

"All that is necessary  
for the triumph of  
evil is that good  
men do nothing . . ."  
— EDMUND BURKE



# THE NEW TIMES SURVEY

THE AUSTRALIAN

LEAGUE OF RIGHTS

Vol. 17 No. 07

Registered Australia Post - Publication PP343214 / 00016

July 2016

## CONTENTS

Can Democracy be Revived by ED Butler (1978)	1
A Realistic Assessment of a 'Hung Parliament'? by Binoy Kampmark	2
Understanding Equity by Owen Barfield	3
Is There 'False Hope' with Trump (and Hanson)? by James Reed and Arnis Luks	7
Health Treasures from the Trash by Mrs Vera West	8

## CAN DEMOCRACY BE REVIVED? by ED Butler (1978)

<http://alor.org/Volume14/Vol14No33.htm>

It is now over 50 years since Lord Hewart, a former Lord Chief Justice of England, warned in his great classic (out of print for many years), *"The New Despotism"*, that there was a conscious policy to make Parliament and Government subservient to a permanent bureaucracy of unelected officials. The sequel to Lord Hewart's warning came after the Second World War with Professor Keeton's chilling work, *"The Passing of Parliament"*.

[http://alor.org/Library/HEWART%20Lord%20Of%20Bury-The\\_New\\_Despotism\\_1929.pdf](http://alor.org/Library/HEWART%20Lord%20Of%20Bury-The_New_Despotism_1929.pdf)

<http://www.abebooks.com/book-search/title/the-passing-of-parliament/author/professor-g-w-keeton/>

It is encouraging that the Speaker of the Commonwealth House of Representatives, Sir Billy Snedden, has called for a reform of Federal Parliament to enable Members of Parliament to control the Executive, which he says is exercising too much power. Sir Billy's comments, made in an address to the Commonwealth Speakers' and Presiding Officers' Conference in Canberra on August 31st, tend to confirm the view of those who believe that Sir Billy Snedden as Speaker has demonstrated qualities not obvious when he led the Liberal Party. His courageous pro-Rhodesian stand early in the year has been recalled by those who hold this view.

Arguing for greater power and stature for the House of Representatives Sir Billy said:

"Clearly, the executive is submerging the Australian legislature to a significant degree, particularly in the House of Representatives, and it has the potential to go further."

He added that while party solidarity had brought stability and strength in government, its rigid application to every issue had been unnecessary and excessive. He said, "The result is that legislation is seen by many as a rubber stamp for the executive and therefore of little importance. Although Sir Billy correctly observed that party solidarity was a major obstacle to reform, he did not point out that one of the major reasons for this "solidarity" is the fear of losing party endorsement, and a lucrative position, by party Members.

He did say that a Government is supported by a "majority of Members who can see that their seats rely upon the executive remaining in power." But some Members refrain from criticising the Government primarily because they fear that without party endorsement, and the financial support provided by the Party machine, they would have little chance of survival. Which leads to the obvious conclusion that the necessary reforms of Parliament will only take place when enough electors free themselves from party domination and unite to make it clear to their Member that he can take an independent stand in Parliament providing he accepts his role as being the servant of the electors.

We agree with Sir Billy when he says "If members broke ranks occasionally, particularly on matters affecting the affairs of the legislature itself, the parliamentary institution could only gain. Members will wait a long time for an executive, which willingly supports significant parliamentary reform, which is not in the executive's own interests. Almost certainly, significant reform will only arise out of action by members." But, we repeat, most Members will only move against their Party if they are confident that they have sufficient electoral support.

The revival of genuine democracy must start at the grassroots, amongst the electors. However, Sir Billy Snedden is to be congratulated for warning of the danger of increasing power being taken by an Executive dictatorship. \*\*\*

<http://veritasbooks.com.au/our-sham-democracy-or-the-majority-vote-racket-%E2%80%93-james-guthrie>

## A REALISTIC ASSESSMENT OF A 'HUNG PARLIAMENT'? by Binoy Kampmark

Hung parliaments are deemed the bane of the Westminster System. It makes politicians sweat, policymakers work, and the broader system of representative government unusually representative. The latter part is particularly irksome for the majoritarians.

Authoritarian tendencies are never far away from the politically elected. It is always easy to become hubristic when voters go your way, less so when they prefer other options of balance and discernment. Majoritarianism tends to be one of the great dangers of democracy practice, largely because it assumes that the stronger the backing for one force, the more democratic it is.

