



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.40, No.41

October 22nd, 2004

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: *"The good person out of the good treasure of the heart produces good, and the evil person out of evil treasure produces evil; for it is out of the abundance of the heart that the mouth speaks."* – Gospel of Luke 6:45

'MORE OF THE SAME' TO COME – AS PLANNED by Phillip Butler:

Buoyed up by their win, the Liberals and their 'little mates' will claim to have a mandate not only to further centralise power and control over us and betray what is left of our national sovereignty, but to drag us into further wars-already planned some years ago by their US-Israeli Neo-con Zionist 'friends'. All signs point to the next war of aggression being waged against Iran.

(It has been suggested Israel will launch the attack against Iran and the US will stay on the sidelines supplying the fire-power and back up. We have heard the US made a recent delivery of 300 'cluster' bombs to Israel.)

How sad to see the Australian elector, so brain-washed he doesn't realise he was being bribed with his own taxes, and so conditioned, he voted in a knee-jerk response to the party's fear-mongering 'doctors of spin'.

The sell-off of our few remaining national utilities, such as Telstra, is of course already planned by the Howard regime, and there are hints of interest rate rises in the foreseeable future. Hold on for a rocky ride.

FOR THOSE WHO HAVE 'EYES TO SEE' by Betty Luks:

One of our newer readers has expressed his frustration in coming to grips with the article in last week's *On Target* Vol.40, No.40. "The Left the Right and the Truth".

He writes: "I am having trouble understanding why you would use a definition of left and right which only makes sense in the original (and scarcely used) French definition of the scale. Modern readers might be confused with this (I was, at least. I'm a novice – a significant element in your target audience).

Therefore, if you want to use the scale this way, wouldn't it be diligent to explain/qualify your use of terms – especially in this case of which the opposite is the common/modern interpretation?

Any scale, of course, is neither right or wrong, it's just a simplified method of understanding the

IN THIS ISSUE: • *Thought For The Week* • *'More Of The Same' To Come – As Planned* • *For Those Who Have 'Eyes To See'* • *Individual Liberty And The Part Of The State*

spectrum, but to use it the way you have, certainly needs qualification within the text so as not to confuse us 'less educated' in these matters.

Incidentally, it seems to me that the French scale was more to do with distinguishing between the Aristocracy and the commoners, rather than Anarchy vs Totalitarian Government, resemblant though it may be. My point being – why give it prominence at the expense of communication?

The importance of the correct use of words: Ah! The constant and continuing battle of communicating in a language which has been captured and corrupted by the revolutionary forces to use as a weapon of dialectical mass deception against us!

Let me give an example: A number of years ago I had a discussion with a state Labor minister who was also prominent within the Uniting Church hierarchy. As with most members of the Australian Labor Party, being in reality International Socialists, this fellow claimed identity with Jesus Christ because "He was the first communist". It is a claim which leaves many Christians confused because they have not thought through the issue.

It is recorded in the New Testament, Jesus and His original group "had all things in common". The early Christians in Jerusalem also "had all things in common", but the group eventually broke up when the Jewish widows were treated more favourably than the Greek widows. They had not reached some 'utopia' as they had imagined; what was not taken into account when dealing with human associations is factor of the weakness of human nature.

'Utopian' Christians make this most serious mistake, by confusing and 'sanctifying' the revolutionary lie of 'common ownership'; meaning in effect, State bureaucratic control of resources. Christians have not distinguished the genuine 'community of goods' as practised in some religious orders under vows of poverty, celibacy and obedience from the revolutionary Marxist/Communist 'common ownership'.

I would think the vow of poverty was absolutely essential under such an arrangement; in fact history shows such an arrangement has never survived in the absence of those vows, or when they have been broken.

'Anti-language' a cover for doing the opposite: Many who think of themselves as 'conservatives' (and voted the Liberals in to power at the federal election) identify 'Rightism' with traditional values of 'social justice': i.e., protecting the weak and encouraging the self-reliant, cannot see past Howard's façade of 'conservatism' or policies of the 'right'. It was a brilliant campaign strategy by Howard to publicly associate with the Family First Party during the election -- all the 'right' values being implied without that party having been put to the test.

"But this is not the Rightism of the revolution," writes Geoffrey Dobbs in *"What is Social Credit?"* – **"but (it is) that which is appealed to by its verbal propaganda,** for the purpose of its stifling and betrayal. A mere matter of words? YES! And desperately important, as the correct use of words is.

It is a fatal thing to accept the enemy's terms at face value, or to upgrade and idealise them; for that is exactly how the Devil operates.

'Anti-language', or 'the reverse technique in words', i.e., creating a verbal image as a cover for doing the opposite, is now a standard, indeed a necessary routine in party politics, since it automatically neutralises the main opposition."

Whilst Geoffrey was dealing with the UK, it is just the same in this land.

"Of course it had to be the party with the patriotic image which could get away with the betrayal of Britain's national sovereignty. If it had been done by declared international socialists and anti-patriots they would have been up against the whole patriotic feeling of the nation."

Time and time again we see this happening in this country with the phoney "Labor vs Liberal" charade. If it had been the International Socialists who handed Rhodesia over to the Marxist revolutionary Robert Mugabe, the outcry would have been ten times greater. But it was 'conservative' 'rightist' Malcolm Fraser, John Howard and the Liberal Coalition in this country, and the Carrington-Thatcher ('conservatives', 'rightists') in the UK, who betrayed the Rhodesian people, thus reducing the protests to impotence.

The 'Third' Way's new clothes: On the other hand, whilst once the verbal champions of 'the poor' and the 'exploited masses', the International Socialists in the Labor Party are having difficulty in presenting themselves in their new clothes as "The Third Way". Having been washed up on the banks of a stream of history after the exposure of 'the workers' paradise' of Soviet Communism and its eventual collapse, they are still trying to 'reinvent' their image.

