

## A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

---

Vol. 60 No. 36

20<sup>th</sup> September 2024

---

### IN THIS ISSUE

Untapped Potential By Neville Archibald	63
In Defense of the Family Farm " <i>the peasant on his freehold</i> " By William Waite	69

---

**Thought For The Week:** The Communist problem in Australia can no longer be dismissed as a question of controversial politics. It has become a matter of national security. Communism is not an abstract political ideology, embraced by starry-eyed idealists. To-day it is a military code of warfare. It has a general staff in Australia. It is training young Australians to be traitors. It employs a gang of unscrupulous mercenaries. It has unlimited financial resources....

...While I refuse to believe that war with Russia is inevitable and cannot be averted by statesman-like handling, realism compels me to consider what would happen in Australia if the Third World War does occur. The Communist Programme for the overthrow of Democratic Government provides:

“Mass action includes strikes, a combination of strikes and armed demonstrations, and finally the General Strike conjointly with armed action against the State bourgeoisie. The latter form of struggle, which is the supreme form, must be conducted according to the rules of war. It presupposes a plan of campaign, offensive fighting and undoubted devotion, and heroism on the part of the proletariat.” (p.89 - J.T. Lang - *Communism is Treason*)

### Untapped Potential By Neville Archibald

Those who know me will probably ask why are you always harping on about the need to change the system? Who are you to decide what road society takes, there are others who study and comment on social direction with much more knowledge than you! Do you have a degree or educational qualifications to be able to comment on these things? Psychologists and political science graduates are already working on these things! Their collected works would fill a library, if anyone was able to offer a fix, why do you think it would be you?

To me this discussion is now on a par with the change in direction that, ‘do your own research’ has taken. In the beginning of the plandemic, those of us who quested for knowledge about the virus and it’s potential, were derided for wanting

to do our own research before putting blind faith in the pharmaceutical companies and planned health care. Our intention to be fully informed was turned into a swear word and used against us, as if we were incapable of understanding what was being put before us. Fast forward 4 years and many of our questions have been found to be legitimate ones, still in many cases without a suitable answer. There can be no question that harms were done to many people and are still being realised. We were right to pursue these questions, it seems.

In the same way, I see our societal direction in need of re-evaluation. The experts have been talking and tinkering for a long time now and nothing much has changed; in fact, the change in stability within reach of ordinary Australians (and in much of the world) has clearly been for the worse. So I ask, why? If so many educated and connected people who profess to be on top of the problem are working on it; why is it only becoming worse for us?

The incomes afforded these professionals is of a magnitude higher than the average wage most of us see, and yet I still see unresolved issues. Not all of the things that bind our community are difficult to grasp, in fact I suggest much of the jargon that has been used to explain away the pains we are feeling is just that, Jargon. Words and explanations that say simple things in a complicated way, thus providing a sub-culture, a guaranteed place of work. In that same way I see 'climate change' jargon creating research jobs and helping to secure grants to 'investigate' all sorts of things, the result of which is often more restrictions on the general population, even though the science (as it were) is not settled. The use of financial jargon (black magic incantations) to obscure a failing within current economic policy that keeps us boom or bust, inflation or interest rises, some form of flux that is rarely to our advantage, yet never solving the issue, always increasing the debt!

If we do not ask questions when faced with a problem, can we expect to get any sort of 'real' solution? The perfect time for us to ask is when others are failing us! If we continue to let these things be explained away in this way we will continue to get these same results. Hard questions must be asked.

Societies direction, it's culmination, affects us all, whether you think of it or not. Your children will bear the brunt of our decisions today, if we don't make any, they will still suffer the consequences of your inaction. If I send my car in to be fixed and it comes back the same, I take it to someone else. If it comes back worse, I must question the mechanic's ability to either diagnose the problem correctly or provide the correct part needed! I cannot just throw up my hands and let it solve itself, it won't! To keep driving it or to get to my desired destination I must get the problem fixed. Death or danger lie ahead otherwise, if not for me then for the innocent bystanders that might become involved when it finally fails! In this case those bystanders are others in our communities who do want to see us progress to a better place.

