A WEEKLY COMMENTARY



- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION





The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance -

Print Post Publication Number 100000815

Vol. 52 No. 14	8 th April 2016
IN THIS ISSUE	
Will the British People Regain Their Sovereignty?	1
Did You Know - Some Background History	2
A Knock at Midnight by Brother Nathanael Kapner	4
Concocting the AntiDote and the Poison in the Same Laboratory by Alex Newman	5
Queensland Premier Shuts Down Talk of a Split	6
Individual Responsibility and the Political Vote by ED Butler	7

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: The Incarnation: A sad state of affairs, due primarily to the impotency of a people who have been drawn aside, lost their way and have no guideposts. Major C. H. Douglas said that in his view the most crucial challenge that faces us is the question of the Incarnation - applying Christian principles to the organic affairs of mankind - giving "flesh" to the Word.

The "Christian" Churches in general have failed miserably in this task - having transcendentalized the Word and making it of no apparent practical relevance in the lives of the people.

We were told two-thousand years ago that He would send the Holy Spirit and that "the Kingdom is within you" - not abstracted to some hypothetical locale in outer space or remote time. Douglas opined that society is primarily metaphysical and that it is from philosophy or belief that policy flows. Every policy, he claimed, can be traced back to its antecedent philosophy. From this perspective, we live in an anti-Christian Dispensation.

Douglas believed that the all-pervasive and controlling, power-centralizing and non-distributive financial system operates on the inspiration of this anti-Christian philosophy. He said that "Society is hypnotized and only a drastic de-hypnotization can save it." We would do well to become informed about the pedigree of ideas.

Personal and National Sovereignty

So sovereignty is an illusion? How then can a regional or world government claim sovereignty? Pure Marxist dialectic distortion and manipulation of the meanings of words. People act like they have been lobotomized. It's this diabolical financial system which makes it impossible to function and drives nations toward increasing amalgamation in the pathetic hope that they can solve their problems by enlarging them.

It is the frightening power of an abstraction to deceive and control brainwashed people. Goldman Sachs should be put on trial for its leading role in all of this seditious activity.

The "refugee crisis" was obviously and deliberately engineered - being an entirely predictable consequence of "NATO" military aggression in the region. I wonder how the U.K. referendum will turn out - and the signs of resistance in other countries such as Hungary and Poland. Greece appears to have been totally betrayed - as I was convinced would be the case.

There are no words in any language to describe this evil. There must of necessity be a total uprising and rebellion. It is happening in the U.S. with the astonishing emergence of Donald Trump. It remains to be seen where he really stands or how he could in any event reverse the course of events.

- Wallace Klinck, Canada

WILL THE BRITISH PEOPLE REGAIN THEIR SOVEREINGTY?

The BBC tells us: "The UK Prime Minister David Cameron has announced a referendum to be held on Thursday 23 June, on whether Britain should remain in the European Union. A referendum is basically a vote in which everyone (or nearly everyone) of voting age can take part, normally giving a "Yes" or "No" answer to a question. Whichever side gets more than half of all votes cast is considered to have won. (continued on next page)

(continued from previous page)

The European Union - often known as the EU - is an economic and political partnership involving 28 European countries. It began after World War Two to foster economic co-operation, with the idea that countries which trade together are more likely to avoid going to war with each other. It has since grown to become a

"single market" allowing goods and people to move around, basically as if the member states were one country. It has its own currency, the euro, which is used by 19 of the member countries, its own parliament and it now sets rules in a wide range of areas - including on the environment, transport, consumer rights and even things like mobile phone charges." I did say the BBC tells us! *

DID YOU KNOW? SOME BACKGROUND HISTORY

The following first appeared in *The Social Crediter*, 4 March 1972:

FROM WEEK TO WEEK:

"In an article in the *Daily Telegraph*, Jan. 22, 1972, Paul-Henri Spaak recalls a speech made by Mr. Edward Heath after the Macmillan Government had announced its decision to join the EEC (the EU was then known as the European Economic Community...ed): "It was therefore in the Quai d'Orsay, in the famous Salon de I'Horloge, that Edward Heath, in an excellent speech in which he announced the decision of his country to accept all the consequences, direct or indirect, of the Rome Treaty, presented the British candidature".

