

A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Vol. 60 No. 34

6th September 2024

IN THIS ISSUE

| | |
|--|----|
| The Territorial Imperative - Love, Land and Debt By Will Waite | 1 |
| A Welcome Discussion That Must Be Had By Arnis Luks | 6 |
| Reconstruction By Neville Archibald | 10 |

The Territorial Imperative - Love, Land and Debt By Will Waite

The title of Douglas' last periodical (1936-1939), *The Fig Tree*, was inspired by the following verse from Micah:

*"But they shall sit every man under his vine and under his fig tree;
and none shall make them afraid."*

Rare exceptions aside the elemental constituents of wealth — earth, air, fire and water — are widely distributed over the earth's surface. So, it stands to reason, that if we are for the decentralisation of economic power we are also for the widespread ownership of land.

Territory is fundamental to human beings. That human beings are a territorial animal is the case made in Robert Ardrey's book *The Territorial Imperative*¹, which he defines as:

A territory is an area of space, whether of water or earth or air, which an animal or group of animals defends as an exclusive preserve. The word is also used to describe the inward compulsion in animate beings to possess and defend such a space. A territorial species of animals, therefore, is one in which all males, and sometimes females too, bear an inherent drive to gain and defend an exclusive property.

And as to whether or not man is a territorial animal Ardrey is unequivocal:

Man, I shall attempt to demonstrate in this inquiry, is as much a territorial animal as is a mockingbird singing in the clear California night. We act as we do for reasons of our evolutionary past, not our cultural present, and our behaviour is as much a mark of our species as is the shape of a human thigh bone or the configuration of nerves in a corner of the human brain. If we defend the title to our land or the sovereignty of our country, we do it for reasons no different, no

less innate, no less ineradicable, than do lower animals. The dog barking at you from behind his master's fence acts for the same motive indistinguishable from that of his master when the fence was built. ²

The territorial pattern of human beings is known in the scientific community as 'the pair territory', and it involves a single breeding couple acquiring and defending from others in the species an exclusive territory. Many and varied are the animals which follow this pattern; beavers, robins, grebes, some types of deer, sticklebacks, worms to name a few. This behaviour is the strategy of species that to rear young require the sustained effort of two parents because the offspring are too numerous, too complicated or too long in maturing. So primal is the factor of territory that in many territorial species both male and female will be sexually disinterested if the male is unpropertied. An observation which prompts Ardrey to suggest that territory is a force perhaps older than sex. ³ In the pair bond it is the *territorial imperative* which brings the couple together, and then ensures the male will stay around to fulfill his duty to his young:

The pair territory is a restraint on the actions of the individual. The attachment of male and female to a single property is an attachment to each other more permanent than sexual opportunity. Freedom is denied, anarchy forestalled. A biological necessity for the male to be responsible for the welfare of his offspring is enforced through a biological attachment for the space they occupy... the territorial imperative reaches into the lives of all members of a pair species to shape and constrain their physical freedom according to the necessities of their demanding offspring. ⁴

If we consider this aspect of the human condition beside our economic condition, we must immediately see the discrepancy.

It is now commonplace to hear somebody lamenting that their children have given up the dream of owning their own home. Just last Wednesday *The Australian* ran a story with the headline "The Aussie dream is in tatters as housing prices surge across the nation." ⁵ The losers, the article explains, is first home buyers who have been pushed out of the market as a result of a combination of soaring prices and interest rates. Adelaide, Sydney and Melbourne were placed amongst the top ten most unaffordable cities in the world for housing. To afford a house in Sydney you need an income of \$186,000 a year. The demand driving house prices is coming from investors and that, of course, means the expansion of the absentee landlord and the enrichment of real estate management oversight.

