



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.41, No.17

May 6th, 2005

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "Behind the declaration of (Pope) Gelasius lies a development of the concept of human personality and of liberty that was unknown to the ancient world...The teaching of our Lord put an end to ancient doctrines of State absolutism: 'Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's.' The Church, which was the bearer of the Christian revelation, had by a necessity of its being to maintain that the moral and spiritual life of man shall be beyond the power and reach of the political officers of the community. There are aspects of human life which are not and cannot be under the control of the laws or authority of the State. Here is the heart of what we may call the Christian revolution..."

Richard O'Sullivan, K.C., in *"Christian Philosophy in the Common Law"*, 1947

PARTIES REFUSED TO EVEN DEBATE DEMOCRATIC REFORM by Betty Luks:

"The Peter Lewis era is over," wrote Dean Jaensch in the *Adelaide Advertiser*, 21/4/05. South Australians understand what he means. The demise of Peter Lewis as Speaker in South Australia's Parliament is the final nail in the coffin of Lewis' attempt at Constitutional reform for this State. After completion of counting the votes at the last State election, both major parties realized Peter Lewis' support was crucial for their own party to hold government.

Both parties blatantly set out to 'woo' him – promising him almost 'anything' he wanted. Those were 'heady days' for Peter – such power.

"But," as Dean Jaensch reminded us, after Lewis had made his choice (Labor) "both parties went cold on the prime demand of reforms". The reforms, he insisted, "were not unreasonable and would have increased the level of democracy in the Parliament and the electorate and brought the Parliament into the new century."

What were Lewis' proposals?

1. Legislative Council (now eight years) to have the same term of four years as the House of Assembly.
2. Optional preferential voting for South Australian elections.
3. Yet another proposal was for multi-member electorates and proportional representation for the House of Assembly
4. Another was Citizen-Initiated Referendums

Jaensch thought the following reasons were why none of the proposals 'saw the light of day'.

IN THIS ISSUE: • *Thought For The Week* • *Parties Refused To Even Debate Democratic Reform*
• *Under Which King?* • *This is British-Christian Constitutional 'Democracy'* • *Our Decaying Infrastructure*

Reform of Legislative Council – the major parties want to keep the eight-year term as a reward system for *their* faithful servants.

Optional preferential voting – rejected by both major parties in Lower House and probably would have been by minor parties in Upper House. Reason? The parties want all the preferences they can get through the secret deals made with other parties or independents. Optional preferences would end these cosy arrangements and give voters a 'real' choice.

Multi-member electorates and proportional representation for the Lower House of Assembly – this would have further increased the range of choices for the voters and improved the representational basis of Parliament. Major parties don't want that! They want to retain their control especially over their safe seats.

Citizen-Initiated Referendums – the major parties refused to even debate this one!

Dean Jaensch is so right: "Opposing them (the Bills) was bad enough, but refusing even to discuss them shows just how opposed the majority of our elected members are to providing a more democratic system for the electors."

And we congratulate him for suggesting that what is needed is a "voter liberation movement, one which will show our representatives that the electorate numbers are in favour of reform of Parliament – now."

UNDER WHICH KING? by C. H. Douglas:

Originally published in *The Social Creditor* of December 15th, 1945, Clifford Hugh Douglas warned the people they must look at this thing called 'political democracy' more closely.

"There is no single aspect of political economy which deserves more attention, and receives less, than the nature of an order.

Like so many other matters of importance and subtlety, most people understand so little of the subject that they are practically unaware that it presents any problem; still less, **a problem on which the whole structure of society depends.**

The immense success of mediaeval civilisation (and its ultimate failure) can be seen to be linked with **one conception of an order and the sanctions which sustained it**; the different, but notable, achievements – of the nineteenth century, **and the chaos which has succeeded that short-lived adventure, are plainly the outcome of another.**

The problem is often stated by the use of the word sovereignty; and we have an indication of that identity in the title of the gold coin which ruled the nineteenth century, the English sovereign, **as well as in the declared intention to remove national sovereignty to an international centre.**

The essence of medievalism (often, it may be noted, referred to as the Mediaeval Order) was the **existence of the Church as a sanction**, as an organisation for making effective certain checks and balances upon the use of physical force to carry an order from its utterance to its execution.

The Church claimed to be, and was to quite a considerable extent, a living body of Superior Law, not different in Intention, but far higher in Conception than the Constitution of the United States.

And: it is important to notice that the breakdown of nineteenth century English prosperity can be seen in retrospect to be contemporaneous with the decadence in social prestige of the village parson.

Political economy as distinct from ideology: Now the nature of the problem presented to political economy, as distinct from ideology, by an order, is simply this: **Either Brown gives orders on his own behalf, or Mr. Pink-Geranium gives them for him.**

That someone has to give orders on Brown's behalf is not in dispute. And the decision between these two courses is *ultimately* dependent on which source of authority succeeds in making results most accurately and rapidly eventuate from orders, in reasonable identity between specification and product.

