

"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. 03

Registered Australia Post - Publication PP343214 / 00016

March 2016

## A BLESSED EASTER SEASON TO OUR READERS



'Resurrection: Angel Rolling away the Stone from the Sepulchre',  
William Blake, (1757-1827)

*"I have come that you might have life and life more abundantly, He said..."*

The Founder of the Christian faith would have saved both religion and human society from error, and would save them both today, if we not merely said "Lord, Lord," to Him but attended more closely to the things he said, and endeavoured to act according to them.

He did not divide human life into compartments, spiritual and material, religious and secular.

The principles of personal power, domination and violence appear to have been dominant traits throughout human history.

The principles of society organised as a brotherhood on mutual love and co-operative lines, in which the sovereignty of the individual is recognised, is the opposite social philosophy.

A democracy must use its Constitutional rights in the domain of government to secure its democratic rights in the domain of the economic structures.

-*The Fig Tree*, 1936

## SOCIAL CREDIT, METAPHYSICS AND THE INCARNATION by Wallace Klinck

Social Credit is a practical application of the Christian ethic which, ultimately, we believe to be the only reliable guide to a happy and abundant life - for the simple reason that it appears to conform to the "Canon" or laws of the universe. It was not initially planned to be so, but after much consideration and reflection has been revealed or discovered as consonant with the Christian message.

C. H. Douglas, himself stated that Social Credit like Christianity has never been tried. He also averred that the Ballot under existing circumstances is worth about exactly what we pay for it. This conforms with the acronym suggesting that the political vote is simply a validation of the process by which we are disinherited. The primary reason for this is that we do not have genuine "economic democracy", without which we are disempowered. For this reason Douglas said that "Political democracy without economic democracy is dynamite."

In order to effect genuine economic democracy, i.e., effective consumer sovereignty and control of economic policy, so that consumption is genuinely served by production, we need a fundamental change of financial policy and a relocation of the locus of power (*that currently resides centralized in finance and is held by banking and its subsidiary and subservient institutions*) to the individual consumer-citizen. The purpose of production is to serve consumption. The first has no *raison d'être* without the second, and the latter is impossible without the former.

*(continued on next page)*

(continued from previous page)

Society, Douglas taught, is metaphysical, i.e., it operates on a philosophical basis. All policies can be traced back to their respective philosophies. The fundamental driving philosophy of modern financial policy is explicitly anti-Christian. It is power-centralizing rather than decentralizing. It is costive rather than distributive and therefore dysfunctional in ways that manifest widely. It is based upon an unrealistic assumption of essential scarcity, which actually stops up and misdirects the Abundance of the Kingdom.

The Kingdom is not abstract and transcendental, as the Churches have tended to teach, but resides as the Holy Spirit or Divine Love of God within us. Douglas said, that the greatest issue before us is that of the Incarnation - i.e., the question of incarnating the Word in the organic affairs of mankind, so that the Promise might be realized and fulfilled.

The policy of the metaphysics of Finance is to prevent the incarnation of the Word, so as to maintain mankind in perpetual bondage. The policy of Social Credit is to release humanity from that bondage, which is achieved primarily on the metaphysical level through a false

## A MINDLESS ACT OF TERMINAL INSANITY? by Wallace Klinck

Finance “capitalism” is just communism in the making. This is accomplished by increasing debt and taxes under the universally accepted faulty financial debt system of Keynesian economics, under which the world functions - or labours. All systems, which employ tools are capitalist and the “capitalist” - “communist” designations constitute a false dichotomy. The inexorable progression is toward increasing centralization of wealth and power.

A correspondent has expressed his disapproval of not only the Provincial “equalization” transfer payments among Canadian Provinces, but also of the massive similar assessments and reallocations of funds in the bureaucratic and undemocratic behemoth known as the European Union. He has expressed his sympathy and support for those in the United Kingdom who are demanding a withdrawal from the EU. I have responded accordingly:

These gigantic and growing “welfare” programs are an inevitable result of a grossly defective financial (not fiscal) system, that generates costs and prices at an ever greater flow than it generates effective incomes - and compels us to compensate this widening chasm with vast and increasing sums of financial debt, which constitute a mortgage against our future.

Meanwhile, we can either “share the wealth” to sustain the expanding masses, who cannot survive on the shrinking pool of financial incomes, or simply abandon them to their fate.

philosophy and practically through the application of financial *legerdemain* or false monetary and cost-accountancy - which Social Credit claims is an inversion of reality.

