

## A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Vol. 60 No. 26

12<sup>th</sup> July 2024

### IN THIS ISSUE

Consider Our Own Family First By Neville Archibald	35
Work and Purpose —Employment and Servitude By William Waite	38
Communism and Christianity By Professor John W. Hallowell	41

### Consider Our Own Family First By Neville Archibald

Some time ago I started an article on Australia as a family. I listed positives and negatives and considered what made a successful family. Trust, positivity and direction were the beginning, many more things united our nation as a whole just like it links the individuals in a family. Since then I have seen quite a few things happen that have added a slightly different dimension to what I was originally thinking.

Tucker Carlson arrived in Australia at the end of June and toured all major capital cities. The only thing louder than his often-jubilant laugh was the condemnation of the mainstream media (MSM). I listened to his last “no holds barred” talk in Perth, via the internet, and found him refreshingly candid in his appraisals of us Australians.

Reading the comments by the MSM and others that must have something to hide, there was no love lost between them. Several describing Tucker and those who went to hear him, as the kind of people most “right thinking” Australians don’t want in this country. I am beginning to see, why, we as a family, are not all on the same page. I would however, disagree that it was us, who was on the outer. As a family I think most Australians still want the same thing, but those influencing and supposedly representing us are leading us astray.

Just the negativity alone from the MSM should be enough to be a wakeup call to all Australians. A call to listen to what he had to say and consider why the MSM portrays us as they do.

I felt a connection that I could place with Tucker’s outlook on who we, “The Australians” are. The first part of his talk was how he grew up with a view of us as independent larrikins, for want of a better description. Being much the same age as Tucker (only a few years older) my demographic would also have been his

when I visited the US on several occasions in the late eighties/early nineties.

The travellers I met, the people I spoke to and stayed with had all grown up with a view of us as the cheeky cousins who cared not a whit for class or elitism, more so in many ways, than them. The tall poppy syndrome, the disregard of saluting senior pommy officers and a flagrant contempt for authority, done in an almost jovial manner.

This of course had been topped up somewhat by the iconic image of Paul Hogan's "Crocodile Dundee" and the "put another shrimp on the barbie", ads.

We were definitely the flavour of the year when I first visited.

As with Australia now, I saw a definite difference between the city and country people. Those whose roots were in the country or small towns and had moved to the city, still had an ease about them that was definable. Those whose jobs included practical or hands on work – engaged in the real – still had a sense of family about them.

Moving further into their cities, the others, who had known nothing else and had not really ever spent time on the land, were detached, more internal. I hate to say this, Narcissistic. It was a lot more about them and what they could do for themselves, not others. About getting ahead.

A good way to get to know someone is to travel with them. As I was backpacking, sharing rides and using trains and buses, I got to know quite a few of them. In their own country, Americans were some of the most generous people I stayed with, the younger generation at that time were also open and tolerant. Not a lot unlike us back here in Oz.

Travelling with them in other countries was another story, and though they were still largely lovely people, the shadow of that narcissism was upon them. At the time I did not see it for what it was and put it down to their insular news services and belief instilled into them that all things American were superior. "It's all bigger and better in Texas." We played a bit on that, and got quite some mileage out of it in a fun way. It was very rare that anyone ever became offended, for that was never the intent.

My knowledge, at that time, of human traits was still in its infancy, I guess. Despite knowing something about psychology, it was not the reason I was travelling. I made copious notes though and regularly posted stuff home.

To me, America was a family of sorts, (as were all the countries I visited) slowly coming together. I witnessed very little racism, even in the south, and never felt it deserved the media portrayal of it. I had travelled with a few Aussies that had made me cringe more so in this regard.

We, young travellers of the world, really were making a difference I felt. Ambassadors of a potential world, where we all realised we were much the same. Certainly doing far more benefit to inter-country-relations than our upmarket political ambassadors.

