

"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. 20 No. 10

Registered Australia Post - Publication PP343214 / 00016

October 2019

CONTENTS

Divine Service by Don Auchterlonie	1
Warmest Greetings to the 73rd New Times Dinner from Betty Luks	3
The Environmental Implications of Social Credit Theory and Practice by M. Oliver Heydorn Ph.D.	4
Editorial: A Review of Policies as Seen from the Home from Home Quarterly by G. & E. Dobbs	5

Divine Service - from *Don Auchterlonie*:

"Heavenly Father we come before you today to ask your blessing on our work. We ask your blessing on our program and pray that it will produce positive results in our work". There is a significant book *'Resurrection or Retreat'* which deals with the three major religions in the World - Islam, Judaism, and Christianity, it points out that they are so divergent that they Produce different fruit, or results. Two of these religions are monotheistic, Islam and Judaism. In the UK some years ago there was a certain University in which Islam was becoming influential. A Christian man, David Pawson, was asked to speak and they gave him 15 minutes, so he said I want three months to prepare my speech because in 15 minutes every word must count. He pointed out that only in the triune religion, Christianity, can love be expressed or put into practise. After he spoke there was no more trouble on the Campus. We in the League stress the importance of the division of power. This is based on the Christian Concept of the 'God-head' - God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Spirit. This was settled in the Christian Church at the Council of Nicaea in 325 AD and is discussed in the John W. Hughes book "Major Douglas - The Policy of a Philosophy". The concept was put up by Athanasius a helper to one of the Bishops and is an important part of the Church Calendar.

Jesus in Human Affairs

The coming of Jesus Christ was and still is a world shattering event. Jesus's teaching radically changed the way things were done. Prior to His coming the only form of government or leadership was various forms of dictatorship. The Bible records the arguments Jesus had with the Sanhedrin, the government of His day. The institutions of the Western world are based on God's Word and the teachings of Jesus. In Matthew 4:8 we read "*Again the devil taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain, and sheweth him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them: and saith unto him. All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me*". Satan was offering Jesus earthly power claiming it was his to give if Jesus would "fall down and worship him". Can we assume that those humans who exercise real power in the world have "fallen down and worshiped Satan". I have discussed this with a number of Christian leaders and they agree that this is the case. We may ask in what form this earthly power was. Well, the most effective and insidious earthly power is the power of finance.

Jesus rejected earthly power and it has been stated that if the Son of God rejected earthly power — what man can be trusted with it? I believe that we can therefore safely assume that the Christian world-view favours decentralization of institutions and everything else that makes up human activities.

In John 1:1, we read "*In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God and the Word was God.*" Verse 14 says "*And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father) full of grace and truth*". This is known as the INCARNATION of Jesus. Incarnation is an interesting word; it means making an idea or a thought '**happen**'. Jesus presented a challenge to the rulers of his day, the Pharisees, who had formulated many 'rules and regulations' to control the ordinary people. When Jesus said in Matt 23:11 "*He that is greatest among you shall be your servant*". He was saying here that service to others should be our aim in life. And in Mark 10:43-45 we find Jesus saying "*...whosoever will be great among you, shall be your minister and whosoever of you will be the chiefest, shall be servant of all. For even the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and give his life a ransom for many*". In answer to the Pharisees asking when the Kingdom of God should come, Jesus in Luke 18:20,21 said "*The kingdom of God cometh not with observation; Neither shall they say, Lo here! or lo there! For, behold the kingdom of God is within you*".

(continued on next page)

(continued from previous page)

So it is quite clear that Jesus is emphasizing the importance of each person as an individual. And this concept is illustrated when someone gets lost in the bush like the time a few years ago, a number of girl guides, one of whom was injured, got lost near the Thomson Dam. Bill Lay and his searching mate Graeme Cook (a policeman) went out with the Police on a shocking night to a point where the search was to start (the guides had phoned with a compass reading). The Police did not want them to go in. Bill and his mate followed the compass reading over large slippery rocks, found the girls, lit a fire to warm them up and got them out the next morning. You may recall the yachtsman Tony Bullimore whose yacht overturned way down south, the rescue ship had to steam for four days to reach him. This is the value put on a life by Christian society. This is why the coming of Jesus was such a world shattering event. It overturned the way people had been governed up to that point in history and you will find that in many non-Christian countries life is cheap.

