

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



## *A Blessed Holy Week to Our Readers*

After this, Jesus realising that everything was now completed said (fulfilling the saying of scripture), "I am thirsty." There was a bowl of sour wine standing there. So they soaked a sponge in the wine, put it on a spear, and pushed it up towards his mouth. When Jesus had taken it, he cried, "It is finished!" His head fell forward, and he died. -- *John 19: 28-30.*

### **The Risen Lord:**

But on the first day of the week, Mary of Magdala arrived at the tomb, very early in the morning, while it was still dark, and noticed that the stone



had been taken away from the tomb. At this she ran, found Simon Peter and the other disciple whom Jesus loved, and told them, "They have taken the Lord out of the tomb and we don't know where they have put him."

Peter and the other disciple set off at once for the tomb, the two of them running together. The other disciple ran faster than Peter and was the first to arrive at the tomb. He stooped and looked inside and noticed the linen cloths lying there but did not go in himself. Hard on his heels came Simon Peter and went straight into the tomb. He noticed that the linen cloths were lying there, and that the handkerchief, which had been round Jesus' head, was not lying with the linen cloths but was rolled up by itself, a little way apart. Then the other disciple, who was the first to arrive at the tomb, came inside as well, saw what had happened and believed. (They did not yet understand the scripture which said that he must rise from the dead.) So the disciples went back again to their homes.

But Mary stood just outside the tomb, and she was crying. And as she cried,

she looked into the tomb and saw two angels in white who sat, one at the head and the other at the foot of the place where the body of Jesus had lain. The angels spoke to her, "Why are you crying?" they asked. "Because they have taken away my Lord, and I don't know where they have put him!" she said.

Then she turned and noticed Jesus standing there, without realising that it was Jesus. "Why are you crying?" said Jesus to her. "Who are you looking for?" She, supposing that he was the gardener, said, "Oh, sir, if you have carried him away, please tell me where you have put him and I will take him away." Jesus said to her, "Mary!" At this she turned right round and said to him, in Hebrew, "Master!" "No!" said Jesus, "do not hold me now. I have not yet gone up to the Father. Go and tell my brothers that I am going up to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God." And Mary of Magdala went off to the disciples, with the news, "I have seen the Lord!" and she told them what he had said to her.

In the evening of that first day of the week, the disciples had met together with the doors locked for fear of the Jews. Jesus came and stood right in the middle of them and said, "Peace be with you!" Then he showed them his hands and his side, and when they saw the Lord the disciples were overjoyed. Jesus said to them again, "Yes, peace be with you! Just as the Father sent me, so I am now going to send you."

And then he breathed upon them and said, "Receive the Holy Spirit. If you forgive any men's sins, they are forgiven, and if you hold them unforgiven, they are unforgiven."



### ***Christ is Risen ... He is Risen Indeed!***

**The Risen Lord and Thomas:** But one of the twelve, Thomas (called the Twin), was not with them when Jesus came. The other disciples kept on telling him, "We have seen the Lord", but he replied, "Unless I see in his own hands the mark of the nails, and put my finger where the nails were, and put my hand into his side, I will never believe!"

Just over a week later, the disciples were indoors again and Thomas was with them. The doors were shut, but Jesus came and stood in the middle of them and said, "Peace be with you!" Then he said to Thomas, "Put your fingers here - look, here are my hands. Take my hand and put it in my side. You must not doubt, but believe."

"My Lord and my God!" cried Thomas. "Is it because you have seen me that you believe?" Jesus said to him. "Happy are those who have never seen me and yet have believed!"

## IN THIS ISSUE

It's Only Taken 320 Years To Publicly Admit The Truth! .....	2
How Can A Tax Be 'Just' When Based On A Fraudulent Accounting? .....	2
Reader Alert - Financial System Inquiry 2014 By Louis Cook.....	3
The Parable Of The Unjust Steward By Betty Luks .....	4
Socialist Housing, The Universities And Asianisation By Peter West .....	4
Using The Truth To Deceive Us - From Don Hank, Laiglesforum.Com: .....	5
The Luddites Got It Right After All! .....	5
The Facts Were Explained In The 1920s.....	6
Laughing At "The Law" By Ian Wilson LL.B.....	7
No More Freebies For Illegals? .....	7
Heritage Book Services and VERITAS Online .....	8

### IT'S ONLY TAKEN 320 YEARS TO PUBLICLY ADMIT THE TRUTH!

And what are the economics departments of universities going to do with all their misleading economics textbooks?  
As things stand, the banks are the permanent government of the country, whichever party is in power.