Now maybe that was an ideal, a bit of a starry-eyed vision, from travel and

freedom, but I was not alone in these insights. Many times, during my journeys, we would discuss these things; it was like a ritual for many, what were we seeking. (There were many long-term travellers about, leaving their homes for more than just the two-week holiday, months and even years at a time for some. As an Aussie, it was almost expected. Being such a long way away, we went for longer periods than most, not afraid of unemployment upon our return, less concerned than all the other travellers combined. (We came from the Lucky Country!)

I'd ask my readers to think back and consider what we had as our younger selves. All of the nasty traits that we supposedly are now guilty of, were on the decline, absolutely. The freedom marches, the civil rights movements and the cries of respect and tolerance had already made its mark. The positives of recognition of people as people, despite oddities was already occurring.

Enter Negativity and Hollywood and the descent of the press into that same negativity. It was noticeable!

The previous decade had already made us aware of the media's ability to control our emotions. The Australian band, the "Skyhooks" had released a song titled 'Horror Movie', which depicted and condemned the News of the time for showing so much violence and hatred, real stuff, not the stylised stuff of movies and its overacted villains.

Conditioning by movies followed; the South Africans were in the spotlight for "apartheid" and were regular villains, heavily linked to Nazis in their portrayal in movies like 'Lethal Weapon' with our own Mel Gibson. The baddies always had a South African accent.

I travelled with a couple of South Africans for a while and they were really nice people, confused by their depiction outside their own country.

I have watched as more and more negativity has been injected into just about every movie released. Always there must be the persecuted Jew, the racist white, the downtrodden coloured man. More recently, the war between the sexes, male abuse of women, hatred of homosexuality and others who are different.

None of this, as it is represented in the media, is real! It is like all the murder mysteries, not that many people are killed in real life, just as this supposed hatred of others, who they wish to feel persecuted, is not real.

People take it in, it becomes a form of realism to them, they see it so often that the divide between screen portrayal and actual reality, is blurred.

I am saddened by these depictions, they were never my experience; in fact I would go so far as to say, we were changing the world with our ability to travel abroad, through so many different countries, opening up true conversations between real people. We thought it a rite of passage for truly enlightened souls, souls that wished to make a difference. To turn a world fragmented by politics and the quibbles of power seekers, into a family of real-world people, the meek who shall inherit this earth.

The voice debacle crowned this despair for me. All that we had been working to

resolve became divisive in a way I didn't think it would.

Talking about it to those I expected more from, showed me just how easily people have been programmed to believe the media lies. I had thought that because of previous exposure to the COVID propaganda, more would be awake and speak out. While not vocally agreeing, the end result of rejection was encouraging.

I am still engaging with people, still trying to keep a conversation based on reality going with those who swallowed the hooks, but many are so used to being fed in this way and are almost, dare I say, addicted to it.

Perhaps we need a societal breakdown, a cold turkey approach. Everything shut down, just to break this addiction. It would be sad if this were the only way.

Tucker, in speaking as a high-profile character, has drawn attention to and opened up a dialogue around our family values, those that are of a Nation family. He brought this up himself and remarked upon it.

Whether you agree with him, or not, this discussion into who we are and what we want, must happen! It must become a passionate enquiry, devoid of the outside influence of media and politics as they stand at the moment.

The people now acting on our behalf, the politicians and bureaucrats, are in fact doing just that – acting! The results of their actions speak more loudly than their words. To turn this around we must confront all the things that Tucker talks about in his general meandering way, and come to our own conclusion.

For it is our decision alone who to put in as our next representative. If it is more of the same, that is exactly what we will get. We need people who are not afraid to speak up for ordinary Australians, not afraid of looking silly when asking for, no, demanding—accountability. Most of all, we need to support/backup these people in every way we can.

A family is only as strong as the bonds of commitment they have keeping it intact. This is why we must unite, (despite the efforts being made to tear us asunder), and banish the influence of the screen and its unreality from our homes and our Nationwide family.