Having established that we need to be involved, what do we need to be asking ourselves? Where does this lead us too? The first part requires some serious thought about what your society should look like, not just knee jerk reactions to what you don't want. When you react to what is already happening you start out at a disadvantage. You not only have a problem to fix, you have the reason for that problem to find and counter, which can be difficult if it has been entrenched in society for some time.

If we look at the refugee problem around the world, we can see the difficulties Nations with high numbers are facing. These indications are not proof of endemic racism in the destination countries, they are just the real outcomes, what eventuates when a population feels threatened or their lives are disrupted in real ways. Lack of affordable housing, overburdened support systems and infrastructure, loss of job opportunities, are all real world problems for those whose lives are disrupted the most. Okay, so the refugees have had it tough, I get that. It is not helping anyone to drag down the very population that can help them the most. We have long had overseas aid groups and volunteers who travel to remote destinations to help populations in trouble; be they well diggers, builders teaching construction, doctors dealing with health issues or educators teaching a generation who can make a difference in their own countries. To continually take in large numbers of people who need help to get set up, creates poverty here and disrupts an existing social structure.

These two things remove both ability and desire to help others. If those coming to live here do not share our views, our destination vision, then trouble will occur. I can hardly imagine the four or five generations of women who fought for equal rights being happy under some form of Sharia law, yet this is what some of our leaders are proposing be accepted, that those migrants who wish to live under their original laws, be allowed to in this country. What madness is this! Does anyone seriously believe that will be a good idea? Let's just throw out all we fought for for the sake of feeling good about being 'tolerant'. When the impact is felt (and we are seeing it in Ireland and England at the moment) the outcomes can be horrific. Those coming out here who want to bring their old ways with them should be encouraged to stay at home and fight for what they believe in there. If it is going to work when implemented, then let them show it working in their own country before asking us to emulate them.

Our history is such that we have endeavoured to leave much of the bad behind us, pushing forward to equality and prosperity for all, the very reason why people flock here to join us. The signs are there, that excessive multiculturalism does not work, all the excuses and name calling does not change that fact.

I spoke on monopoly control in my last article. If we have a vision for the future and it includes being largely self-sufficient, then we must put some thought into what that actually means. The reasons for wanting to be, will clarify this. Self-

sufficiency is a reflection of our ability to survive whatever the world may throw at us. We need to be independent as far as possible and know the origin of the things we use. Why? If we believe in going forward into a fairer world then we will be against child labour or exploitation, slavery of all forms (including financial debt slavery in its many forms) and any other form of ill treatment of populations. In our own way we deal with this. If it is local we can exert local pressure via laws or direct action through the courts or our representative to government; if it is outside our direct control then we use that other great tool, money. In a true free market, we refuse to buy or support those who exploit. If it is a major shoe manufacturer who uses child labour, we refuse to buy their product; but, we can only do this if we have a reliable, known, alternative source. Those sources that are behaving as we would wish, would get our support, being local we would at least know how they work and could talk to the employees if there was any doubt. (hard to do when they operate out of various third world countries)

Food self sufficiency raises its head here too, in a big way. Not just working conditions apply, but health and nutrition are interlinked. We know what chemicals and sprays our farmers are allowed to use, how they operate. We can see it, speak with them, and using our money vote, shape what they produce; what we want. The big multinationals who buy the cheapest from wherever they can, or manipulate the market to drive down purchase price, (and they do) only care about the bottom line, the profit. We see this in what is on offer in supermarkets. A careful check of country of origin on labels will show you just how far removed we have become from knowing our food. Condensed milk from Spain, Netherlands, China, yet we exported huge amounts of this in my childhood. We know what drenches are used, how cattle are fed and looked after, how it is processed. Same goes for canned fruit or frozen veges, we know the sprays allowed, the water source used, the whole production process is under some form of scrutiny to be safe. We have control of these things by virtue of it being local and subject to the restrictions we allow via legislation. (While I am not a fan of excessive legislation I do agree that some is needed to safeguard exploitation in its many forms, including dangerous or untested forms of production. Be they chemical use, fertilisers or hormones, what goes into our bodies directly reflects upon our health as a nation.)

