

*"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. 27 No. 10

October 2026

IN THIS ISSUE

Social Crediters: Let Knowledge and Initiative Ignite, So Victory May Be Ours By Mark Anderson (USA)	1
Social Credit vs. Utopianism By Robert Klinck (Canada)	2

Social Crediters: Let Knowledge and Initiative Ignite, So Victory May Be Ours By Mark Anderson (USA) (text of a presentation given at the ALOR 80th anniversary National Weekend — Oct. 17-18, 2026)

As is well-known, the Australian League of Rights (ALOR) produces a weekly video discussion called Cross Roads—which is predicated on Douglas Social Credit (DSC). We are indeed at a crossroads in this ailing world. But the “signs” posted at the Cross Roads that the ALOR talks about don’t involve Democrat versus Republican, nor capitalism intersecting with socialism, nor liberalism and conservatism intersecting.

Such carefully crafted conventional “alternatives” constantly fool the bulk of humanity by providing a patina of plausibility and truth, but they are really false choices. Indeed, the Cross Roads that the ALOR has in mind constitute a genuine choice, as DSC represents the avenue of real societal renewal, while all the other lame “isms” and pet theories can be lumped together and viewed more or less as one useless mass of misdirection.

DSC, simply put, involves phasing out the commandeered work-state by putting automated production in the service of humanity, rather than a menace that will forever haunt us. Under DSC, everyone becomes an heir to all the past industrial and technological innovations that add even more value to the natural resources of God’s creation.

And based on the monetary value of that automated production everyone in this universalized-shareholder arrangement naturally and properly receives an accurately calculated regular dividend—to supplement work income where applicable, or to serve as retirement or standard income for young and old—as no one would be forced to work.

The dividend's funding would be based on new debt-free money, or credit, NOT the redistribution of tax dollars in the socialist way. After the proper dividend amount is calculated by the new nonpartisan National Credit Office created under DSC, the dividend would be issued directly by the state or through intermediaries such as strictly regulated private banks whose current monopoly of credit would be abolished. In the U.S., federal postal banks, like the ones that operated around the time of the Great Depression, could be brought back as another way of distributing the dividend.

Of course, there are other DSC mechanisms, such as the Compensated Price that I won't go into detail about here, except to say that it's designed to be a firewall against demand-pull inflation, by helping secure the alignment of prices with consumer spending power.

And it cannot be stressed too strongly that the DSC animated tutorials that are posted on You Tube, through the efforts of Social Credit Economics author Dr. Oliver Heydorn, offer crystal clear (and rather entertaining) explanations of all of DSC's components and aspects. Those who haven't watched these animations are strongly encouraged to do so as soon as possible and share them widely.

WHAT TO DO?

Granted, we could just keep on doing the same thing we've always been doing—hoping against hope that casting votes for today's favorite candidates, and doing the same thing during the next elections far into the foreseeable future—will somehow usher in the financial and political changes that are desperately needed.

Ah, but perhaps Mark Twain was correct when he said, "If voting did us any good, they wouldn't let us do it."

Still, there is cause for hope. Based on my travels and conversations with people, I am more convinced than ever that the majority of the citizens in the U.S., Canada and beyond, clearly including Australia, and just about everyone everywhere else, knows something is fundamentally wrong with the economic "porridge" we've been served by corrupt governments, their banking bosses, insurance companies etc.

To be sure, the "dark side" is wily. It plants snares, erects false intersections and invents bogeymen everywhere. Consider the constant referrals by big media and politicians to those external "enemies" of which we are all supposed to be forever fearful: "China" this, and "Iran" that . . . on and on and on, when the government that can really damage or end your freedom is invariably your own government—even at the local, county or provincial levels, not just the national level.

Beyond such fear-mongering, we have media follies in the form of brain-addled celebrities and the phenomenon of vast numbers of people getting caught up in the lives of entertainers. Meanwhile, the financial media touts the line of the central banks—the Federal Reserve, the European Central Bank, the Bank of Canada, Bank of England, the Reserve Bank of Australia, as well as the Bank for International Settlements (BIS, the central bank of the central banks) and its ridiculous “rules” for host countries.

The BIS, take note, arrogantly enters into a written agreement with each host country that provides BIS with an inroad, basically to establish that the host nation will have as little say as possible on BIS operations. And yet the host nation must still supply all necessary police protection to the BIS bankers and their employees.

ROLL UP OUR SLEEVES

The underlying secret to measurable DSC progress is for those who understand DSC to make it a central priority of their lives while always teaching others—anyone and everyone who will listen. Even those who won’t listen . . .