\*\*\*

## **Work and Purpose —Employment and Servitude**

*The tenuous moral position of full-employment in an age of automation*

**By William Waite**

Because I think the public is confused about the correct usage of these words let's be crystal clear on definitions <sup>1</sup> :

Employment: “The state of having paid work”

Job: “A paid position of regular employment.”

Work: “activity involving mental or physical effort done in order to achieve a purpose or result.”

Usually when people consider the prospect of a Universal Basic Income UBI (because they are not aware of the superior Douglas dividend) the thread invariably turns from it and how it could be done to whether or not it should be done. That is: whether or not it is good for people to be released from the necessity for paid

employment or if it would inevitably lead to a deterioration of moral character.

I think much of the confusion around this question is due to the error of conflating employment with work. Take for instance what Rogan says to a couple of AI boffins on the Joe Rogan Experience:

*you've got to wonder what happens to the general population, people that work menial jobs, people that their life is going to be taken over by automation and how susceptible those people are gonna be. They're not gonna have any agency. They're gonna be relying on a check... You're gonna have a giant swath of the population that has no purpose.* <sup>2</sup>

Rogan seems to forget that for many people their employment is not synonymous with purpose. That the jobs currently required by the employed masses to distribute incomes is not the same thing as “their life”. Nor does employment guarantee agency. Ask an Amazon store-man if he feels like he has agency. I’ve listened to enough of Rogan to say that I think he is confusing employment with working for a purpose.

The working people I know, those who do the real work that keep the whole thing ticking over, don’t confuse their jobs with their purpose. If you asked your plumber if his life’s purpose is plumbing he’ll probably give you a funny look and likely push your jobs to the back of the queue. My neighbour is a builder, he likes building as a job, but I doubt he considers it his life’s purpose. If I asked him what his life’s purpose is, and I might have trouble getting a serious answer, it would probably be a mixture of making sure his family is alright and perfecting his golf game with moderate-to-high levels of beer throughout. The building is a way of getting at the purpose.

The essential thing to notice about “work” is that it captures important activities which may not be included under the definition of employment. For instance, raising one’s own children, studying, exercising, practicing a skill, volunteering, and growing one’s own food is all work, but since, for most, these activities do not include the money system they cannot be considered employment. We should keep this distinction in mind when we read Paul’s letter to the Thessalonians (KJV):

*<sup>10</sup>For even when we were with you, this we commanded you, that if any would not work, neither should he eat. <sup>11</sup>For we hear that there are some which walk among you disorderly, working not at all, but are busybodies. <sup>12</sup>Now them that are such we command and exhort by our Lord Jesus Christ, that with quietness they work, and eat their own bread.*

I don’t think Paul is talking about employment. Distinct from the broader definition of work, having a job must include interaction with the money system. It is activity for which one is paid money. Employment therefore is essentially an umbrella term for sales. Employed people either sell their time, something they make, or something which somebody else has made. This, you will agree, is something very different from “work” defined more broadly as effort made in order to achieve a purpose. I think it is fair to say that Paul’s commandment to work has

more to do with disorderly busybodies finding a purpose than selling things. I read, “*that with quietness they work, and eat their own bread*” to mean “*at the very least stop causing trouble and take responsibility for yourself,*” rather than a directive to go out and sell something.

The other thing about working for money is that one’s efforts become exposed to confiscation by the various means built up in modern financial economies. This is why governments and banks are not concerned with the provision of meaningful work but rather prioritise the creation of jobs and full employment. On the necessity for full employment there is consensus across the political divide because “a high rate of labour force participation is central to economic growth and sustaining revenues for government services.”<sup>3</sup> and the RBA still holds full employment as its number two priority. It is only through the money system that these institutions survive, growing ever more powerful by parasitising the social credit \* created by others. Additionally, our economic settings which insist on employment regardless of purpose is the base ingredients for a whole class of “busbodies” whose activities generate resentment and unnecessary obstacles for the rest of us.