Being an essential to live, our ability to feed ourselves must be a part of our vision. Anything that impedes this, or makes it impossible to compete (food dumping by other countries – read monopoly companies) should be, if not removed, then restricted by tariffs to ensure there is no cost advantage. Who benefits from removal of tariffs or allowing open slather? Rarely the individual farmer, usually big business.

Use of our natural resources is also a crucial part of our vision for our future. No one wants to see huge chunks of our beautiful wilderness areas hacked about or locked up so that we cannot enjoy them. No one wants pollution or permanent

damage to our environment, but I do think there are things we recognise as necessary. Changing our environment is always a part of life and living. When we plant a garden we change things, build a house, construct a road. All these things are needed to live life as we determine. Coal, gas, iron ore, farming, are all things that change the face of this earth. Done responsibly these things are okay, who can live without steel or power, who would want to. As a society, we determine these things as we progress, unless we are subjected to advertising or political manipulation, this goes for all sides of all arguments. Coal and gas have been made into dirty words and are being forcibly reduced, despite no real alternative to replace them. That's okay if you wish to live in the dark and be subject to major fluctuations in power availability, but we were not asked and research into the possible cleaning up of the current power production system was not really considered. Run down power stations or those supposedly at the end of their effective lifespan, are not the fault of the consumer. When sold off by Government under pressure from outside sources (we the people did not pressure government to sell off these essential services to private industry) they were bought and have been allowed to become run down, no longer up to date. Like many companies purchased by outside sources these days, the business is used to make money until it requires major reinvestment, then either flogged off to someone else or closed down, the major profit being made, no need to reinvest and continue, it's off to greener pastures. Is this what we have seen here? Our environment is our responsibility, it should be reflected in government as we desire, a correctly behaving set of representatives would listen and respond to our wishes. We have always been an outdoor in our leisure sort of people. Far more used to travel and seeing our country than most other countries. As a traveller overseas I was amazed by the reaction of others who were incredulous when I explained how we would travel three or four hours to a destination for a weekend trip. In England a visit to Loch Lomond (only an hour or so away) was considered a major holiday event, needing as much thought and preparation as us going on holiday to Bali. Our knowledge of our country is an advantage in this case, we are probably more capable of making a judgement on the health of our country than most. This vision of a well managed (husbanded) country is certainly in our reach, we just need to focus on the real view of it not that reflected by vested interests or climate alarmists.

Health has to be mentioned here too. A country which neglects its populations overall health is one that, in reality, shows it doesn't care about the individual.

I must speak on this for various reasons, not the least of which is the recent mandatory push for an Australia wide roll out of a trial inject-able. To me it was on a par with Germany's use of prisoners of war for testing medical procedures on. Something that many were hanged for. Forcing, at risk of exclusion from society, people who were unwilling to participate in a drug trial (a new form of drug as well with no long term safety history) to actually take the drug, not once but many times. Our constitution forbids Medical Conscription (section 51 xxiiiA) and as such it

should be respected, this did not happen. Your opinion on the pandemic aside, bodily autonomy is a critical part of any medical care. The future looks shaky in this regard, with two large drug factories to produce mRNA vaccines currently being built. Does this mean anything the 'health industry' thinks is a potential threat, or is concerning, is going to have a vaccine created for it and then have this forced upon the whole population, like last time?

Other factors around the health of a Nation include foodstuffs. The actual food value of much of the processed food we largely consume, has dropped considerably over the years. Fresh tomatoes that are canned or bottled in season are one thing, but the use of bulk quantities of already processed tomatoes to re-can or re-make into something else is but one of the things going on in big industry. This short-cut means we are getting twice cooked/processed food and thus it is less than optimum.