The fallacy of untrammelled majority rule ignores what parliamentary practice tends to be. Well it may be that governments are elected with a majority, but the rules of representation demand that other parties and voices are accounted for. Strictly speaking, governments may make laws, but parliament passes them in a final vote.

The Australian elections this early July gave politicians a richly deserved outcome. It shocked Turnbull's conservative government of the day, but did not award victory to Bill Shorten's opposition Labor party. While Australia's parliament, notably the lower house, could do with many more independents, it was heartening to see five come through in a body with 150 seats.

This is where the hung parliament comes into play. No government of the day will be entitled to treat debate as a cosmetic exercise. Policies will have to be thought out instead of rammed through with indifference. (No government with majorities in either the Senate or the Lower house ever *genuinely-ed* debates anything.)

This point is easily missed by Australian political commentators who find the idea of a shredded majority disturbing. They have nightmares that Australia will become a pseudo-Italian state, marred by the corrosion of changing governments. *The Australian* foreshadowed three years of chaos, with the prospect of another election in 12 months. (Never accept an electorate's viewpoint till they come around to your viewpoint; but that would be the view of a Rupert Murdoch paper.)

Little thought is given to the obvious fact that Parliament never goes through such a door, remaining with entrenched institutional defiance. Politicians still remain to pass acts. Debates continue *(in the party room-ed)*, irrespective of what party decides to subject their leader to decapitation.

The close election result from July 2 makes perfect historical sense. The entire premise of dissolving both chambers of parliament by the Prime Minister had been to obtain irrepressible numbers by popular demand. That Malcolm Turnbull assumed he would get such unqualified support suggests a total absence of sentience

*New Times Survey*

in Canberra's governance. The disgust in what must be one of the more stable political systems in the world, with the tribal blood-letting has been well stated in these election results. Neither side should govern outright. If governing parties cannot get their act together, they deserve a good electoral scolding at the polling booth, and more appropriately, some restraint in practice. Such figures certainly should not be encouraged in their usual form of behaviour.

Both major parties have found political assassination irresistible. The Australian Labour Party under Kevin Rudd and Julia Gillard specialised in sessions of regicide when in government, instigated by party pollsters and propaganda wonks who confused approval ratings with effectiveness in government.

In 2013, when Tony Abbott, a conservative prime minister, made his way to the office, it took till 2015 for his own party to tire of him. The excuses in removing Abbott in favour of the more conciliatory Turnbull were all too familiar in their historical rhyming: poor consultation, episodes of mania, the firm influence of an inner unelected circle constituted of one.

This Australian parliament, notably at the senate level, has the potential to be as colourful as the last, though establishment chatterboxes fear that some of the figures seem all too reactionary. In her return to national politics, Pauline Hanson of the One Nation Party will again make her presence felt in Canberra, keeping company with a host of other plain speakers who loathe party machines.

Hanson, more than any other member of parliament, has every reason to feel that her pugnacious ideas on halting the arrival of immigrants, refugees and human beings not quite familiar with the "Aussie" way of living, were purloined by various governments from the late 1990s onwards.

Hanson is only a scourge in so far as her crude siege philosophy has been totally integrated into Australian political life. Conveniently called racist, her views pair rather well with the concentration camp essentials of Australian refugee policy.

The attitudinal change inflicted by a hung parliament is a blissful thing indeed. Rather than being dismissed in a flurry of authoritarian sentiments, it should be embraced as a productive enterprise. Any decent history of the traumatic years of the Gillard minority government will show, that working with crossbenchers and independents is exactly what democratic government is all about. Besides, such trauma is always exaggerated, usually by the calculatingly unimaginative. \*\*\*

**Source:** <http://www.onlineopinion.com.au/print.asp?article=18361>

## UNDERSTANDING EQUITY by Owen Barfield

**INTRODUCTION** *Barfield provides a powerful explanation of the origin of the term equity as understood in English law and, therefore, in the field of commerce. With the precision of a legal mind, he makes comprehensible one of the most fundamental yet subtle aspects of modern economic life - its reliance on equity, both as regards the rights between human beings and its use to mean, misleadingly, acquired wealth. Not everyone is minded to engage in the complexities of law, and yet we need to understand them for we rely on them. As Barfield quietly unfolds his logical exposition, the reader finds himself arriving inside, as it were, the meaning of equity, and thus better able to recognise its deep significance for human affairs, but also the danger of too superficial, too ill-informed, and too selfish an interpretation of that significance.*