-- Lord Skidelsky, House of Lords, UK Parliament, 31 March 2011

The Bank of England was formed in 1694 - and with it began the National Debt

-- Eric D. Butler in "The Enemy Within the Empire" (<http://www.bankwatch.info/>)

**Bank of England News Release - Quarterly Bulletin pre-release articles:**

**Source: [www.bankofengland.co.uk/publications/pages/quarterlybulletin/default.aspx](http://www.bankofengland.co.uk/publications/pages/quarterlybulletin/default.aspx)**

"Where does money come from? In the modern economy, most money takes the form of bank deposits. But how those bank deposits are created is often misunderstood. The principal way in which they are created is through commercial banks making loans: whenever a bank makes a loan, it creates a deposit in the borrower's bank account, thereby creating new money. As 'Money creation in the modern economy' explains, though, banks cannot create money in this way without limit: how much banks lend will rest on the profitable lending opportunities available to them which will, crucially, depend on the interest rate set by the Bank of England. In this way, monetary policy acts as the ultimate

limit on money creation.

***This description of how money is created differs from the story found in some economics textbooks.*** For instance, in normal times, the central bank does not in practice choose the amount of money in circulation. Nor is central bank money 'multiplied up' into more loans and deposits. Rather, the Bank of England implements monetary policy – which is set to be consistent with low and stable inflation – by setting the interest rate on central bank reserves ('Bank Rate'). This then influences a range of interest rates – including those on bank loans – and, in turn, the aggregate amount of spending in the economy..." (emphasis added...ed)

**Read further here** " Bank of England on Money and Money Creation in the Modern Economy" written by Positive Money March 12, 2014 – and watch the videos - <http://www.positivemoney.org/category/bank-of-england-qe/>

**Bank of England Charter 1694:** Source...

<http://www.bankofengland.co.uk/about/documents/legislation/1694charter.pdf>

### HOW CAN A TAX BE 'JUST' WHEN BASED ON A FRAUDULENT ACCOUNTING, OR BOOK-KEEPING SYSTEM?

The daily papers tell the story of *WHAT* is happening but do not tell *WHY* it is so. "Farm Debt Heat Builds" : "Declarations to help growers hit by high power, water cost" : "Foreign investment in agriculture won't make it rain money" : "Transport costs in focus".

In the 1994 postscript of "A Just Tax" Geoffrey Dobbs explained how he came to write the 1952 article for

*Theology* a leading UK Anglican theological journal. It seems the theological world was "ransacked" for someone who had any ideas on the subject of "the just limits of taxation" – but none could be found and an approach was made to Geoffrey Dobbs.

Geoffrey writes: "It seems that then, as now, while there was any amount of passionate discussion in the

churches about the distribution of the taxation levied on different classes of the community, the moral nature of taxation itself, *or of the money of which it consists*, was scarcely ever then, nor is it now, considered in the light of Christian theology."

As in Christ's time on earth, the 21st century Children of Light are just as dull of understanding as was the case two thousand years earlier.

**Read further here (<http://www.alor.org/blog/entry/the-just-tax-by-geoffrey-dobbs>)**

## Reader Alert - Financial System Inquiry 2014 by Louis Cook

From the FSI website: First round submissions to the Financial System Inquiry have now closed. The Secretariat will starting making first round submissions publicly available at close of business 4<sup>th</sup> April.

All submissions to the Financial System Inquiry, with the exception of those marked confidential, will be made available on the Inquiry's website, [www.fsi.gov.au](http://www.fsi.gov.au).

Submissions on all of the terms of reference are welcome but respondents should not feel they must address each of the Inquiry's terms of reference in making a submission. Submissions should highlight particular issues, ideas, data or research that may be relevant to the Inquiry.

The Inquiry will publish an interim report in mid-2014 setting

out initial findings **and seek public feedback**. (My emphasis) A final report is to be provided to the Treasurer by November 2014.