Money in the modern world is simply accountancy, and we want money to become the passive servant of mankind rather than its active master, as it functions presently.

The power of an idea ultimately exceeds that of all other forms of power. That is why Social Credit stands as a critique and condemnation of modern civilization, which Douglas claimed is founded upon an Incarnate Lie.

We want to expose that Lie and release humans from its destructive spell, which draws us into the worship of Mammon and the slavery of a twisted materialist charnel house, wherein we are condemned to eternal toil on an ever upward-tilting treadmill, in a futile effort to liquidate increasingly unpayable financial debt.

We are aware of the spiritual, psychological and material challenges, which we face, but are convinced also that there is only one way to proceed - the correct way.

\*\*\*

Not only would this be crassly immoral and inhuman, but it would result in a social upheaval, which would destroy the foundations of civilization. So we share our own already inadequate financial incomes in order to provide a pressure release valve to ease the intensifying social and economic malaise, thinking foolishly and blindly, that we can forever stave off the consequences of financial ignorance and folly.

The core problem of the modern world is not production, but rather, how to market a surfeit of real wealth.

Companies can, and do, terminate millions of so called “jobs”, while still maintaining and even increasing the flow of real consumer goods - so as to maintain, through the efficiency achieved by “mechanical and technological advantage”, the glut, without any real scarcity whatsoever—the real scarcity being a deficiency of the means of effective distribution—claim tickets which we choose by convention to call “money.”

Production and consumption are mutually dependent and merely opposite sides of the same coin. Without consumption production has no *raison d'être*; without production consumption is impossible.

As a society, we produce our actual physical requirements as we live, contemporaneously—but because of a fraudulent financial accountancy system of *legerdemain* we allow ourselves access to this production increasingly only on condition, that we account it as a mounting charge against an ever-receding and unrelated future.

(continued on next page)

(continued from previous page)

This has all the appearance of being a mindless—or diabolically guided—act of terminal insanity.

The solution to this problem lies in personal responsibility and a reassessment of the proper relationship between the elector and his or her elected representative. It does not lie in the abrogation of responsibility--of being seduced into the bog-lands of political party politics by the emotional seeking of a “new redemptive Party” or another “Great Leader” to deliver us up from Evil.

It lies in a responsible personal quest for sound understanding of issues and a determined program of impressing upon elected representatives (and public officials), of whatever ideological stripe, that they will

## **SOCIAL CREDIT: AN ECONOMIC MODEL FOR PERSONALISTS** by M. Oliver Heydorn

*All emphasis and definitions by editor*

One of the more worthwhile currents in contemporary philosophy is the school of thought known as ‘**personalism**’. Whereas other philosophers might ponder on the nature of knowledge, of morality, or of ultimate reality, **personalist philosophers take a special interest in personal being as the central object of their preoccupations**. These thinkers are keen on doing full justice in their research and teaching to the nature and the dignity of the personal, especially as this reality makes itself manifest in the case of *human* persons.

In comparison with non-personal or impersonal beings, persons are more fully real, i.e., they occupy a higher rung in the hierarchy of being. They are not passive objects devoid of *interiority*, instead they are self-possessing and self-transcending. Through the powers of self-awareness and self-determination, the person consciously experiences himself as an incommunicable and **unrepeatable subject**, a subject who can establish various relations with other beings outside of himself.

*interiority: the quality of being interior or inward*

Naturally, **such a high view** of the ontological dignity of the person necessarily **bears moral implications**. If one accepts certain ‘personalist’ ethical standards as normative (take, for example, the claim that human beings should never be treated as a mere means, but rather as ends in themselves), then it follows that there are patterns of social life that are more or less *concordant* with the value of the person.

*concordant: agreeing; harmonious; unanimous; consistent*

In this blog, I propose to examine what a particular tradition within personalism, what may be termed ‘**realist personalism**’, **demands, in moral terms, of the economy**, and how the introduction of Social Credit would enable such moral demands to be fully and properly satisfied in practice. Unlike some of the more

*New Times Survey*

deliver the results desired, or hire qualified personnel capable of designing the means to such results—or they will cease being elected representatives.