**Full text version available here:**

<http://www.owenbarfield.org/equity-between-man-and-man/>

“In his lectures on economics, Rudolf Steiner speaks of the way in which the economic process of the production and consumption of commodities subsists between two poles: Nature and Spirit (*in more English and economic parlance, land and intelligence - ed.*). In the first place human labour operates upon nature; in the second place the creating and organising spirit works upon human labour, ‘saving’ it and making it more and more productive; and in this way the thing which we call capital is built up. Steiner goes on to point out how it is not merely morally but also economically necessary that - as a third stage - the capital so accumulated should be placed at the service of the spirit and thus allowed indirectly (that is, via its disbursement on educative and other spiritual activities) to flow back into the land and into further production. Instead of this the spirit is omitted, and as a result huge masses of capital pile up in mortgages and land-values and produce a terrible congestion, that most people today consider, illusorily, as wealth.

*illusorily - tending to deceive*

If we ask, what makes possible the accumulation of capital, its conversion into personal wealth and, above all, its congestion in the form of land-values and upon the security of land, the answer is short and simple. It is the fact that there is a law of property, that men have certain rights as against each other, rights which the law guarantees and will if necessary enforce. The history of the law of property is the history of these rights. The basic distinction is, of course, the distinction between land on the one side and all other kinds of property on the other. English law calls these two classes **Real Property** and **Personal Property**.

To understand the law of real property, it is necessary to be able to think with a certain amount of sympathy of the feudal system. In a feudal society, we have, to begin with, a social organism in which the land is everything and the human being (except possibly for a few exalted nobles) is attached to it. The notion that the word ‘law’ involves a separate, abstract system of personal rights, rights independent of topography and attaching equally to all men simply because they are men, is as yet hardly existent. The very rights themselves spring, as it were, from the soil.

It was only gradually that there first emerged from this older conception of ‘**real**’ property, and afterwards grew up side by side with it, steadily increasing in relative importance, that very different conception of ‘**personal**’ property, which covers the sort of property that is easily transferable by simple delivery and in which (as far as the law is concerned) any man may acquire a good right, irrespective of his status or the place of his birth, by paying the price which its owner demands for it.

The distinction between real property and personal property is, however, not quite as simple as it is apt to appear. One is tempted by the terms themselves to think of land as having been called ‘real’, because it is nice and solid and immovable, while ‘personal’ property would be the kind of property (cash and so forth) which can be carried on the person. But this is not really the meaning of the terms.

**What is a right?** How is its nature defined and determined? The lawyer answers this question by asking another. If my client’s right is infringed, what sort of action can I bring, and against whom? It is in the answer to this question that the origin of the difference between real and personal property is to be found.

The owner’s right to his land was a right which he could enforce against the whole world. It was a right in rent - to the thing itself - so that if he were dispossessed, he could bring an action for the recovery of the thing itself.

But the law at first recognised no such right in the case of personal property. He who was deprived of this could not, at law, enforce its return. His sole remedy was an action for damages against the person who had wronged him. Such an action was called a ‘personal’ action.

For similar reasons a distinction arose between two different kinds of personal property. Just as there is real property and personal property, so personal property itself may consist either of ‘things-in-possession’ or ‘things-in-action’.

*(continued on next page)*

(continued from previous page)

The difference is again a question of rights. If I see my watch lying on your table, I am entitled to pick it up and carry it away without your permission. In order to recover 'my' £10 against your will, I must bring an action.

These rights to the possession of property, as distinct from property itself, are called things - or choses-in-action. My watch, on the other hand is classified as a chose-in-possession. Thus, choses-in-possession are concrete, ascertained chattels; choses-in-action are, in essence, rights enabling me to obtain something if I choose.

These rights may be contingent only, for there may be nothing to be got. Yet though choses-in-action are only 'rights' to property, they are also a form of property itself. They may be bought and sold, and a large part of the buying and selling that goes on in the world today is concerned with them.

We can now amplify a little the original distinction between real property and personal property into three categories: real property, choses-in-possession, and choses-in-action.