Our God is a trinity that is He is God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Spirit. There are three parts to a trinity, and we find *“trinities”* in abundance if we look around. Considering that God said *“Let US make man in our image”*, is it not natural that man is a triune being; that is Spirit, Soul and Body. We are a spirit, we have a soul and we live in a body. So each one of us is a trinity, considering that we are God’s creation as described in Gen. 1.26 this should not surprise us. Let us see how many *“Trinities”* we can find in God’s world. Time is a trinity, time is either past present or future. A normal family is a trinity father, mother, and children. What about the field of science? All matter is a trinity it is either solid, liquid or gas. The first wheeled vehicle you travelled on alone would have been a tricycle. Think of the stability of a tripod, whether in a photographer’s studio or on a surveyor’s instrument. Ecc.4.12 tells us that *“A threefold cord is not quickly broken”*.

Now, how does the trinity work out in our daily lives? What sort of society has been built by the Christians who have gone before us and put their faith into action? A triune God will influence men to build institutions which split up power and give each person personal responsibility to live a normal life. A mono-theistic God will influence men to build institutions around *“strong men”* and concentrate power. If we look around the world we see that the countries which have not accepted Christianity nationally are run by *“strong men”*.

The first thing that happens to you in a Christian society is that you are given a Christian name. We don’t call John Smith *“one of the Smiths”*, we call him John Smith and if John Smith forges a cheque, John Smith is held responsible for that. We don’t round up all the Smiths and lock them up.

John Smith’s birth will be recorded and his death will be recorded. Such is the concern a Christian society has for each of its members. Earthly power can be very *“heady”* wine, which is why Lord Acton said *“all power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely”*. We have inherited a system of government which is based on trinities; we have Federal, State and Local Government. Each of which have different responsibilities.

Read Matt 22:15 *“Then went the Pharisees, and took counsel how they might entangle Him in His talk. Master, we know thou art true, and teacheth the way of God in truth.... Tell us therefore, what thinkest thou? Is it lawful to give tribute to Caesar, or not? But Jesus perceived their wickedness, and said Why tempt ye me ye hypocrites? Shew me the tribute money. And they brought unto Him a penny. And He saith unto them whose is this image and superscription? They say unto Him Ceasar’s. Then said He unto them Render unto Caesar those things which are Caesar’s and render unto God the things that are God’s”*.

The word Caesar means the government and Jesus is saying here that we need some government but we do not need too much of it. In Mathew 7:15 -20 we read Jesus saying *“Beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep’s clothing, but inwardly they are ravening wolves. Ye shall know them by their fruits. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles? Even so every good tree bringeth forth good fruit; but a corrupt tree bringeth forth evil fruit. A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire. Wherefore by their fruits ye shall know them”*. I have hoed thistles for 60 years and have never seen a fig on one of them. We need to beware of false prophets, people who put forward ideas to trick us. We need to test ideas or policies which are put to us, sometimes by important or respected people, as we will never get a good result out of a bad idea. What should we do? The world is in a mess, what should a Christian do? Should we concentrate our efforts on dealing with minor sins or should a Christian act like salt and give a lead in society to traverse the influence of those who are promoting the insidious power of the purse? Or as Macca said one Sunday *“unless you work on your culture you will lose it”*. ***

VALE

At this year's New Times Dinner we record the passing of the following League folk -

CEDRIC TURNER

BARBARA TRELOAR

KEVIN BERNARD JOHN KEOGH

GREETINGS TO THE 73RD NEW TIMES DINNER

from *Jeffrey Dunlop*

All the very best to those celebrating the *New Times*. I am with you in my thoughts, however the car has another point of view.

from *Wallace and Robert Klinck*

Greetings to all the guests at the *New Times* Dinner. We wish you well in your celebrations and hope for continued good work in the years ahead.

from *David and Gwen Smith*

Geoffrey Dobbs wrote in *On Planning The Earth*: "for the survival of the race (*will mean-ed*) a turning back to reality". This was written in 1951. Back then, not many could see the predicament we were in, but today blind Freddie can see the mess.