And the problem is complicated for Mr. Pink-Geranium by the fact that he has no one but Mr. Brown to whom to give orders, and Mr. Brown is convinced that it is more blessed to give than to receive.

There was a period, say between 1850 and 1914, in which the economic aspect of this problem was in a fair way to solution. The gold sovereign was a complete order system.

Mr. Brown had only:

- to tender his yellow warrant of sovereignty and he got what he wanted.
- He set in motion the most marvellous train of self-acting psychological sanctions.
- Factories sprang to life, trains ran, and ships sailed, all concerned not merely to do his will, but to do it better than anyone else.
- It is quite irrelevant to this particular argument that a large and increasing number of Mr. Browns had no sovereigns; it is a fact of history that the man who had one always wanted two, and, in consequence, if every Mr. Brown had possessed a sovereign it would still have been effective.
- It is perhaps unnecessary to observe that the virtue of the gold sovereign lay not in its material but in its sanctions.

The political equivalent: Now the political equivalent of the gold sovereign is the vote, and the merest glance at our life and times is sufficient to establish the conclusion that it fails to work.

There is nothing in the possession of a vote which remotely approximates to the power of choice and the certainty of delivery enjoyed by Mr. Brown with his golden sovereign in the latter days of the nineteenth century.

No one outside the walls of a mental hospital would contend that the individual voter gets what he votes for, or voted for what he is getting. So obvious is this that the greatest difficulty is experienced in getting people to vote at all.

The vote costs nothing; and it is worth precisely what it costs. If it cost ten shillings to vote, how many voters would be registered?

But the matter does not end there. While the political vote is valueless to the individual, it enables the Satanic Powers to claim a mandate which it in fact does not confer, and which it is powerless to enforce.

This situation is so satisfactory that the ballot-box is a cardinal provision of the World State, and it is clear for any ordinary intelligent person to see that it is the intention – and in Britain the rapidly developing fact – that the economic vote will be destroyed in its nineteenth century effectiveness, and substituted by the political vote as exercised in Russia. (And that is the present situation in Australia...ed)

It is urgently necessary to realise these matters because they dominate our future.

British Governments now hold office by a trick; no British Government has any genuine mandate. Our whole political system is not merely irrational, it is a fraud and a usurpation.

We have allowed the vicious nonsense which derided the values established by a thousand years of unique political experience to destroy in our name every safeguard against tyranny provided by historic continuity in the Three Estates, and we welcome the people who spawn this nonsense when they desert the Europe they have wrecked.

Nothing can save us but a drastic de-hypnotisation. It is coming; but it may kill us."

THIS IS BRITISH-CHRISTIAN CONSTITUTIONAL 'DEMOCRACY': Either Brown gives orders on his own behalf, or Mr. Pink-Geranium gives them for him.

Either you have a representative Parliament or you have a delegate to whom you have handed over your freedom to make your decisions for you!

Your politician is there to represent you, not, as he presently thinks, to do the will of his political/financial masters.

That is why the Australian League of Rights continually exhorts Australians to exercise their freedom by acting responsibly, and insisting their political representative does just that – represent them, NOT ACT ON THE ORDERS OF SOME MULTINATIONAL CEO, NOR THE WORLD BANK, NOR THE UNITED NATIONS.

If Australians don't take up the challenge and exert the pressure to insist their Member of Parliament is their servant and not their master, then this nation will continue down the road to greater tyranny.

OUR DECAYING INFRASTRUCTURE by Daniel Taylor:

"Alarm Bells on Infrastructure" is the leading article of *The Weekend Australian*. 26-27/3/05. A sub-headline said: "Everyone is aware we are at crisis point – Business Council of Australia" (BCA). The article, plus an internal article with the telling heading "Get Ready to Pay More", discusses the BCA report on Australia's road, rail, electricity and water infrastructure. Governments should be spending \$50 billion over the next twenty years on road, rail and water infrastructure and \$40 billion on electricity generation and distribution. The failure to do this and as well to produce an efficient set of rules and regulations governing infrastructure, is great indeed: "If we don't, more blackouts, ever-worsening road congestion, increasingly tighter water restrictions and continuing export bottlenecks are the way of the future."

The article goes on to say that Australians will pay more for water, electricity and roads, but glibly states that by smart pricing – hitting only high water users or those driving on roads when they are congested – we won't really have to pay more. Nonsense, of course we will pay.

The infrastructure problem is much worse. Things such as bridges, sewerage pipes, etc., have a finite lifetime from an engineering perspective, and much of Australia's basic infrastructure will need replacement in the first part of this century. This problem has been discussed from time-to-time in publications in the United States but not extensively in Australia.

Under the present financial/economic system it is difficult to see how the comprehensive rebuilding of society's infrastructure is possible without insurmountable debt as governments borrow billions from the bankers.

One of the core arguments for social credit in this area is that vital infrastructure necessary for the undergirding of the economy, should be supported by debt-free credit for capital works, created by the sovereign nation.

The BCA has said that government spending on infrastructure will potentially boost GDP by two percentage points of \$16 billion. If this is so, then why should borrowing by governments from the private financial sector occur at all?

"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.