*\* <https://alternativesx.substack.com/p/what-is-the-social-credit>*

The concept of work has become so confused with the earning of money that the original meaning of work, to achieve a purpose or result, has been sidelined. But there is another, deeper aspect to our confusion which we should not overlook. It relates to what Mattias Desmet refers to as the failure of the “Grand Narrative of our society”:

*This is the narrative of mechanistic science in which man is reduced to a biological organism. A narrative that ignores the psychological, symbolic, and ethical dimensions of human beings and thereby has a devastating effect at the level of human relationships. Something in this narrative causes man to become isolated from his fellow man, and from nature; something in it causes man to stop resonating with the world around him; something in it turns the human being into an atomized subject. It is precisely this atomized subject that, according to (Hanna-ed) Arendt, is the elementary building block of the totalitarian state.*<sup>4</sup>

The narrative of mechanistic science promotes the erroneous view that the universe is analogous to a machine eventually decipherable by science. In this conception people are merely cogs in the universal machine which must be placed somewhere into the mechanistic whole. The mechanistic view, propagated by the ruling political and financial agenda, enforces a reductionist concept of man as merely, a human resource on one side, and consumer on the other. Widespread implicit belief in this conception, as Desmet says, isolates us from nature and each other, and generates an amorphous anxiety which is fertile ground for the designs of megalomaniacs. The whole situation is so bananas I can hardly believe it.

Professor of Anthropology, David Graeber, has 37% of us working bullshit jobs and a further 13% not sure. It’s not even recognised as a problem. Contrary to what we are led to believe, this is *not* a state of affairs which supports the development

of moral character. Spending a large part of one's life being useless, but pretending otherwise, makes people miserable and drives them to despair.

The sense that life is some kind of an opportunity is universally felt. It feels like we are here to do something. What? Answers will differ widely, but we can be sure about what this impulse for achievement is not:

*I propose to bring as forcibly as possible to your attention that it is not the prime objective of existence to find employment. I have no intention of being dogmatic as to what is the prime object of existence, but I am entirely confident that it is not comprised in the endless pursuit of turning this originally very beautiful world into slag-heaps, blast-furnaces, guns and battleships.*<sup>5</sup>

A political and financial system which corners people by fiscal and monetary policy into wasting their lives is no longer permissible. The financial system must be made to recognise the reality of industrial progress and the resultant material abundance by enabling a full distribution of consumer goods, employment or not. Consumption must be de-coupled from work.

To be healthy and happy people need to pursue meaning and purpose, but, the expansion of automation to the exclusion of useful work means there is neither moral or practical justification for a policy of full employment. Industrial progress designed to save labour must be allowed to realise its purpose and release the individual from unnecessary employment so we can be free to work and pursue purpose as a free agent. Full employment should be publicly abandoned. From the economic standpoint it is an anachronism. Politically, it constitutes an essential pillar of the unaccountable rule by finance, and it is not compatible with democracy.

## References

1. All definitions available at Oxford Languages - Google search.
2. Joe Rogan Experience. 24.06.24. #2156 - Jeremie & Edouard Harris. Video and transcript available from: <https://ogjre.com/episode/2156-jeremie-edouard-harris>. Accessed 17.06.24
3. Australian Government. 2023. Intergenerational Report 2023. Available from: <https://treasury.gov.au/sites/default/files/2023-08/p2023-435150.pdf>. Accessed 18.06.24
4. Desmet, M. 2022. *The Psychology of Totalitarianism*. Chelsea Green Publishing, Canada.
5. Douglas, C.H. in Heydorn, O. 2016. *Social Credit Philosophy*. International Academy of Philosophy Press, Chile.

## Communism and Christianity By Professor John W. Hallowell

Everyone knows that there is a world-wide struggle or controversy raging today, and that it is sometimes referred to as *Communism vs Christianity*. But not everyone understands the basic issues involved in this conflict or can meaningfully define what the protagonists stand for and against. A contribution to a better understanding may be found in the following excerpts from a penetrating address by Professor John W. Hallowell which was delivered in 1951 and published by *The Canadian Intelligence Service* in 1965.