History is nothing but crystalised politics said C.H.Douglas. Events happen in order to bring about the required result. Do you get the picture, this world is at war and the reality of the real world God gave us to tend has been replaced with a false reality wherin 'science' and scientists are god. (That is the ones that get re-presented through the controlled media) Real science reveals 'what is' and uses it for man's benefit, science today is like money, a tool for control.

Mr Richard Eason from Canberra in a lecture on Monarchy to the Australian League of Rights in Toowoomba years ago said that when a nation turns away from God, the state takes on the attributes of God, namely, the state becomes omnipotent, omnipresent and omniscient. That is the reality of what is happening before our eyes today, and the lure of "stuff" and "normality" and for many "escapism" whether in drugs, religion or fantasy worlds that do not exist are all made readily available to blind us as to what is happening to our society. How alike to ancient Rome, all the same conditions were present then as now. The choice always is and has been, freedom under God or collapse and slavery.

Our Churches point to conversion to Christ as Salvation, but fail to consider that to turn to Christ must result in a seeking for truth in all things as well as a turning from ALL untruth to reality or the convert remains a prisoner in this world, attempting to serve both God and mammon. Nigel Jackson a Melbourne based school teacher, historian and writer, in a review of Alexander Solzhenitsyn's *First Circle* and *Cancer Ward* wrote: "I did not suspect at the time that my own nation, Australia, would gradually fall towards such a sad state of tyranny as described in those books and that one day I would become a dissident and pariah as Solzhenitsyn was in the Soviet Union; but it is happening. Unless the trend can be halted and reversed, it is only a matter of time before we have our own equivalent of the Gulags."

New Times Survey

As he noted, from Solzhenitsyn's writing you had to look for what the papers don't tell you, what they don't want you to know, in our idiom what rocks they do not want us to look under, there you will find some truths as to why and how this world has degenerated so in this last turbulent century. Two leads to follow are the centralization of credit issue as debt and the failure of the Christian Church to follow their Lords lead in throwing the money changers out of the temple, indeed they are now patrons of the same along with their system of usury and consider it normal.

Well might we pray today for salvation from this self serving materialistic society we have become, or rather seek the physical reality that was created for our nourishment, fulfillment and enjoyment in life, and rightly pray as per verse two:

O Lord our God arise,
Scatter our enemies and make them fall,
confound their politics,
frustrate their knavish tricks
for on THEE our hopes we fix,
God save us all.

Our real enemies, are within ourselves and our national political system.

from *Harry Dreckow*

Greetings. My thoughts and prayers are with you all. Keep up the good work

from *Peter Davis*

Congratulation to another *New Times* Dinner celebration. The work of the Social Credit movement has never been more important.

from *Nigel Jackson*

Please convey my apology for non-attendance at the national weekend, together with my warm wishes for its success. Well done, you good and faithful servants!

from *Betty Luks*

I may not be with you in the flesh but I am sure with you in spirit! Composing this message has taken me back in my memories – so please indulge me a little while. My first contact with the *Australian League of Rights* was through a couple named Abrahamsen in Geelong Victoria which was my hometown. I went to speak with them because I wanted to know more about this man Eric Butler, and his strong anti-Communist message.

The year is etched on my memory because it was the year President Kennedy was assassinated – 1963. I was reminded of this by my son Arnie giving me a copy of an old *New Times* which included my 1980 Toast to *The New Times* and seconding of the toast by my eldest son John, - 39 years ago.

(continued on next page)

(continued from previous page) I explained I was very much AGAINST Communism but wasn't sure of what I was FOR! Over the years I have found what I am FOR. I am FOR 'PEARLS OF GREAT PRICE'.

