



A WEEKLY COMMENTARY



ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance –

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.38, No.21

June 7th, 2002

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "The power to create money must be withdrawn from the commercial banking system. The creation of the community's money supply, must revert to an independent governmental authority – a National Credit Authority – charged with the duty of maintaining a strict relationship between the volume of money supply and volume of real wealth production, allowing for imports and exports and for capital depreciation and appreciation – thereby ensuring that there is always 'effective demand' sufficient to clear markets in each productive period. All the statistics necessary to do this are already available within the various government Statistical Bureaus."

– Victor Bridger, Social Credit School of Studies, 2002

THE NATION-WIDE ATTACK ON PRIVATE PROPERTY by Jeremy Lee:

There is no joy in being able to say "We told you so" over an issue of national importance that threatens liberty.

In 1968 – 34 years ago – the Australian League of Rights published a small booklet of 29 pages titled *They Want Your Land*. The theme was that a programme devised by the British Fabian Society in the 'thirties to dispossess property-owners was being applied in Australia. It did not operate by forceful ejection, but by a combination of controls, charges, inflation and debt which finally robbed owners of any equity in their property.

The objective was the same as that of Karl Marx, although methods differed. As *They Want Your Land* explained:

"In 1848 a man called Karl Marx, and his colleague Engels, outlined in *The Communist Manifesto* ideas which have changed the course of history. In this basic Communist document, Karl Marx listed his famous ten steps for communising a State. It was made clear that these steps were means to an end, not an end in themselves. *The Communist Manifesto* said that they will '**in the course of the movementnecessitate further inroads upon the old social order**' As a former Canadian Communist Party Member, trained in Moscow, put it 100 years later, '**...one control leads to cause another, until, as a logical result, the State controls and finally owns everything.**'

IN THIS ISSUE: • *Thought for the Week* • *The Nation-Wide Attack On Private Property* • *Irving's Court Case Costs Him His Home*

The following are eight of Marx's ten points:

1. Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.
2. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.
3. Abolition of all rights of inheritance.
5. Centralisation of credit in the hands of the State, by means of a national bank with State capital and an exclusive monopoly.
6. Centralisation of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the State.
7. Extension of the number of State factories and instruments of production; the bringing into cultivation of waste lands, and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a common plan.
8. Equal obligation of all to work. Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture

They Want Your Land went on to point out the difference between Lenin's revolutionary approach and the Fabians' 'gradualistic' programme for achieving Marx's objectives. The gun was Lenin's weapon; 'permeation' that of the Fabians. The famous George Bernard Shaw described the Fabian approach:

"....we urged our members to join the Liberal and Radical Associations in their district, or, if they preferred it, the Conservative Associations – we permeated the party organizations and pulled all the strings we could lay our hands on with the utmost adroitness and energy, and we succeeded so well that in 1888 we gained the solid advantage of a progressive majority full of ideas that would never have come into their heads had not the Fabians put them there."

Less than 20 years after the formation of the Fabian Society in Britain, Federation took place in Australia. It was to be some years – 1948 – before an Australian Fabian Society was formed. But British Fabian ideas had arrived in Australia earlier, through the Socialist International.

The Fabian concept for the future of farming was published by its policy division, "Political and Economic Planning" (PEP), on April 25th, 1933, which included the following statement:

"Whether we like it or not – and many will dislike it intensely – the individualistic manufacturer and farmer will be forced by events to submit to far-reaching changes in outlook and methods. What is required Is the transfer of ownership of large blocks of land – not necessarily of all the land in the country, but certainly a large proportion of it – into the hands of the proposed statutory corporations and public utility bodies and of land trusts."

Instead of wiping out the farmers by brute force, as Lenin did in the Soviet Union, the devious Fabians preferred the never-ending economic "squeeze", coupled with more and more regulations designed to ensure that the farmer, while retaining his title-deeds, was unable to make choices on the use of his property.

The combination of these policies of gradualism began to exact a terrible toll of Australia's family farms. The National Party (or the Country Party as it was formerly called) found itself under enormous pressure as farmers demanded answers. Sooner than tackling the Fabians, the Nationals chose the easier course of attacking the League of Rights for explaining what was happening. But even their own advisers were spelling out the future. *The Queensland Countryman* (the Party's own newspaper) in November 1968 carried the remarks of Professor Tribe, who told the National Farmers' Union in Hobart:

"This problem of clearing the country of clodhoppers and hayseeds is a human problem. We're caught in forces which are international and enormous – if we stand up and try to stop them, they will overwhelm us, we have to soften the blow in economic and human terms. The people who remain on the farms are also going to be syndicated, corporations, companies, etc. What has happened to the broiler industry is setting the pattern for other industries"

Faced with such a programme the Country Party-cum-Nationals crumpled, and ever since have accepted the role of a limp tail on the Liberal dog. John Anderson was recently described as a "Liberal in gumboots". But so were his predecessors, as far back as Doug Anthony, who coined the infamous phrase "Get-Big-Or-Get-Out".