Other high volume processing is also done this way for convenience, and some will endeavour to justify it as economically better. The rise of modern varieties of some plants also can be manipulated for better/more economic production, but this too needs to be considered carefully by you as the actual food value/nutritional content can be quite different to the original variety. Trade offs are made, and genetic modification by selective breeding has been going on for a long long time, but we now have gene manipulation between species to contend with. This again is all well and good as far as economics goes, but a proper study into the changes it makes for our health are often deemed less important than the money.

Our food should be the best we can provide, if food production becomes solely about monetary gain, (as it appears to be these days) then our health will suffer.

We are seeing this now!

Our vision of the future in each of the above cases is connected to both finance and control. The control we are seeing as government or big business overreach. Monopoly control where we have little say it seems. We could use finance to control some of this by not buying bad products, but sadly our financial system is geared towards monopoly control and the government seems intent on making it more so. We saw this with the recently attempted removal of parliamentary control over the reserve bank. If we, through our elected parliament do not control our finances, then we are at the mercy once again of monopoly, which cares not a whit for the individual. To this end I think it crucial that we have at least a basic understanding of what we truly want to see. Solutions to all these ails are often a lot more simple than they seem, many of the real solutions have just been demonised by those who wish to control the way the world works. By looking closely at these things, doing some of your own thinking, and not relying on those, who many times have vested interests, we should be able to see who is heading in our direction. If we join forces and insist upon improvement, the potential we have to create a better life is huge.

\*\*\*

## **In Defense of the Family Farm By William Waite** **“the peasant on his freehold”**

Since I started writing *Alternatives Exist* I have wanted to reproduce the following excerpt from Robert Ardrey’s *Territorial Imperative*.<sup>1</sup> It contrasts the abject failure of Soviet agriculture with the equally stunning success of its counterpart in the United States. Eventually Ardrey concludes that the difference of prime importance is the energy and dedication of a pair on their territory — a condition enjoyed by the farmer in America but denied to the Russians by the Communists and their system of collectivised agriculture. This piece is the best argument I know for the family farm, “the peasant family on its freehold” as Ardrey describes it.

While most farms in Australia are family owned its not really freehold is it? Agricultural land is loaded with debt. The least indebted livestock farmers are those raising sheep with an average business debt of \$329,000. Cattle farmers carry significantly more at \$570,000.<sup>2</sup> A third of dairy farmers owe up to \$300,000, a further third between \$300,000 and \$1.3 million and the most indebted third are north of that.<sup>3</sup> In 2022 - 23 the average interest bill for dairy farmers was \$89,000. It’s a treadmill from which there is no escape.

In addition to debt costs the typical agricultural business relies heavily on outside inputs the prices of which tend to increase, sometimes dramatically, for reasons outside the farmer’s control. Fertilizers, biocides, machinery, insurance, water, fuel and energy costs are all crucial to modern farming operations so the farmer must buy them whatever the cost. Compounding the problem is the fact that conventional methods tend to result in the deterioration of natural fertility leading to increased inputs to maintain production levels. For these reasons corporate agribusiness has a decisive influence on the method of farming and the quality of produce.

Since most farmers do not sell directly to the public they are also squeezed on the distribution side. Prices for primary production are notoriously volatile and the nature of his products, being perishable or costly to store, means the farmer must take what the market is paying. Furthermore, limited choice in processors, retailers, transport and warehousing leaves farmers vulnerable to price gouging and middlemen abound.

On top of all this is the ever-present risk of bad seasons. In a good year the sums can be made to work but in the inevitable bad years all bets are off. For instance, dairy farmers average \$330, 000 a year for feed. Imagine that in a drought.

