted and primary facts are concealed.

Of course we have not listed all of the possible and necessary deviations from falsehood. But a person who purifies himself will easily distinguish other instances with his purified outlook. No, it will not be the same with everyone at first. Some, at first will lose their jobs. For young people who want to live in truth, this will in the beginning, complicate their young lives very much, because the required recitations are stuffed with lies, and it is necessary to make a choice.

But there are no loopholes for anybody who wants to be honest. On any given day one of us will be confronted with at least one of the above-mentioned choices even in the most secure of the technical sciences. Either truth or falsehood: Toward spiritual independence or toward spiritual servitude.

And he who is not sufficiently courageous even to defend his own soul – don't let him be proud of his “progressive” views, and don't let him boast that is an academician or a people's artist, a merited figure, or a general – let him say to himself: I am in the herd, and a coward. It's all the same to me so long as I'm fed and warm.

Even this path, which is the most modest of all paths of resistance, will not be easy for us. But it is much easier than self-immolation or a hunger strike: The flames will not envelop your body, your eyeballs will not burst from the heat, and brown bread and clean water will always be available to your family.

A great people of Europe, the Czechoslovaks, whom we betrayed and deceived: Haven't they shown us how a vulnerable breast can stand up even against tanks if there is a worthy heart within it?

You say it will not be easy? But it will be the easiest of all possible resources. It will not be an easy choice for a body, but it is the only one for a soul. It is not an easy path. But there are already people, even dozens of them, who over the years have maintained all these points and live by truth.

So you will not be the first to take this path, but will join those who have already taken it. This path will be easier and shorter for all of us if we take it by mutual efforts and in close rank. If there are tens of thousands of us then we would not even recognize our country.

If we are too frightened, then we should stop complaining that someone is suffocating us. We ourselves are doing it. Let us then bow down even more, let us wail, and our brothers the biologists will help bring nearer the day when they are able to read our thoughts and that they are worthless and hopeless.

And if we get cold feet, even taking this step, then we are indeed worthless and hopeless, and the scorn of Pushkin should be directed to us:

Why should cattle have the gifts of freedom?

Their heritage from generation to generation is the belled yoke and lash.

The Freedom of Association By Will Waite -

antidote to the subordination of the individual to the group

<https://thepeoplescredit.com.au/substack-articles/>

<https://alternativesx.substack.com/p/the-freedom-of-association>

The relationship of the group to the individual is the central theme constant throughout the Douglas Social Credit story. The question as to how the individual may reap the benefits of group activity without him becoming dominated by the group is the problem which Douglas sought to unravel.

The objective of Douglas' economic proposals is to grant to each individual the freedom of association. That is the power of the individual to choose what they will or will not support with their time and energy. The problem is that while it is true we are free to quit our jobs if we like, for most of us, the penalty for doing so is financial hardship or having to immediately resume something similar to that which we were, in quitting, trying to get away from.

At the moment many of us are coerced by the economic system into supporting activities for an income, with secondary importance given to the quality of contribution that we make through our work. At the same time, much of the necessary work that contributes so significantly to human well-being — the raising of families, voluntary community service, self-education, physical and mental nourishment, care for the sick and tired — is being edged out by expanding financial commitments in a vicious cycle of social deterioration.

Platitudes about duty aside, we must acknowledge that in the main people submit to economic associations for their own benefit. The actual activity performed is, so far as individuals are concerned, a less important factor. Because the money paid for work is more important to the individual than the job done, it is inevitable that people will persist with a bad job for the sake of the monetary reward. In this way commercial activity is able to, and increasingly does, bypass moral concerns effective in other areas of peoples' lives.

It is a dangerous system that places large numbers of individuals in positions whereby their physical needs can only be satisfied by periodic payment so long as they unquestioningly do as they are told by increasingly distant and indifferent authority.

Fundamentally what we are talking about here is the tension which exists between the individual and the group. It is undeniable that there is great advantage to be gained by people associating in groups. For instance, the modern productive system is a cooperative venture that enables people in association to get the necessities of life in a fraction of the time and energy it would take to secure these things on their own. But, so far as the individual is concerned, the advantages of associating in groups for economic purposes are reduced to nothing if the conditions of work, or the time it demands, does not endow greater freedom personally.

In Social Credit, first published in 1924, Douglas summarised the policy of the hidden government, which controls money to administer a system of rewards and punishments, as simply the treatment of individuality as subordinate to the group.