Don’t overthink it — parents, teach your kids; kids, teach your parents; grandparents, teach your grandkids! Just do it.

Why not organize a coffee club at your local diner or in your kitchen—and in so doing, watch those above-noted DSC animations while reading DSC articles and books. Perhaps throw in some home or community gardening projects. Have a good time.

Or, maybe you are a member of a local fraternal organization—so why not, if possible, get together with your fellow members, color outside the lines, so to speak, and discuss something fresh like DSC “off the record.”

From there, at least in a loose-knit way, we ultimately need to form an educational vanguard that can revive or reconfigure the adult-education DSC classes that were taught across the UK in the early 20th Century, stemming from C.H Douglas himself. That tradition, by any means possible, must not be allowed to remain a mere relic of the past but, rather, an example to modify and mimic with all the steely determination we can muster.

In terms of achieving some constructive media outreach, most of us can write a letter to the editor to local and regional newspapers (print, online or both) to spread the word about DSC. If by chance you need a little guidance on that, or if you want to put together some more formal like a press release or guest-opinion newspaper column to show how DSC is relevant to countless things in everyday life, feel free to contact me through Arnis Luks, who oversees ALOR; or email me, Mark Anderson, directly at truthhound2@yahoo.com

RECALLING COACH ROCKNE

Norway-born Knute Rockne (1888-1931), who became the famous philosopher-coach of the “Fighting Irish” football team at the University of Notre Dame in South Bend, Indiana, often said that a man’s real worth, which is sometimes enhanced by proper “education,” is the hard-wired integrity that “hangs in his heart,” not so much the diploma that hangs on his wall. ‘

In other words, it’s the heart that counts the most. And Rockne often inspired the many players who loved him to fuse knowledge and sheer determination in order to take that football over the goal line, literally and figuratively.

Social creditors should take note of Rockne’s insightful and motivational advice on the vital importance of irrepressible determination, while remembering his high ethical standards as represented by “*The Prayer of the Sportsman*” that he often cited, to wit:

*Dear Lord, in the battle that goes on through life
I ask but a field that is fair,
A chance that is equal with all in the strife,
A courage to strive and to dare;

And if I should win, let it be by the code
With my faith and my honor held high;
And if I should lose, let me stand by the road,
And cheer as the winners go by.*

Social Credit vs. Utopianism By Robert Klinck (Canada)

(text of a presentation given at the ALOR 80th anniversary

National Weekend — Oct. 17-18, 2026)

Following decades of observation of and interaction with the so-called powers that be, the originator of the Social Credit movement, Anglo-Scottish engineer Major Clifford Hugh Douglas, was categorical in his assessment of utopianism. His first public writing was in 1917. In a comment published three decades later, on September 14, 1946, he asserted that “Utopians are disciples of Lucifer”. Such unequivocal language derived from his close following of political and economic developments in the 1930s and 1940s. He had concluded that actions that had caused the levelling of nations and the deaths of tens of millions of people were not accidental or random but, rather, were what he characterized as “crystallized policy”. Hopefully, what Douglas meant by his definition of utopianism and how it relates to human association will be made clear by what follows.

As a starting point, we should define utopianism. A utopian is a person who

believes that it is possible to create a workable plan for society into which all citizens can be fitted and made to conform. It is analogous to the Greek myth of Procrustes, whose policy was to adjust the person to fit the bed, by either stretching or amputation, rather than adjusting the bed to fit the person.

Social Credit has regularly been associated with a plan for so-called monetary reform. While his writings made important and original contributions to realistic thinking about monetary issues, Douglas stressed that the primary focus of his thinking was on enabling proper human relations, which he saw as a matter precedent to monetary arrangements. Because human attributes and purposes are widely variable, when they are enabled, by their very nature, they are not conformable to rigid planning.

It seems as if to many people who have superficially studied the financial system, the term “monetary reform” has come to have a virtually mystical import—rather like a magical incantation. It *is* an important answer to our woes. However, in itself the phrase “monetary reform” is of no practical use in shedding light on what ails our economy and suggesting beneficial remedial measures. The devil, as they say, is very much in the details. and how these intersect with reality.

It is as true of the pursuit of administrative policy as it is of physical travel that, for you to have prospects for a successful outcome, before setting out you must know your ultimate destination. The failure to be clear about this is what allows politics to fail chronically in delivering results that will effectively change things for the better. Either people are not clear about what constitutes “better” or they have such a narrow perspective that their proposals do not address overriding issues. Social Crediters lay claim to having a special role in defining the essential goal of monetary reform because of their unique perspective on the inherent deficiencies of the income distribution function of the current financial system. This deficiency was discovered fortuitously by Major Clifford Hugh Douglas in the course of an accounting project he was carrying out for the Royal Aircraft Factory at Farnborough, England, during the First World War.