There are many here tonight who understand what I mean by 'the pearls of great price' and the price I must pay to obtain them. I would like to end with this message to younger people because it is to them that the future belongs. The words come from that great social creditor the late Geoffrey Dobbs: "*Young people are commonly told by their elders to 'face the facts of life' — which are always understood to be bad. But these are not the facts of Life, but literally, the facts of death, and the last thing we should do is to live our lives 'facing' them. On the contrary, we should face away from them,*

THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS OF SOCIAL CREDIT THEORY AND PRACTICE by **M. Oliver Heydorn Ph.D.**

The topic for my talk today has to do with the connection or the intersection between Douglas Social Credit, particularly the financial and economic ideas of Major C.H. Douglas, on the one hand, and the proper care and stewardship which we should exhibit towards the natural environment, on the other. It is my personal conviction that anyone who claims to be genuinely concerned about environmental issues, anyone who is interested in matters of pollution, conservation, environmental repair and renewal, etc., needs to look very closely at our financial system and at the sort of economic model under which we are forced to live.

The rationale for that thesis is fairly simple and it goes as follows: if you ignore finance, if you ignore economics, you will never be able to deal effectively with some of the key factors that are responsible for environmental damage and harm. As a result, whatever action you do take in favour of the environment will tend to operate more or less at the level of symptoms or symptom management, rather than at the level of root causes. In many cases, such misdirected or misaligned action may turn out to be completely ineffective, or might even make things worse while unnecessarily irritating many other sectors of the society.

Now before we look at what Douglas Social Credit has to offer when it comes to the environment, I will, of course, have to provide a short crash course in what Social Credit is all about. For those of you who are already familiar with Douglas Social Credit, it will serve as a refresher. Of course, when we are talking here about Social Credit we are NOT referring to the recently introduced Chinese totalitarian reward & punish surveillance system, but rather to a social philosophy and policy that is, if anything, the opposite of what the Chinese have implemented – even though they have - quite unhelpfully - decided to use the same term.

One metaphor which I like to use when explaining the Social Credit approach to economics to newcomers

towards the real, glorious and overwhelming facts of the living Creation.

The great and true Christian myth tells us that originally Satan was a glorious and good archangel who fell from grace through pride. Lucifer, the light-bearer, now all turned to darkness, with no creative power whatsoever, but only the power to corrupt, pervert and invert reality. 'Get thee behind me, Satan!' is the right attitude, as we have been clearly shown. And that must mean always subjecting the imposed electronic pseudo-world (in so far as we cannot escape it) to the prior test of the infinitely greater world of the reality of goodness''.

Don't be like me, who, in my younger days thought it was enough to be 'against' Communism... The question to answer is: What am I FOR? *God bless you all. ****

is that of the computer.

Computers, marvelous inventions that they are, depend on both hardware and software in order to function. With the term 'hardware' we are referring, of course, to the computer's latent capacities, its memory, processing ability, etc., which are a function of its physical components, like its motherboard, hard drive, CPU, Ram, and so forth. With the term 'software', we are referring to the operating systems or other programmes which can be loaded on to the hardware and which tell the computer what to do by providing it with instructions. The combination of hardware and software allows a computer to take some informational input, to transform that input in one way or another, and to yield some output.

In an analogous way, the economy depends on its hardware, in the form of material resources, labour, technology, know-how, etc., as well as on economic software, in the form of the financial system, along with other things such as various institutions, laws, regulations, etc., in order to produce its output: goods and services.

So the suggestion is that the financial system is akin to a computer software programme. It's a part, certainly the most important part, of the economy's software. Now, just as you can run different types of software on a computer, different programmes, it is possible, in an economy, to run different financial systems. In other words, it is important to realize that the financial system that we have is a man-made phenomenon; it is not a phenomenon of nature or something inherent to the nature of reality. It is synthetic and that means that, at least within certain limits, it can be changed or altered. Naturally, not all financial systems, just like not all computer software programmes, are created equally and some of them will be better, or more apt, at facilitating or achieving certain objectives in comparison with others.