How, at that time, Mr. Heath could know all the consequences of the Rome Treaty, and whether 'his' country would be prepared to accept them, it is hardly possible to imagine. No doubt he had been briefed, even in those days, by the Chatham House "gang", as Douglas called them. But it is more than doubtful whether he was fully briefed.

On the other hand, there can be no doubt that the British public had no inkling of what was intended - the surrender of British national sovereignty, this time without a fight.

For the forces behind the Common Market idea are the forces - including the Bank "of England"- which financed

German rearmament, and after Germany's defeat in the consequent war, financed her "economic miracle"- to create a 'Europe' to which Britain, having been ruined financially by the same forces, mainly now operating out of New York, could be subjected by Treaty. And if anyone thinks that the "indirect" consequences of the Rome Treaty will not be enforced if the British attempt to evade them, he does not know what international politics is really all about.

The Government is bound now to take the attitude that because Mr. Heath has signed the Treaty of Accession, even though by subterfuge, Parliament must pass the legislation of surrender. Thereafter the Laws and Regulations to govern us will be in foreign hands - the Social Democrats of World Revolution.

And high on the list of these, of course, is Herr Willi Brandt, 'ex'-Communist Chancellor of 'West' Germany; and M. Pompidou, of Rothschild connections.

Mr. Heath's association is with the banking firm of Brown Shipley & Co, representing New York interests, and which, through Mr. Montagu Norman, ran the Bank "of England" during the inter-war years when Great Britain was physically and morally disarmed, and German re-armament financed to the accompaniment of soothing leading articles in the *Times*...."

Continue reading ... *The Social Crediter*, 4 March 1972 Vol.51 No.25

AGENDA 21 IN ACTION: LAND-CLEARING LAWS by Ian Wilson LL.B.

An "Agenda 21" inspired Bill was introduced into Queensland Parliament on March 17 to retrospectively enforce a crackdown on farmers who have illegally cleared vegetation on their properties. (*The Australian*, March 30, 2016, p.2) The Palaszczuk minority government is basically at the mercy of the Greens to halt land clearing. As noted in a previous article, farmers almost always have sound reasons for clearing, particularly fire control. An independent report into the Esperance Fires, which killed four people, found that high fuel loads was one of the factors making the fires virtually "unstoppable".

The Queensland legislation will not only be backdated to deal with illegal clearing, but would reverse the onus of proof on farmers accused of illegal clearing by "handing land-use powers to Brisbane based bureaucrats and block landowners from applying for high-value agricultural permits". Although these vegetation protection laws were repealed by the Newman government, they were reinstated by the Palaszczuk government to "reduce Queensland's carbon emissions". That too is part of Agenda 21, the new religion of climate change. In practical terms the crackdown on farmers doing lifesaving fire breaks is just a CO2 molecule in the ocean of hot air.

What to do? The Liberal National Party and Katter's Australia Party oppose the bill, but that may not be enough. To ensure the Liberals also oppose it, Queensland actionists need to contact their local MP and let it be known that you oppose this politically correct climate change nonsense. The fate of the legislation is said to be ultimately decided by Crossbench MP Billy Gordon and Speaker Peter Wellington.

This issue will not stop at the Queensland border! ***

ON TARGET Page 2 8th April 2016

NOW IT'S AUSTRALIA'S TURN

The Turnbull Government Prepares to Flog off the Kidman Empire to the Chinese

David Pascoe's Facebook: Frankly, as long as their Chinese masters are happy - and in Turnbull's case, even his own in-laws - this tawdry, flawed and corrupted Government couldn't care less what the rest of us think.

What a tragedy we are watching unfold as our great nation is being destroyed

ABC News reports: "Chinese bidder for Australian cattle empire defends investment in foreign farmland" A Chinese company wanting to buy Australia's largest agricultural landholding says Australians have much to gain from foreign investment.

TO THE HONOURABLE SCOTT MORRISON MP

Dear Mr Morrison,

As an 87 Year old, 4th Generation Australian of Anglo-Saxon-Celtic heritage with Australian grandchildren, I feel I have the right to contact you in the following manner.

As a retired farmer with one of the first Diplomas of Sustainable Agriculture in Australia,..and a history of innovative work with Victorian Department of Agriculture and the Commonwealth Conservation Department and with a deep concern for the future of agriculture and indeed the future of Australia, I must raise a few important issues.