Generally speaking, our minds are comforted by habit and conditioned to follow conceptual tracks. Douglas’s discovery took the form of a revelation—a tearing away of the veil of habitual perception—whose implications necessarily transformed conventional economic thinking. A sudden revelation can radically alter the nature of the game and, under the new light that Douglas’s accountancy discovery brought into the room, the theorizing of professional economists was exposed as being largely misguided maundering. In our money-dominated society, which one should note is a departure from what was a formerly largely religion-guided society, we have, unfortunately, developed professions for hire, be they doctors, politicians, preachers or economists. In an uncertain

employment environment, they are all concerned to keep a steady stream of income coming their way. Their credentials as authentic professionals have been ravaged by this cynical pursuit of cash.

It is apparent to every thinking person that the financial system causes much hardship to people—in other words, in a period of unprecedented material abundance, this system is flawed. However, detractors of the financial system tend to “jump the gun” in proposing changes to it. Being focussed on derivative defects rather than primary ones, their proposals fall short of delivering satisfactory solutions. Remember, an incorrect question as the starting-point for analysis can never lead to a correct answer. Unfortunately, the protagonists of misconceived answers commonly end up futilely expending their energies at cross purposes with each other, generating a dialectical friction-point that expends much energy without improving our position. This paralytic situation is no doubt looked upon favourably, and hence encouraged, by those who would perpetuate the influence that finance has established over all fields of human endeavour. The irreconcilable polarizing of ideologies of late has taught us much about the strategy of dividing in order to rule, which is well-served by confusion about the effective approach to monetary reform.

By definition, promoting policies in disregard of what actually needs doing is the essence of utopianism, i.e. policy detached from reality, and has the effect of enabling the imposition of the anti-social plans of a cabal upon the whole of humanity.

Before investigating what Douglas meant by identifying utopianism with luciferianism, we shall do well to establish some other basic understandings. One—and it is a major one—is to define the real purpose of government. Logically, this must cohere with the purpose of people in constituting an association in the pursuit of shared goals. What could it possibly be, then, other than to improve the lives of the people within its jurisdiction by furthering their prosperity and security and ability to use their life potential as they personally choose. If we seek virtue in public affairs, this is where it lies. Any other purpose is simply “no go”, and necessarily a departure from reality. If a policy is not derived from any perspective other than realism, the facts of the world, but rather is a constrictive theory imposed on society, it is by definition utopian.

Now, politicians blatantly contend for power, on the pretext that possessing power will enable them to do good things in the public interest. However, in our so-called democratic societies, with the connivance of the major media politics boil down to superficial popularity competitions, based on such attributes as physical attractiveness or verbal glibness. As a result, the public are brought not only to tolerate misrepresentations about policy intentions but even to accept them as part of the game. How this disregard for accountability could yield

results that are comprehensible, much less desired by the population, is hard to conceive.

We have it on good authority that one cannot serve two masters, and this is as true in the area of public administration as it is in personal life. Trying simultaneously to serve different purposes is debilitating. It dissipates your intentions and compromises your endeavours. The American maxim “Government by the people”, which clearly implies that the people will be making policy decisions, is rendered meaningless when they are working for different aims. And when the will of the electorate is scattered, the field of policy formulation is occupied by backroom manipulators. Because more decision-making by governments automatically means less decision-making by citizens individually, the supervisory abilities of the population atrophy. Since developing the ability to make decisions is essential to becoming fully human, in fact determines what it is to be human, the occupation of ever more of this field by government is at odds with developing a population of thriving individuals. Burgeoning government bureaucracy always discourages general personal growth.

Again following his custom of reducing issues to their essence, Major Douglas enunciated a truism that is strangely absent from modern economic theory. The truism is that the only sane purpose of production is to provide goods and services for consumption. In orthodox economic thinking, consumption is viewed as being more or less incidental in the economic scheme of things. Indeed, it has even become commonplace to regard it as antithetical to healthy economic activity. Thus the phrase “consumer society” has been given a pejorative connotation. However, since sustaining life necessarily involves consumption of resources, this is a misleading perception.

Realistically, consumption is the completion of economic activity—in effect, its crown, without which productive effort is sheer waste. Again Douglas expressed the truism that the only sane purpose of production is consumption. Expressed otherwise, the Social Credit position is that the essential purpose of production is to create something that not only can be of use to people but actually shall be of use to them.

