

A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Vol. 61 No. 08

28th February 2025

IN THIS ISSUE

The Illusion of Renewable Energy: It's Fossil Fuels or Bust! By James Reed	49
The Brain Valve - Notes on a Pallid Reality By William Waite	51
Major Douglas Visit to Australia 1934	54
The Supreme State, Planning and Scarcity By CH Douglas 1934	56

The Illusion of Renewable Energy: It's Fossil Fuels or Bust! By James Reed

In the early 2000s, it was trendy to be an ardent advocate for renewable energy. The promise of harnessing the sun and wind to power our world seemed not only feasible but imperative. The idealistic folk envisioned a future where solar panels adorned every rooftop and wind turbines dotted every horizon, leading us to a sustainable utopia free from the shackles of fossil fuels. This vision was shared by many, and significant investments were made to turn it into reality.

However, as the years progressed, the flaws in this vision became increasingly apparent. One of the most pressing challenges was the intermittent nature of renewable energy sources. Solar panels, for instance, are at the mercy of weather conditions. In North America, the average solar farm generates meaningful power less than 20 percent of the time. Wind energy is similarly unreliable, fluctuating with seasonal and daily wind patterns. This inconsistency necessitates reliable backup systems, which invariably means fossil fuels or nuclear power must remain part of the energy equation.

Initially, renewable energy advocates pointed to battery storage as the answer. Yet, the reality proved more daunting. Current battery technologies can store energy for a few hours, but storing enough electricity to power entire regions during prolonged periods without sun or wind is not feasible. The sheer scale of storage required presents both technical and economic challenges that remain unsolved.

Moreover, the environmental footprint of manufacturing renewable energy infrastructure cannot be overlooked. The production of solar panels, wind turbines, and batteries demands significant mineral resources, leading to increased mining activities. This surge in mining has its own set of environmental and social implications, from habitat destruction to the displacement of local communities.

Ironically, in the name of “saving the planet,” the renewable industry is causing significant ecological harm while failing to meet energy needs efficiently.

A poignant example is the Wayuu Indigenous community in Colombia’s La Guajira region. Plans to develop wind farms on their ancestral lands have been met with resistance due to concerns over environmental degradation and cultural erosion. These communities are being asked to sacrifice their way of life for energy solutions that do not deliver on their promises.

Furthermore, the integration of renewable energy into existing power grids has revealed economic challenges. In Queensland, the cancellation of the Pioneer-Burdekin hydroelectric project, which was intended to store renewable energy, has led to projections of a 60 percent increase in wholesale electricity prices by 2035. This highlights the financial burden of transitioning to a renewable-based energy system without sufficient infrastructure to support it. Across Europe, heavy investments in renewables have resulted in rising energy costs, with countries like Germany facing some of the highest electricity prices in the world.

International dynamics further complicate the narrative. European countries, eager to enhance their green credentials, have turned to North Africa for renewable energy imports. However, this strategy has been criticised for perpetuating energy dependencies and environmental burdens on countries like Morocco and Egypt, which continue to rely on imported fossil fuels. This raises the question: if renewable energy is truly the future, why do so many regions still require fossil fuels to sustain their economies?

At the heart of this push for renewables lies an even larger issue: the assumptions behind climate change policy. The prevailing narrative asserts that fossil fuels are causing catastrophic global warming and that an immediate transition to green energy is necessary. Yet, climate models have consistently overestimated warming projections, and predictions of climate disasters have failed to materialize at the scale once feared. Meanwhile, fossil fuels have played an undeniable role in global economic prosperity, lifting billions out of poverty, enabling industrial progress, and providing the most efficient and reliable energy source humanity has ever known.

If we are truly concerned about energy security, economic stability, and human well-being, then dismissing fossil fuels is not only impractical but reckless. The reality is that renewables alone cannot sustain modern civilization, and fossil fuels will continue to be the backbone of global energy for the foreseeable future. Instead of chasing the illusion of a green utopia, we should focus on improving existing energy systems, investing in cleaner fossil fuel technologies, and acknowledging the undeniable benefits that coal, oil, and natural gas have brought to humanity.

The renewable energy idealism of the past few decades has led us down an expensive and impractical path. It is time to reassess our priorities and embrace an energy policy grounded in realism rather than ideology. The world needs energy solutions that work—not just ones that sound good on paper. Fossil fuels must be

with us for the foreseeable future. And that means coal-fired power stations, Albo!