We must not sell any,.. more farms or assets to any foreign organizations or government for any reason whatsoever, particularly to obtain finance for future development of infrastructure or any other purpose.

Both you and the government need to be reminded that the Commonwealth Bank was established in 1911 with the ability to make interest free, non repayable finance available for any worthwhile venture (Government or private), based on the total wealth of the Commonwealth of Australia. As a result WWI was totally financed by this method. Sir Dennison Miller, the first Governor of the Bank stated that the war could have been financed twice over by this method. Later the transcontinental railway was built on the same basis.

Utilizing a re-established Commonwealth Bank would enable assets repurchased and not sold to enhance our total wealth. We would become totally self generating - the standard of living would increase and we would indeed be a powerful and respected nation,...which incidentally will not be case with the TPP-trans pacific partnership, which will ultimately cause the demise of our sovereignty forcing us into world slavery at the hands of large corporations and foreign governments.

Highlighting the above points is the ludicrous and highly treasonable sale of our main naval port of Darwin to China. This must be rescinded immediately!

Bio-security is also a major issue for Australia's future. Farms that are still owned by Australians could in the future be adversely affected by the large tracts of prime land with water rights being sold to China,...given their hopeless agricultural record of putting millions of acres

arable land out of production via misuse of polluting chemicals.

A major concern with the foreign buy up of large tracts of farm land is the distinct possibility that large factory farms will be established, as in China, USA and Britain thanks to the weak regulations and our dishonest and obsequious labeling laws. Our government will succumb to the dictates of the TPP to the total detriment of every Australian, the destruction of the environment and the welfare of farm animals

China has decimated their own bee population to the extent that now thousands of children are paid virtually nothing to climb fruit trees in order to pollinate them by hand! Do we want this in Australia?!

Because I have 10 grandchildren and because everyone that I talk to from 16 YO to 60 YO plus, agree with me, as also the majority of the silent majority,..I therefore, absolutely expect, that you will,...

- 1. Reinstate the Commonwealth Bank in its original format, immediately .
- 2. Buy back Cubbie Station and other properties sold off to foreigners.
- 3. Buy back Tasmanian dairy farms sold off to China and others likewise etc
- 4. Eliminate the costly and secretive F.I.R.B. (financial investment review board)
- 5. Insist on zero sales of farms and businesses to foreigners.
- 6. Rescind immediately the sale of Darwin's port.
- 7. Become a loyal Australian by implementing these points.

You are not alone, since every like minded politician and so called advisor's could be guilty of Treason.

Australia is at stake! *Maurice Lloyd, Wangaratta* ***

"This is not only a good letter but is a great example what actionists can do. Well done Maurice!" - ND

A KNOCK AT MIDNIGHT by Brother Nathanael Kapner

Darkness is deepest at midnight and there's a knock at the door.

It startles...you pull up the covers and go back to bed. The sun has set on America and we sleep in the midnight of morality.

Once, if homosexuals holding hands and lesbians cuddling up to one another was put on TV by a presidential candidate, the stones would fly.

It's a bad dream come true.

Once, if a president gave weapons to terrorists who killed Christians and called for the toppling of a foreign leader who protected them, he would've been stoned. It's a strange dream come true.

The door knocks...we roll over and sleep in the midnight of social order.

White males are dying before their time; white youths don't marry but party instead; white women abort their babies; and white suicides are soaring.

The faith of their fathers has been cast off; blasphemies lay on their lips; and Churches are turned into taverns and bars.

Trading places with the Soviet Union can darken the mind and enfeeble the soul.

The door is knocking and no one gets up to see Who it is as we sleep in the midnight of confusion.

An Olympic champion impersonates a woman; A woman impersonates a killer; A millionaire impersonates a

victim; A billionaire impersonates democracy; and a bunch of left wing Jews impersonate Republicans.

There's an identity crisis adrift. Trumpsters live in an imaginary time zone. The fifties are gone and babies don't boom. Babe Ruth is now Abdul and TSA's at the ballpark.

The Transportation Security Administration is an agency of the U.S. Department of Homeland Security that has authority over the security of the travelling public in the United States.

There's a knock at the door as we sleep in the midnight of political control.