Readers are urged to keep watch on this inquiry and be ready to make comment.

The following submission is an example to follow: -

### ***SUBMISSION TO THE FINANCIAL SYSTEM INQUIRY/THE HON. JOE HOCKEY.***

In his preamble, Mr David Murray states that: "An important role of the Inquiry is to assess the current state of the Australian Financial System and the extent to which the system meets the needs of the users of the system."

The system does not meet user needs and the following submission will rectify the principal fault in the system. In a free society systems must serve the individual and not the reverse.

The current money system generates progressively unrepayable debt resulting in debt enslavement and its far-reaching effects. There is a flaw in the monetary system necessitating ever increasing economic growth whether required or not, with its concomitant pollution and transfer of real wealth from a mine to a rubbish tip at an exponential rate.

That flaw is a deficiency in purchasing power issued as wages, salaries and dividends at each stage of production, the deficiency comprising the cost of depreciation of capital equipment produced in a previous cycle of production, but added to the current cost structure.

The issue of a bank loan when deposited results in the creation of money which when repaid, results in its cancellation (with the exception of the interest which was not created with the issue).

Credit issued for previously manufactured capital equipment is cancelled when repaid during that cycle and is unavailable as purchasing power to meet the capital

depreciation cost component of current production.

Progressively automated production increases the depreciation component factored into current costs and prices and reduces wages. The resultant deficiency in purchasing power is evidenced by the necessity for increasing wages in an attempt to meet increases in the costs reflected in prices.

The deficiency in purchasing power to meet current consumption is currently met by ever expanding debt. This is the conscious policy of centralist administration.

The current system does not accord with any natural law, has failed to serve the individual, and its continued application will continue the enslavement of its users.

The remedy is to issue an interest free, easily calculated percentage of the money supply as a self-cancelling National Dividend to all citizens to meet the deficiency.

The stated policy and platform of a Liberal NP conservative administration should result in emancipating the user from debt enslavement, and to encourage automated production. The true purpose of a productive system should be to provide the individual's requirements with as little effort as possible. Its purpose in a free society is not the current policy "to provide jobs", or of G.B.Shaw's "compulsory labour with death the final reward"!

***Forwarded by Ronald Mackinnon.***

The next stage of the Inquiry will be most important for we will see the direction of submissions.

I expect most will deal with the technical aspects of finance and how it affects organisations connected with the finance industry but there will be little joy for the individual keeping in mind there have been other Inquiries and there always seems to be a need for another review, nobody is satisfied except the bankers.

'Financial policy' is not being examined in any depth at all!

The present administration has a belief

in 'debt' and even worse; the existing system is totally unacceptable, *for it tolerates poverty* whilst the 'finance managers' are some of the highest paid individuals in the country.

In two ways poverty militated against the flowering of individuality. The basis of independence is most definitely economic; it is simply hypocrisy to discuss freedom of any description which does not secure to the individual an average economic equivalent for the effort made.

Secondly, and more importantly, poverty was accompanied by its "twin

evil . . . servility."

Physical want is bad enough, yet after all it is only a "transient phenomenon." Servility, however, was "a definite component of a system having centralized control of policy at its apex."

If direction of 'financial policy' is the role of elected governments, then the elected officials are the ones who should rightly suffer the wrath of electors if desired results are not forthcoming.

**Your participation in this Inquiry is important.**

Received submissions can be found here... <http://fsi.gov.au/consultation/submissions-received/>

## THE PARABLE OF THE UNJUST STEWARD by Betty Luks

I am sure most Christians have pondered over the parable of The Unjust Steward and Jesus' *seeming* praise of his dishonest actions. I know I have. But I finally came to the conclusion Jesus' praise was for the Steward's shrewdness "*in relation to their (his) own kind* rather than the Sons of Light in relation to *their own kind*."

The parable in the Gospel of Luke 16:1-8: Now He was also saying to the disciples, 'There was a certain rich man who had a steward, and this steward was reported to him as squandering his possessions. And he called him and said to him, "What is this I hear about you? Give an account of your stewardship, for you can no longer be steward."