What is required is intensive individual action and/or action exercised by informed and proliferating spontaneous and decentralized “Voters Policy Associations” to do an “end run” around corrupt Party politics.

When politicians learn conclusively, that their electors have more control over their destinies than do their present shadowy backers and benefactors, they can be expected to become surprisingly responsive to the public’s needs. As a society of idol worshippers, we probably get what we deserve.

**Source:** <http://www.socred.org/index.php/blogs/view/social-credit-an-economic-model-for-personalists> \*\*\*

‘secular’ branches of personalism, ‘realist personalism’ has evolved in close association with Christian philosophy, i.e., with reasoned reflection on Christian belief and practice.

One of the earliest thinkers within this tradition, the philosopher Emmanuel Mounier, made the following declaration in his book: *A Personalist Manifesto*:

**“A personalist civilisation is one whose structure and spirit are directed towards the development as persons of all the individuals constituting it. They have as their ultimate end to enable every individual to live as a person, that is, to exercise a maximum of initiative, responsibility, and spiritual life.”** [1]

Notice that in his description of a ‘personalist civilization’, by which he means a civilization that is worthy of the incomparable dignity of each human being, Mounier explicitly includes the concept of ‘structure’. It is not enough to talk about or promote ‘personalist virtues’ on the part of individual moral agents as some personalists are wont to do. Instead, we must recognize that **the very political, economic, and cultural systems, under which we live, will either promote the person, by respecting his dignity and facilitating his flourishing, or else they will undermine him and interfere with the unfolding of his vocation as person**. For this reason, the choice of structures, of institutions, laws, and conventions, is morally relevant and *ineluctable*. This fact has been underscored by recent Popes who have elucidated, in their social teaching, the notion of the ‘structures of sin’ and have **declared such structures to be incompatible with Christian doctrine and practice**.

*ineluctable: unable to be resisted or avoided*

(continued on next page)

(continued from previous page) The bottom line is that the personalist civilization, which Mounier championed cannot come into being if the existing economic order, for example, does not adequately support personalist ends. Since a personalist economic order is a necessary condition for the establishment of a personalist civilization, economic questions cannot or ought not to be ignored by personalist thinkers. Furthermore, personalists have an obligation to work in favour of positive change: whenever or insofar as economic structures treat the person as if he were an impersonal object, as, for example, mere raw material for the economic process, **personalists must denounce such structures and advocate for their replacement by alternatives that are in greater accord with a personalist ethic and hence with the natural law.**

But which specific economic model should personalists support?

Contrary to the doctrine of 'economic personalism' (so-called) bandied about by the Acton Institute, I do not think that a right-wing version of the mixed economy, one that tends toward the ideals of *laissez-faire* capitalism, is in any way sufficient, even when fortified by the personalistic qualities of a virtuous population, to deliver the kind of results personalists should expect from economic association.

*laissez-faire: government abstention from interference in the actions of individuals, esp. in commerce*

Indeed, if we were to look at economics through a personalist lens, I think that we would have to admit – while holding any questions concerning individual ethics in abeyance – that nowhere in the Western world is **the structural failure of the economic system to respect the person and to serve the authentic common good more evident than in the case of the United States.**

Just consider its puritan work ethic, its systematic failure to recognize (much less respect) the legitimate rights of workers, its institutionalization of the exercise of power without responsibility in both corporate and government bodies, and, indeed, **its systemic consecration of the whole of society to the religion of Mammon**, i.e., the pursuit and adulation of the almighty dollar as an end in itself, as evidenced by the permeation of moneyed celebrity, conspicuous consumption, and throw away consumerism as mainstays of American 'culture'. To top it all off, there is the curious tendency on the part of many of Americans to deny the objective truth (perhaps because they have no standards of comparison); that is, to deny the reality that there are indeed serious

ethical problems with what they take to be the normal way of conducting business and running the economy. From an ethical and indeed personalist assessment, the American economy, which is one of the closer *exemplars* we have of the *laissez-faire* ideal (at least in rhetoric if not always in practice), is an abject failure. Cf. <http://www.socred.org/index.php/blogs/view/america-s-puritanical-obsession-with-work>

*exemplars: a model for imitation*

But this critique of American-style capitalism is not to suggest that personalists should therefore embrace socialism, as if this were the only other alternative. In his book, *Jobs of Our Own*, Race Mathews notes the following regarding the economic views of two of the earliest personalist thinkers: "Maritain and Mounier in particular - adherents of the personalist school of philosophy - saw both capitalism and state socialism as being incompatible with personalist values." [2] Indeed, a full-blown socialism, with its centralization of control over economic initiative, its subordination of the individual to the group, and the limitations it puts on genuine economic independence and freedom is arguably even more at odds with human dignity than the depersonalization of the capitalist economic order.