Patriots are ignored and smeared; Political correctness is dictated by Jewish autocrats; Political blackmail is committed on Capitol Hill; and Jews legislate from the bench.

Democracy is awarded to the highest bidder and you're nothing. You're not even a number, you're a digit.

It's a knock at midnight that scares you out of your sleep.

"Who's there?" you cry. No reply. You ask again but you won't get up. "There's no justice in this world," you say, and go back to bed.

Sleep on dreamer, sleep on. The FEMA camps are stocked with widescreen TVs and Dunkin' Donuts has the concession stands.

You can die in your sleep (and in your sins) and not hear a thing.

FEMA concentration camps have been built across the continental United States by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, in preparation for a future declaration of martial law.

THREE CONSPIRATORS AND A FOUR PARTY STITCH UP by Malcolm Mackerras AO

Political commentator Mr Malcolm Mackerras AO, is spearheading a public information campaign titled 3 MILLION VOICES – aimed at fighting the Turnbull Government's changes to the Senate voting system which were recently passed by Parliament.

Senate Voting Reforms: The three co-conspirators in this four-party stitch-up can make some claims on their own behalf.

The Greens can say these Senate changes are in accordance with the principles they have espoused since 2004. They can also claim their views are consistent with the world-wide Green view of democracy.

Senator Nick Xenophon can claim he will make decent gains in numbers of senators under a system truly rigged in his favour. The Nationals can claim they will be able to continue contesting Senate elections in Western Australia – for the time being. That was the important concession they were able to wring from the Liberal Party...

The Liberals, meanwhile, are left with crumbs from the Xenophon-Greens table – probably an early double dissolution election on July 2 and, perhaps, one more senator.

But, of course, that is what Malcolm Turnbull wants. So Turnbull has a quick win but the Liberal Party loses over the longer term to the Greens...

Meanwhile the trade union movement is delighted with Labor and disgusted with the Greens. Rightly so!

Read further:

CONCOCTING THE ANTIDOTE AND THE POISON IN THE SAME LABORATORY

by Alex Newman

A European Union military force with power to intervene in member states.

A new "Marshall Plan" to radically redesign whole regions of the world and impose regional government.

A United Nations empowered to manage it all. Christendom under siege.

And the end of nationhood...

That is where the "refugee crisis" is heading, as the engineered disaster wreaks havoc across Europe and beyond. **Despite the appearance of chaos, though, it is all by design, with a series of radical goals in mind.**

While the establishment's demands on Europe to accept millions of Middle Eastern refugees have been couched in "humanitarian" rhetoric, the real agenda is nothing of the sort. Rather than helping out their fellow human beings, globalist forces actually created the refugee crisis and the suffering behind it. And they are using it to advance multiple, related agendas - primarily globalism and statism.

That the crisis is being exploited to undermine Western culture, national sovereignty, and even nationhood itself is now beyond dispute. Top globalists are openly bragging about it.

"I will ask the governments to cooperate, to recognize that sovereignty is an illusion - that sovereignty is an absolute illusion that has to be put behind us," declared former Goldman Sachs chairman Peter Sutherland, an ex-member of the Bilderberg Steering Committee who currently "serves" as the UN special representative of the secretary-general for international migration.

"The days of hiding behind borders and fences are long gone. We have to work together and cooperate together to make a better world. And that means taking on some of the old shibboleths, taking on some of the old historic memories and images of our own country and recognizing that we're part of humankind."

Billionaire globalist and open-borders zealot George Soros, in denouncing European officials trying to control the human tsunami coming across their borders, similarly declared, "Our plan treats the protection of refugees as the objective and national borders as the obstacle."

In essence, then, the engineered refugee crisis was created and is being used, at least in part, to advance what globalists often refer to in public as "global governance" and their "new world order."

As part of that, even the idea of nationhood is under fire - everybody is just part of "humankind," as Sutherland put it. And as such, people must be governed by the "Parliament of Humanity," as UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon referred to the dictators club known as the UN last year.

Read further: http://www.zerohedge.com/news/2016-03-24/refugee-crisis-using-chaos-build-power

TRUMP IS INDEED PART OF THE GLOBALIST SUPER-CLASS OPEN "CONSPIRACY" - BUT DOES IT MATTER? by Peter West

Articles by groups across the world and respected thinkers such as Professor Kevin MacDonald, continue to mount up on Donald Trump's presidential run. As well there are articles highly critical of Trump in places such as *Haaretz*, *The Times of Israel* and many other conventional media sources generally supportive of globalists.