Douglas talked about how the financial system contrives to load land with debt and engineer government and corporate interference in his book *The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket* published serially in the *Social Creditor* in 1942-43. Doulgas begins with a quote he attributes to *Grimm's Fairy Tales*, fictional though it may be, it describes what has happened:

The aristocracy of the goyim as a political force is dead – we need not take it into account; but as landed proprietors they can still be harmful to us from the fact that

they are self-sufficing in the resources upon which they live. It is essential for us at whatever cost to deprive them of their land. This object will be best attained by increasing the burdens on landed property – in loading land with debts.” ⁶

The absurd price levels of residential property is wholly attributable to the (financial-exploitation-ed) by governments and big finance. To start with, one of the most important factors influencing real estate prices is the lending policy of commercial banks. A person who goes into a bank looking to borrow money for a house will very likely set their price ceiling at what the bank is willing to lend. If Sydney banks are lending \$600,000 to young couples who are then bidding against each other at auctions what do you think the houses will sell for? Add to this the financial advantages available to investors and denied to owner-occupiers, and the unique exposure of mortgage debt to the vicissitudes of monetary policy, and it would take nothing less than the territorial imperative to convince any sensible person that home ownership is a good idea.

Why is this allowed? Essentially all money is bank credit. That is money borrowed into existence by government, businesses and private people. Since repayment of debt is ongoing and destroys money it is essential to the functioning of the economy that sufficient volumes of bank credit come into the system by borrowing. In the last couple of decades the main contributor to credit volume has been borrowing for real estate purchases. In other words, the exorbitant cost of housing is a direct reflection of the degree to which real estate has been pledged as collateral for money creation. That’s what the Australian debt clock means when it reports that housing debt is now over \$3 trillion (\$3,000,000,000,000) and “Mortgage debt on housing has been the largest expansionary category of debt in the Australian economy over the last 20 years”. ⁷

Let’s do some Maths. Taking the debt clock’s figures at thirty dollars an hour the country owes the banks one hundred billion hours. Assuming the standard work year of 260 eight-hour days Australians owe the banks 48 million work years. Factoring a compounding interest rate of 3% and we’re looking at seventy-three million years to cover our mortgage debt. ⁸ The 14,000,000 workers in this country could knock it over in just over five years if all their money went to mortgage debt repayments but the rules of the game are that old debt can only be serviced with new. By the time we got the monkey off our back we’d only be older and deeper in the hole. I’m describing a system of intergenerational debt-slavery.

The Latin root of ‘mortgage’ is ‘dead’ (*mortus*) ‘pledge’ (*gage*)’ and the promise is literally coming true. Our children can’t afford their own property and many are not having families. Couples are limiting the size of their families and cite financial constraints as a main reason. A study by the Australian Institute of Family Studies revealed a shift in household composition with statistics showing decline in all directions. Single-person households increasing, childless-couple households increasing, fertility rate in decline from 3.55 children in the 1960s falling to 1.77 today. Also, for the first time, there are now more than a million single-parent

households with four in five of these being single-mothers.⁹ To what extent does our estrangement from territory account for the disintegration of the family and attendant social damage? A question that concerns Ardrey:

*As our populations expand, as a world-wide movement from countryside to city embraces all peoples, as problems of housing, of broken homes and juvenile delinquency, of mass education and delayed independence of the young rise about us in our every human midst, as David Riseman's phrase "the lonely crowd" comes more and more aptly to describe all humankind, have we not the right to ask: is what we are witnessing, in essence, not the first consequence of the deterritorializing of man?*¹⁰

It is not clear to me how we can get people to appreciate the importance of our financial arrangements as the source of our complaints. The case is not all that complicated. The financial establishment that creates our money supply is systematically sucking in everything of value as collateral for this debt game which it seeks to expand in dimensions of both time and space to infinity. It's the method for a system of world governance, and unless it is stopped it will proceed as it has been proceeding. It seems to me that the first requirement to stopping it is a widespread understanding and public acknowledgment that we are looking at a global system of control, (*complete control-ed*).