Like everything else, the Australian farming scene has changed dramatically over the last 40 or so years. Since the 1980s the number of farms has halved<sup>4</sup> and, since the year 2000, the average price of farmland per hectare has quadrupled<sup>5</sup>. Its a hard game to break into. Increased equity in land values means that farmers can access more debt, and they are, but this does not necessarily mean that their businesses are more profitable. Economy of scale is the strategy for those choosing to stay on,

and with the average Australian farmer pushing sixty (58) there should be plenty of properties to be had. The trouble is that this strategy of go big or get out inevitably looks less like an enterprise dealing with life and more like the “factory in the field.”

You could slow down the big ag juggernaut with financial reform. A challenge to the debt paradigm is sorely needed. If farmers had more breathing space many would choose not to drive their land and animals so hard and look to gentler methods. Unfortunately, the general population remains plunged in ignorance about the most basic financial facts so this seems unlikely anytime soon. Consumer demand might also be able to do something but again there are still a lot of people who don't seem to care enough to know anything about what they are putting in their mouths.

For those of you not willing to wait for the hoi polloi and who worry about food quality and security the real message of hope is towards the end of Ardrey's piece.

**Hint:**

*Private plots occupy about 3 percent of all Russian cultivated land, yet they produce almost half of all vegetables consumed, almost half of all milk and meat, three-quarters of all eggs, and two-thirds of that staff of Russian life, potatoes.*

There are things that can be done on small plots and you don't necessarily have to become a Russian peasant either — though it probably helps. What definitely helps is keeping the trident of world dominion; the banks, the government and the multinationals, out of your back pocket. This is a lesson Australian farmers have forgotten, if they ever learned it. The new small farms must aspire to the ideal of Lord Northbourne who coined the term ‘organic agriculture’ in his book *Look to the Land*: “the farm itself” he wrote “must have a biological completeness; it must be a living entity, it must be a unit which has within itself a balanced organic life”.

That to me is real farming and there is much useful work to do here.

Anyways, without further delay I give you Robert Ardrey's thoughts...

If we think back, we shall recall that farm and farmer have been the central problem of civilization, even as they have been its central cause, ever since in neolithic times almost 10,000 years ago we began our domestication of plants and animals. Having gained control over an abundant food supply, we made possible populations of such number that the old hunting life could never again support us. We could not return. Like the beaver, we mastered a culture which in turn mastered us. Pasture and field, orchard and garden became like portions of our body, organs without which we could not exist. And like the beaver's dam and lodges and wooded acres, they commanded an intolerable lot of work.

Which of us from dawn to dark would bend in the rice paddies, cut hay in the fields? As the millennia progressed, we supplied many an ingenious answer. We tried at first to push the work off on our women, an answer favored in much of Africa even today. We tried human slavery, a solution respected throughout the civilized world until a century or so ago. We tried serfdom in many guises, chaining



the worker to someone else's soil. But there was always a shortcoming that the involuntary worker is inefficient.

Until the industrial revolution the inefficiency of our agriculture was of no alarming moment. So long as the slave in the field was pressed to feed only a handful of nobles and warriors and priests and artisans, involuntary labor was good enough. But with the rise of industry and the massive increase of a factory and office population, our old systems collapsed. Despite the most humane or brutal attentions of landlord and overseer, the involuntary worker in the field could not produce the surplus food which such populations required. Slavery and serfdom vanished. To whatever extent other forces, moral or political, may have caused the final dismissal of our ancient institutions, the first cause was that they no longer worked. And we turned, most of the world's people's to another old if less prevalent institution, the peasant family on its freehold.

It is an accident of history that in 1862 the American President, Abraham Lincoln, with his signature on the Homestead Act committed the American agricultural future to the principle of private ownership based on a one family unit, and that two years later Karl Marx with his call for Communism's First International committed what would someday be the Soviet Union to public ownership and the collective way. A giant race, of which we are almost as unaware today as we were then, was set in motion. As in two enormous living laboratories, the two human populations that would someday dominate the world's affairs were placed on opposite courses to solve a common problem. And that problem, in an industrial age, became in time the problem of all peoples the world around.