(continued on next page)

(continued from previous page)

The basic diagnostic claim then of Social Credit is that the current financial system is not properly designed – in other words, if we think of it as software, the accusation is that the financial system is faulty. Because the financial system involves faulty programming, the real economy, i.e., the physical economic hardware, is not actualized as effectively, as efficiently, and as fairly as it could be. And, as a direct result, we suffer from problems like: poverty in the midst of plenty, servility in place of freedom, periodic financial crises, constant inflation, heavy taxation, the centralization of wealth and power in fewer and fewer hands, ever-increasing debt burdens, etc., when we could and should have, purely on the basis of the physical economy's objective capacity to deliver, abundance and security for all, combined with increasing freedom in the form of leisure. The financial system is the great artificial or man-made bottleneck which limits and misdirects our economic activity.

It's as if we could be playing 'World of Warcraft' with our economies, but are condemned to running 'Pac-Man' instead.

So what exactly is this fault which Social Credit theory claims to have detected in the current financial system? Well, the financial system is a virtual world, a world of figures, which is supposed to have some connection to the real world, to the real economy ... and so we can ask: "do those figures, the kind of figures which the current financial system spits out, do they accurately represent the real world in which production and consumption actually occur?"

Social Credit theory asserts that the answer to that question is 'no'; the financial system does not provide us with an accurate picture of the physical or real-world economy, of our economic hardware, neither of its potential, on the one hand, nor of its actualization, on the other. The financial system does not correspond to the physical reality; and in that respect it is not an honest system. Instead, it paints a picture that we are poorer than we actually are. Poorer, when it comes to our ability to produce things, and poorer when it comes to our ability to consume what we have produced.

In other words, the present financial system, which is supposed to serve us as a tool, is not a good or useful tool, because it is not an accurate tool. What good would a thermometer be, for example, if it always underestimated the temperature by a few degrees? Doctors would not be able to diagnose patients accurately and so forth. So what we are claiming is that something similar is happening in the realm of the physical economy as an effect of an unreliable financial system.

So first off, on the level of production, the present financial system artificially limits our ability to produce new wealth, new goods and services, by rationing the credit that is created and that can be made available for

production purposes, whether public or private.

That means that if we look out on the economic landscape, as it were, there are countless instances, many of which would be familiar to any number of us, in which there is a disconnect between what we can and need to produce on the one hand and what we actually do produce on the other.

That is, there are many examples of there being some pressing need for a particular good or service combined with the ready availability of all the raw materials, technology, labour, etc., that are required to bring it into being ... and yet, the production does not take place because there is one thing that is lacking, and that thing is money. Money is the necessary catalyst for the 'productive reaction' to actually take place in the formal economy. In the absence of money, nothing happens. And for this reason, needs, in some cases vital needs, go unmet. That is a tragic state of affairs because it is a situation that is completely avoidable. There is no good reason for that sort of dysfunction.

In the Canadian medical system, for example, it is not uncommon that people have to wait inordinate periods of time for certain surgeries or diagnostic scans and so forth. When people ask about it they are told that 'money is lacking' or 'the system is cash-strapped' and, when they protest, they may be goaded with something like: "but where is the money to come from?" Well, ultimately the money is only lacking because the present financial system dictates that there be no money for this or that productive purpose, even though, on a physical level, that production would be easily realizable.

Now, if the financial system were an honest system, if it were designed in such a way that it automatically reflected the physical economic reality, then what that would mean is this: needs and the physical capacity to fulfill those needs would always be connected. That is, sufficient credit for production would be automatically forthcoming so long as a society possesses what Douglas termed 'the real credit': the physical ability to deliver goods and services, as, when, and where required. It is the real credit which is the only ultimate basis for financial credit and thus it is the only thing that should serve as an intrinsically limiting factor for financial credit. An old Social Credit axiom reads: "Whatever is physically possible and desirable should be financially possible".

This bears repeating. Social Credit says: "whatever is physically possible and desirable should be financially possible", whereas the existing financial system says: "only some of the things that are physically possible and 'desirable' are financially possible."

"And which things are those?" you ask. Well, we are talking here usually or mainly of those things that promise to be maximally profitable within the context of a dishonest and artificially limiting financial system ... a system which treats money...

(continued on next page)

(continued from previous page) ...as a commodity that is to be bought and sold, rather than as a mere accounting tool.

Now, both the artificial restriction on production, on our production possibilities, under the current system, as well as the Social Credit remedial proposals which would alleviate and indeed eliminate that restriction, have a number of implications for the environment.