Could it be otherwise? The financial system is in its entirety a human contrivance. It is designed to get the results it does for the benefit of those positioned to influence it. It could be designed to get different results. Graeber in his historical survey of debt reports that "faced with the potential for complete social breakdown, Sumerian and later Babylonian Kings periodically announced general amnesties", and apparently successful peasant revolts from China to Europe were often accompanied by the cancellation of debt and the redistribution of land.¹¹ That is not necessarily the best sort of reform but it shows that options are available.

But there is no point in talking about how to change it until we can agree that what we are doing now is stupid and bad. Once we acknowledge it, as individuals and collectively, it is a short step to understanding that the financial system and the bilge that flows out of it trespasses on our territory and liberty in a multitude of ways and it is perfectly legitimate, as territorial animals, to defend ourselves against it.

Douglas said "We want, first of all, *security in what we have*, freedom of action, thought and speech and a more abundant life for all. Ardrey would agree. Finishing the last quote from *The Territorial Imperative*, he writes "And if man is a territorial animal, then as we seek to repair his dignity and responsibility as a human being, should we not first search for means of restoring his dignity as a proprietor?"¹²

References

- 1 Ardrey, R. 1966. *The Territorial Imperative*. McClelland & Stewart Ltd. Canada. p. 3.
- 2 Ibid. p. 5
- 3 Ibid. p. 5
- 4 Ibid. p. 100

5 Kirk, E. 01.08.24. The Aussie Dream is in Tatters. The Australian. Available from: <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/breaking-news/the-aussie-dream-is-in-tatters-as-housing-prices-surge-across-the-nation/news-story/1615eb97217facc370d14e56dbb918cb>

6 Douglas, C.H. 1942-43. *The "Land for the Chosen People" Racket*. The Democratic Federation of Youth, Sydney.

7 Australian Debt Clock. Available from: <https://australiandebtclock.com.au/>

8 Chat GPT helped me with the interest calculations. It's quite fascinating.

Step-by-Step Calculation with Compound Interest:

1. Monthly Interest Rate: The annual interest rate of 3% gives a monthly interest rate of:
 $r = 3\% \div 12 = 0.25\% = 0.0025$

2. Number of Payments: For a 30-year mortgage, the number of monthly payments is:
 $n = 30 \times 12 = 360$

3. Monthly Payment Formula: The formula for the monthly mortgage payment MMM is:
 $M = \frac{Pr(1+r)^n}{(1+r)^n - 1}$ where PPP is the principal (\$3 trillion), rrr is the monthly interest rate, and nnn is the number of payments.

4. Calculate the Monthly Payment: $M = 3,000,000,000,000 \times 0.0025 \frac{(1+0.0025)^{360}}{(1+0.0025)^{360} - 1}$

Let's break this calculation into parts:

- Part 1: $(1+r)^n(1+r)^n(1+0.0025)^{360} \approx 2.448(1+0.0025)^{360} \approx 2.448(1+0.0025)^{360} \approx 2.448$
- Part 2: Calculate the numerator $0.0025 \times 2.448 \approx 0.00612$
- Part 3: Calculate the denominator $2.448 - 1 = 1.448$
- Part 4: Calculate the monthly payment $M = 3,000,000,000,000 \times \frac{0.00612}{1.448} \approx 12,690,000,000$

So, the monthly payment is approximately \$12.69 billion.

5. Total Amount Paid Over 30 Years: Total amount paid = $12,690,000,000 \times 360 \approx 4,568,400,000,000$

This means the total amount paid over 30 years, including interest, would be approximately \$4.568 trillion.

Calculate the Number of Work Hours and Work Years

6. Work Hours Needed: Total work hours = $4,568,400,000,000 \div 30 = 152,280,000,000$ hours

7. Work Years Needed: Number of work years = $152,280,000,000 \div 2,080 \approx 73,230,769$

So, it would take approximately 73,230,769 work years to pay off \$3 trillion in mortgage debt at \$30 per hour, accounting for a 3% compound interest rate, assuming 260 work days per year and 8 hours per day.