If the critique is of compulsive consumption, the motive for this is to be found in the pressures generated by an unbalanced financial system

In a bizarre departure from this foundational *raison d'être* of an economy—namely, to create products that people will actually use—virtually all professional economists operate on the assumption that an economy exists primarily in order to provide people with something to do. To this end, the supreme achievement of economic activity is seen to be manufacturing products for export—the more the better. This of course is consistent with

keeping homegrown consumers short of the monetary means to purchase the goods slated for export.

Canada's current Prime Minister, who is well schooled in conventional economic thinking, is an enthusiastic promoter of the concept of exportation as the principal economic purpose. He plans to attract huge amounts of foreign investment, which of course will decide exclusive of Canadians how Canadian resources are to be developed, and then to make Canadians prosperous by shipping these resources out of the country. It's a continuation of the old bankers' protocol of not making a national population prosperous directly but rather giving it the means to acquire a bit of prosperity by shipping the lion's share of it abroad.

From his understanding of the impulsion to capture foreign markets we can make sense of what Douglas and his supporters observed through the Great Depression of the 1930s as a contrived path to another world war. And we can understand the international madness going on now—with European and North American governments spoiling for war, warning that we must be prepared for war (specifically with Russia et al. with the et al. to be formalized later) within a few years, and diverting increasing percentages of national resources into the preparations therefor. I appreciate, as I never could so well before, how Social Crediters in the 1930s knew that war was in the works; it was seen by international finance as the remedy for a world in danger of enjoying too much prosperity and excessively amicable international relations. The Great Depression of the 1930s, a ginned-up economic punishment of the masses, was a cruel preparation for recruiting national populations into a general military conflict.

As the world emerged from the First World War, which had demonstrated not only the immense latent productive capacity of national economies but also how quickly and profusely the financial spigot of war could activate it, the control valve was abruptly tightened down. Apparently the spectacular wartime productivity had only been a feverish dream. Oddly, the dramatic contrast between the capacities of wartime and peacetime economies went unremarked by the major, corporate-controlled media, which switched from prewar bellicose yellow journalism mode to blinkered austerity journalism mode. Somehow the post-war contraction of productivity had to be made to appear normal. I recall coming across in my reading a British cabinet minister of the time lamenting how he would have difficulty explaining to Englishmen that there was no way that they could have better housing after peace had been achieved. Indeed, looking back on the achievements in the preceding years of spewing out mountains of armaments while much of the healthiest component of the manpower of the country was overseas fighting an enemy, it

is not hard to see the minister's predicament.

Another trenchant observation Douglas made was that economic benefits can be meaningfully effective only at the level of the individual. Being abstractions, governments and corporations have no incarnation that can experience benefit apart from their individual human components.

As has been stated, the Social Credit position is that the only sane purpose of production is to create something that both can be of use to people and *shall* be of use to them. Looking through a different lens, virtually all professional economists assume that a, if not *the*, fundamental purpose of an economy is to provide people with something to do, it being assumed that they are incapable of doing this on their own. Uniquely, in the economic field, Social Creditors don't see the economy as being a means of keeping people busy working on other people's agendas.

Douglas's writings expose the fraudulent character of the preoccupation of orthodox economic thinking with so-called "work". Promoting paid work as an end in itself is obviously a form of utopianism. It immediately raises serious questions, such as: who will set the work program?

I need hardly point out that the economists' and politicians' social idea of work does not correspond with the formal definition of the term in theoretical physics—that is, the displacement of a mass through a distance. In fact, it is a common observation that in a bureaucratic system much of what is labeled "work" is done without moving anything at all!

What, then, is "work" in the world of orthodox economists, those hirelings of the Money Power? We still hear, for instance, constant references to something called "the working class". I submit that the accurate definition of "working" in this sense is "doing something for which some one is willing to reward you with money". This criterion leads to identifying as work, and hence as desirable, all manner of disparate activities, from marketing pornography to manipulating public opinion with false stories to developing biological weapons with which to kill your neighbours. No matter how pointless or perverse such pursuits might be, they somehow become ennobled when people are deriving income from them. If work is seen as being wasteful or degenerate, the imposition of the obligation to do it, which is predicated by financial necessity, evidently proceeds from utopian thinking.

Hopefully some day, after the income deficiency flaw in our financial accountancy will have been corrected, an inquiry will expose how much of what has until then been accounted as work has actually consisted of attempts to deal with problems spawned by that flaw, which is unquestionably the dominant aspect of the economy.