And the steward said to himself, "What shall I do, since my master is taking the stewardship away from me? I am not strong enough to dig; I am ashamed to beg. I know what I shall do, so that when I am removed from the stewardship, they will receive me into their homes."

And he summoned each one of his master's debtors, and he began saying to the first, "How much more do you owe my master?" And he said, "A hundred measures of oil." And he said to him, "Take your bill, and sit down quickly and write fifty."

Then he said to another, "And how much do you owe?" And he said, "A hundred measures of wheat." He said to him, "Take your bill, and write eighty." And his master praised the unrighteous steward because he had acted shrewdly; for the sons of this age *are more shrewd in relation to their own kind* than the sons of light" (italics added)

**How I pondered over these words:** I found many commentators thought this parable difficult to interpret, but noted that though the disciples were the primary audience, the Pharisees were also included (v. 14).

The *physical goods* in question were a hundred measures by *quantity* and *weight* of oil and wheat and in *his accounting records*, the steward reduced the amounts of quantity and weight for *his own kind*. The facts were, the steward 'doctored the books'; in modern terms *he "cooked the books" of his Master – just as is happening in the 21<sup>st</sup> century!*

Let's look again at the article "Fundamentals of Social Credit in the Teaching of Jesus" which first appeared in *The Fig Tree* in 1936 and we republished here... (<http://www.alor.org/Volume42/Vol42No1.htm>).

### **Faithful Dealings between Man and Man:**

The Rev. G.R. Robertson explained the Greek word generally translated as 'faith' in the *New Testament* could also be translated as "faithful dealing" between man and man in that famous passage where Jesus took the scribes and Pharisees to task for their hypocrisy:

"Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you tithe mint and anise and cumin, and have left undone the weightier matters of the law, justice and mercy, and faithful dealing between man and man (thereby enabling them to draw on the 'social credit'); these you ought to have done, and not left the other undone". Paying of tithes and burning of incense were only the phylacteries of religion - social justice and 'credit' were weightier matters.

St. Paul wrote, "The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy... faithfulness." (R.V.) It is translated "good faith" by Weymouth and "fidelity" by Moffatt.

**Rev. Robertson wrote:** Jesus is saying to the religious leaders of his day that man's trust in the reliability of his neighbour should be the outcome of true piety, and, as such, should be the concern of religious leaders and teachers, if they are functioning properly.

**Do listen to the "Social Dynamics" CDs here... (<http://www.alor.org/MAYO.html>)**

---

## SOCIALIST HOUSING, THE UNIVERSITIES AND ASIANISATION by Peter West

Labor had a dream... a dream of social housing for low income Australians. In itself, not a bad thing to do. But now it has been revealed (*The Australian* 11 March 2014, pp. 1,4) that the National Rental Affordability Scheme was primarily funding wealthy foreign students rather than low income Aussies. The universities had secured thousands of grants under the scheme and had filled hundreds of units with fee-paying foreign students. So much for the talk of university folk about 'social justice and equity'! At least \$80 million of taxpayer money has subsidised these units for the foreign elites. All this could have been seen because apart from Queensland there are no regulations stating that

National Rent Affordability Scheme tenants have to be Australian citizens. Probably, it was intended for this scheme to subsidise foreign students in the beginning. The scheme's total cost is \$5 billion. As Judith Sloan has noted, a one-bedroom NRAS dwelling gets roughly the same subsidy as a three-bedroom dwelling, gearing the scheme towards university accommodation and the education market.

The need for such a scheme in the first place came about because of a shortage of rental accommodation, produced by globalist forces, such as mass immigration and the international foreign student marketplace – talk about getting Aussies to 'dig their own graves'!

## USING THE TRUTH TO DECEIVE US - from Don Hank, laiglesforum.com

How can telling the truth be deceitful? Easy. Here is an expose of the sleight of hand trick used by the MSM and even by 'conservative' reporters. The devil is in the details omitted.

**The following is a true account** - In 1964, an athlete in his prime savagely attacked an older, handicapped man with his fists in full view of countless witnesses, causing the victim lacerations under the left eye and severe bruising under the right eye. The assailant was never arrested but amazingly, the victim was arrested weeks later!

What I have just described is the Cassius Clay-Sonny Liston fight of

1964. I used a tactic employed daily by media and government, inserting accurate enough details but omitting the most important details that the public would need to assess the situation correctly.