(Tasmanian timber workers witnessed this first hand with the ruthless gamble of the Labor Party 'heavies' to sacrifice them to the Greens in return for votes in the major cities... But it didn't pay off! The sitting Labor politicians lost their seats instead!)

These political dinosaurs are attempting to link themselves back to the movement coming out of the guild socialism of the late 1800s early 1900s and the catholic Distributist movement which grew out of it, but they haven't got the new role quite right as yet.

In politics as in all aspects of national life, we must make a realistic analysis of not just what is said but what is done! As Dr. Dobbs tells us:

"This sort of realistic analysis, relating actual policy as expressed in deeds with the use made of words in relation to it, is commonly rejected by those who have swallowed the anti-language at face value, as 'cynical'; but though these people (e.g. the average patriotic Conservative voter) think of themselves as 'sincere', they lack integrity in so far as they refuse to face the 'deeds'.

If they did so, all the parties would have been forced to fit their policies to their words long ago, or else would have been left high and dry with a mere handful of supporters.

"Since the point seems so hard to make, let me put it with different emphasis. There is no 'happy mean' between running and walking to Hell, between Right and Left, Conservative and Labour (let alone Liberal or Social Democrat!); between monstrous borrowing to keep the economy going with massive handouts, and strangling it with monetary restriction; between Tory (Right) inflation and Labour (Left) inflation; between multinational financial monopolies and State-controlled national monopolies; or between the typical bum's rush of a Labour or Tory Government (but the Tories are worst) to give instant 'recognition' to any gang of Leftist murderers who seize bloody control of a country. Indeed, when one compares them, it is clear that the Right has done a more competent job of encouraging the World Revolution than the Left.

The Left/Right conflict is a divide-and-rule strategy: The Left/Right conflict is a divide-and-rule strategy, and it is remarkable how closely it has succeeded in splitting the population down the middle, so that a 'swing' of only a few per cent can change governments. **The two sides are at one on their evil policy, they differ only on the truth, which they divide between them and so render (Truth) impotent.**

Further reading: "What is Social Credit?" by Geoffrey Dobbs; "None Dare call it Conspiracy" by Gary Allen; "Responsible Government in a Free Society" by Geoffrey Dobbs; "Censored History" by Eric D. Butler.

INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY AND THE PART OF THE STATE: For many the problem is solved by sacrificing one of these elements: either authority, as the anarchists; or liberty, as the partisans of permanent dictatorship.

LIBERTY AND AUTHORITY AT THE SAME TIME: The Church knows very well, on the one hand, that liberty is not only one of the most important privileges of man, but an inalienable right, and she is desirous of having that right not only respected, but also promoted. On the other hand, she sees that when different men freely associate themselves for a common purpose, they are unable to unite their efforts in harmonious co-operation without the help of a superior principle by which those efforts will be organized and unified, that is to say, without an authority.

The Church, therefore, speaks out for liberty and authority at the same time. She does not demand the sacrifice of either, but tries to conciliate and to bring them in harmonious accord with each other, by basing herself on the principle which the Pope calls that of the suppletive function of the State, a fundamental principle of social philosophy, unshaken and unchangeable. This means that in the first place, the greatest liberty possible -- legitimate liberty, of course -- must be left to private enterprises, individual or associated, and that State intervention must be resorted to only when such enterprises prove themselves unable to attain their particular ends, become detrimental to the general interests of all, or when the direct promotion of the common welfare is concerned.

This, in our opinion, is the real teaching set forth by the Encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno*: "None the less, just as it is wrong to withdraw from the individual and commit to the community at large what private enterprise and industry can accomplish so, too, it is an injustice, a grave evil, and a disturbance of right for a larger and higher organization to arrogate to itself functions which can be performed efficiently by smaller and lower bodies...."

Individual liberty protected: In this way the individual is assured of his liberty and protected against continual and embarrassing interference by the State, and the State in turn is delivered of almost unlimited and overwhelming responsibilities which do not rightly belong to it and which it cannot properly fulfil... "The State should leave to these smaller groups (and to the individuals) the settlement of less important business, by which its efforts would be exceedingly dispersed; it will thus carry out with greater freedom, power, and success its own tasks, because it alone can effectively accomplish these, directing, watching, stimulating, and restraining as circumstances suggest or necessity demands."

Socialism on the contrary: To the individual, first of all, must be left the greatest liberty and initiative possible. Then, in order to make up for his incapacities, appeal must be made in the first place to the family group, then to a group of greater dimension, professional or others, for everything that is beyond the power of domestic society; and finally, the State will be called upon to undertake the tasks which these larger organizations themselves are unable to accomplish, especially those directly concerning the common welfare. Thus each social group must supply the deficiencies of the inferior groups or those of the individual, to co-ordinate their respective activities while protecting their own initiative and liberty.

The proceedings of the Socialistic School, on the contrary, are exactly the reverse. It aims to build up society by beginning with the State, entrusting to the latter nearly all the power, functions, and wealth of the country and paying but a secondary attention to the individual's liberty, tastes, personal enterprises, and rights.

Taken from "*Social Credit & Catholicism*" by George-Henri Levesque, O.P. Professor of Economics, Laval and Montreal Universities, Dominican House of Studies, Ottawa Canada, 1936.

"ON TARGET" is printed and published by The Australian League of Rights, 145 Russell St., Melbourne.
Postal Address: GPO Box 1052, Melbourne, 3001. Telephone: (03) 9650 9749, Fax: (03) 9650 9368.
Subscription \$40.00 p.a.