“The appeal” he said, “is away from the conscious-reasoning individual, to the unconscious herd instinct.” Douglas focuses in on the practical result of this in his chapter on The Relation of the Group to the Individual:

The shifting of emphasis from the individual to the group, which is involved in collectivism, logically involves the shifting of responsibility for action. For instance, the individual killing of one man by another we term murder. But collective killing, we dignify by the name of war, and we specifically absolve the individual from the consequences of any acts which are committed under the orders of a superior officer.¹

But if we keep in mind that we live in a world that does not necessarily conform to the intentions good or otherwise of superior officers, captains of industry, politicians etc. and “that over every place of action with which we are acquainted, action and reaction are equal, opposite, and wholly automatic” then we will see the danger of such an approach to human organisation. To return to Douglas’ example of war, while “there “may be, *ex-hypothesi*, no moral guilt attributable to the individual who goes to war; the effect of intercepting the line of flight of a high-speed bullet will be found to be exactly the same whether it is fired by a national or private opponent.”²

The widespread absorption of the individual into the group and the consequent suspension of individual reason and responsibility occurs at every level. At a school where I worked, I was once told by the head of the health and physical education faculty that he would do his job standing on his head if he was told to. The implication being that the following of orders would, by a very long distance, take priority over the efficient performance of his teaching duties. Needless to say, he would not have considered carrying out his own business inverted.

The financial system makes money the prime consideration of human organisation. The prioritising of this external and highly manipulated medium amounts to negligence of the causal nature of the universe. We must recalibrate the financial mechanism so that it allows for the building of society on the only legitimate basis that exists —the satisfaction of the individual.

The practical remedies of Douglas Social Credit, consisting of the national dividend and the compensated price, would not only take the friction out of the economic machine, it would ultimately provide people with the power to exercise their judgement about what projects are worthy of their support. All sorts of activity that persist because they provide employment would suddenly have to justify themselves on more than just financial grounds. Surely it would be an advance if the financial mechanism could be made to support the individual in bringing their standards of common decency and sense into the economic sphere. The present state of affairs that sees the money our society requires to carry out its business inadequately dispensed for the purpose of providing a tiny minority with extravagant profits and power is ludicrously illogical and unbalanced.

Douglas once said that the fundamental objection to slavery was not bad treatment, but that it deprived slaves of control over their own policy. For most people the economic order amounts to the same thing. Conversely, the democratic idea asserts

that free choice at the individual level should be the operative force in shaping society. Douglas defined liberty as the “freedom to choose or refuse one thing at a time.” If we accept this definition, we cannot say we enjoy a state of liberty while we are forced to trade our personal judgement for economic security. The freedom to choose our associations without fear is the why of the economic proposals of Douglas Social Credit.

1 Douglas, C.H. 1924. *Social Credit*. Eyre and Spottiswoode, London.

2 Ibid.

The Reeds of Runnymede - Rudyard Kipling (MAGNA CHARTA, JUNE 15, 1215)

At Runnymede, at Runnymede,
What say the reeds at Runnymede?
The lissom reeds that give and take,
That bend so far, but never break.
They keep the sleepy Thames awake
With tales of John at Runnymede.

At Runnymede, at Runnymede,
Oh hear the reeds at Runnymede:—
“You must n’t sell, delay, deny,
A freeman’s right or liberty,
It wakes the stubborn Englishry,
We saw ’em roused at Runnymede!

“When through our ranks the Barons came,
With little thought of praise or blame,
But resolute to play the game,
They lumbered up to Runnymede;
And there they launched in solid line,
The first attack on Right Divine—
The curt, uncompromising ‘Sign!’
That settled John at Runnymede.

“At Runnymede, at Runnymede,
Your rights were won at Runnymede!
No freeman shall be fined or bound,
Or dispossessed of freehold ground,
Except by lawful judgment found
And passed upon him by his peers!
Forget not, after all these years,
The Charter signed at Runnymede.”

And still when Mob or Monarch lays
Too rude a hand on English ways,
The whisper wakes, the shudder plays,
Across the reeds at Runnymede.
And Thames, that knows the moods of
kings,
And crowds and priests and suchlike things,
Rolls deep and dreadful as he brings
Their warning down from Runnymede!

Annual Subscription to ‘*On Target*’ \$75.00 pa which includes an
Insert, the *On Target* and the *NewTimes Survey* journals -
printed and posted monthly.

Donations & Subscriptions can both be performed by
Direct Bank Transfer to:

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

BSB 105-044

A/c No. 188-040-840

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

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

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

Our main website of the Douglas Social Credit and the
Freedom Movement “Archives” :: <https://alor.org/>

On Target is printed and authorised by Arnis J. Luks
13 Carsten Court, Happy Valley, SA.

Essential Reading:

What Is Social Credit?

[https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/
Dobbs_G-What_Is_Social_Credit.pdf](https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Dobbs_G-What_Is_Social_Credit.pdf)

On Planning The Earth

[https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/
Dobbs_G-On_Planning_the_Earth.pdf](https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Dobbs_G-On_Planning_the_Earth.pdf)

The Local World

[https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/
Dobbs_G-The_Local_World.pdf](https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Dobbs_G-The_Local_World.pdf)