9 Australian Institute of Family Studies. 2024. Population and Household. Available from: <https://aifs.gov.au/research/facts-and-figures/population-and-households#:~:text=The%20proportion%20of%20family%20households,Households%20are%20getting%20smaller.>

10 Ardrey, R. 1966. *The Territorial Imperative*. McClelland & Stewart Ltd. Canada. p. 102.

11 Graeber, D. 2012. *Debt: The First 5000 Years*. Melville House Publishing, London.

12 Ardrey, R. 1966. *The Territorial Imperative*. McClelland & Stewart Ltd. Canada. p. 102.

A Welcome Discussion That Must Be Had By Arnis Luks

Several book titles by Prof Anne Twomey from the University of Sydney came across my desk this past week. The *'Chameleon Crown'* brought to light, for me, unknown constitutional areas of interest which caused me to research the ALOR archives to read what has been previously written about this important title.

Prof Anne Twomey has also recently introduced a series of educational videos concentrating on our constitution and the federal-structure of our government/s – *'Constitutional Clarion'*. What a timely and welcome round of messages.

There are many ALOR *bona fides* contacts out there who have links with the 'freeman movement', who I believe are mistaken in their approach to constitutional and legal matters. These videos and writings by Prof Anne Twomey will greatly assist to clarify some of this confusion, undoing the programming of those minds.

The significance of Prof Anne Twomey's educational videos and her written works, which include an essay on *'Federalism'* and *'Citizens Initiative and Referenda for New South Wales'*, is a gentle but firm disassembly of much false-thinking - one falsity at a time, re-orientating those caught up in this movement back to earth.

I did not appreciate that our Commonwealth Constitution, apart from applying the Referendum process as written in Section 128 of the Constitution, could also be affected under Section 51 part 38.

Successful Section 128 Referendum

In the early days of Federation, the states were hamstrung with debts. An agreement was reached between all the States and the Commonwealth to transfer those debts to the Commonwealth on the basis that a certain value (per head of population) of Commonwealth-Taxes were returned to the States, but with a proviso that only the Commonwealth was authorised to draw loans through the Loans Council, successful referendum's occurring in 1910 and 1928.

Successful Section 51 Without Referendum

The *'Australia Act 1986'* was historically examined in fine detail within Prof Anne Twomey's *'Chameleon Crown'*, fitting within the specific requirements of Section 51 part 38 of our Constitution – being agreed between all (the States and Commonwealth parliaments) and relating to UK Law still having an effect with the States or the Commonwealth.:

Section 51

(XXXVIII) the exercise within the Commonwealth, at the request or with the concurrence of the Parliaments of all the States directly concerned, of any power which can at the establishment of this Constitution be exercised only by the Parliament of the United Kingdom or by the Federal Council of Australasia;...

All States needed to pass their own enabling legislation, before the Commonwealth and UK parliaments could pass their *'Australia Acts 1986'* to have effect. Negotiations took several years across differing governments to bear suitable fruit –

being the ‘Australia Act 1986’ – enacted in both the Commonwealth and the UK.

Differing Approaches – Differing Nations

The differing approaches towards constitutional adherence from England and Australia was another important consideration within the book. Not every nation approaches their Constitution in the same manner. England, not having a written constitution as Australia, concentrates on precedent and convention (historical work-practice), whereas Australia concentrates on the meaning of the words written within the Constitutional Act.

p.186

The difference between Australian and British views on the constitutional position was in part derived from the different constitutional contexts in which they work. In the United Kingdom, with no formal written constitution, what was considered ‘constitutional’ was based heavily on constitutional convention. These conventions were in many cases treated as binding. In Australia, State constitutional lawyers relied on written Constitutions and focused on whether there was legislative power to enact a law. Constitutional convention was not considered binding, and always gave way to validly enacted legislation. Thus, the Australian advice focused on whether there was any limit on the legislative power to enact such a law, while the British advice focused on the application of the underlying constitutional convention concerning advice to the Queen...