In place of these two systems, which form the bookends of the conventional economic spectrum, and in place of any mix or compromise position between them, Mathews also notes that the personalist concerns of Mounier and Maritain seemed to imply something along the lines of distributism: "**The personalist teachings of the prominent French Catholic philosophers, Jacques Maritain and Emmanuel Mounier, were widely seen as being supportive of distributism.**" [3]

Whereas capitalism concentrates private ownership of productive property in the hands of the few, and socialism wishes to replace private ownership with public or collective ownership of one kind or another, **distributism seeks the decentralization of private ownership**, that is, to make as many people as possible owners.

The organic connection between distributism and personalism lies in the fact that 'property' is proper to the person. It is appropriate (i.e., fitting) and even in some sense necessary for each person to own property, especially productive property. Hence, a personalist economic system would naturally seek to enfranchise the members of an economic association with property.

(continued on next page)

"NewTimes Survey" 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 \$30.00 p.a.

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

(continued from previous page)

Ownership bestows on individuals the economic independence, security, and freedom that fits or corresponds to the metaphysical nature of persons as self-aware and self-determining beings. **Distributism is thus the only type of economic system that aims, in its very institutions and conventions, to do full justice to the nature and dignity of the person, just as personalism, on the philosophical plane, seeks to do full justice to the person in its investigations.**

The instincts of our French personalists were, I believe, certainly correct: **distributism, personalism, and Catholic social teaching are all of one piece.**

One of the basic problems with classical distributism, however, is that it is a *do ut des* system. There must always be a something for a something and never a something for a nothing. In other words, it is assumed that all economic benefits must be earned by somebody somewhere working very, very hard and that there is, in consequence, no such thing as a free lunch (unless this free lunch were a form of economic rent and hence entirely illegitimate).

Indeed, all existing economic systems and all alternative systems with which I am familiar are '*do ut des*' systems ... in complete opposition, I might add, to what Christian doctrine regarding the reality and necessity of unearned grace in the spiritual life would seem to imply for the economic organization of a truly Christian social order. [4]

**Thankfully, there is an alternative.** The Social Credit Economic Model, developed by the late British engineer, Clifford Hugh Douglas (1879-1952), distinguishes itself against all comers by **embodying a principle of gratuity** as part and parcel of what both distributive justice and the conditions of the possibility of equilibrium demand of the modern, industrialized economy. The recognition of the necessity of economic 'grace' as part of the financial system is but one of the reasons that **Social Credit has been referred to as 'Practical Christianity'**.

How is this apparent miracle of economic grace possible? Ironic though it may be, the present financial system does do a good job of monetizing, as a component of price-values, those contributions to the productive process that are made by the common factors of production. We are referring here to such things as **natural resources, the unearned increment of human association, and the cultural heritage.** These common factors, in virtue of which each individual can make a claim to a share in society's productive output, may be regarded as being represented (however unintentionally) in the gap between prices and incomes, a gap that is largely due to the existence and use of real capital under standard rules of industrial cost accountancy. That gap exists precisely

because, while the present financial system inadvertently monetizes the common factors of production as price-values within the pricing structure, it simultaneously **fails to monetize**, in the form of a corresponding flow of consumer incomes, **the earnings that should accrue to these common factors.**

The genius of Social Credit is its proposal that, instead of relying, as we currently do, on additional debt to fill the gap, it is both just and expedient for the gap to be **monetized via the creation of a sufficient flow of 'debt-free' credit.** This compensatory credit is to be issued, both indirectly and directly, for the chief benefit of consumers. Accordingly, **a portion** of this compensatory credit **would be used to lower retail prices** in conformity with an economy's consumption/production ratio, while **another proportion would be distributed as income to each citizen**, whether he be employed or not, in the form of a National Dividend.