The onslaught has now reached a new intensity with the advent of a mass of environmental laws which go as far as telling a farmer with freehold title deeds the sort of vegetation and grasses he may or may not grow. Any of his land within 50 metres of a waterway is confiscated from usage - even though he must by law keep it free of state-proscribed weeds and pay rates on it. That's a perfect example of a successful Fabian operation.

Now – as we explained in last week's issue of ***On Target*** – under the new provision of water privatization, he will face the loss of the water that falls on his own land, either having to buy a "water-title" or else 'leasing' the water he requires for his farm. If ever there was an example of the separation of ownership and control, that's it.

The farmer can endure a great deal so long as he has certainty of title. He is, by the nature of his occupation, both innovative and independent. A system of viable family farms is the greatest deterrent to tyranny. Both Marx and the Fabians knew that. What a pity the Nationals refuse to recognize the fact!

Mabo struck a mortal blow at the certainty and security of tenure. The mass of bureaucrats who arrive with instructions on how the farmer is to run his property have added to that uncertainty.

Freehold title goes all the way back to Magna Carta in Britain, which declared:

"No free man shall be seized or imprisoned, or stripped of his rights or possessions, or outlawed or exiled, or deprived of his standing in any other way, nor will we proceed with force against him, or send others to do so, except by the lawful judgement of his equals or by the law of the land.

"To no one will we sell, to no one deny or delay right or justice."

Ever since the right to private property has been woven into the freedoms of the English-speaking peoples. Magna Carta went so far as to enshrine the biblical principle that a man's debts could not be applied to his widow when he died. The practice of usury, which is the root cause of today's inflation, was condemned in terms which today would be called 'anti-semitic'.

At the time of its formation, when it possessed some philosophical principles, the Liberal Party recommended and used the classic book ***The Road To Serfdom*** by F.A. Hayek, first published in 1944. Hayek made this statement:

" ... What our generation has forgotten is that the system of private property is the most important guarantee of freedom not only for those who own property, but scarcely less for those who do not. It is only because the control of the means of production is divided among many people acting independently that nobody has complete power over us, that we as individuals can decide what to do with ourselves. If all the means of production were vested in a single hand, whether it be nominally that of 'society' as a whole, or that of a dictator, whoever exercises this control has complete power over us. It is pathetic, yet at the same time encouraging, to find as prominent an old communist as Max Eastman rediscovering this truth:

"It seems obvious to me now (he writes in a recent article) though I have been slow, I must say, in coming to the conclusion – that the institution of private property is one of the main things that have given man that limited amount of freedom and equalness that Marx hoped to render infinite by abolishing that institution"

The sanctity of private property developed in Britain over hundreds of years (resulting in such well-known concepts as "an Englishman's home is his castle") was transferred almost immediately into the fledgling Australia of 1788. Records of newly-released convicts being granted land-titles can be found in the first settlements. The States, as they gained authority each instituted secure title-deeds, lease-hold and free-hold, under the Crown.

It is suspected that many of the hundreds of regulations being applied to property owners are in conflict with established freedoms under Common Law, and would be struck down if tested before the High Court. Certainly, earlier precedents in Australia appear to justify such an opinion. But it is only when land-owners begin to work together instead of being penalized one at a time, that we'll ever know. The time to find out is now.

IRVING'S COURT CASE COSTS HIM HIS HOME: United Kingdom newspapers are reporting on David Irving's valiant efforts to stave off the seizure of his family home by his creditors after a ruling against him in a legal battle with Penguin Books and author Deborah Lipstadt. David's attempt to have a bankruptcy order lifted has been refused and he now faces losing his Mayfair flat which has been his home for more than thirty years.

Penguin Books claim they incurred costs of £2 million and in May 2000 Irving was ordered to pay an interim amount of £150,000, but so far has failed to pay any of it.

He has offered to pay Penguin Books £2,000 a month over the next six years towards the interim payment, but the judge has ruled against him.

The judge also said there were six other charges over the home that would take precedence and that the building society that granted a £248,000 mortgage for the property may take possession proceedings now Irving has been declared bankrupt.

The historian's lawyers announced they were considering taking the case to the Court of Appeal.