How many workers can be released to the wheel by a single man at a plow? As nations came to compete for power and prestige under a single racing flag of industrial worth, a stubborn equation of human mathematics came to limit their most splendid ambitions. What fraction of a people's numbers must remain in the field to free the remainder for the ultimate competition? And by what means may the energies of that farming fraction be so enhanced as to reduce its number to a minimum?

No argument exists — certainly not in Moscow's Central Statistical Administration — concerning the current state of the competition. In the united States of America one worker on a farm produces food for himself and for almost twelve more in the city: 92 percent of all Americans are freed for industry by a rural 8 percent who not only feed them but produce a food surplus of politically embarrassing dimensions. In the Soviet Union one worker in the field, but only in good years, feeds one worker in the factory. A doubtful half of the Russian population is freed from the soil. And as if to confirm the Soviet calamity, its major partner in the collective way, China, pursuing more extreme communal policies, must combine the efforts of six in the field to free one man for the industrial adventure.

China's pretensions to power are young, enveloped in a cloak of secrets, and cannot be inspected here. But the Soviet Union has been with us for almost a century and makes no effort to hide or dismiss its failure. We know that many a blight besides proscription of private property has fallen on the Russian farm. Stalin's liquidation of the kulaks eliminated at an early date the ablest Russian farmers. The reign of Lysenko and his Lamarckian nostalgias all but annihilated Russia's science of plant genetics. Permafrost, that layer of permanently frozen earth underlying so much of the broad Russian plain, has been less than helpful. Drought, combined with the blunder of putting to the plow so much virgin but marginal land, has enforced the disaster in recent years. And for decades there was the naive pressure to favor the factory over the field, to neglect fertilizers, farm machinery, irrigation.

Like Chekhov's man of two-and-twenty misfortunes, the Russian farmer has had his full share. But does the total misfortune explain in full the catastrophe which has come to Russian hopes? There, of course, lies the argument. And I submit that, were the ratio between American and Russian effectiveness, as measured by this final yardstick, a matter of two to one, or three to one, or even of four or five to one, then American wealth, soil, science and luck might account for the difference. But that the American farmer can feed twelve men besides himself, whereas the Russian can feed only one, is a little too much. I submit that a final multiplication of natural American assets arises from the biological value of the pair territory.

The smallness of American farms is among the best-kept secrets in the arsenal of American power. The Soviet Union's collective farms, in which workers shared until 1966 nothing but surplus earnings, average 15,000 acres, each with about 400 families. The state farm, hiring all workers at a fixed wage, averages 70,000 acres and employs 800 workers. Yet of America's two and one half million commercial farms, only one in ten is over 500 acres. The average number of workers, including the farmer and his sons if he has any, is five. Despite those advances in farm machinery which permit a worker to cultivate an acreage far greater than in Lincoln's day, still half of our farms are not larger now than then. The factory-in-the-field exists but it is of minor significance. The American agricultural miracle has been produced by a man and his wife with a helper or two on a pair territory. (...)

One recalls the beaver and his saplings, and a vigilance concerning his dam that makes him so easily trapped. One recalls the parent robins gathering a thousand caterpillars a day. One recalls the platys and their duckweed, and the intruding cichlid fish who must be twice as big to challenge a proprietor. One recalls planarian worm who will take twice as long to start feeding, despite all hunger, if his plate is unfamiliar. Are we to believe that a biological force, commanded by a sense of possession, which plays such a measurable role in the affairs of animals plays no part in the measurable discrepancies of man?

In any final inspection of the Soviet-American experiment with the territorial imperative one might thumb through statistics as dreary as they are endless to

demonstrate the superior efficiency of the man who owns over that of the man who shares or works for wages. Some have their fascinations such as that process called stock raising, in which availability of fertilizer and machinery and irrigation provide limited advantage. Yet to achieve a net gain of one hundred pounds in a walking unit of beef, the American farmer will expend three and one-half hours of labor, the wage worker on a Soviet state farm twenty-one, the sharing worker on a collective farm an impossible fifty-one. But it is a situation within the Soviet farm economy that provides the last garish touch.