(See for a summary Jim Goad, "I Have Met the Enemy and He is Easily Terrified", Takimag.com, March 21, 2016).

American nationalists are embracing Trump because Hillary Clinton represents the apocalypse, not just the end of traditional America, but probably the end of Western Christian Civilisation, given her desire for war against Iran and a war that will involve a shooting match with Russia. Trump is at least sympathetic to Putin, more so than the other candidates.

Maybe, just maybe, he could avoid World War III which Clinton will plunge the world into. And at home, Clinton will take away guns, in itself a move likely to bring on Civil War II.

Trump is no "glorious leader" and as Henry Makow (Henrymakow.com, March 15, 2016) points out, Trump's

loyalties ultimately lie with the global super-class. Recent speeches by Trump confirm this. Nevertheless, it is still preferable that Trump would defeat Hillary Clinton because if anything, he may prevent some - emphasis here, some - globalist agendas, such as the TPP. Even if this were so, no doubt another version of the TPP will come back again in a few years,

but that's the way the battle goes against communism -

endless opposition. As previous articles have stated, even though Trump is

part of the "Illuminati", he is not a favoured son, and if he became president it would quickly be organised for him to fail. Even so, such a failure could be good for the freedom movement that could lead to more good folk waking up.

According to Vdare.com (January 19, 2016), Heidi Cruz (wife of presidential candidate Ted Cruz) is a Goldman Sachs investment manager, who together with her team wrote a recommendation to abolish borders between Mexico and the United States to create a European Union Style mega country. I think I prefer Trump's great wall, but alas, it will never be built.

ON TARGET Page 5 8th April 2016

QUEENSLAND PREMIER SHUTS DOWN TALK OF A SPLIT

Queensland Premier Annastacia Palaszczuk has defended her commitment to the state's north as three powerful cross bench MPs discuss a referendum on secession.

Ms Palaszczuk says Queensland should be bigger, not smaller, as Katter's Australian Party (KAP) MPs Rob Katter and Shane Knuth, along with former Labor MP Rob Pyne, reignite the debate on whether north Queensland should be its own state.

The trio is reportedly mobilising against what they see as a lack of infrastructure investment and interest in north Queensland from a Brisbane-centric government. The premier said there were parts of northern NSW that shared a greater affinity with Queensland. "We should be inviting them to join us, not dividing our great state," she said. "Queenslanders always do best when we all work together."

Ms Palaszczuk said she wanted to unite the state after the era of "threats and divisions" under Campbell Newman. She pointed to the reopening of the Office of North Queensland and three ministers north of the Tropic of

Capricorn, including Treasurer Curtis Pitt, as proof of the government's focus on regional areas...

Mr Pyne, the now-Independent Cairns MP, this week admitted he quit Labor to take advantage of the state's hung parliament, believing he could secure more local projects and services for his electorate by making demands of his former party.

He has long been frustrated by what he sees as the lack of investment in the region - a qualm also shared by his new cross bench colleagues Mr Katter and Mr Knuth. KAP Founder and federal MP Bob Katter said residents in north and regional Queensland should be able to decide their own future.

"Within the next 18 months, I think we can most certainly get a referendum up," he said.

The Federal Member for Kennedy, Bob Katter has responded to claims made by Treasurer Curtis Pitt that a state of North Queensland would not be economically viable.

"Queensland's income comes almost solely from the four C's: coal, cane, cattle and copper" Mr Katter said. ***

IN PRAISE OF UNIVERSAL SECESSIONISM? by Chris Knight

Plenty of people in the southern United States would still like to see the "South" secede from the Union. In this context I read Lee Siegel's article "Memo to the South: Go Ahead, Secede Already!" (The Daily Beast.com, April 30, 2013)

Without the South, the Union would: have no guns, even higher mass immigration, ban carbon emissions and contain every Leftist, globalist, Communist policy you care to name.

Although Siegel sarcastically sinks the boot into the more traditionalist south, he has a point. Why should people who really don't get along, and indeed even dislike each other, have to live together?

