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.45, No.9 March 13th, 2009

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "Let us particularise: The immediate necessity as to which all political parties are agreed is improved housing. The financier says: " Yes, you shall have money for housing as the result of building gunboats for Chile," thereby implying that there is a chain of causation between gunboats for Chile and houses for Camberwell. Not only is there no such real chain of causation, but the building of gunboats for Chile, or elsewhere, decreases the energy available to build those houses, and when the total available energy is utilised, as has been approximately the case during the war, (WWI) and may easily be so again, not all the gunboats ever sold, no matter what the accounting figures attached to the transaction may indicate in added wealth to this country, will produce one house at Camberwell, or anywhere else. What is, of course, common to the two is the " inducement to produce," but that may or may not be a sound inducement."

– Clifford H. Douglas, "A Mechanical View of Economics"

HUMAN SMOKE AND THE END OF CIVILISATION by Peter Ewer: Nicholson Baker has published "Human Smoke: The Beginnings of World War II and the End of Civilisation" (Simon and Schuster, New York 2008). Unlike most accounts of WWII (excluding the work of David Irving) Baker does not take a victor's view of the event. He does not portray WWII as a product of insane Adolf (if insane then how could he have made it to the top?), and virtuous Winston Churchill and Franklin Roosevelt. In fact Baker presents considerable evidence that Roosevelt and Churchill were warmongers who essentially destroyed Western civilisation.

This interpretation – that WWII was an outcome of power mongers on both sides manipulated by the financial elite and the arms industry (U.S. aircraft company Lockheed sold aircraft to Germany right up to the start of the war) – has upset our intelligentsia. Every review, especially by Jewish reviewers, understandably enough, has been bad.

Yet, the book has been a best seller and from a mainstream press as well. It raises questions which couldn't have been answered in the received media even a few years ago. This just goes to show, as Shakespeare said, that the truth will out!

$1.2.BN IN BONDS ON WEEKLY OFFER: Mayor Peter Davis, Port Lincoln South Australia wrote: "The following is a good example of how stupid is our government issuing $1.2 billion of interest-bearing debt per week when it could create the same 'debt' (credit) itself and pay NO interest."

According to Fleur Anderson of *The Australian Financial Review*, 27/2/09: "Australia will owe at least $200 billion in commonwealth debt within four years as the federal government begins borrowing $1.2 billion a week to stave off the financial crisis.

The Australian Office of Financial Management – the agency that issues government bonds – told a Senate committee yesterday it had recently accelerated its tender of commonwealth bonds to help fund the federal government's $42 billion economic stimulus package.

AOPM chief executive Neil Heyden said the agency had increased bond tenders to two $600 million bond offerings a week. This was in line with a forecast blowout of the federal government's underlying cash deficit to $35.5 billion in 2009-2010..."

Dear reader, picture just what *physically* happens in the above case: The private financial institutions accept bits of paper from the Commonwealth government's representative (a 'bond' document) and in return the private financial institution releases a set of figures (loan credit [debt]) into the system which the government then draws on to calculate its 'financial' national accounting affairs. On the basis of that credit-debt our children will now be responsible to repay those sets of figures – that ever-growing 'debt' – forever and a day through the government's power to tax their incomes, dividends, profits, purchases, etc.

Do we live in a mad world, or do we live in a mad world?

DOUGLAS' METAPHOR FOR 'MONEY': Douglas' metaphor for 'money' was a "ticket," which is a contract. From his testimony to the Alberta Legislature in 1934: http://www.geocities.com/socredus/douglas-alberta-1934.txt

"Let us examine the monetary system as it stands, as we know it, and in order to do that I think it is necessary again to strip ourselves of a number of misconceptions. A great many of these misconceptions unquestionably arise from what you can call, if you like, practical economics. You will hear money described as "a medium of exchange"; you may hear it described as a storehouse of values, and a great many things of that kind.

"Now money is not any one of those things, although it is conceivable that from time to time it may take on, as a sort of side issue, attributes which appear to justify that description of it. Money is nothing whatever but a ticket system which has nothing whatever to do with all these abstract descriptions of it such as a medium of exchange, or a storehouse of values or any of these other things. It is a ticket system and nothing else... if you will bear in mind money is nothing but a ticket system you will save yourself a great deal of trouble by stripping your mind of pre-conceptions."

Later in the testimony:

"**Q.** Take the farmer. His wealth is, to a large extent, in this province, wheat?

"**A.** From his point of view, wheat is nothing whatever except something for which he exchanges purchasing power. He doesn't grow, from his point of view, any wealth at all. From the world's point of view he does, but, from his point of view, if he is left with the whole of his wheat on hand, he has no wealth.

"**Q.** In other words, if the exchange possibility for his wheat for other things remains constant? That is what you are aiming at?

"**A.** No. We are looking at the problem from a diametrically different point of view. The point of view that I have is that the function of money is no longer that of a medium of exchange.

"**Q.** I agree with you in that entirely, that money is simply the means of transferring real wealth from one person to another.

"**A. No; that is exactly what it is not**. (emphasis added...*ed*)
"**Q.** You state it is like a ticket on the railway that enables you to get transportation from one place to another. I will take that view, that money is a means of transfer for that transportation.
"**A.** That is not the correct interpretation of money. The only correct one is, I believe, that all wealth at the present time is produced by synthetic purposes: that the wheat that the farmer grows does not produce any wealth at all; that the manufacturer of motor cars does not produce any wealth at all. Those things only become wealth by reason of the fact that somebody else produces roads, and somebody else bakes the farmer's wheat, and a number of such things. So it is impossible to say that anyone, at the present time, produces wealth, except considered in the light of what everybody else is doing at the present time. **Under those conditions**, wealth is a central pool into which everybody is contributing, and the proper function of money is not to interchange between those separate producers of wealth, but to give the general community, by whom the wealth is produced, the necessary power to draw from the central pool of wealth."