Differing Crowns

The differing crowns that Queen Elizabeth held also came into focus as a topic of import. Prior to 1986 with the introduction of the Australia Act 1986, the states’ link to Queen Elizabeth were within her ‘*Queen of England Crown*’, (in Australian ‘State matters’, the Queen taking advice from British Ministers), whereas the Commonwealth links to Queen Elizabeth were within her ‘*Queen of Australia Crown*’ (taking advice from our own Commonwealth Ministers).

Prof Anne Twomey is performing a most welcome and timely public service in this important area of civic understanding of our State and Commonwealth Constitutions and their relationship with our ‘shared’ Monarch.

Free To Think -

The recent ‘*2023 Review of the Reserve Bank of Australia*’ is possibly relevant to Section 52: Exclusive Powers of the Parliament, whereby the parliament is attempting to abrogate their exclusive powers over to the bureaucracy rather than sitting firmly within the Executive Government of the Commonwealth – being answerable to the parliament.:

Section 52

(II) matters relating to any department of the public service the control of which is by this Constitution transferred to the Executive Government of the Commonwealth;...

Our Constitution is a vitally important document that should be kept close at hand by every patriotic and loyal Australian.

Running Policy Into The Long Grass

I received an email about a Malcolm Roberts article '*Predatory Billionaires Are Corrupting Free Enterprise*' <https://www.malcolmrobertsqld.com.au/predatory-billionaires-are-corrupting-free-enterprise/> from which I concluded he had badly missed the mark. Will Waite's article, '*The Territorial Imperative*', illustrates the systemic flaws within our financial system, and the desire for all to own their plot of earth. Recalcitrant billionaires are simply the next line of defence/sacrifice to protect central-banksters' systemic policy, which does nothing to alleviate the suffering of holders of irredeemable debts. Sen Malcolm Roberts' superficial approach provides no permanent solution for our progeny, let alone promoting a financial-policy for the nation as an independent, self-reliant peoples, furnished by a secure industrial base to produce security for all. CH Douglas led the way out from this financial tyranny.

Eric Butler has produced two works on this important subject - *A Defence of Free Enterprise and the Profit Motive* - and *The 'Achilles Heel' of the Conservative Movement*. Both available in our online Social Credit library for immediate download, and both provide a detailed examination of monopoly, debt-finance, inflation and progressive taxation leading to financial slavery, as communist policy.

The Libertarian perspective from the Austrian School of Economics, (rather than genuine free enterprise), advances collectivism for the people, and industrial/central-banking anarchy for the marketplace. Laissez-faire - *the policy of leaving things to take their own course, without interfering* - champions less and less government to the great joy of the monopolists. Libertarianism, as Laissez-faire, is achieving a dialectical policy-outcome – both monopoly – being collective-capitalism for the few, with collective-communism for the many, which have both been condemned as inherently evil within the Roman Encyclicals.

Perhaps an acquaintance who has access to Sen Malcolm Roberts' ear may wish to present these damning facts to him. I certainly would be interested to hear of any response that may be forthcoming, and will readily print it here - should it come.

Secret Men's Business - Smoke and Mirrors

<https://www.abc.net.au/news/2020-03-18/history-indigenous-acknowledgment-of-country-national-custom/12029886>

<https://expressdigest.com/welcome-to-country-ceremony-was-created-by-ernie-dingo-and-richard-walley-oam-in-1976/>

Ernie Dingo's dance troupe came up with an impromptu new ceremony (welcome to country-ed) in 1976 after an awkward stand-off with Maori and Cook Islanders who refused to perform at an arts festival until they were ritually welcomed.

Since the beginning of time, Indigenous communities have greeted strangers to their lands. However, the 'welcome to country' ceremony we now have before school starts, when parliament sits, and even when we catch a plane, is only 46 (48-ed) years old...