"Who Called the Cook a Bastard" by Brig. C. Stanton Hicks - a personal account of a one man campaign to improve the feeding of the soldier - \$13.00 posted to anywhere in Australia from PO Box 27 Happy Valley SA 5159 Not only for Americans, but Australians too. Why should freedom loving people have to live under a globalist regime, which essentially crushes diversity and is driven by the inner-city elites? They can conduct all the social experimentation they want on their own kind. Just as long as they leave us alone.

I am in favour of universal secessionism: those who don't want to live together should not have to. Let the Leftists, globalists and the Communist impose their views on themselves, only on themselves and traditional Australia get on with living as they see fit.

Now where do we start to redraw the boundary again?

Social credit has already provided the answer with "Individual Responsibility and the Political Vote". Even a majority is not allowed to dominate the freedom (within responsibility) of the individual -ed.

See the ED BUTLER (1948) **radio talk transcript here:** http://alor.org/New%20Times/pdf/NT1409.pdf

"ON TARGET" is printed and published by The Australian League of Rights, Level 9, Suite 8, 118-120 Queen Street, Melbourne, 3000 Postal Address: GPO Box 1052, Melbourne, 3001. Telephone: (03) 9600 0677 Subscription \$45.00 p.a.

All electoral comment authorised by Ken Grundy, Level 9, Suite 8, 118-120 Queen Street, Melbourne, 3000

INDIVIDUAL RESPONSIBILITY AND THE POLITICAL VOTE (Radio Talk by ERIC D. BUTLER over 3CS, Colac, 1948)

Reformers of last century thought that they had paved the way for increasing individual liberty and individual security when their years of agitation resulted in the political vote being made available to every male over a certain age. Later came the stirring campaigns to gain the political vote for women.

We are now in the position to assess the value of the political vote to the individual.

Judged by the appalling results, it must be admitted that the political voting system as operating at present does not provide the individual with an effective mechanism through which he can prevent the society in which he lives from being progressively demoralised by alien forces.

If the individual is to save himself from the threatened Servile State, already partially introduced, he must have an effective political mechanism. Now, although there is more confusion amongst electors than ever before, most individuals still possess a great amount of fundamental common sense, which, if applied correctly, could undoubtedly stem the totalitarian tide.

The Genuine Alternative

The critical question confronting us is this: Under what conditions can the individual elector effectively use his common sense?

The answer is simple: The elector can bring his common sense to bear when he is confronted with genuine alternatives, which he can understand.

We can best study this matter in our economic arrangements. The nearest approach to a genuine democracy we have ever had is the system of free, competitive enterprise. Under this system of enterprise each economic unit is competing for the monetary votes of customers; it has to supply the goods and services required by customers, not the goods and services it thinks the customers should have. The customers control the policies of the economic units by having the very effective power of putting any unit out of business if it does not provide what they require.

The Economic Vote

It must also be noted that customers are fully responsible for the policies they pursue. If they are so foolish as to buy a poor quality article, then they personally suffer the consequences. Further, customers do not worry about technical arguments; they judge simply on results produced. They are in the position of being able to decide whether they are getting value for their money.

Common sense operates

Now surely our examination of the economic system indicates what is required in reforming the political system. We want a political system under which electors

are made **individually responsible** for the Government they support. Under the party system as operated at present it is impossible for electors to be made responsible for the Government they support.

It appears then that we have to discover some way in which we can make Governments genuinely competitive.

It may be argued that electors can at present eliminate one Government in favour of another Government, but it can be easily seen that changing one set of politicians for another set does not mean a real change in Government.

The Permanent Government

An increasingly important part of Government today is the permanent bureaucracy. The bureaucracy decides fundamental policies. The politicians may compete with one another in advancing different arguments to gain support for these policies - but very seldom do they directly challenge policy. The electors are confused about all sorts of technical arguments, which they cannot understand - in fact, they are not meant to understand them. It is impossible for the common sense of the individual elector to be applied. Now, as the immediate objective of every Party is to gain power, a fact which we must realistically accept, the electors must be in the position to ensure that Governments only obtain power by giving the electors definite desired results. Supposing we had electoral arrangements under which all Parties at election times had to come before the electors and say: This is our programme and it will cost so much. These are the benefits, which will accrue to you as individuals if you support it. Further, suppose the electors, having bought a programme - yes, that is what it would mean - had to accept responsibility for the results of that programme; that is, gained or lost according to how the programme worked out.