It is obvious that choses-in-action lie at the opposite pole to reality. On the one hand, the actual possession and enjoyment of something ascertained is guaranteed by the law; on the other hand, it is only a right to possess something un-ascertained which is supported.

The gradual recognition of this often not very early defined right to possess is, in England, closely bound up with the history of equity. What is equity? How has it come about that this academic name for a universal principle of justice or equality is now used in such peculiarly technical ways, so that, for instance, a man who has signed a contract to purchase a house is said to 'have the equity' in it and the shares of the most bogus and disreputable limited company that can possibly be imagined are properly called 'equity shares'? When A lends money to B - you have a relation between two persons.

**The history of equity** is precisely the history of the recognition of this relation between two persons by the Courts. Equity begins as soon as the 'relation between two persons' begins to be recognised as a thing, as an object no less 'real' in fact though not in name than a piece of land.

In the origin of the English common law everything depended on using the correct words in your summons. A right was only enforceable if there happened to be some established form of action which would fit the particular infringement of which you had to complain. If not, no matter how unjustly you had been treated, the courts could do nothing for you.

This cramping limitation of the right of action lasted in England well into the thirteenth century and the remedy, when it came, took a rather curious form.

People who had a genuine grievance, for which, owing to formal reasons, no relief was available at law, turned to the king as the ultimate fountain of justice; and the person who had to deal with their petitions was the king's highest official, the Chancellor.

**Down to the Reformation this official  
was invariably an ecclesiastic,  
known as the 'keeper of the king's conscience'**

The relief which the Chancellor gave to oppressed and remediless suitors became more and more systematic, until it eventually resulted in a whole set of courts existing parallel to and yet quite distinct from those of the common law and known as the **Courts of Equity** or '**courts of conscience**'.

The term 'courts of conscience' was in many ways a singularly correct description of the courts of equity and indeed it conceals in itself the very essence of equity.

For, while on the one hand it is still necessary today for a lawyer to have some understanding of the meaning of this phrase, 'courts of conscience', even for the ordinary practical purposes of his business, at the other end of the scale it carries us deep into human consciousness.

**What does it mean?**

Equity is a branch of civil law, and the court would only move at the instance of a plaintiff with some grievance. But in spite of this, the principle which underlay the relief granted was not, as at common law, the satisfaction of the aggrieved plaintiff. On the contrary, the court was concerned to clear the conscience of the defendant.

A man might be a notorious rogue, but nevertheless he could succeed in evicting from a piece of land (if he could show that it was technically 'his') another man whose personal right to the land was universally admitted to be far better than his own. This was where equity stepped in.

When such a situation arose, the sufferer could apply to the Chancellor and, if satisfied of the rights of the case, the Chancellor would say, in effect, to the oppressor: 'It is perfectly true you have this legal right to the land, and if you choose to go to law to enforce it the common law will assist you. I cannot stop that. But there is something else that I both can and shall do. The moment you begin any such action, in order to prevent you going on with it, I shall imprison your person for contempt of my court.' Thus the would-be oppressor was helpless. He had a legal 'right' but equity prevented him from enforcing it for 'personal' reasons.

The maxim was: '*Equity acts in personam.*'

(*personam* - affecting a specific person only) (continued on next page)

*(continued from previous page)*

There was another sense in which the courts of equity were 'courts of conscience.' The person who applied for relief must be able to show that his own conscience was clear. Otherwise the court would not help him.

*'He who seeks equity must do equity'*

In enforcing this principle the Chancellor would particularly take into account the degree of knowledge of certain significant facts which the parties could be shown to have possessed at the time when they acted. (This is the important equitable doctrine of 'notice'.)

A crime is essentially an offence against the group of which the criminal is a member. It is breach of the king's peace.

**Whereas the infringement of an equitable right is the wronging of another individual human being.**

It depends on a relation between two persons.

The word conscience originally means 'knowing with'. It implies a state of knowledge either shared with or at any rate considered in relation to another being. This 'knowing with' another (which, reduced to its lowest terms, is the bare admission that there is another being) is, firstly, an act of will, and, secondly, the basis of self-consciousness.

Self-consciousness is only made possible by the voluntary recognition of another self-consciousness. It becomes possible when, by an act of free will, we resist the impulse to regard other human beings as mere phenomena, as mere points on the circumference of a circle; and it is developed in us at any moment only to the extent that we are able to acknowledge with our whole heart that these others too are centres, centres of equal status with ourselves.