At the time of the fight, Liston was suffering from severe bursitis and at one point could not lift one of his arms beyond waist level. This "handicapped man" was in fact a ruthless ex-con who had learned boxing in prison. Sports reporters considered him the most feared boxer in history. His arrest weeks after the fight was for drunken driving and driving without a license.

Now if reporters had reported this

fight as I did above, they would have lost all credibility. Yet in matters of war that cost the lives of young men, they—and their cohorts in politics—report in precisely this manner when describing a supposed enemy in an effort to stir up war from scratch.

After 911 at ground zero, G. W. Bush, his arm draped around the shoulder of a NY fireman, said on live TV, "The people who knocked these buildings down will hear from all of us soon." The people responsible were all Saudis, every one, and strong evidence later surfaced that the Saudi government had supported the terrorists. Yet, the people who "heard from" us were the nation of Iraq. *Classic bait and switch!*

Source: <http://laiglesforum.com/3119/3119.htm>

## THE LUDDITES GOT IT RIGHT AFTER ALL!

Source - Editorial *The Social Artist* Spring 2014

The Luddites got it right after all! Machines were turning farmers, parents and craftsmen into the wage slaves of a productive system that would progressively isolate them from the natural world. Locked into the wages system, totally dependent upon a money income, women and men were losing the power to manage households and social forms in tune with the natural environment of the locality... A century after the Luddites, Clifford Hugh Douglas, following William Morris, John Ruskin and the later Guild Socialist thinkers, saw wage slavery as an unmitigated evil. They considered it absolutely crazy to spend all day working under orders in factory, mine, mill or office. For Douglas, machine technology was here to stay: there was no putting the clock back. But there was no earthly reason why modern science and technology should be used to enslave humanity, still less to wage war against the natural life support systems of the planet. Centralisation of control, whether by State or private corporations, would inevitably lead to a 'brave new dystopia', of the Nanny State controlled by Big Brother. "The only possible

method by which the highest civilisation can be reached," wrote Douglas in 1922, "is to make it impossible for either the State or any other body to apply economic pressure to any individual." That puts great responsibility upon the individual. Freedom cannot be given, because the giver can retract the gift. Hence in order to be free individuals must understand the system of oppression, so that they can unite to generate the necessary political will for change. Douglas placed great faith in the democratic system. The National Dividend could, he asserted, free all citizens from wage slavery, enabling them to decide the terms on which they would co-operate or associate with others. As the Alberta Experiment <https://www.veritasbooks.com.au/social-credit/the-alberta-experiment-c-h-douglas-detail> demonstrates, however, there were deep-seated political and cultural obstacles to the implementation of so visionary a reform of the money system (See "Understanding the Financial System" for details).

The tragedy of the twentieth century is that such far-sighted thinkers as Rudolf

Steiner and Clifford Hugh Douglas have been consistently, repeatedly and ruthlessly silenced by the cultural institutions (again, see "Understanding the Financial System", (<http://www.veritasbooks.com.au/social-credit/understanding-the-financial-system-social-credit-rediscovered-detail>)). In this issue of *The Social Artist* we reprint David Adams' seminal article on the work of the renowned German artist Joseph Beuys who originated the term 'social sculpture' or 'social artist'. Inspired by the Anthroposophical teachings of Rudolf Steiner, Beuys sought to generate "a conscious dialogue regarding a social reform into three independent spheres, maintaining a free cultural and educational life, a democratic equality of rights, and a new cooperative economics". Douglas would probably have been utterly bemused by Beuys's means of communicating his thinking on the social order. But Douglas, and the Luddites before him, would have stood shoulder to shoulder with Beuys as he portrayed the power of money over social relations.

"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.

## THE FACTS WERE EXPLAINED IN THE 1920s...

As you read this 1920s letter to the *Manchester Despatch* by C.H. Douglas, keep before you the recent words of our latest Federal Treasurer, this time Liberal Joe Hockey.