Why I refused to acknowledge the traditional owners at the Vic Bar Council **By Lana Collaris <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/commentary/why-i-refused-to-acknowledge-the-traditional-owners-at-the-vic-bar-council/news-story/ee5464c1cde45b69bc46a383b536b935>**

...The term First Nations deserves attention. A nation is a distinct political society. Therefore, the term First Nations suggests there was once a number of distinct political societies, separated from the others, that lived upon our land and were the first nations.

While the existence of tribes or clans at the time of British settlement is an established fact, the notion there were “nations” by any definition cannot be established. The idea has also been rejected by the High Court of Australia and is accordingly wrong in law: *Coe v Commonwealth* [1979] HCA 68 at [12].

...The term First Nations is wrongly used to strengthen the claims of the “sovereignty was never ceded” and “always was, always will be” movement, and to give some Indigenous people of today, who seek to make treaties with the states of Australia, the appearance of some kind of legal standing.

...For as long as people continue to make political statements by way of acknowledgments of country, I will continue to acknowledge all Australians, signalling my support for an Australia where we are all equal and subject to the same laws regardless of our race.

Lana Collaris is a barrister and member of the Victorian Bar Council.

Career Blackmail - Just Like ~~Which~~ Doctors and Covid

<https://www.skynews.com.au/australia-news/voice-to-parliament/victorian-barrister-reveals-culture-of-fear-preventing-lawyers-opposing-voice-to-parliament-says-bar-council-exceeding-its-power/news-story/2841589085b6bbb094e1acf34f589fe5>

...The Victorian Bar Association is embroiled in a dispute over whether the 21-member Bar Council should publicly come out in support of the Voice, and whether it is within their power to do so.

Last month 300 members of the Victorian Bar signed a petition calling on the bar council to publicly support the Yes campaign. This is being opposed by a group of barristers pushing for a special general meeting where all 2,200 members of the bar can decide on the issue. But according to former Bar Council member Lana Collaris, many barristers who oppose the Voice are reluctant to say so publicly because they “perceive a risk to their career.”

... The former bar council member also revealed that publicly supporting the Yes campaign may be outside the Council’s power, as the organisation’s constitution prohibits the council from exercising its power for political purposes. “I’ve examined the bar’s constitution, and I’ve formed the view that the bar does not have that power, and I’ve put the bar councillors on notice about that, setting out my reasons and particular clauses of the constitution,” Ms Collaris said. ***

Reconstruction By Neville Archibald

In the years between the first war and the war to follow, CH Douglas gave a series of lectures on what he saw as over production and under consumption.

Perhaps you think it a strange observation to make in post first war England. The country was struggling to rebuild, had lost the flower of its young men to the battlefields of Europe and had a large debt to pay. The lead up to the second war was becoming apparent to those who chose to look, but no one was willing to address what Douglas saw as a crucial defect in the financial system worldwide. His actions after making this discovery was to travel throughout the Commonwealth of Nations in an attempt to awaken some of its leaders to this defect.

Not just the bearer of bad news, Douglas had also thought long and hard about the means to remedy the problem and had written several volumes of work dealing with ways to implement a solution.

The small booklet that prompted this article, was written and appeared in the *Glasgow Times* as a series of articles in May of 1932. He was concerned with the social reconstruction of his country. His ability to see this over-production was firsthand. His link of that ability to the wider public's inability to purchase that production by normal means, had become even more apparent when the forward was written in 1943.

“It does not require unusual powers of discernment to grasp the fact that the jeeps, tanks, aeroplanes, shells, etc., etc., of our vast war production are really kitchen ranges, electrical installations, aluminium saucepans, fertilisers and POWER in an altered form, and that if they were being offered for sale in the shops, the public could not buy them.”

The whole world at that point (1943) was creating a huge over surplus of material goods which were effectively exported to be destroyed, with no real financial benefit at all for our economies. Upon seeing that the first time, Douglas was confounded by the fact that everything just shut down after the war and reconstruction was to continue without the benefit of the previous ability to overproduce.