Self-consciousness has its rise in the recognition by one being of the equality of another. It is a gift which men can only receive at each other's hands. To be an expression of the equality of all men is characteristic of the politico-legal structure of the state, of that life of reciprocal rights which corresponds in man himself to the life of feeling, out of which his private social relations with other men are built up. In other respects men are not equal.

The phenomenon of equity and the way in which, originating in the sphere of rights, it has gradually spread outward and incorporated itself in a metamorphosed form into the economic life, throws much light on this conception. It is characteristic of the [different] members or systems of the modern state to inter-penetrate in this way. The important thing is that they should be able to be separated in our thinking about them. The history of equity assists us to do this.

We can trace its progress from the rights sphere through a changing conception of property into the economic sphere. But its nature is such that in doing so we do not easily lose sight of its essentially juristic origin.

Thus, equity enables us to feel how equality - not the abstract uniformity of the bureaucratic foot-rule, not 'standardisation' - but equality in a most inward and truly human sense, is at the very heart of the life of rights.

With the advent of capitalism the ancient feudal attachment of man to the land was allowed to fade away into the background. It did not wholly disappear, but there came into existence, hovering as it were above it, a quite separate system of ownership, in which the theory was that, not the land itself was owned, but the personal right to enjoy it.

Under the feudal system it had been in some respects almost as true to say that the land owned the man as that the man owned the land. But now these personal rights had come to be felt as things no less actual and concrete than the land itself. They could be left in a will, bought and sold, dealt in. The conception of property had thus become a much freer one. It no longer involved a kind of physical oneness with the object owned. It was a personal right.

*Editorial Note: For some this will sound contentious, for detachment from the land (or the real economy) is often seen as the root illness of modern economic life, and the cause of our journey into abstraction. But freedom in Barfield's sense is not to be equated with abstraction per se. Rather, it consists of the ability to experience abstraction (or to err, even to do evil) so that a new reality is born, not of the earth but of heaven, not from imposed scripture but from an experience universally had.*

The characteristic of this kind of property was the ease with which it could be transferred from one person to another. Thus in a sense the equitable doctrines of ownership underlay the whole phenomenon of the growth of commerce and the rise of the free cities.

In commerce the relations of human beings to one another are based not on the land but on cash. This is not necessarily an evil. It is rendered evil by the egoism of human beings, but that makes other things evil also.

A commercial 'bargain' is not essentially a transaction by means of which one human being 'does' another and gains something at his expense. Essentially, it is a transaction from which both are the gainers and as such is a material reflection of the spiritual significance of men's coexistence on earth.

*(continued on next page)*

*(continued from previous page)*

But the development of that conception of property which equity fosters did not stop here. There remains the question of the nature of property in cash itself.

For Rudolf Steiner, a loan in its pristine form was a gift for which the consideration was not a defined contract to repay the exact amount with or without interest, but rather a tacit understanding that the present borrower would be willing to become a lender in his turn, should occasion arise. He thought it characteristic of the loan that it creates a peculiarly personal relation.

Now it is just this whole sphere of personal relations, relations which are based on some kind of confidence, some 'trust' or 'credit' that is so peculiarly the sphere of equity.

Trust is the soul of equity. So strong is its sense of the concreteness of the situation which is created as soon as one man places confidence in another and acts accordingly, that it will, up to the limits of possibility, presume that that confidence is justified.

The influence which such conceptions have had on the development of money and of those numerous substitutes, such as cheques, which are its virtual equivalent in many of the transactions of modern social life, can hardly be exaggerated.

But what is money? Must a 'promise to pay' be a promise to pay something or may it be a promise to pay nothing? Are these promises 'money'? What is money? Does it exist before it is issued and, if so, to whom does it belong?

These are some of the questions upon which an absolutely hopeless confusion reigns today, not only in the minds of persons in the humbler walks of life but also among those whom destiny has called to the task of governing the central banks of the great nations of the world.

Having advanced to a system of ownership based on cash instead of one based on land and the family, today we appear to be in the midst of another process - the emergence of a system based on credit.

The principles of equity are influential in both cases, but there is this difference. In the former process the personal element which underlies equity was never quite lost sight of. Personal relations and the rights based on them were indeed felt to be realities, things. They were freely bought and sold - but they were never actually confused with physical things. The physical thing with which they might have been confused - the land - was there in the background in men's consciousness, in full contrast to them, and the equities hovered above it, as it were, in a different sphere. Such is the essential nature of the Trust Settlement, for example.