<https://www.artberman.com/blog/the-end-of-climate-change-idealism-facing-geopolitical-and-economic-reality/>
<https://democracyjournal.org/arguments/why-renewables-cannot-replace-fossil-fuels/>
<https://quillette.com/2019/02/27/why-renewables-cant-save-the-planet/>
<https://www.forbes.com/sites/michaelshellenger/2019/09/04/why-renewables-cant-save-the-climate/>
<https://news.mongabay.com/2024/12/renewables-wont-save-us-from-climate-catastrophe-experts-warn-what-will/>

The Brain Valve - Notes on a Pallid Reality By William Waite

In 1953 Aldous Huxley was the human subject in an experiment that saw him taking the drug mescaline. His report on the experience is called *The Doors of Perception*.¹

One of the curious effects of mescaline reported by Huxley was that it seemed to induce an extraordinary interest in everyday things. For instance, under the influence of mescaline, the legs of a chair became a source of intense fascination:

The legs, for example of that chair - how miraculous their tubularity, how supernatural their polished smoothness! I spent several minutes - or was it several centuries? - not merely gazing at those bamboo legs, but actually being them - or rather being myself in them; or, to be still more accurate (for "I" was not involved in the case, nor in a certain sense were "they") being my Not-self in the Not-self which was the chair.

He felt this degree of fascination in books on a shelf and in the folds of his pants. He surmises that mescaline brings the perception of the ordinary person closer to that of the artist allowing him to appreciate details in his environment that ordinarily escape unnoticed.

Exciting as Huxley's description sounds there is a drawback to all this heightened awareness:

Though the intellect remains unimpaired and though perception is enormously improved, the will suffers a profound change for the worse. The mescaline taker sees no reason for doing anything in particular and finds most of the causes for which, at ordinary times, he was prepared to act and suffer, profoundly uninteresting. He can't be bothered with them, for the good reason that he has better things to think about.

From these observations he proposes a certain theory about the function of the mind. He quotes some learned eminence:

The function of the brain and nervous system is to protect us from being overwhelmed and confused by this mass of largely useless and irrelevant knowledge, by shutting out most of what we should otherwise perceive or remember at any moment, and leaving only that very small and special selection which is likely to be practically useful.

Then, a bit later:

To make biological survival possible, Mind at Large has to be funneled through

the reducing valve of the brain and nervous system. What comes out at the other end is a measly trickle of the kind of consciousness which will help us to stay alive on the surface of this Particular planet.

In short:

The suggestion is that the function of the brain and nervous system and sense organs is in the main eliminative and not productive.

If there is any truth in this metaphor of the brain valve it would be useful to consider at least two aspects of our situation.

Firstly, there seems to be, by accident or design, a significant narrowing of the sensory information coming within range of ordinary people. The obvious culprit is “the device” where everything is artificial, two-dimensional and without texture, taste or feel, but it’s happening in the unplugged world as well. I have noticed this in a marked reduction in tolerances. Temperatures must be between 22 and 25 degrees celsius; chemical air “fresheners” and sanitizers are deployed to eradicate offensive smells and invisible pathogens; a mania for sunscreen and covering up as though the sun were the most dangerous thing; a widespread zoophobia indicated by panic at a spider scuttling across the table or a wasp in proximity. My brother told me he had read something about an increase in depression amongst people who never saw horizons, a kind of slow burn, generalised claustrophobia.

Some anecdotes:

Some years ago I was involved in the delivery of a remedial reading program at a high school in Queensland. We started with a simple test to determine how smoothly students could track a finger as it moved across their field of vision. Many of the students were unable to track smoothly. Their eyes involuntarily jumped back and then forward as they lost and picked up the finger again. This, of course, had serious implications for their ability to read comfortably. The theory was that as a result of excessive screen use many children had insufficient training tracking objects through three dimensional space.

On a recent family trip to the Sunshine Coast this contrast between the three dimensional and two dimensional world was on full display. We took our three kids (ages 3,4 and 6) to Australia Zoo to admire their animals. It was the full sensory experience: crocodiles, people, rhinos, food, swimming, snakes, noise, smells and lots of walking on hot roads. I also felt a certain sympathy for the animals in the enclosures being deprived of the real life enjoyed by wild members of their species. The next morning I let the kids watch ABC kids while they ate their cereal. Normally our kids get neither television or cereal. Looking over at the breakfast table was like looking at a painting. No exaggeration. No movement disturbed the still life of my children staring at the multi-coloured procession of taxpayer funded incoherence that is ABC kids. I switched the television off and watched the painting slowly re-animate, then begin to complain. Just out of interest I repeated the experiment with exactly the same results before deciding that it violated standards of ethical scientific inquiry. I recognised the uneasiness I had felt about the animals in

the zoo. Click. I killed the babysitter.