The currently obscured reality to which this dividend (the purchasing power of which would be enhanced by compensated prices) would give concrete effect is this: "due to the far greater productivity which modern technology makes possible, **it is simply not necessary to insist that every able-bodied adult must work before he can be granted access to goods and services.**" Indeed, the notion that 'all wealth must be earned' is not merely inappropriate as a necessary condition for economic participation, it becomes an impossibility when machines are doing more and more of the work.

But I would argue that the introduction of a principle of gratuity as a distributive principle is not only called for on the basis of strict justice (as paradoxical as that may sound), and on the basis of functional necessity, such a principle is also a personalist requirement.

If a personalist economy is to be an economy of the people, for the people, and by the people (people understood here as the aggregate of individuals and not as an abstract mass), it must treat people, well, as people, and not as commodities or as mere means for the attainment of an impersonal economic end, whether that goal be employment as an end in itself, the maximization of monetary profits at any and all costs, or the centralization of power in the hands of an oligarchic elite.

But something else is called for beyond these proscriptions. For personalists have perceived that **the only proper or adequate response to the person, i.e., the only way of fully treating people as people, is through the gift of love.** By 'love' I don't mean any soft sentimentality or even the more noble affective responses with which that word is sometimes associated, but rather the affirmation of another in his nature and the promotion, via concrete actions, of his well-being:

(continued on next page)

(continued from previous page)

**‘Love is willing the objective good of the other.’**

If this is so, then it follows that the economic gift, the something for nothing, is also necessary if persons are to be treated on the economic plane with the dignity that is their due.

**Social Credit and Social Credit alone seeks to make the economic gift a real feature of our social arrangements.**

The National Dividend in conjunction with the National Discount would, in the words of Mounier, **‘enable every individual to live as a person, that is, to exercise a maximum of initiative, responsibility, and spiritual life.’** They would provide each citizen with economic security, independence, freedom, and, perhaps most importantly, with the opportunity for leisure. It is for this reason that Social Credit should be of great interest to personalist thinkers.

The necessity of the economic gift as the due response to the person was recognized by no less a personalist than Jacques Maritain in his book *Humanisme Integral*:

“It is an axiom of the bourgeois economy and the mercantile civilization that one gets nothing for nothing ... On the contrary, at least and in the first place where the primary material and spiritual needs of the human being are concerned, it is fitting for him to receive the maximum number of things possible in exchange for nothing. (...) That the human person be served in this way in his primordial necessities is, after all, the preliminary condition of an economy that does not merit the name of the barbaric.

The principle of such an economy would lead to a better appreciation of the profound meaning and the essentially human roots of the idea of heritage. (...) in such a way that any man, upon entering this world, may effectively enjoy, in some fashion, the condition of being an heir of preceding generations.” [5]

This alternative personalist civilization to which Maritain looked forward, **a civilization providing persons with as much as possible in terms of goods and services** in exchange for nothing, but rather **on the basis of their cultural heritage**, is the same objective towards which Social Credit is the effective means:

“What are we aiming at? What are we trying to get? Well, now, I will put it in a very large general form, as I see it from one point of view.

**We are endeavouring to bring to birth a NEW CIVILISATION. We are doing something which really extends far beyond the confines of a change in the financial system.**

**We are hoping by various means, chiefly financial, to enable the human community to definitely step out of one type of civilisation into another type of civilisation, and the first and basic requirement as we see it, of that, is absolute economic security.” [6]**

Indeed, in comparison with this vision, the prevailing *do ut des* economic order is nothing less than barbarism.

----

[1] Emmanuel Mounier, *A Personalist Manifesto* (London: Longmans, Green & Co, 1938), 167.

[2] Race Mathews, *Jobs of Our Own* (Irving, Texas: The Distributist Review Press), 181.

[3] Race Mathews, *Jobs of Our Own* (Irving, Texas: The Distributist Review Press), 5.

[4] As a direct result, the sad reality is that the ‘free gift’ is not structurally embedded in the present economic order at all. Everything must be earned for oneself or else taken by force (by redistributive taxation) from those who are lucky enough to earn an income. Even gifts of charity that might be made by one individual or group of individuals presuppose costs that must be deducted from someone’s labour or capital earnings.