From the Social Credit perspective, creating work is not the a priori

purpose of economic activity at all. In particular, work imposed by one person on another without the latter's voluntary consent is intrinsically evil. Because of the denial of distribution of the cultural heritage, such imposition is mediated by unnatural financial pressure. To the extent that it is necessary to provide people with the goods and services they want, work is merely a side-effect of production. In fact, utopian glorification of work has the negative result of creating a constant tension in economic projects between those who want to keep a job going in perpetuity for its income benefits and those who want to finish it and get on with living. Because people need to have work-derived income continuously coming in, in nearly all projects nowadays there is a perverse tendency to encourage inefficiency.

Add to this negative aspect of contemporary work the fact that psychological studies consistently find that around 60% of employed people see what they do under the rubric of "work" as being meaningless. The psychological harms of having no sense of worth in what we spend the largest part of our lives doing are surely catastrophic.

To listen to factions playing the game of politics, one would think that giving people chores with which to occupy their time, and so justify giving them "earned" revenue, is the essential purpose of governmental administration. They all promise to generate "full employment", or at least an approximation thereof. Douglas showed that the provision of income within the current economy is so conceptually wrong from the outset that trying to achieve it through payment for largely redundant work misses the mark completely.

Idealism, which is the precursor of utopianism, is often highly regarded, but Douglas warned that in fact society is never in greater danger than when it falls under the control of the idealist. As an engineer, Douglas was above all a practical man, dealing with the physical world. When idealists try to implement their strong personal convictions about what form society should take, they can wreak havoc on it. Typically these types of persons are players in revolutionary movements, which historically, when ideologically motivated, have taken mankind through some of its cruelest excesses. As one would expect, the more extremely utopian the motivation, the bloodier the resulting revolution. One thinks of the slaughters by Cromwell's fanatical Roundhead army in Ireland, or the orgy of guillotining by "The Incorruptible" Robespierre and his fellow Jacobins during the 1789 revolution in France. The utopianism there encompassed plans to remodel all aspects of French society—social, legal, geographical, cultural—you name it. As seems always to happen, purporting to remove abuses according to a utopian agenda led to their intensification rather than their abolition. Utopian logic ultimately

concluded that the simplest way of dealing those resisting imposition of the utopian scheme was to deny their citizenship and chop off their heads.

The most implausible, yet persistent, instance of this utopian cast of thought is the faith in the inevitable triumph of the militant communism prescribed in *The Communist Manifesto*, which Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels were commissioned to compose in order to rouse the multi-nation revolutionary activity that occurred in Europe around 1848. The program the manifesto set forth, which was to be achieved by the continuous underground subversive activity that Marx referred to as “Old Mole”, consisted of 10 objectives that required for their accomplishment unprecedented concentration of power in the state.

Marx's totalitarian objectives were formulated in absolutist language. For example, they included the abolition of ALL private ownership of land, creation of a SINGLE central bank for the nation, MONOPOLY state control of education, onerous progressive income taxes, abolition of ALL inheritance rights, etc. His was the utopian language of what we now call “zero tolerance”: no discussion or expression of dissenting views was permissible. In their pursuit of Marx's revolutionary goals, historically his disciples, once they had acquired a measure of governmental control, adopted increasingly severe measures in the rigid belief that nothing could impede their creation of a new ideal world. Their certainty that they were on the right side of history left a trail of organized repression and death through the twentieth century. One need only recall the careers of Lenin, Stalin, Mao Tse-tung, Pol Pot, Mengistu, Ceaucescu, and many others who have killed en masse for ideological—in other words, utopian—reasons. Despite Nazism and Fascism being portrayed, for dialectical purposes, as polar opposites of that rogues' gallery, those movements were inspired by the same impulse to organize and dominate whole populations.

The Marxists' credentials as the most extreme utopians are assured by their bizarre contention that the inescapable law of economic evolution dictates that the path to effecting the withering away of the state requires the concentration of all power in its hands. This fancy flies in the face of every experience of concentration of power in the hands of the few known to history.

Utopianism has been sloshing freely around in society for so long that only a minority of the population is now capable of clearly recognizing when it is operative and the danger it poses. This leaves most people susceptible to being swept up by its recurrent manifestations.