In the first place, there are, *ex hypothesi*, many environmental projects which should be undertaken – I am not going to specify with any definitive judgement exactly which ones, because that is a matter for unbiased scientific experts to determine – which are not undertaken at the present time even though we have the physical resources to accomplish them and which could, given the political will, be undertaken in a Social Credit system.

For example, there may be areas of the world that have undergone deforestation and which should be reforested for the sake of preserving the soil and biodiversity, etc. We have the know-how, the technology, and the labour to do that, but it is not being done presently to the extent that it may be needed because there is a lack of producer credit.

Similarly, there is a lot of plastic waste floating around in lakes, rivers, and the oceans. There is technology available to help clean that up, but it is not manufactured or employed to the extent that it is both desired and possible because of a scarcity of money.

In these and many other ways, Social Credit would provide a supportive financial environment, which would make it easier for us to repair damage to the natural environment and to restore the biophysical world.

In the second place, once you remove any artificial restrictions on producer credit, it also becomes more feasible to act pre-emptively or pro-actively and to prevent environmental damage from occurring in the first place by developing, and/or manufacturing, cleaner technologies and industrial processes.

One of the things which often holds back authentically green technologies (as opposed to things that might be sold under that label but which constitute no real improvement and may even be worse for the environment) is the lack of funds that are available to set the production of such alternatives in motion. Social Credit, by contrast, guarantees that there will always be a green financial light for the rapid expansion and refinement of green technologies of all kinds, provided that there is the public will to support it.

Now, if we shift our attention to the matter of consumption, the present financial system is a problem there too because it artificially limits or conditions our ability to consume the wealth that we do produce. And it does that by releasing insufficient credit in the form of consumer income to fully offset the costs/prices

that have simultaneously been built up in the course of production. It's as if credit in the form of consumer income has been deliberately rationed, rather than having been distributed as freely as is necessary to keep pace with the flow of costs and prices.

You see, as the current financial system reads or represents the physical economic activity, there are two financial flows, or flows of figures, which correspond to the flow of goods and services that are being produced. There is the flow of costs/prices on the one hand, and then there is the flow of consumer purchasing power that is simultaneously being distributed.

According to the Social Credit analysis, these two flows are not, under the current system, in an automatic balance when they should be. Instead, the flow of costs/prices exceeds the flow of consumer purchasing power. So there is a fundamental imbalance in the system.

Now, this imbalance has to be compensated for in some fashion because otherwise the economy will stall: goods will go unsold, people will lose their jobs, businesses will go bankrupt and so forth.

The present economic system tries to compensate for the imbalance, the price-income gap, by relying on the contraction of new debt-money, such as consumer loans to make up for the lack of consumer buying power. But the main way of providing additional consumer buying power is for the new money to be created and issued for additional production, whether private or public, whether needed or not. The incomes distributed in the course of additional production help us to sell goods and services that were produced in the past, without, in the present, or in the immediate future at any rate, adding to the flow of costs/prices. That is especially true of capital production, of public goods and services, and of goods/serviced destined for export. These goods and services either never add to the flow of costs and prices, or only do so at some later stage in the more or less distant future. They provide more income in the here and now while kicking the can down the road where costs/prices are concerned. In this way, the 'surplus' goods that are presently on the consumer market can be distributed and their corresponding costs of production can be met. The economy can then hum along without too many difficulties.

But what this means concretely is that, under the existing economic model, the economy must continuously expand – and not only must it expand, but it must expand at an ever-increasing rate (or exponentially) in order to maintain a balance between the two flows that were mentioned earlier: that of costs/prices, on the one hand, and that of incomes on the other.

Growth, constant growth at an ever-increasing pace, becomes the condition of the possibility of maintaining equilibrium between the flow of costs/prices on the one hand, and the flow of incomes or consumer buying power on the other.

(continued on next page)

(continued from previous page) To provide you with a ready-made image: imagine a bicycle that could only be kept in balance by pedalling ever faster on it. If the bicycle represents the economy and the pedalling represents the rate of economic activity, the Social Credit analysis claims that our economy is like this hypothetical bicycle that can only be ridden or kept upright by pedalling ever faster on it. As soon as the accelerating pedalling loses pace, the economy stalls.