But the obligation which is produced by a 'promise to pay', and the corresponding right called 'credit' - these things have become actually confused in men's minds with physical objects. They are indistinguishable from 'money' and money is still thought of by most people as an aggregation of physical objects.

Money in its earliest form was in fact a commodity among other commodities, and it has always been so treated by the common law. It is not regarded as evidence of a right to demand goods; it is itself goods.

It is not a chose-in-action, but a chose-in-possession. Yet bank notes, when they are also currency notes or when they are legal tender and inconvertible, are indistinguishable from money. On the other hand bank notes are merely 'promises to pay'!

In the nineteenth century, when all English bank notes were as a matter of course freely convertible into gold, it was settled that they are negotiable instruments and thus choses-in-action.

Such confusion on such a subject is unfortunately of more than theoretical importance. For what effect does it have when the essentially inter-personal nature of promises and 'credit' is forgotten, when rights are metamorphosed in men's minds into the semblances of physical things, so that the attempt is made to compel them to obey physical laws? The result is that the world is caught within a network of unreal ghosts of personal obligations.

**A situation arises in which the whole world is in theory (but the theory is acted on) head over ears in debt to itself. Huge sums of money are owed to nobody and are withdrawn from circulation to liquidate that spectral debt.**

But without money the world cannot get at the goods which it produces and, as a result, it soon ceases even to produce. We therefore have a world starving to death in the midst of material plenty.

The failure of the whole system of financial credit built up by the western world, with which we are now threatened, will not be due to a lack of personal confidence between human beings. This has probably never been greater than it is now, as is proved by the very abuses to which it is exposed.

The failure will be due to ignorance of the nature of credit and the position it has come to occupy in the economic life of the world.

It will be due, and so far as it has already happened, it is due, to inability to realise that confidence is an immaterial substance, and not a material one. \*\*\*

# IS THERE 'FALSE HOPE' WITH TRUMP (AND HANSON)? by James Reed and Arnis Luks

There is a belief that Donald Trump (or our own Pauline Hanson) will somehow turn things around. Trump is presented as a father figure, but our view is that on his own, he cannot fix what is broken in America. Even if Trump were sincere, he will be neutralised by the administration. But if individuals, pursuing the correct policies, get along side him, adhering with the correct rules of association, that is a completely different story.

**We need to make our Constitution and political representatives work for us. This can only be done if we the people play our part in this Constitutional Monarchy.**

Each person must ask themselves:

“what can I do in order to bring about a restoration of democracy? and then do it”.

You will need to work along side and get behind those willing (representatives and other actionists) to ensure we all work together for the desired outcome - the restoration of democracy in Australia.

*Social Dynamics Training*

*Facilitators will be provided upon request*

Preparing for action, it is essential to understand the correct principles to work from. These can be garnered from the **Social Dynamics DVDs** and **booklet** available from the Heritage Bookshop or from the web:  
<http://alor.org/Library/Butler%20ED%20-%20Social%20Dynamics.pdf>

**Videos here:**

<https://youtu.be/Qi4KbOjjjTE>  
<https://youtu.be/pn3t5bWTsIA>  
[https://youtu.be/rkg9ca\\_DJIE](https://youtu.be/rkg9ca_DJIE)  
<https://youtu.be/seL3LqF5uSk>

The young have the energy, but the ‘not so young’ have the wisdom. It is the ‘not so young’ who must guide the young through this most difficult period.

We have recently transcribed an excellent booklet titled **Our Sham Democracy** by James Guthrie, available here:  
<http://alor.org/Library/Guthrie%20J%20-%20Our%20Sham%20Democracy.pdf>

**or the printed booklet here:** <http://veritasbooks.com.au/our-sham-democracy-or-the-majority-vote-racket-%E2%80%93-james-guthrie>

Guthrie shows in his booklet, that democracy, real democracy, is “where the people can exercise effective control over their governments’ actions”. Even with a benevolent leader, without effective influence over policy, there can be little or no benefit for the individual. We see no good outcome from the proposed conservative movement directed by Cory Bernardi, without a complete change of policy by him and those around him.