A recent vivid demonstration of the threat utopian thinking poses, which offered a window into the future envisaged by the guardians of the current

work-state, was provided by the handling of the COVID panic, beginning early in 2020. Out of the blue, an unprecedented strait-jacket was inflicted on the entire population of the world. The freedom of speech people assumed they had disappeared in a flash, as the slightest expression of scepticism about the so-called public health measures being imposed could result in a heavy fine, dismissal from your job, or even an unprovoked assault by jumped-up police. In retrospect the policies of safe social distancing (which, oddly, ranged between one and two metres depending on the political jurisdiction); wearing of a mask, then of multiple layers of masks; insanely attempting to sterilize all surfaces with which humans might come into contact; confinement in one's home or a government barracks, etc., have all since been shown to have been superstition-based and ineffectual. The culmination of the back-pedaling on Covid policies occurred when, three years into the pandemic, the director of the American Center for Disease Control admitted that the vaunted so-called anti-Covid vaccines—which, having been represented as humanity's only hope for avoiding mass death, by then had been injected into billions of people—had never had an effect on transmission of the virus. It was yet another case of idealism—belief in a perfect grand plan—running rampant over realism and making fools of the compliant. In their planning the utopian jabsters didn't balk at destroying millions of businesses and disrupting the educational trajectories of a generation of students. Except for certain politicians and bureaucrats, who we later discovered had privately partied maskless throughout the crisis in their accustomed style, everyone was treated the same under the threat of COVID.

This egalitarian treatment disregarded the fact that equality, human and non-human, is a fiction invented for administrative convenience. This of course means that indiscriminate medical schemes are necessarily utopian and produce unpredictable individual outcomes. The utopianism of the COVID measures included flouting established rules on patient consent for medical intervention and imposing a patently bogus public health regime on the entire world.

Just as people have been conditioned to look for a new politician to deliver them from the harms caused by the incumbents, they reflexively hope that a new approach to social organization will get them closer to the promised land. Hence political candidates' perpetual refrain about achieving "change". Although the voters' trust in the electoral system to improve conditions is constantly being betrayed, as good utopians themselves the voters cleave to the electoral plan. Unfortunately this distracts them from other possible means of getting the results they want from the political

infrastructure and, conveniently for the Powers that Be, constantly moves the chance of obtaining better results indefinitely into the future. Thus, future-looking words like “hope” and “change” are the perennial slogans of aspirants for political office.

Utopians can be distinguished from idealists in that the former carry ideas from the realm of ideation into practical implementation. This is what makes utopians especially dangerous to society.

As previously stated, Social Crediters contend that people are disabled as a result of being alienated from the benefits that should accrue to them as a matter of course from their relentlessly growing cultural heritage. The financial system, which should be the doorway for all to share as a birthright in a burgeoning potential, instead acts as a self-appointed keeper of the gate to material well-being.

As an illustration of how this oversight works, consider the history of proposals for standardizing hours of work, which obviously is a utopian goal. Abuses during the Industrial Revolution led to legislation a century ago prescribing eight hours as the normal length of a workday. Bizarrely, throughout the subsequent hundred years, during which work-reducing technology has been accruing at more or less at an exponential rate, the legal standard workday has remained basically unchanged. This makes no logical sense. It shows how utopian thinking can seriously thwart adaptation to changing conditions. Unless some hidden agenda is at work, it is difficult to see why in the case of reducing hours of work for pay—which may be seen from the obverse side as increasing hours of leisure—there is such obstinate inflexibility.

Of course the eternal problem with centralizing power, which is the *sine qua non* of utopianism, is that acquisition of some power becomes the platform for the acquisition of more power. This is a dynamic that is always at play in human societies and was the rationale for adopting constitutions having provisions for keeping organizational power in check. In the agricultural societies of the past, when life consisted of constantly dealing with physical reality and people in communities knew each other personally, the corrupting influence of power was observable firsthand. However, when specialized technological change removes more and more people from practical experience and higher off the ground, they are rendered virtually defenceless. An alienated population—for example, one brought up on fantasy video games—can be rendered politically null, though the trappings of democracy, such as elections, persist. And thus it happens that the purported road to utopia tends to lead, in the result, to actual dystopia.

It is astounding that anyone could be comfortable with what is currently emerging as the utopian shape of the society of the future. The elements of the end plan are unmistakable. First, the notion of privacy, so jealously protected by earlier generations, will be rendered completely obsolete, even retrospectively, by the amassing of information about everything in gigantic data-compiling centres; I don't know of anyone who has asked for these, but they are springing up like mushrooms in their thousands. The extinction of traditionally treasured privacy will encompass even personal medical histories, which were once regarded as sacrosanct. Surveillance cameras will scan every physical space with a view to enforcing bureaucratic rules of correct behaviour. The human ability to forget is a great boon, but in the future what is observed and recorded will never be forgotten. A permanent record will exist of your every movement, both outdoors and indoors. Every unapproved move will be punishable, with no practical possibility of appeal. So-called fifteen-minute cities are even now under construction everywhere, as the apartment unit intentionally replaces the single-family home—the family “castle” of bygone days. Central Bank Digital Currency using algorithms to monitor all financial transactions will definitively supersede cash, which has till now protected privacy in purchasing preferences. Again, CBDC will enable the state to punish anything it perceives to be naughty behaviour. Such punishment is not hypothetical: it was imposed on participants in the Canadian trucker convoy that a few years ago contested state-mandated medical injections; apparently a telephone call was all it took to get the banks to break faith with their customers.