Political Competition

Many electors will say, yes, this is an excellent idea in theory, but to be made practical it would be necessary for records to be kept of those who voted for the Government and those who voted against it. This is exactly what we are suggesting. We suggest that the Parties must be placed in the position where they have got to compete with one another to produce results, the same as business organisations compete. The effect of this proposal would be to break the

The effect of this proposal would be to break the power of the party system and those who manipulate it today; it would ensure that control of policy resided in the electorates.

Confused and bewildered as he is today, if the elector at election time were confronted with the genuine alternative of choosing (continued on next page)

(continued from previous page) between a Party which proposed to tax him £300 million pounds per year and one which proposed £200 million pounds, he could make a commonsense decision, particularly if all those electors voting for the Government paid, say, 75 percent, of the taxation levied.

Government Losses

And most important, it is proposed that any losses incurred by the Government be borne by those who voted for the Government.

For example, it is not right that the electors who voted against the present Government at the last elections should be called upon to pay portion of the losses incurred by this Government.

The first financial statement issued by the Government T.A.A. revealed that this organisation lost £500,000 during its first year of operations. If those responsible for electing the Government, which decided on a Socialistic airline, were made personally responsible for all losses incurred, the common sense of electors would soon start to assert itself in political matters. Needless to say, of course, those who elect a Government should take the biggest proportion of any benefits.

Reducing Taxation

One of the main powers of Government derives from its power to tax. An increasing tendency of all modern Governments has been to increase their powers by increasing taxation. This weakens the financial position of the individual. Under the proposals we are advancing, genuine competition for office would compel all parties to reduce taxation to the absolute minimum.

The result would be that individuals would be able progressively to look after their own economic arrangements instead of Governments looking after them.

Government would be reduced to matters essentially political. With the divorce of politics from economics, it would be much easier for a rectification of unsatisfactory financial and economic policies. For example, if financial policy were unsatisfactory, the electors would be in the position to take action **through** their Government to make the controllers of the banking system **personally responsible** for a policy satisfactory to the individual. If, however, Governments are going to take over all economic activities, electors have to fight their own Government to get any changes. And experience proves that this is a most difficult matter.

An Open, Recorded Vote

Undoubtedly the greatest difficulty in persuading electors to support the proposals we have outlined is the fact that these proposals would necessitate the abolition of the secret vote in favour of an open, recorded vote. There were undoubtedly good reasons for the introduction of the secret vote. It protected individuals, from possible

victimisation as a result of their political views. But with a voting system under which every individual were made personally responsible for his vote, there would still be no possibility of victimisation.

Personal Responsibility

A little thought should convince any reasonable person that unless electors can be made personally responsible for their votes, we must expect a further deterioration in our community. Why should any elector be in the position where he can support disastrous policies without having to accept responsibility for the results of these policies?

No civilisation can survive unless every individual is made responsible for his actions. Although many people find it very comfortable to have power without responsibility, this deadly idea has got to be attacked. When electors are made personally responsible for their votes, the way will be cleared to make politicians, economists, financiers, and all other individuals in the community personally responsible for their actions.

THE LEAGUE'S BOOK SERVICES: — http://alor.org/

When ordering journals, 'On Target' and 'New Times Survey' – Please make Cheques/Money Orders payable to – 'ALOR Journals'

For educational books, videos and DVDs, etc. please make Cheques/Money Orders payable to -- Heritage Bookshop Services'

For donations to the League please make payments to-'Australian League of Rights' or 'ALOR'

Books are available at meetings or by mail order from the following addresses:

Victoria, Tasmania:

Heritage Bookshop, Level 9, Suite 8, 118-120 Queen Street, Melbourne, 3000 (G.P.O. Box 1052, Melbourne, 3001). Phone: (03) 9600 0677

South Australia:

Heritage Book Mailing Service, P.O. Box 27, Happy Valley, 5159 SA Phone: (08) 7123 7131;

All Other States:

To either Victorian or South Australian addresses.

VERITASBOOKS ONLINE: http://veritasbooks.com.au/

Note: The views expressed in these articles are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official position or policy of the Australian League of Rights.