Oh yes you say, but we were broke! We couldn't afford to! We had to tighten our belts! Whose words were those? Think long and hard about that and then look into who made the enormous profits during the wars. Money was quick to flow then, despite there being no visible return on investment. No lasting assets were made, no big new buildings or developments, only wanton destruction. The removal of real wealth from the world. If it could be justified then, why not for the rebuilding?

We went instead into a “Scarcity Complex”. An illusion that money was scarce, which of course is not the same thing as wealth. The distinction between the two things is an important one to make, for it is by this deception that we so often end up losing our real wealth.

If we have property, but not money, we are encouraged to mortgage our property to obtain this money, the terms are incredibly favourable to the bank, and they create money and charge interest as though it was their property. It is not! You are effectively monetising your own property, it is your wealth you are borrowing against, if anyone deserves the interest on the capital loaned, it is you.

It is this deception of ownership that is at the core of our problems. The current push to monetise our national parks or areas of natural beauty to boost our wealth, makes a mockery of the intention of our money supply. The ability to exchange goods and services between us, is the sole purpose of money. To give away, or put in hock, our natural resources or even our country itself, so that we can share what we make is nonsensical.

Issuing tickets against this wealth makes no sense when you boil it down. The issuing of tickets is only limited by the number of seats we have or rather our ability to swap/exchange what we produce and consume, an ownership claim on those tickets just for the mere act of printing them or making them available is as preposterous as it is a con. Sadly, this is the con we must all face down, the true purpose and ownership of money.

In this “scarcity” we found that finance did not reflect the facts. We needed money to buy the production. As in the war, when money was made available to destroy vast quantities of wealth, equally during the rebuild it could have been made available for “benefit”.

Instead, financing went back into its “salaries and wages mode” alone to provide purchasing power, which in itself is insufficient to buy all production.

The consumer being solely financed by wages and salaries is left in a shortfall situation of not being able to buy all that is produced, thus the push to export and correct the problem in that way. Otherwise, the extra finance to correct this is only available by debt financing, with its never issued interest component, a self-defeating action. To continue on in this way means an ever-increasing debt burden, UN-payable. This is what we have seen.

This shortfall situation, is in reality, strictly an accounting issue. The real wealth is there, it is just not able to be exchanged among ourselves. An essentially moral conundrum for many, who have been brought up to believe nothing is for free. Or the protestant work ethic, where if you do not earn it, you do not deserve it. This is a situation that we must grapple with as we move forward. It is essential to do so, for if we do not, we are playing along with an illusion that will continue to use us as slaves to the very system that should have freed us over a century ago.

There must be another way to introduce purchasing power into the economy. One that is fair and does not favour one group over another. One of Douglas's proposals was to sell below cost. Have two sources of income for the producer, one the buyer and the second the general credit of the country. This would give the government the ability to correct the imbalance of purchasing power as needed. Subject, of course, to book-keeping requirements.

To add credit into a society is nothing new. The mechanism for expanding credit exists at this time. We see it done over and over as new credit, but it is controlled by the banking system. If the government issues a bond or promise to pay, the bank creates a credit to this value. It comes out of nothing on the basis that the government will pay it back. There is no tangible wealth in the bank that created it, just a belief in our ability to pay it back.

What are these limits then, and who really owns them. If it is credited against our ability to pay then surely it is our credit. The bank may have the right to a service/ book-keeping fee but it has no right of ownership of this money, nor of any interest accruing from it. It is not "lenders money" in that someone's deposit is being used, it is issued against our promise to pay. Again, if anyone is due an interest component it is us, for providing the confidence that we can pay.

In calculating the limits to the issue of money (and there are limits) we must realise that the economy is a dynamic one. A snapshot at any point will not contain all the aspects of wealth. In fact, wealth of a country is not so much the things it possesses, as it is its ability to produce them.