Before long, computer chips will be obligatorily implanted in human bodies for a various purposes, as they are already in domesticated animals. Medical treatments will be both mandatory and scheduled frequently—another surveillance device—as a condition for being able to avail oneself of medical care. Wireless services will make vast amounts of algorithm-skewed information, deceptively purporting to be “truth”, accessible to all and sundry. The legal system will increasingly zero in on deviations from officially approved ways of acting and speaking, and eventually even of thinking; we already see that fairness and objectivity can not be counted on from the police and the judiciary. Citing concerns about national security, militaries will focus on concocted domestic threats as much as on potentially real external ones. And finally the whole panopticon will be policed by humanoid robots enforcing zero-tolerance regulations against a cowed populace.

There is no doubting that a freight train of administrative utopianism is bearing down on the best aspects of the way of life we have gained over time.

And it has reached the point that nothing can stop it without a conscious rejection of many enticements to get on board. Social planning to accommodate new technology is clearly out of hand and passive acquiescence in it will efface the freedoms won over centuries of engagement with utopian elites that want to end organic human individuation.

Opting out of any measures of the newformed society will not be allowed, since people making personal choices is incompatible with comprehensive planning.

Actually, this point about proscription of opting out needs a qualification. One means will still be allowed: when finally it all becomes too much for a beleaguered population to contend with, euthanasia will round off the utopian system. In Canada it's called MAiD—Medical Assistance in Dying—already a huge program with vast growth potential amidst an injured and demoralized people.

A hot utopian topic today, largely because of the projected reduction of employment opportunities by so-called artificial intelligence, is the Universal Basic Income. The common UBI is conceptually radically different from the Social Credit dividend. The dividend is a measure necessary for unclogging a chronically constipated economy by balancing consumer income with aggregated production costs; in other words, it is related to real, measurable economic phenomena. On the other hand, the UBI will just be another revocable benefit arbitrarily set by bureaucratic planners, probably without taking into account anything but some swelled-head's notion of the income needed to meet basic economic needs. UBI disregards Social Credit concerns such as representing the cultural heritage and challenging the monopolistic aspect of the current financial system. Whereas UBI would have to tailor taxation to cover its cost, which looks to me rather like a snake eating its own tail, the amount of the Social Credit dividend would be tied to real phenomena and would therefore vary as economic conditions changed. As the current incentives to sabotage productive efficiency would be replaced by the goal of getting the job done with as little bother as possible, we can foresee the national dividend quickly becoming a significant component of personal income.

Another fundamental feature of the Social Credit dividend and compensated price subsidy would be financing by means of infusions of fresh financial credit that would have no pre-existing claims upon them and therefore would leave no trail of compounding irredeemable debt.

In short, from dictatorial public health measures to dictatorial UBI, moves are afoot everywhere that will produce a society radically at variance from

the one people have known in the past. Psychological manipulation is indispensable to the transformation, which is why the past has been systematically besmirched by the promotion of concepts like race-based favouritism and cancel culture.

We are racing into this new world at breakneck speed in part because excitement about the spectacular achievements of the technology buoys us along through the iterations. Evidently this is especially true for younger people, who have shallower roots in what had been. The issue in doubt is whether that they will turn out to have been dupes ripe for the picking by a cabal of powermongers or, as Social Crediters, to be visionaries of a vibrant and flourishing society for all.

With our smartphones performing magic in our hands, we are not accustomed to thinking that what is passing for progress might actually constitute regression where human wellbeing consistent with human nature is concerned. People have been mesmerized by technological marvels, but surely we should exercise judgment about which of these are desirable and which are pregnant with disaster. Is it not appropriate to hesitate before we accept designer babies, compulsory medical treatments, and everything about us being stored in computer memory media under strangers' control? The utopians of Silicon Valley are having their way with us as bought-and-paid-for governments no longer apply anti-monopoly criteria to their plans, which make no provision for any form of citizen oversight and direction.