One of the difficulties we face is that this rhythm cannot be maintained indefinitely. From time to time the debt-burdens associated with growth become too heavy and people start to default. Banks tighten up their lending and the flow of credit slows. The result is a financial crisis. Such a system-induced financial crisis occurs and has real world consequences even though nothing at all has happened to the physical economic hardware. In a financial crisis of this nature we are still physically capable of producing everything we produced before the financial crisis hit, so the resultant suffering and hardship, though real in itself, bears a purely artificial or 'software' type cause.

Now, if the financial system were an honest system, if it were designed in such a way that it automatically reflected the physical economic reality, then what that would mean in terms of consumption is this: we would always, as consumers, possess sufficient income in the aggregate to meet all costs and prices and to clear the markets of production. We would not have to borrow additional money, either directly in the form of consumer loans or indirectly by having to engage in additional production, whether public or private, whether of capital or consumer goods and services, and whether for export or domestic use. The flow of costs/prices would always be automatically balanced with a sufficient and corresponding flow of incomes or consumer buying power ... and all would be well with the world.

Social Credit proposes, then, that in lieu of any additional borrowing or production, a National Credit Office, an organ of the state, would create sufficient additional consumer buying power in the form of 'debt-free' credits and issue it to citizens directly, in the form of a National Dividend (a periodic payment distributed to all independently of employment status), and indirectly in the form of a compensated price discount on all retail goods and services. These two measures would close the gap and bring the economic system into an automatic and natural equilibrium.

To continue with the bicycle analogy, Social Credit would allow us to speed the bike up, to slow it down or to keep it at a steady pace, according to our desires as to how we wish to make use of our economic resources. Notice this key or fundamental difference between a Social Credit financial system and the present financial system: under the existing system we are not in the driver's seat, we have no choice but to peddle ever-harder

on the bicycle to keep it in balance and to avoid disaster, whereas, under Social Credit, we are free to decide how fast we want the bicycle to move, and we know, that at whatever speed we select, the bike will maintain itself in balance.

So what are the potential environmental implications of having a financial system in an automatic, self-liquidating balance, with the flow of income equalling the flow of costs/prices, as opposed to the present system, which is inherently imbalanced and which suffers from a chronic lack or deficiency of consumer income?

Well, to begin with, all of the additional pollution, whether of the air, water, land, etc., that is generated by forced economic activity and forced economic growth could be eliminated if we could run the economy in a much more efficient manner, where we only undertake new or additional production for the sake of additional consumption that is genuinely needed and not mainly for the sake of distributing additional incomes so that past production can actually be sold and the associated costs met.

From a Social Credit point of view, the excess or superfluous economic activity and growth that the current system requires is simply a form of waste. It's unnecessary, and the additional pollution associated with that waste is likewise unnecessary.

Imagine, for example, that instead of a 21 trillion dollar economy, the United States, if organized on Social Credit lines, could meet the needs of its citizens amply with an economy only half its size, say 10.5 trillion, but one that is more effectively, efficiently, and fairly targeted at fulfilling consumers' real needs. On that scenario, we could foresee that the pollution associated with the present scale of the economy could be significantly reduced, perhaps by as much as a half or more.

In the same way, when it comes to the conservation of non-renewable resources such as bio-diversity, scarce minerals, etc., and renewable resources, such as forests, soils, and habitats, etc., a smaller-scale but more efficiently run economic system, free from the compulsion of forced economic activity and of forced economic growth, could significantly reduce the rate at which societies draw on the natural environment for their economic sustenance. This would slow the depletion of non-renewable resources and prevent the misuse and waste of renewable resources.

In order to bring this home or to make it more concrete, consider all of the production that occurs principally in order to distribute additional incomes under a full employment economic model, and/or to make it easier or more comfortable for people to work in order that these incomes may be distributed.