The rate of both production and consumption is a changing thing. It is a ratio, and it is this ability to produce and consume that money is intended for, our ability to swap as needed. If that ability is hindered by artificial means or by a desire to control, then it fails us as a system.

An interesting point here is the next step, the creation and destruction of that money.

If it is issued at the rate of production, to allow for something to be produced, then it ought not to be taken back at that same rate, but only at the rate of consumption. Unless it is all available to be consumed, this could result in, as we said before, under-consumption, or having excess production which cannot be consumed.

It is here that the constant improvement in the production process also needs to be discussed. Every improvement results in more and more labour being made redundant. This redundancy results in less consumer spending power. We must make provision for those displaced to also be capable of purchasing that production.

With less of a workforce needed, the necessity of some form of dividend system to supplement wages and salaries is required. The current system has allowed for this by the continual employment in service industries and by an increasing bureaucracy.

Government has created jobs and paid for it out of borrowing as debt from the banking industry, to be repaid with interest. This is unsustainable and we are seeing the result of this policy in the ever-expanding government debt. These largely unneeded jobs have resulted in over regulation and a system whereby any piece of paper must pass through many hands before reaching it's final destination. Slowing down processing and adding layers of complications to an already over governed population.

It is the job of government to manage our money supply and ensure it is fit for purpose. It is not for them to contract it out at enormous cost and allow others to milk the system for their benefit.

The current monopoly of money creation means that there will be active resistance to providing this supplemental purchasing power. What is in fact the correct socialisation of credit would be at the expense of the large profit currently being made by those in the banking business, whose actual job it is to make it available to us for use, not to own it.

So used to being allowed to view it as their own to command, the real ownership of this credit (the people) needs to be enforced. The first attempt at criticism will be that it is ridiculous! It has always been ... etc. on close inspection it can be seen that it is not at all ridiculous but reality that has been skewed.

The second Attempt will be that of accusing us of failure to understand the financial system. The long and complicated explanations that have even to this point, resulted in a failure to manage our finances without boom and bust cycles and increasing un-payable debt. The natural tendency to believe that because it has been that way, that it is right, despite their very failure.

The third will be the failure of people to recognise and appreciate the physical possibilities of the monetary system as distinct from its currently purported financial features.

So really the problem we come back to, is that even with the best will in the world to find a solution to the financial inequalities that exist, we are going to be limited by the current monopoly of credit that exists in the banking fraternity. It is the same in every country around the world, the control and issue of money is held by financial institutions that are essentially privately owned.

The fundamental cure, is to wrest that control away and place it into the hands of those who truly own it, the public.

League Objectives

- (a) To promote loyalty to the Christian concept of God, to the Crown, and to the Country.
- (b) To advocate genuine competitive individual enterprise and personal initiative.
- (c) To defend private ownership and advocate its extension in order that individual freedom with security shall be available to all.
- (d) To attack and expose government-by regulation and bureaucratic interference with economic and social activities.
- (e) To take steps designed to secure to the individual very definite rights which no government can take away, and especially steps which defend the written constitution.
- (f) To defend the Rule of law which makes all equal before the Law.
- (g) To stress the value of our system of Common Law, originally built up in Great Britain, to protect the rights of the individual; and to that end, to expose corruption and partiality in all their forms.
- (h) To expose the manner in which the safe guards of individual rights and liberties are being destroyed.
- (I) To emphasise the value of the Senate and of Legislative Councils.
- (j) To expose and oppose all anti-British propaganda and actions, irrespective of their origin.
- (h) To take such other actions as may be deemed desirable to promote the policy of the League.

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

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:

Communism is Treason

https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Lang_JT-Communism_is_Treason.pdf

Communism in Australia

https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Lang_JT-Communism_In_Australia.pdf

An Introductory Course on the Real Communist Conspiracy

https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Butler%20ED%20-%20bew0Real_Communist_Conspriracy.pdf