*By their fruits -*

*not what they say, but by the results they produce*

Introducing yourself to your local, state and federal representatives, to explain who you voted for and why, and also to ensure they personally receive a copy of the following documents, is a very good start for action.

**The Story of the Commonwealth Bank:**

<http://alor.org/Library/Amos%20DJ%20-%20Commonwealth%20Bank.pdf>

**Bank of England Working Paper 529 - Banks are not intermediaries of loanable funds - and why this matters by Zoltan Jakab and Michael Kumhof:**

<http://alor.org/Library/Bank%20of%20England%20working%20paper%20529.pdf>

**Bank of England Quarterly Report Q1 2014:**

[http://alor.org/Library/Bank%20of%20England%20Q1\\_14.pdf](http://alor.org/Library/Bank%20of%20England%20Q1_14.pdf)

While you are with your representatives, make another appointment to discuss these documents to see if they are willing to support a restoration of democracy.

There are many lessons already learnt by others during **Operation Bankwatch** here:

<http://veritasbooks.com.au/operation-bankwatch-j-cronin>  
**or here:** <http://alor.org/Bankwatch/Library/OperationBankWatch.htm>

There is also an excellent booklet titled **Voters Policy Association Handbook** which provides guidelines for setting up and running effective action groups:  
<http://alor.org/Library/VPA%20Handbook.pdf>

*VPA groups are an excellent environment for encouragement and guidance amongst friends.*

Once a local VPA group is established, set targets, commit to meet regularly, (recommended once per week), and work through one issue at a time. This may be in the form of letter writing to your representative and the media, or phone-ins to radio stations or comments to existing blogs.

Ensure you keep up to date on current issues by visiting our blog here: <http://blog.alor.org>

**Consider a gift to the young of a subscription to *OnTarget* and *NewTimes Survey* available here:**

<http://veritasbooks.com.au/cat/subscriptions>

**We need to make our Constitution and political representatives work for us. This can only be done if we the people play our part in this Constitutional Monarchy.**

\*\*\*

## HEALTH TREASURES FROM THE TRASH

by Mrs Vera West

Getting around a bit now with my trusty walking frame, I went down the street to check out the garage sale. Marvellous things, garbage sales - I mean garage sales. I picked up Dr Michael Colgan, *The New Nutrition: Medicine for the Millennium*, Dr Barry Sears, *The Anti-Ageing Zone* and Dr Toni Jeffrey's, *Your Health at Risk*.

It will take some time to go through them all, but having a flip through and grazing on bits that caught my eye, the key is: watch what you eat. Go organic and eat plenty of colourful vegetables: the more colour the better. Exercise is good - but rigorous exercise increases oxidation stress which can increase ageing. Hence the need for antioxidants, most of which can come from food. In general antioxidants are the coloured chemicals in the bright food which you eat.

One important thing found in all the books is the need to reduce oxidation stress, to get away from sources of pollution as much as possible. The ancient Romans drank wine from lead goblets and paid the price from the lead poisoning. We know about the dangers of lead, but plastics and pesticides are proving to be our Achilles heel.

### "Who Called the Cook a Bastard"

by Brig. C. Stanton Hicks - a personal account of a one man campaign to improve the feeding of the soldier - \$13.00 posted to anywhere in Australia from PO Box 27 Happy Valley SA 5159

### MORE DANGERS FROM ANTIBIOTICS?

by Mrs Vera West

[http://www.cell.com/cell-reports/pdf/S2211-1247\(16\)30518-6.pdf](http://www.cell.com/cell-reports/pdf/S2211-1247(16)30518-6.pdf)

The journal Cell Reports of May 19, 2016 contains an article reporting that antibiotics, which are strong enough to kill off bacteria (both good and bad) in the gut, also impact upon the growth of brain cells in the hippocampus, that part of the brain dealing with memory.

Based on a mice study, the researchers found low levels of white blood cells particularly Ly6Chi monocytes. When the Ly6Chi levels were replaced neurogenesis, the growth of brain cells resumed normally. It has been hypothesised that Ly6Chi acts as a communicating cell, linking the immune system, gut and brain. This shows that the human body is very much an inter-dependent holistic entity.

The researchers have been quoted at Science Daily.com (May 19, 2016) as saying that for humans "probiotics and exercise can balance brain plasticity and should be considered as a real treatment option". \*\*\*



**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](http://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](mailto: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](http://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](mailto: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.