This little vignette brings me to the second aspect that arises when I consider the brain valve. At the same time as our sensory experience is impoverished it is also true that the valve itself is being regulated by individuals and organisations unconcerned about our survival on “this Particular planet.” An old friend of mine used to say that people won’t believe anything until they see it on television. The means of delivery may have changed somewhat but control of the important details of the driving narrative remains highly concentrated. I have no doubt.

The best evidence of this occurring at scale was the assault on brain valves that induced the great flu panic (GFP) of 2020. I recall the daily briefings (though I hardly ever watched them), the dead, the dying, the infected, the hospitalisations, the super-spreaders, the vaxed, the unvaxed, the mandates, masks and social distancing. What we saw there, I think, was the hostile takeover of brain valves. Not only was our environment laden with the messaging of the regime but we were actively discouraged from thinking about obvious things. Baseline health, exercise, nutrition, Vitamin D, existing treatments, even natural immunity was the dangerous derangement of conspiracy theorists.

Former colleagues have described Dr Kerry Chant as honest and uninterested in politics, which might explain her longevity in the role of NSW Chief Health Officer - Covid brain-valve operator Kerry Chant

I think the remote regulation of brain valves has special relevance to our topic of Douglas Social Credit as well. It is a constant source of puzzlement that the whole world can be obsessed with money yet continue to be plunged in ignorance as to what it is and how it operates as a limiting factor in human affairs. It is as though we are under a spell, unable to come to grips with the tangible facts of our economic reality. The truth is we have been conditioned to not look for solutions to our problems in the financial system. Our brain valves have been so tinkered with that the source of our discontents can be anything but financial in origin and until we can wake up to the facts which Douglas revealed I see little hope for a lasting change of direction.

In an address Douglas gave in 1936 called *The Approach to Reality*, he made the point:

The abolition of poverty in the midst of plenty, important as that is, is not the core of the problem. It is conceivable that people might be provided for as well-fed slaves. It is fundamental that the freedom inherent in things should be conditioned only by the nature of the world, as one might say. ²

It is “the nature of the world” which must be perceived and conformed to. This virtual existence that moves us through a sort of insipid, prepared “reality” interspersed with digitally induced comas is not the sort of experience upon which we can build meaningful lives and societies. Furthermore, it is not the sort of experience from which any sort of resistance can be raised against whatever it is the powerful want to do to us. It makes us malleable. That’s the point of it.

References

- 1 Huxley, A. 1954. *The Doors of Perception*. Harper & Brothers, New York
- 2 Douglas, C.H. 1936. *The Approach to Reality*. Available from:
<https://www.versdemain.org/images/pdf/Douglas-The-Approach-to-Reality.pdf>

Major C. H. Douglas, M. I., Mech. E., M.I. Mining E., M.I.E.E., London Visit to Australia 1934

Major C. H. Douglas, whose social credit analysis and proposals are arousing interest throughout the world, is shortly to pass through Melbourne *en route* to New Zealand, he will stay for a period of six weeks. His stay in Melbourne will be brief. He is expected to arrive from Adelaide, on January 21, and will leave on January 23. He will deliver a public lecture at the Melbourne Town Hall on the evening of Monday, January 22 1934.

Major Douglas is a Scotsman, son of a clergyman, and a cousin of Lord Weir. He was educated at Cambridge University, and is an engineer of world-wide reputation. Those who have known him personally speak in high terms of his cultured and charming personality, and describe him as an alert business-like man, with a most hospitable nature.

Major Douglas is recorded in Vol. 11. of *“Europa,”* the European *“Who’s Who,”* in the following terms:— *“Douglas—Clifford, Hugh, Major, British engineer and financial expert. Born 1879. Educated Cambridge University.*

Chief construction engineer, chief engineer and manager, India, 1900-1910.

Deputy chief electrification engineer, Buenos Aires Pacific Railway, 1911.

Engineer P.O. Railway, London, 1913-14.

Assistant superintendent, Royal Aircraft Factory, 1917.

Chief European witness, Canadian Parliamentary inquiry on Banking and Commerce, 1923.

Member of the World Engineering Congress, Tokyo, Japan, 1929.

Witness, McMillan Committee on Finance and Industry, 1930.

Published. *“Economic Democracy,”* 1919; *“Credit Power and Democracy,”*

1920; *“Social Credit,”* 1927; *“The Monopoly of Credit”* 1931.