Because they conflict with the healthy exploratory human spirit, secular utopian schemes have not fared well. Joseph Warren was one of the original participants in the New Harmony Society—the famous short-lived utopian communal experiment organized by Robert Owen along the banks of the Wabash River in Indiana in 1825. Warren described vividly how that collectivist project was doomed to failure due to its lack of individual sovereignty and private property. He commented: *“It seemed that the difference of opinion, tastes and purposes increased just in proportion to the demand for conformity. We had tried every conceivable form of organization and government. It appeared that it was nature's own inherent law of diversity that had conquered us ...our 'united interests' were directly at war with the individualities of persons and circumstances and the instinct of self-preservation....”*

Back in the 1970s a school friend of mine who had lived on a hippy commune portrayed in similar terms the difficulty of making that experiment succeed: absent the factor of financial necessity, it seems to be

inherent in human nature to react against being required to conform to another's plans.

The idea that utopianism will always lose to the spirit in man is a reassuring thought, but we have never preciously experienced such an intense and multi-faceted onslaught as we now face. Bear these observations in mind while considering this distillation by Douglas of his ultimate goal in his first book, published in 1918: *"It is suggested that the primary requisite is to obtain in the re-adjustment of the economic and political structure such control of initiative that by its exercise every individual can avail himself of the benefits of science and mechanism; that by their aid he is placed in such a position of advantage, that in common with his fellows he can choose, with increasing freedom and complete independence, whether he will or will not assist in any project which may be put before him."*

The technological potential is there and constantly increasing; the issue is whether individuals will be able to avail themselves of it rather than being crushed by it. Douglas's take on the dimensions of the struggle for human freedom that he had first described in 1918 never changed fundamentally, but as he observed the effects of financial monopoly and the fierce hostility of Establishments toward Social Credit, his characterization of them intensified. Three decades on from his first writing on the subject, he opined that "The war between socialism" (which is the essential contemporary term for utopianism) "and Social Credit is only an earthly simulacrum of a War in Heaven." In other words, Social Credit is a side in a cosmic battle. The solution is the national dividend, which would allow people to decide for themselves what technology they will avail themselves of. Would you not agree that for humanity the dividend is a vast improvement over the food bank? Douglas's legacy is that he both unveiled the source of the conflict we face and bequeathed to the world the practical means of triumphing in that conflict's earthly dimension. ***

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

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

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

BSB 105-044

A/c No. 188-040-840

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

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

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

Our main website of the Douglas Social Credit and the

Freedom Movement "Archives" :: <https://alor.org/>

On Target is printed and authorised by Arnis J. Luks

13 Carsten Court, Happy Valley, SA.

“

We believe that the most pressing needs of the moment could be met by means of what we call a National Dividend. This would be provided by the creation of new money – by exactly the same methods as are now used by the banking system to create new money – and its distribution as purchasing power to the whole population. Let me emphasise the fact that this is not collection-by-taxation, because in my opinion the reduction of taxation, the very rapid and drastic reduction of taxation, is vitally important.”

C.H. Douglas

Money and the Price System (1935)

C.H. Douglas

thepeoplescredit.com.au | socred.org | C.H. DOUGLAS (1879 – 1952) | SCE-38

“

You, the individuals whose interests are always at stake in matters of policy, who are killed, wounded, maimed, poisoned in every war, who are starved and broken in every industrial depression, who work long hours under, in some cases, unpleasant conditions for objects from which you do not benefit – you are the people who never apply any effective and continuous pressure to the Government.”

C.H. Douglas

Dictatorship by Taxation (1937)

C.H. Douglas

thepeoplescredit.com.au | socred.org | C.H. DOUGLAS (1879 – 1952) | SCPL-40

On Target Subscription - details

Title: _____ Name: _____

Postal Address: _____

Suburb / City _____

Postcode: _____ State: _____

Telephone : _____

Post Subscription details to ALOR c/o PO Box 27, Happy Valley, SA 5159

On Target Subscription - details

Title: _____ Name: _____

Postal Address: _____

Suburb / City _____

Postcode: _____ State: _____

Telephone : _____

Post Subscription details to ALOR c/o PO Box 27, Happy Valley, SA 5159

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

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

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

BSB 105-044

A/c No. 188-040-840

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

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

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

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

On Target is printed and authorised by Arnis J. Luks

13 Carsten Court, Happy Valley, SA.

On Target Subscription - details

Title: _____ Name: _____

Postal Address: _____

Suburb / City _____

Postcode: _____ State: _____

Telephone : _____

Post Subscription details to ALOR c/o PO Box 27, Happy Valley, SA 5159

On Target Subscription - details

Title: _____ Name: _____

Postal Address: _____

Suburb / City _____

Postcode: _____ State: _____

Telephone : _____

Post Subscription details to ALOR c/o PO Box 27, Happy Valley, SA 5159

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

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

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

BSB 105-044

A/c No. 188-040-840

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

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

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

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

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