## THE “INEVITABLE WAVE OF THE FUTURE”

The economic interpretation of history finds philosophical support in the metaphysical conception of dialectical materialism. Each part of this philosophy is linked inseparably to another, and each conclusion derives logically from its premises. Marx did not invent socialism, and he was not the first socialist. What he did, and his followers believe with success, *was to provide socialism with a “scientific” under-girding.*

He did not argue, in his theory at least, from moral or humanitarian grounds for the superiority of socialism but rather contended that he had discovered the laws of history which inevitably decree the victory of socialism over capitalism. Marx depicts the coming of revolution, the dictatorship of the proletariat and the classless society as events of natural necessity. It must happen this way since the laws of history and of economics decree it. It is not a matter of choice but a matter of necessity.

## MARXISM: A NEW RELIGION

Now it is clear that this is something more than a political or economic theory. There is a sense in which it might well be described as a religion; for it offers a complete explanation of life, requires total commitment of the person who espouses Communism as a cause, and holds out to men the promise of redemption from evil in a new society in which mankind shall be truly free and equal. It is a gospel of salvation by revolution, and therein lies its most powerful appeal, especially to those who feel, and with reason, estranged from the society in which they now live.

It holds out a creative mission in life, a creative role to play in the redemption not only of the proletariat but of mankind itself. For it is nothing less than the redemption of mankind from corruption and evil that is its professed aim.

**But only when a “scientific” conception of life is substituted for a religious conception is this redemption possible.** Marx, so his followers believe, has discovered this scientific explanation. Marx was aided in that discovery by the previous writings of Ludwig Feuerbach, who had declared that God is just a projection of human hopes and aspirations. God is a beautiful illusion, a dream which men manufacture.

From Feuerbach, Marx learned that it is not God who creates man but man who creates God. And this discovery had an intoxicating effect upon him because, if this is so, then absolutely nothing stands in the way of men to do what they will.

Marx proceeded to draw more revolutionary conclusions from Feuerbach's “discovery.” And this is what he said:

**“Man makes religion; religion does not make man... Religion is the sign of the oppressed creature... It is the opium of the people. The people cannot be really happy until *(they have been-ed)* deprived of illusory happiness by the abolition of religion...”**



Religion has taught us that man is a stranger in the world, a pilgrim seeking the kingdom of God. Feuerbach's discovery frees us from this illusion. And freed from this illusion, mankind can now transform "the condition which needs illusion." **It is the world that is wrong; it is man that is right; and "the root of things is man himself."** The only reality is human action.

The emancipation of mankind depends solely upon a radical revolution (by which) the proletariat liberates not only itself but mankind. It establishes ultimately a classless society in which each shall contribute according to his ability and receive in accordance with his needs.

**Marxism offers a complete explanation of existence, it provides a vision of a new society which is attractive in its justice, and it offers the downtrodden and oppressed no less a role in history than the emancipation of mankind from exploitation. Certainly, Marxism has elements of nobility and it provides a cause for which many individuals might well think it worth the sacrifice of their lives. It is no mere selfishness that attracts many to the banner of Communism, but rather a cause and a mission which seems to them to restore meaning to life though it may demand self-sacrifice and even death. The disinherited of the earth are attracted to Communism less by the material promises which it holds out, which promises they know they may never live to see fulfilled, than by the creative role they are called upon to play in the emancipation of mankind.**

**Communism presents itself as an appealing alternative to those who, for one reason or another, have lost their faith in God.**

## CHRISTIANITY vs MARXISM

In Christianity everything derives from and is referred back to God; while in communism everything derives from a material process. For the Marxist, the universe is not the creation of God and subject to His purpose, but rather it is regarded as self-creating and self-sustaining. To the question: Which is the primordial element in the universe, spirit or nature? the Marxist answers: Nature. In the words of Marx, "nothing exists outside nature and man."