A fellow Scotsman writes of Major Douglas: *“He will be discerned in retrospect as having been one of the great contributors of re-orientated Scottish genius to world affairs.”*

Mr. A. R. Orage, the brilliant English Editor and Economist, has written his impression of Major Douglas in these terms:

“His knowledge of was extraordinary; from our first conversation, everything he said concerning finance in its relation to industry—and indeed to industrial civilization as a whole —gave one the impression of a master-mind perfectly informed upon its special subject. After years of the closest association with him, my first impression has only been intensified. In the scores of interviews we had together with bankers, professors of economics, politicians, and businessmen, I never saw

him at so much as a moment's loss of complete mastery of his subject. Among no matter what experts, he made them look and talk like children."

At the World Engineering Congress, held at Tokyo, Japan, 1929, Major Douglas read a paper, "*The Application of Engineering Methods to Finance*,"** as a result of which many thousands of his published works have been translated into Japanese, and are widely read throughout that progressive nation. It is believed that it is by the application of some of the essential principles enunciated by Major Douglas that Japanese industry is able to more successfully compete, commercially, in all other countries."

Those who have studied the various published works of Major Douglas cannot but be struck by the fact that the philosophy, logic and natural truths therein indicate his as one of the best-swept minds of the British Empire.

Melbourne will shortly have the opportunity of seeing and hearing this much-quoted authority on world affairs.

– from *The Dandenong Journal*: January 11, 1934

<https://trove.nla.gov.au/newspaper/article/213861433>

** *Appendix II page 149 - The Development of World Dominion*: <https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Douglas%20CH%20-%20The%20Development%20of%20World%20Dominion.pdf>

X Comment:

The question has often been asked: what is a Canadian? How does Canada differ from the USA (besides the King and the French)? Why should Canada be a separate country?

The recent episode with Trump's tariffs has actually had a positive effect in that it has stoked Canadian nationalism (something which has been dormant for decades, due to a deliberate programme of institutional and cultural sabotage). In any case, just today a Canadian speaker on an X space (social media platform-ed) has crystallized for me the nature of the difference between Canada and the USA. The question was put to him: would you want to become an American? He responded: "*Me, personally? No. I would probably be better off economically if we joined the US, but that doesn't matter to me. I have deep roots in this country and I want to maintain who we are and what we have.*"

Canada, traditionally, is a Tory country; i.e., there are values beyond money values and indeed some of these other values trump (no pun intended) money values ... and, at times, it is even worth sacrificing economic advantages in order to safeguard those values. In spite of so many years of subversion and perversion, of sabotage and of corruption, this attitude towards money and economics still marks the general cultural to a significant extent.

This is what makes Canada different - perhaps more than any other factor - from the USA (the US is a Whig nation on steroids, where money and money values are the bottom line par excellence).

“The modern economic system, as controlled by Finance, at one and the same time saves labour and exalts Labour into a religion and a virtue. In consequence, it condemns man to perpetual bondage. (a) It derides all spiritual values. What can't be sold has no value.” --- C.H. Douglas, “Whose Service is Perfect Freedom”

There are cultural limits in Canada on this financial and economic Leviathan that threatens the whole world because of the Toryism that lingers in the collective consciousness. I don't see any such limits in the USA. ***

The Supreme State, Planning, and Scarcity

Extracts from a speech by Major C.H. Douglas at Calgary, Alberta, Canada, April, 1934

I will put the objective as I see it for your consideration in a very general form and that is, we want to establish a correct relationship between the individual and the group so that the group, and the attributes of the group shall serve the individual and not the Individual be the slave of the group.

The whole of society exists from my point of view - it may not be yours - but from my point of view the whole of society exists for the benefit of the individual... The great danger at the present time is not that the present financial system will persist ... but that under the confusion that will exist as a result of the crises caused by the breakdown of the financial system, an even greater tyranny may be put over on you as in the cases of many countries at the present time, and which is in active progress in still more countries even as I speak.

That is the danger, and you must keep in your minds to avoid that danger, some clear objective, and that objective, the proper relationship of the individual to the group, is in my opinion, the relationship and objective to which we want to strive. ...

We are at the present time unquestionably under the domination of a financial system, which rules us. It rules us in our most basic necessities; the necessity for bed, board and clothes, and the other things that go to make up the standard of living. But we do not want to transfer that domination from, let us say, what we can call the banking system under another name to something we call the State.

We have no desire whatever if we will analyse what our objective is, to change one master for a still more powerful master. That is one of the greatest dangers at the present time - that large bodies of people will be carried away by words of which they have not analysed the meaning...