From the days of Stalin's enforced collectivization of the land, the peasant has been permitted to retain a tiny plot for family cultivation. It is the last bedraggled remnant of the pair territory in the Soviet Union, and in times of political crisis and ideological pressure its size has been reduced. Today the private plot averages half an acre in size, but there is little likelihood of further reduction. Without it Russia would starve.

Private plots occupy about 3 percent of all Russian cultivated land, yet they produce almost half of all vegetables consumed, almost half of all milk and meat, three-quarters of all eggs, and two-thirds of that staff of Russian life, potatoes. After almost half a century the experiment with scientific socialism, despite all threats and despite all massacres, despite education and propaganda and appeals to patriotism, despite a police power and a political power ample, one would presume, to effect the total social conditioning of any being within its grasp, finds itself today at the mercy of an evolutionary fact of life: that man is a territorial animal.

Natural selection deals ruthlessly with any populations, bird or beaver, which fails to solve the problems of its environment with all those resources, learned or unlearned, which may be at its disposal. It deals as ruthlessly with men. And in time when we should like to pretend that natural selection no longer pertains to the human being, the most cynical observer must be moved by compassion for all those hundreds of millions of his fellow beings, in this earthly setting or that, who are being subjected to selection's surgery to prove that man is being more ancient than all man's theories. But the evolutionary process grinds on, whatever our hopes or compassion undeterred by tyranny, undeterred by dogma, undeterred by our most soaring excursions or delicate perfections of human self-delusion.

The territorial nature of man is genetic and ineradicable. We shall see, farther along in our inquiry, a larger and older demonstration of its powers in our devotion to country above even home. But as we watch the farmer going out to his barn with the sun not risen above the wood lot's fringe, we witness the answer to civilization's central problem which none but our evolutionary nature could provide. Here is a man, like any other territorial animal, acting against his own interest: in the city he would still be sleeping, and making more money too. What force other than territory's innate morality could so contain his dedications? But here also is the biological reward, that mysterious enhancement of energy and resolution —

territory's prime law and prime enigma — which invest the proprietor on his own vested acres. We did not invent it. We cannot command it. Nor can we, not with all our policemen, permanently deny it. He who has will probably hold. We do not know why; it is simply so. It is a law that rings harshly in the contemporary ear, but this is a defect of the ear, not the law. I believe that we shall see, as this inquiry develops, that, harsh though the law may be, in this territorial species of which you and I are members it has been the source of all freedom, the curse of the despot, and the last desperate roadblock in the path of aggression's might. \*\*\*

## References

1

Ardrey, R. 1966. *The Territorial Imperative*. Atheneum, New York.

2

Meat and Livestock Association. October 2023. Strong financial outlook for the agricultural industry. Available from: <https://www.mla.com.au/news-and-events/industry-news/strong-financial-outlook-for-the-agricultural-industry/>

3

Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry. Financial Performance of Dairy Farms 2021-23. Available From: <https://www.agriculture.gov.au/abares/research-topics/surveys/financial-performance-of-dairy-farms#:~:text=At%2030%20June%202022%2C%20one,of%20%241.3%20million%20or%20more>

4

ABARES: Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry. 2024. Snapshot of Australian Agriculture 2024. Available from: <https://www.agriculture.gov.au/abares/products/insights/snapshot-of-australian-agriculture#daff-page-main>

5

ABARES: Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry. 2024. Farmland Price Indicator. Available from: <https://www.agriculture.gov.au/abares/data/farmland-price-indicator>

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:

### Communism is Treason

[https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Lang\\_JT-Communism\\_is\\_Treason.pdf](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](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\\_Conspiracy.pdf](https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Butler%20ED%20-%20bew0Real_Communist_Conspiracy.pdf)