[5] My translation. “C’est un axiome pour l’économie « bourgeoise » et la civilisation mercantile qu’on a rien pour rien... Bien au contraire, du moins et d’abord pour ce qui concerne les besoins premiers, matériels et spirituels, de l’être humain, il convient qu’on ait pour rien le plus de choses possible. (...) Que la personne humaine soit ainsi servie dans ses nécessités primordiales, ce n’est après tout que la première condition d’une économie qui ne mérite pas le nom de barbare. Les principes d’une telle économie conduiraient à mieux saisir le sens profond et les racines essentiellement humaines de l’idée d’héritage. (...) en telle sorte que tout homme, en entrant en ce monde, puisse effectivement jouir, en quelque façon, de la condition d’héritier des générations précédentes.” (Jacques Maritain, *Humanisme Intégral* (Éditions Montaigne: Paris, 1946), 197.

[6] C.H. Douglas, *Major C.H. Douglas Speaks* (Sydney: Douglas Social Credit Association, 1933), 84.

\*\*\*

### SOCIAL CREDIT TRAINING

**We are expanding our Social Credit Training Base with the opening of a training website:**

**<http://thecross-roads.org/sct/>**

**Here we will provide a comprehensive Training Program for all things Social Credit.**

**Please Register on the website in order to participate fully in the training program.**

## INNOVATIVE WORK: PREDICTING RAINFALL WITH NEURAL NETS

I wrote the following two statements down on a scrap of paper when I was an undergraduate at the University of Queensland in the early 1980s. They seemed to resonate more with me as each year passes:

1. Belief in the truth of a theory is inversely proportional to the precision of the science.
2. The creativity of a scientist is directly proportional to how much [s]he knows, and inversely proportional to how much [s]he believes.

- - Jennifer Marohasy

Innovative work: Predicting rainfall with neural nets\*\* – Jennifer Marohasy

Predicting seasonal rainfall months ahead has surely got to be the Holy Grail of weather forecasting. Imagine the billions of dollars, the man-hours, and the anguish-prevented if we can do it. What if neural nets can be trained, validated, and used to help farmers, investors, and “Oi” — even Dam Managers?

According to Bill Gates, “You can achieve incredible progress if you set a clear goal and find a measure that will drive progress towards that goal.” This may seem basic, but it’s not practiced enough, and certainly not when it comes to rainfall forecasting.

The Bureau of Meteorology increasingly use their weather and climate forecasts to warn of looming catastrophe. This use of ‘forecasts’ to advance an agenda is common in politics, but it’s not something the Bureau should be engaged in.

A key Bureau goal should be the best possible rainfall forecast for the public. Their rainfall forecast should be presented and reported in a measurable and understandable way. Instead we are given vague probabilities, which research has shown are often misinterpreted by farmers.

Furthermore, there should be some follow-up. For example, at the end of a week, a month, or a season we should be told how reliable their daily, monthly and seasonal forecasts have actually been.

Its five years now since Brisbane flooded, so about five years since I started working with John Abbot and artificial neural networks to see if it was possible to actually forecast the extraordinary wet season of summer 2010/2011 in south eastern Queensland.

Back in 2010, sea surface temperature and sea surface pressures profiles across the Pacific suggested we were in for a big wet. Yet the Wivenhoe reservoir upstream of Brisbane, a dam actually built for flood mitigation, was kept full of water.

John Abbot’s little red corvette sports car was drowned in the Brisbane flood. It was in a river-side garage in St Lucia, Brisbane, and totally submerged for 36

hours. He was heartbroken. The loss spurred us to see if we couldn’t apply the technique he had used to make the money to buy that car, to rainfall forecasting. In particular, we were keen to see if artificial neural networks with the right algorithms, and high quality historical temperature and rainfall data, could have forecast the flooding. John Abbot regularly used artificial neural networks and historical trading data to successful forecast directional trends in the share market.

By August 2011 we had monthly rainfall forecasts for 20 sites across Queensland, and we wanted *to-ed* compare our output *with-ed* the best general circulation model (POAMA) used by the Bureau of Meteorology. But try as we might we couldn’t actually get the taxpayer-funded Bureau to give us the data we needed to make proper comparisons.

The Bureau were not doing the one thing that Bill Gates says is critical to improvement: benchmarking. After flying to Melbourne, and threatening to jump out a sixth floor window if the data wasn’t handed over (well I exaggerate somewhat), we got access to only enough data to enable us to publish a series of papers. Indeed, the Bureau still refuses to make available the most basic of data which would allow their rainfall forecasts to be objectively scored.