The opponents in this matter - we will put it on its lowest terms - can either allow the world to be plunged into another great *delirium tremens*, another great World War, or the opponents themselves can take steps to change the system. Now I have myself no doubt as to what is happening at this particular time, and that is that the opponents are endeavouring to change the system, and the endeavour is being made to change over from the tyranny of finance to a tyranny of administration. That is being pursued with extraordinary sagacity.

It is coming in many nations, at this particular moment almost under your very

eyes... In Great Britain the phrase under which this change is taking place is called *Rationalisation* or *Planning*; in Italy as the *Fascisti* or Corporate State; in Russia it is the *Dictatorship of the Proletariat* ... and is being aimed at in Germany by the Nazis... Whether it be by accident or design, the world is steadily moving over from a financial tyranny which has both the elements of breakdown and has also been found out to another tyranny, a tyranny of administration ... the setting up of an entire State which can say, “You shall do so and so”. “You shall have such and such rations”. “You shall live in such and such a house, you shall work such and such hours”. “You shall be taught such and such things”. “And any deviation from those laws which we lay down for you will be penalised by either starvation or by all the rigours of the law”.

Nationalise The Banking System Alone? A Fate Worse Than Debt! **by Betty Luks**

Last week (25 July 2014-ed) James Reed wrote of the IMF proposals to ‘dethrone the bankers’ ‘slashing debt’ and promotion of an updated version of the 1930’s ‘*Chicago Plan*’ thereby ending the “fractional reserve banking” and the banking system’s power to ‘create money out of thin air’.

James Reed noted: *“That could be good, but is still a long way from social credit and in the long-term could have the unexpected result of killing off the development of a social credit economy. If the 100% money idea alone is tried, and is observed to fail, then people will lose faith in social credit for a number of generations...”*

This morning I received the latest email from the UK “Positive Money” group with their explanation as to “Why it’s time to switch to a sovereign money system...”. It reads: *“A couple of months ago Martin Wolf wrote that we should “strip banks of their power to create money” in the Financial Times. He referred to the proposals we put forward in “Modernising Money”, and ended his article with: “Remember the possibility [of this reform]. When the next crisis comes - and surely it will - we need to be ready.”*

That article sparked a significant debate between economists and bloggers, both for and against the idea of stopping banks from creating money. Of those against, many critiques either misunderstood the proposals or simply made claims without providing evidence. To respond to some of the common objections, we’ve revised the paper that outlines our proposals and can be downloaded from here:

<http://modernisingmoney.org/>

Bank Nationalisation in the 1940s

How many Australians are aware the Australian League of Rights ‘cut its first teeth’ on the Bank Nationalisation issue way back in the middle 1940s? Eric Butler recalled those years in “Social Credit Opposition to Bank Nationalisation” in The New Times, October 1995 (found here: <https://alor.org/New%20Times/index.html>)

At the time Eric Butler wrote: “There was no hint of banking nationalisation during the 1946 federal election campaign. Those who claimed that Chifley’s decision to nationalise the banks was made in a sudden “fit of pique”, overlooked Chifley’s background, and that at Canberra he was surrounded by bureaucratic planners like Dr. H.C. Coombs who openly advocated the creation of the centrally planned State.

The most devastating criticism of the Chifley government’s policies came from the controversial former Labor Premier of New South Wales, J.T. Lang, who had been elected to the federal parliament as an Independent at the 1946 elections. Lang correctly pointed out that bank nationalisation was but a logical step in an ongoing programme to destroy the federal Constitution. Lang vividly recalled that back in the Great Depression era, Chifley had, as a Minister in the Scullin Labor government, been a strong supporter of the infamous Premiers’ Plan, imposed at the insistence of Sir Otto Niemeyer of the Bank of England, who was accompanied on his 1930 visit to Australia by Professor Theodor Emanuel Gregory, a member of the teaching staff of the London School of Economics at a time when one of the dominant influences at this Fabian-created institution was Dr. Harold Laski, a dedicated Marxist pro-Zionist Jew who openly expressed his detestation of Christianity.

Laski had strongly influenced large numbers of students from around the English-speaking world. Numbered among these were Pierre Elliott Trudeau, Canadian Prime Minister, who openly boasted that he was taking Canada down the Fabian Socialist road; John F. Kennedy, USA President; and Dr. H.C. Coombs, who was a key adviser to both Labor and Liberal governments at Canberra. Laski said that Coombs had been one of his best students.

Dr. H.V. Evatt, Australian Attorney-General, who was the major driving force behind the thrust to destroy the federal Constitution, spoke glowingly of the advice he received from Laski, who lamented the defeat of Evatt’s 1944 powers referendum.