"The Government has just received the final report of the Commission of Audit - a document set to guide the drafting of the Government's first budget. In a series of media interviews this morning, the Treasurer fuelled the annual flurry of budget speculation by pointing to figures showing the nation's books were on course for a decade of deficits. (What! You mean the Unjust Steward has 'cooked the books' again?! ...ed) "Unless we take immediate remedial action in the budget, then Australia will never have a surplus," he said. "The fact is we have to address this and address this fast. "And the challenge is that everyone in Australia has to help to do the heavy lifting in the budget, because if the burden falls on a few, the weight of that burden will crush them." Source: ABC News 31 March 2014

### Major C. H. Douglas in the "Manchester Despatch" UK - 1920s

Out of the welter of discussion and recrimination which has been proceeding on the subject of the economic and social crisis through which the world in general, and this country in particular, is passing, one idea stands out clearly. It is a new idea, and yet it has been, I think, grasped by a majority of the population.

It is that the crisis, the poverty, and the mental and physical distress which are the features of these present times, are in a certain sense artificial. We are starving in the midst of plenty. It is not goods and services which are lacking - it is the money with which to buy those goods and services which either actually exist or could potentially be made. Money is only a ticket system.

It would appear that every effort has been made to confuse and obscure this issue. The crisis is described as an unemployment crisis, whereas a little consideration will make it clear that our scientists, our organisers, and our engineers have been engaged for hundreds of years,

and successfully engaged in producing this so-called "unemployment" crisis, which properly considered is, of course, the successful transfer of economic labour from the backs of men on to the backs of machines.

That is what we have been trying to do, and that is what we have succeeded in doing. The machines are capable of making the goods, but the unemployed cannot buy them because they lack money, and to them a situation which should be one of freedom and leisure, appears disguised as one of economic catastrophe.

The actual and potential wealth of the world is demonstrably beyond all the requirements of the highest standard of living for the whole of the population.

What are we told by our politicians and our inspired Press and Broadcasting agencies?

That we cannot afford even our present standard of living, that our taxes must be increased, which, if it means anything at all, means that we have less money to spend on our personal requirements and can therefore draw less upon the real wealth of the country.

That we must work harder and our social services must be curtailed. That the wages of labour must be cut down, and the dividends of railway shareholders, amongst others, must be so reduced that they, in turn, will be powerless to obtain even that portion of this abundant and increasing wealth to which they have been accustomed.

Obviously these two claims, first, on the one hand, that the world is rich and getting richer (which is the claim of the engineer and the scientist), and on the other hand, that it is poor and getting poorer (which is the claim of the financier and his protagonist, the orthodox politician) cannot at one and the same time be true.

In spite of every hindrance to the formation of an instructed opinion,

the man in the street has arrived at the correct conclusion. The scientist is right, and the financier is wrong.

Now, the first step towards understanding how it is that the financial system presents a fictitious picture of poverty when, in fact, there is no fundamental poverty anywhere, can, I think, best be taken by realising that when you make goods or grow food, you do not thereby make the money with which to buy the goods that you have made or the food that you have grown.

The greatest factor in the creation of real wealth is the cultural inheritance of civilisation -- scientific knowledge, tools, processes, organisation, and so forth. A second factor is that of raw materials, and especially solar energy, and a third factor, of diminishing importance, is that of labour. This cultural inheritance is beyond dispute the birthright of the community and not of any section of it.

But the money which is required to distribute this real wealth comes from an entirely different quarter. There is now no dispute possible in regard to the matter. It is actually made by the banks, and the ownership of it is claimed by the banks.

The process is mainly a book-keeping process and has been epitomised by a well-known banker -- the Rt. Hon. Reginald McKenna -- in the words: "Every bank loan and the purchase of every security creates a deposit, and the repayment of every bank loan and the sale of a security destroys a deposit."

Suppose you grew a ton of potatoes, and I wrote you out a cheque for £5 and took your potatoes. If you were willing to accept my cheque indefinitely, it is obvious that as fast as you grew potatoes I could come into possession of them by writing out cheques for them.

It is also obvious that if your only method of getting the goods and

(Continued on page 7)

services which you require was by obtaining cheques from me for the purpose of handing them on to someone else, that so long as I retained the monopoly of writing cheques I should be potentially the owner of everything you and your neighbours could produce.