For we Australians to be able to draw on the central pool of our own wealth, we must call for a National Dividend, for each and every one of us.

Imagine: A National Dividend issued on the basis of the productive capacity of Australia Unlimited, so that we can all, individually, personally, choose and enjoy the fruits of our own nation's production systems.

Further *essential* reading: "Charles Ferguson: Herald of Social Credit" by Michael Lane $11.50 plus postage; "Releasing Reality" by Eric. D. Butler $5.00 plus postage; "Economic Democracy" by Clifford H. Douglas, $1000 plus postage; "Social Credit" by Clifford H. Douglas $10.00 plus postage; "The Meaning of Social Credit" by Maurice Colbourne, $10.00 plus postage.

HOW DO *YOU* DEFINE 'WEALTH'? In the "Elements of Social Credit" lectures, Tudor J. Jones Sc., M.D., (Glasgow), F.R.S.E. of the early Social Credit Secretariat referred to John Ruskin ("Unto This Last") as insisting on a logical definition of wealth as a necessary basis of Economical Science. Ruskin quoted J.S. Mill, who, after having claimed that writers on political economy professed to teach or to investigate the nature of wealth, gave his opinion that "everyone has a notion, sufficiently correct for common purposes, of what is meant by wealth" and further protected himself by asserting that it was no part of the design of his treatise (Principles of Political Economy) to aim at "metaphysical nicety of definition".

Such a need for "metaphysical nicety of definition" was met in John Ruskin's opinion by the statement that "there is no Wealth but Life. Life, including all its powers of love, joy and admiration."

These men of science – such as C.H. Douglas and Tudor Jones – were not satisfied with such a definition and Tudor Jones gave reasons why:

"Ruskin scarcely meant to assert that ***wealth*** and ***life*** were interchangeable terms, e.g., in the statement that a man in danger of his ***wealth*** escaped from the captivity of the Cossacks, leaving all that remained of his ***life*** among them."

From the Abstract to the Concrete: Ruskin went on to say that "that country is richest which nourishes the greatest number of noble and happy human beings." And to that statement Tudor Jones commented:
"It does not matter much whether the riches lie in the number, the nobility or the happiness. The people of a country can hardly be numerous, as well as noble and happy, without something to nourish their numbers, nobility and happiness upon!

"Bringing the matter down to various kinds of nourishment it is at once brought down from the abstract to the concrete! And so Ruskin, in the context of his writings, also understood it.

Wealth is, strictly speaking, not the source from which the needs are supplied but the supplying of the needs. In other words, a nation's wealth is what its citizens consume. Apart from wealth, a community or an individual may have assets, but these are not wealth. No nourishment results from the meat in the pantry; but only from the consumption of the meat in the pantry..."

And so it is essential we all bring our thoughts down from the abstract to the concrete. This land once known as the Commonwealth (Common Well Being) of Australia produces enough to feed 200 million people. Bringing the matter down from the abstract to the concrete, we know there is enough for all to live well. Think about what stops the people from having access to that wealth.

We must insist our political representatives stop serving mammon and start serving U.S.! They can begin by releasing the nation's (i.e., the peoples') credit by instituting a National Dividend whereby all may have access to the abundance this land produces. There must be a release of the nation's real credit.

Essential further reading: "The Story of the Commonwealth Bank" by D.J. Amos, $6.00 plus postage; "The Money Trick" $10.00 plus postage.

CRICKEY! CALIFORNIAN CATACLYSM! TAKE THAT ARNIE! by James Reed: Former steroid-taking Mr. Universe/Olympia, Californian Arnold Schwarzeneger, sure has a weight in his hands this time. In February he authorised lay-off notices to go to 20,000 public employees. You see Arnie failed in his bid to get Republicans to vote on a US$14 billion tax increase. (*The Australian*, 19/2/09 p.8)

New public works projects are being cancelled, offices of the Department of Motor Vehicles are closing as fast as a body-builder downs steroids (oops, wrong metaphor – apparently big Arnie and the like *inject* them).

There is a $40 billion budget shortfall because of a decline in tax revenues due to the global financial crisis. Thus California faces a financial collapse. Let us hope that this will mean the end of Arnie Schwarzeneger's political career. He was better playing a mindless robot in movies. Maybe, after politics, he could return to his roots, "pumping iron".

WILL THE GLOBAL CRUNCH BREAK THE CHINA? by James Reed: Millions of workers, rural migrants in China, have been laid off of factory jobs. – sweatshops making consumer goods for westerners – and left like chickens, scratching for a living. About 26 million of China's estimated 130 million workers are unemployed.

Many, rightly, see this as a "social time bomb." They have had the taste of the "good life" – poor things – and are set to respond violently if it is taken from them. Who could blame them if they tear the Chinese system apart?

And 11.1 million Americans feel the same way. So, how did they protest? They put pin-up-boy Obama into office, to save them.

When they end up scratching for food like chickens, unlike their Chinese colleagues, they only have themselves to blame. (See, how can people that I'm "racist" when I'm so even, fair and balanced and even have a good word to say for struggling Chinese workers?)

"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 $45.00 p.a.