Chairman of the British Labour Party during Attlee’s Labour government - which was stacked with large numbers of London School of Economics products - Laski visited Moscow in 1946 to meet with Soviet dictator Joseph Stalin. Laski made the historically significant statement that he had pointed out to Stalin that while he and the British Socialists were travelling on separate roads, Stalin on the Marxist-Leninist road, and the British government on the Fabian-Socialist road, they were travelling towards the same objective, both inspired by Karl Marx’s famous 1848 *Communist Manifesto*, which included Marx’s ten steps for communising a State. These steps were all designed to centralise all power. Marx advocated the establishment of a State Bank monopoly.

It is not too much to say that Harold Laski was one of the most influential Marxists of the twentieth century, reflecting Shakespeare’s famous observation that: “*The evil that men do lives after them, the good is oft interred with their bones*”.

Ten Most Important Questions: 1933 Address By Major Douglas

Please note: This document was prepared from a rather poor copy of what appears to have been a type-written draft of Major Douglas's address to the Social Credit Council. The document was found in the personal papers of the late Leslie Denis Byrne who was a close confidant of Douglas. Wednesday, 4th October, 1933:

"I would like to begin by saying that I am very much impressed by the Questions submitted. It would have been very difficult to draw up ten questions which seem to go more to the heart of the matter than these do.

Question 1. Are you in favour of the Nationalisation of the Central Bank, i.e., the control and issue of all forms of money by the Crown? *

** It has been brought to our notice that some folk don't have a clear understanding of what the term "The Crown" means in the United Kingdom. The term does not refer personally to the reigning King or Queen. "The Crown is a term used to mean, in effect, the state. It is a symbol of the power of the state, which was formerly vested in the monarch. Thus, for example, the prosecution of crime is said to be on behalf of the Crown."*

This question is one of the most important which can be asked of anybody making pretensions to understand [the] bearing of [the] money problem on social conditions. Extraordinarily subtle question - requires good deal of technical experience to assess its importance.

To give you a sort of picture of the thing, I am going to ask you to dismiss from your minds the whole idea of money. Try and put yourselves in a state of mind which you would be in if you have never heard of money, and there was none. Imagine that you had an unlimited supply of water, supplied in unlimited quantities from the clouds and the rivers, and that the whole problem was one of the distribution of water. Substitute for it, the idea of a water system.

Problem is the distribution (administration) of the Water

Imagine also that you had a conception in your mind of a reward for service and that the people who were responsible for the satisfactory distribution of this unlimited supply of water - which was absolutely vital to every member of the community - were going to be remunerated for their services by a share of the water. Remember also that the amount of water is fundamentally unlimited. The problem is that of the distribution of the water.

Under these conditions you will see that the question of whether the 'State' should undertake the distribution of water, or whether you should have a state of affairs in which a local organisation undertakes this distribution, is simply a problem of administration. Fundamentally the question is, which of these possible organisations will distribute the water most satisfactorily?

Your personnel (preference-ed) is likely to be the same in both cases. Therefore, ultimately it becomes a question as to how you can transmit the desires of the general population to those people in control of the distribution of water.

If the desires of the population are not satisfactorily represented by the

administrators, what will be the most easily flexible form of pressure to bring upon them to bring them back into the ways of rectitude, e.g., the successful translation of the desires of the general population in regard to the distribution of water?

Amount of water is a side issue

Remember that the question of the amount of water that these people get themselves is a very side issue. There is a lot of water - more than you can possibly use. They can have – if they want it - a great deal more water than they themselves can possibly use. If you assume as a postulate, that the amount of water is not limited, this question as to how much administrators get is a side issue. The important thing is that everybody should get enough water.

Let us imagine that you have a ‘State’ organisation in connection with the water system which is immune from public pressure - as public servants are supposed to be and as civil servants actually are - the only way in which you can bring public pressure to bear upon the organization is by the extremely cumbersome way of Democracy and the Ballot-Box - a very long and complicated process.

Suppose you have in your village a couple of shops, both selling the same sort of cigarettes. In one of them, when you go in, you get courtesy and instant service, and in the other you are met by the announcement, “I will give you your pound of tea as soon as I have washed up,” (or done some other thing), you immediately apply effective pressure by going to the other shop.

In my own opinion the first thing to recognize is that it is secondarily a problem of administration and that so far as it is a problem of administration, all the evidence we have is in favour of private competitive administration, which is much more amenable to pressure than is nationalized administration which is only a changed administration and has no relation whatever to policy.

What is the policy in regard to the money system?