There is a sense in which Christianity is materialistic. The central doctrine of Christianity is the Incarnation "the Word made flesh." The Christian God is not an Idea, but a Being, a Person. And Christianity holds out to men the promise not simply of the salvation of their souls but of the redemption of their bodies "in a flesh that shall be incorruptible." Like Marxism, Christianity rejects idealism, that philosophy which absorbs matter in mind and affirms the sole reality of the idea. But unlike Marxism, Christianity regards the material universe as the creation of the living God and subordinates matter to spirit.

Thus Christianity avoids the pitfalls both of materialism and of idealism. It denies that the ultimate reality can be reduced to ideas or to matter. It does not deny the substantial reality of matter but subordinates matter to spirit.

And it is in the sacraments that the peculiarly Christian conception of the relationship between spirit and matter is best exemplified. It is the spiritual utilisation of a material object for a spiritual purpose. As William Temple has expressed it: "In the sacrament ... the order of thought is spirit first and spirit last, with matter as the effectual expression or symbolic instrument of spirit."

**For the Communist the primordial element is nature. For the Christian it is spirit. And it follows from this that the Communist seeks a natural explanation of history while the Christian espouses a supernatural or spiritual interpretation. There is a semblance, however, between the Marxist and Christian philosophies of history, and probably the Marxist interpretation could not have developed apart from an intellectual soil prepared by Christianity. For the Christian conception of the Garden of Eden, the Marxist substitutes a primitive communistic society. Corresponding to the Christian fall of man, there is in Marxist theory the establishment of the private ownership of the means of production. From then on human history is a history of corruption, but of corruption gradually being overcome; of mankind, if you like, being "redeemed."**

The history of the world is a history of class struggles between the exploiters and the exploited. Corresponding to the Incarnation, which the Christian conceives as uniquely revealing the meaning of history, there is the advent of Karl Marx, in the light of whose teachings the long-suffering exploited class may, for the first time, understand the meaning of its suffering and the meaning of history. And, just as those in Christ constituted the Church, so those who are enlightened by the teachings of Marx constitute the vanguard of the proletariat, leading the proletariat and, through them, mankind, to redemption from evil. Just as history ends for the Christian on the Day of Last Judgement, so history culminates for the Marxist in the Revolution that will inevitably result in the victory of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie, and in the establishment of a classless society in which man shall ever after live in peace and harmony with his neighbour.

But, of course, there are significant differences. **One locates evil in man, the other in a social institution. One regards evil as a defect of will, the other regards evil as residing primarily in the institution of the private ownership of the means of production. Christianity regards all men as sinners, but Marxism regards the proletariat as the innocent victims of a system for which they are in no way responsible. Where Christianity attributes perfect innocence alone to Christ, the Marxist attributes perfect innocence to the proletariat. Where one looks to Christ for redemption from evil, the other looks to the proletariat. The price demanded for redemption from evil in Christianity is repentance and a new way of life responsive to God's will and purpose. The price demanded for redemption from evil in Communism is enlistment in the cause of the proletariat under the direction of the Communist Party.**

**Where one finds redemption from evil through the body and blood of Christ, the other looks for redemption through slaughter of the capitalists.**

By attributing absolute righteousness of the proletariat, and hence excommunicating all other social classes from the human race, it leads in practice to the most brutal and ruthless suppression and extermination of its opponents. The Communist thinks of his enemy as an enemy of mankind, and perhaps this is why he does not call the extermination of his opponents murder, but the liquidation of unsocial elements... (On the other hand,) though not always practiced by Christians, certainly the commandment of Christ that we should love our enemies is central to the ethical teaching of Christianity. Though we may hate his ideas and battle against them, we must love him as a person, desiring his good as we desire our own.

The Christian conception of man is a realistic conception for it neither overrates man's motives nor underestimates his potentialities. If man is a sinner, he is also potentially a saint. Though defaced by sin, there remains in every man the image of God. The Marxist denies not only that man is sinful, but that he is created in the image and likeness of God. Human nature is rather conceived by him as the product of society, as the image or reflection of social conditions. That is why the Marxist believes that if you change social conditions you may create a new human nature.