(continued on next page)

(continued from previous page) This sort of activity constitutes an enormous amount of resource consumption. Think of all of the additional buildings that must be constructed to house those extra workers. Their factories, offices, etc., have to be fitted with furniture, equipment, supplies. These buildings must be warmed and cooled, lighted, and powered. Vehicles, roads, and other transport systems must be manufactured and operated to ferry the workers from home to their place of work and back again and so forth. This all represents wasteful production and consumption and it means that humanity is drawing on the natural world to a far greater extent than is necessary, or that would be necessary under a sane financial system, than is actually required for its authentic economic needs. And that is, perhaps, the fundamental environmental problem.

There are two other features of the present financial system, besides the impetus to forced economic growth, that have a significant impact on environmental matters: 1) the power of vested interests and 2) the artificial advantage possessed by cheaper goods. These factors, we anticipate, would also be eliminated or at least attenuated under a Social Credit system.

When it comes to vested interests, there are certainly many powerful industries and players who would perhaps oppose or thwart the development of alternative technologies, even if those technologies were much more environmentally friendly than what we have at present. The obvious reason being that such alternatives might undermine their own investments, profits, agendas, and so forth. This, I think, helps to explain some of the inertia that we see in various sectors of the economy. Social Credit would help to neutralize this tendency because firstly there would be more money available for new, innovative production, and the income security that Social Credit would afford everyone through the universal citizen's dividend would reduce the pressure some people feel to acquire and control as much wealth as possible as a hedge against future uncertainties.

When it comes to the artificial advantage possessed by cheaper goods under the current system, it is true that cheaper goods/services possess a double advantage over other goods/services whenever you have an economy that is labouring under a chronic lack of adequate consumer buying power. Cheaper goods and services are obviously more attractive in any economy from the point of view of price, simply because they require less money to purchase them; but when there is an inherent deficiency of income, they acquire a second advantage. You see, consumers often opt for shoddy goods or goods characterized by built-in obsolescence not because these things are really representative of what they would like or prefer, but because it may be all that they can afford. In this way, the production of things that are wasteful or polluting, etc., tends to be incentivized in the current economy because they are cheaper and possess this

double advantage. And not just incentivized, but, as patterns of production, they tend to be ingrained for the same reason: people come to rely on them as a matter of guaranteeing financial survival and being able to make do.

By contrast, in a Social Credit economy, where you always have enough consumer income being automatically distributed so that we, as consumers, can buy back in full, whatever we produce, consumer choices can be more flexible and more reflective of what consumers would really like to have. This, in turn, would enable producers to respond more effectively to consumers' true or finance-independent preferences and that, by itself, should result in more genuine environmentally friendly choices becoming economically supportable and viable.

So what I am suggesting at the end of the day, is that, if we had a healthy financial system and hence a healthy economic order, one that was stable and flexible, because it is built on truth and incorporates balance or the principle of homeostasis as one of its operating principles, it would be far easier to ensure that our interactions as a species with the natural environment are likewise healthy and balanced. On the other hand, if we continue with a financial/economic model which is built on falsehood, which is fundamentally unbalanced in its routine operations and predatory in its spirit, we need not be surprised that our interactions with the natural environment and even the attempts we make to care for the natural environment (out of this dysfunctional framework) are similarly going to be grounded on falsehood, to be marred by imbalance, and to end up leaving a trail of senseless destruction in their wake. This is especially true when we consider the level of technological development that we have now reached and the impact that we are capable of having on the natural world. Social Credit, Douglas Social Credit, provides us with the hope that a high technology civilization and the natural world can live in greater harmony with each other than has hitherto been possible, both for the benefit of the human person and of all other living things. Thank you. ***

Subscription to On Target \$45.00 p.a.

NewTimes Survey \$30.00 p.a.

and **Donations** can be performed by **bank transfer:**

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

BSB 105-044

A/c No. 188-040-840

or cheques to: 'Australian League of Rights (SA Branch)'

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

Telephone: 08 8387 6574 **eMail:** heritagebooks@alor.org

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

<https://alor.org/> our main website and repository of the

Douglas Social Credit and Freedom Movement 'Archives'.

NewTimes Survey is printed and authorised by

K. W. Grundy, 13 Carsten Court, Happy Valley, SA.