This can be answered by saying that the whole question at issue in regard to the policy of the money system is “Does the effective demand represented by money, belong to the banking system or to the public?” That is the whole issue of the money question. It is only secondarily a question of administration at all. Whether it is administered by the civil service or by the joint stock banks is not the point of issue at all. I have no doubt whatever that to transfer ‘money-power’ to the Government before you have altered the money system (that it cannot be an additional source of tyranny, as it is at the present time), is simply to concentrate your tyranny. I have no doubt whatever that to nationalise the Bank of England at the present time, would not only be one of the most cardinal errors that could take place, but would make impossible any changes in the money system as such, without an armed revolution.

Question 2. Do you advocate the abolition of the Gold Basis?

Yes. The Gold Basis has no relation whatever to the necessities of a scientific money system - is simply devised for the retention of control of credit in the hands of the international financial organisers.

Question 3. What Basis do you advocate?

This is a very highly technical question. The short answer to it is that the proper basis for a money system is the ratio of production-to-consumption. There is no such thing as a “standard of value” at all. The whole idea of a standard of value is a complete misapprehension of reality or anything else. All values are relative. They do not bear any relation to gold as such, because gold is no more a standard in this sense than anything else is. For example, every time you may conceive of yourself as inventing a new use for gold, you obviously alter the relative value of gold to everything else. What you can do is to generalise all production and all consumption, not in regard to some perfectly arbitrary thing like gold, but in regard to each other. In this way you have a flexible standard which takes into account from second to second all the changes that take place in production and consumption. These changes are what is important in regard to the answer to the next question.

Question 4. What should be the purpose of money?

In many places there is a complete misapprehension as to the use of [a] money system at the present time. In the first place all the vocal orthodox economists are quite obviously and honestly unaware of any change whatever in the reasonable functions of money and in the economic system in the last 300 or 400 years. For example, I saw a letter attacking me in *‘The Listener’* from someone who said that my views on Economics had been exposed by Sir Francis North in 1641! To my mind that is one of the most completely damning things that could be said. Anything I can contribute is based on the conditions which have come into prominence within the past fifty years.

The first thing to be clear about is that the idea of money as a medium of exchange is, if not obsolete, so rapidly becoming obsolescent it is really not worth considering [i.e.,] the idea of an economic system carried on by isolated craftsmen or farmers exchanging their products with each other on a basis which will ensure that the products are in fact, exchanged.

The modern economic system is not in least like that. It is a system in which you have a central pool of production through enormous industrial organisations in which by far the most important factor is real capital - machines, power, etc., and the problem is not to exchange between these institutions. It is to distribute from them to people who fundamentally have nothing whatever to exchange. They are simply standing on the outside line of an organisation which is productive, and the problem is to get the goods over from the organization to these people - not to exchange at all.

The idea of a money system as a means of exchange is only applicable to a small and diminishing fraction of the total production of the world. Therefore, it is of the most fundamental importance to enquire what is the purpose of money. It is that it is first of all an effective demand - a ticket system - a valid demand for goods and services. Consequently, it is the most extraordinarily flexible voting system which

the mind of man can conceive. Every time I go into a tobacconist's shop and buy a pack of Black Cat in preference to Gold Flake; I vote for Black Cat in preference to Gold Flake. Every time I buy Cadbury's cocoa in preference to Fry's; I vote for Cadbury's. This preference is transmitted day by day to the companies concerned and they know whether or not their goods are meeting with public approval.

This is the whole essence of the economic system. The problem is to produce what the public want and to get it over to them. The fundamental purpose of a proper money system is first to give the most rapid and flexible indication to producing organisations as to what the public want, and secondly to see (the public-ed) get it.

Question 5. In what form do you consider money should be put into circulation?

This does not matter. My own opinion is that ultimately something like the cheque will supersede all other forms of money. (Remember Douglas was speaking in 1933-ed) It is anyway not a matter of the slightest importance.

Question 6. Do you consider that a standardisation of currency or of values is necessary?

From my point of view, this question is meaningless, though it is important to make this clear. It is in the phraseology of an outworn type of thought. The first essence of appreciation of the problem is to divest yourself from the classical type of thought. Standardisation of currency, does not mean anything, for example, a standard weight. The whole idea of relating this problem to the physical idea of standards is a complete misconception. It is one on which more people have fallen down than anything else, and it is being used at the present time by orthodox financial people with the greatest success. (For example, Strakosch at a recent meeting of engineers pointed out the absurdity of taking a tube of mercury, which altered with every movement, as a standard.) To ninety-nine people out of one-hundred, this sounds like a conclusive argument. It has nothing to do with the problem whatever.