Although banks have the monopoly of the creation of money, no bank has ever been known to give money away. It lends money: that is its business, and it expects repayment, with interest. In consequence, there is a certain volume of money flowing out from the banks in the form of loans, and a certain volume of money always returning to the banks in the form of repayment of loans.

It is this volume of money, and not the amount of available goods, which governs the purchasing power of the general population. In order, quite ineffectively, to enable goods to be disposed of in the face of an inadequate supply of purchasing power, prices are driven down, with the result that producers make a loss and their producing plants are put out of action.

While the technical details of this

situation are too complex for treatment in a short article, it is accurate to say that ultimately the core of the problem can be put into four words - "the monopoly of credit," and that the solution of the problem is also contained in four words - "the distribution of credit."

Put into language which anyone can understand, this means that just as the cultural inheritance, to which I previously referred, is the birthright of the community and forms the main basis of our immense productive capacity, so the financial purchasing power necessary to transfer this production to the members of the community essentially belongs to them and not to the banking system.

We are all of us entitled not merely by right, but by expediency, to a large and increasing dividend based not upon work, but upon our inheritance, and without that dividend it is impossible for the economic system to function since it is obviously useless to produce goods if they cannot be used, and the orderly production and distribution of goods depends upon orders backed by money.

If our present civilisation survives the growing stresses and strains

which are being placed upon it by an ineffective monetary system, future generations will owe a great debt to such individuals as Mr. Montagu Norman, the present Governor of the Bank of England.

For he has succeeded in demonstrating, even to the more public spirited amongst our bankers, that the banking mentality is conspicuously unsuitable for the position of immense power in which circumstances have combined to place it.

Neither a change of system nor a change of personnel by itself is sufficient, and in the last resort the issue lies in the outcome of a conflict between reactionary financiers and the general population.

Not only do we require a radical modification in the credit and financial system, but this modification requires for its operation a type of mentality which is capable of distinguishing facts from figures.

If our civilisation can provide both this change of system and the personnel to operate it, we can pass within a short period of time into, at any rate, an economic millennium.

Found here (<http://www.alor.org/Library1.htm#1a>)

## LAUGHING AT "THE LAW"

by Ian Wilson LL.B.

For readers who still have the old Freedom Movement belief that "if I could just get into Court and show 'em my reason... well!"... please consult "The World's Strangest Laws" at [www.dailytelegraph.com.au/.../weird/...worlds-strangest-laws/story-e6fre](http://www.dailytelegraph.com.au/.../weird/...worlds-strangest-laws/story-e6fre) doesn't distinguish between reality and urban legend, but I am willing to bet that many of these weird laws are real. For example, in Victoria it is forbidden to wear pink hot pants after mid-day on a Sunday – did you hear that Donny Dunstan? And in Victoria, only a licensed electrician is allowed to change a light-bulb! But my favourite is: in Chico, California, it is illegal to detonate a nuclear device within the city limits, with a fine of US\$500. Good luck with prosecuting that one! That one is so crazy that it just has to be a law!

## NO MORE FREEBIES FOR ILLEGALS?

*The Standard* Hong Kong: Asylum-seekers arriving in Australia illegally by sea or air will no longer be granted free advice on immigration matters, the government said. Scrapping the scheme that helped asylum-seekers complete visa applications and gave them advice on complex immigration matters is expected to save A\$100 million (US\$93 million) over four years. "From today people who arrived illegally by boat, as well as illegally by air, will no longer receive taxpayer-funded immigration advice and assistance," Immigration Minister Scott Morrison said. "Australia's protection obligations do not extend to providing free immigration advice and assistance

to those who arrived in Australia illegally." Canberra is taking an increasingly hardline stance on asylum-seekers arriving on smuggler boats. Saturday marked 100 days since an asylum-seeker had arrived by boat in Australia, although the government refuses to say how many vessels have been forced back to transit hubs such as Indonesia. The government would still provide asylum-seekers with clear instructions in multiple languages on the application and assessment process and would also provide interpreters, Morrison said. The government will provide a small amount of additional support to those considered vulnerable, including unaccompanied minors.—AFP

[http://www.thestandard.com.hk/eaking\\_news\\_detail.asp?id=48325&icid=a&d\\_str=](http://www.thestandard.com.hk/eaking_news_detail.asp?id=48325&icid=a&d_str=)