Back in 2011 it was evident that John Abbot and I could do a better monthly rainfall forecast than the Bureau. To our surprise key science managers at the Bureau agreed: conceding that our forecasts were more skillful. But, they argued, climate was on a new trajectory so our method would not work into the future!

This claim is, of course, based on the theory of anthropogenic global warming. This is the same theory that continues to underpin all the forecasts provided by the Bureau through the use of general circulation models.

Neural Networks on rainfall

An alternative approach using artificial neural networks, fits under the umbrella of ‘Big Data’ and ‘machine learning,’ that relies on pattern analysis, and is proving successful at forecasting, where results are properly benchmarked, in fields as diverse as medical diagnostics, financial forecasting and marketing analysis.

\*\* Neural Networks: An Artificial Neural Network

(ANN) is an information processing paradigm that is inspired by the way biological nervous systems, such as the brain, process information. The key element of this paradigm is the novel structure of the information processing system.

**Source:** [https://www.doc.ic.ac.uk/~nd/surprise\\_96/journal/vol4/.../report.html](https://www.doc.ic.ac.uk/~nd/surprise_96/journal/vol4/.../report.html)

\*\*\*

# INNOVATIVE DOCTOR LAUNCHES FOOD “FARMACY” AFTER SELLING MEDICAL PRACTICE...FOOD HEALS BETTER THAN DRUGS! by Harold Shaw

In a world where curing a disease usually means taking a pill, giving up his practice after years of medical training is nothing short of innovative.

We have known for thousands of years that a healthy diet, varied in whole grains, vegetables, fruits, nuts and seeds, is the foundation of a vigorous life. Yet we have applied ourselves to discovering drugs that can deal with the symptoms of our diseases. Why? It's simple: so that we don't have to deal with them ourselves.

The arguments are there, but with an overwhelming majority of authorities supporting Big Pharma, taking an alternative route isn't easy.

## **The drug industry's goal is not your health**

At a glance, the aim of conventional medical practice is to cure illness. This is not an entirely wrong assumption. However, much like the crust of a pie, what's important is what lies beneath, and you can't be sure unless you taste it. This is the case of Robert Weiss, a New Jersey medical doctor who had a full serving of traditional medicine and found the recipe to be wanting.

While he advises that we still seek medical help when we have a serious injury or an accident, the variables change when it comes to chronic diseases. We're discussing heart conditions, diabetes, insurmountable amounts of cholesterol that lead to cardiovascular complications, every known cancer and more of the like. For some of us, they are a distant echo on the news, while others are very familiar with the medication, expenses and toils that come along with them.

Those who have yet to experience these horrors are very likely to experience them in the future. From the all-American diet, to the side-effects caused by pharmaceuticals, **the industry seeks to create addiction.**

## **Their ultimate goal is to create profit, not health.**

You're not persuaded to eat what's right, but what tastes good.

According to them, your diabetes and high cholesterol don't demand you include natural sources of essential fatty acids in your diet, but insulin shots. Dessert today, followed by an injection. While you're at it, there might be some pills that help you. Do they have horrible side effects? There's a pill for those too.

## **The proof is there, but the industry's not**

Dr. Weiss decided to put an end to the vicious circle. He monetized everything he had and created a farm-based medical practice, “Farmacy.” Less than 60 miles from the place where he used to write prescriptions, Robert now invites patients to help pick weeds and harvest vegetables.

The truth behind the science of nutrition can no longer be ignored. Attention has now been given to this natural way

of curing chronic diseases, with determined researchers investigating and measuring what happens when we eat right. The effects are literally life-saving. You can reduce your chances of developing diabetes by as much as 43% or even cure it altogether. Obesity becomes a non-issue, and heart disease a marginal risk.

Nonetheless, in the eyes of Big Pharma, a healthy diet that contains modest amounts of meat and dairy has an “inherent flaw.” Plants, seeds, vegetables and nuts have the same defect. They don't include any pills, nor will they increase your chances of buying pills in the future.

## **People are catching on**

At the end of 2014, he and his two former colleagues had 90 families as active subscribers to his “Farmacy.”

## **People everywhere around the world are disconnecting their auto-pilot.**

**Learn more:** [http://www.naturalnews.com/053151\\_Farmacy\\_healthy\\_food\\_prevent\\_disease.html](http://www.naturalnews.com/053151_Farmacy_healthy_food_prevent_disease.html)

### **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.