There is no conception in Marxism of the human being as a person. But it is precisely the conception of the human being as a person that is one of the distinctive teachings of Christianity. We are persons *because we are created in the image and likeness of a Personal Being*. Through sin that image is defaced, but through Christ it is restored. There is a sense in which it might be said that the restoration of personality is the essential meaning of history for the Christian. God's purpose for man is his redemption from evil and history has no other purpose. For the Marxist, history is "the activity of man pursuing his own aims." For the Christian, history is a dialogue between man and God, with God taking the initiative and man either fleeing or responding to His call.

There is a sense in which Marxism also holds out to men the promise of redemption from evil, but the important difference between the Marxist and the Christian view is that the Marxist promises this redemption at some future date in time through the medium of revolution and the establishment of a socialist society. The Christian holds out to men the promise of redemption here and now if only they will turn to Christ in love and with repentance for their sins. The Kingdom of God is not something that is to be established at some future date in time, but it exists here and now. Every moment of time for the Christian is eschatological; **in every action he stands under the judgement of God. In every action he chooses or rejects the Kingdom of God.** He can, if he chooses, be one with Christ now, and even now enter upon that eternal life of blessedness which God promises those who do His will. Or he can, if he chooses, even now live the life of the damned.

It is here in the world that we choose our ultimate and eternal destiny, and we choose it by the way in which we respond to God's will and love. The way in which we respond to God's will and love will certainly be reflected in our relations with our neighbours, in our political, social, and economic systems; but those systems, whatever they may be, have no ultimate significance. The Kingdom of God cannot be identified with any particular system, but exists as a judgement upon them all. Thus, the Christian will find himself in any and every society in the position both of a critic and as leaven.

\*\*\*

*(End of excerpts from Professor Hallowell's address)*

The excerpts from Professor Hallowell's paper quoted above should be sufficient to show that Communism is more than merely an idea, a theory, an economic system, a life-view or military imperialism. It includes all these ingredients, imposed, and impressed upon those it 'liberates' with incredible brutality. But it is more than this. It is, indeed, a religion; not a religion, as some of our 'Social gossellers' have led us to believe, akin to Christianity, but a religion which, when closely analysed and examined in practice, is seen to be the very antithesis of Christianity.

Marxism, in spite of its theory and practice, still seems to have an "idealistic" appeal to many 'intellectuals' who, having rejected God, still yearn for a vision and meaning to life for a religion.

And, keeping in mind the source of the finance and leadership which promoted and executed the Bolshevik Revolution, we are satisfied that the inspiration behind this phase of Communism had no remote connection with any genuine idealism, but was rather a crafty move to seize Russia as a home base and harness her resources and people in a gigantic effort to destroy Christian society and reconstruct it along quite different lines.

Annual Subscription to 'On Target' \$75.00 pa which includes an Insert, the On Target and the NewTimes Survey journals - **printed and posted monthly.**

Donations & Subscriptions can both be performed by **Direct Bank Transfer to:**

A/c Title Australian League of Rights (SA Branch)

BSB 105-044

A/c No. 188-040-840

Postal Address: PO Box 27, Happy Valley, SA 5159.

Telephone: 08 8322 8923 eMail: [heritagebooks@alor.org](mailto:heritagebooks@alor.org)

Online Bookstore : <https://veritasbooks.com.au/>

Our main website of the Douglas Social Credit and the Freedom Movement "Archives" :: <https://alor.org/>

On Target is printed and authorised by Arnis J. Luks  
13 Carsten Court, Happy Valley, SA.

Essential Reading:

**Approach to Reality**

<https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Douglas%20CH%20-%20Approach%20to%20Reality.pdf>

**The Realistic Position of the Church of England** <https://alor.org/Storage/Library/Douglas%20CH%20-%20Realistic%20Position%20of%20the%20Church%20of%20England.htm>

**Brief For The Prosecution** <https://alor.org/Storage/Library/Douglas%20CH%20-%20Brief%20for%20the%20Prosecution.htm>