The problem of the distribution of the products of production is not an ethical problem or one of measuring what has been produced. It is primarily a problem of estimating what can be produced and is desired (that the products of production-ed) shall be distributed. The actual rate of production of the machinery of the world changes from minute to minute and from day to day. Every time you have a new invention it may add five per cent or six per cent to the productive capacity of the whole world, in regard perhaps to every other machine that has previously been invented.

The idea of standardization is one which has to do with a particular type of thought, all mixed up with "justice" and "equity" and these sorts of things. Take this question of justice. Supposing you had ten men who were crossing the Sahara Desert in a caravan and had a limited supply of water, and a long journey to take. Quite obviously the exact distribution of that water is not merely a matter

of justice but one of efficiency. There will not be enough to go around unless you measure it out, a certain amount every day. You will create friction if one man gets more than another. But if you take the men out of the Sahara and put them by the shores of Lake Superior, * is it reasonable to go on ladling out teaspoons full of water when there is so much they can drown themselves in it if they want to?

All these ideas may have been sound when there was a genuine scarcity. At the present time the problem is to distribute abundance and not to measure the scarcity.

** Lake Superior is the largest freshwater lake in the world by surface area and the third-largest freshwater lake by volume*

Question 7. What method of international exchange of goods do you propose?

This is a highly technical question. The short answer is that the Bill-of-Exchange is a perfect mechanism under premises of ideas discussed this morning.

Theoretically, exchange works in this way. The price of exchange of the currency of a community is inversely proportional to the price level of the country to which it relates. Supposing you have the exchange level between *francs* and *pounds* this week, of one-hundred to one. This means that the Frenchman will pay one-hundred *francs* for every *pound sterling*. He can buy of English goods for one pound what he can buy in French goods for one-hundred francs. He will not pay for the pound, more or less than this amount.

Then suppose that by some process, next week, I reduce the general price level from a price level of one-hundred to a price level of fifty (francs-ed). Immediately, the Frenchman is prepared to pay two-hundred francs for every pound because with one pound he can buy in England what he can buy in France for two-hundred francs.

The fly in the ointment of this theory is that the Exchange Brokerage is a closed corporation. If you want to buy a large number of francs you will come ultimately to six or seven people all of whom are international brokers and have control of the exchange. They can raise or lower exchange, or refuse it altogether in which case an impasse is reached very shortly. If they raise the exchange of a country, e.g., England - if they put a premium on sterling, they would penalise our products, but at the same time it enables this country to buy a great many imports much cheaper.

These two things off-set each other to the extent that we make the necessary arrangement to absorb imports without creating an internal economic situation.

If they take the opposite line - to hammer the exchange down - immediately they create a tremendous pressure on export and if any change in the economic system occurs at all we are put in a very advantageous position to capture foreign imports. People can buy sterling at a low rate and therefore can buy British products at a low rate. This is a very serious problem to exchange brokers.

Question 8. Are you in favour of an international currency?

No. There is no necessity for an international currency, and you never solve any problem by making it bigger. One of the very strongest lines of defence of the

international financier is this curious idea which has been inculcated in people's minds that you do solve a problem by making it bigger. They desire to get people to believe that although one state cannot solve its problems or one town, if you make the town subservient to the state, that will solve the problem. But it will only defer the solution of the problem.

It is a Military Problem

This problem of currency can be solved nationally - not because theoretically it could not be solved on a much smaller scale, i.e., a municipal scale - but it is not a theoretical problem; it is a military problem. What you have to do is to decide the unit of population which can effectively challenge the measures brought to bear on any state or town which departs from those rules favourable to high international finance.

Wherever this problem is effectively challenged, first, the whole weight of World International Finance will be brought to bear on this spot.

The only question is what can they do? And how can it be resisted? I think this is a very large bogey. If you get to the point when you get to action, international finance can probably do very little. The problem must be made smaller and smaller and smaller till you have got it under control.

Question 9. What is your method of getting and continuing control?

Constitutional pressure. The real problem is not a technical problem. Having once got the ideas clear, the ideas can be pigeonholed away. Ultimately it is a military problem.

Ultimately the decision rests with the last squadron of bombing aeroplanes. If you are going to do things which the rules of the game forbid, all the sanctions of the State will eventually be brought to bear against you and the last final sanction is stark force.

Very largely speaking, stark force in any modern country is very nearly neutral or agnostic. It does as it is told. If a military officer gets orders from the right room in the right building, he does not care whom he gets them from. Your business is to get the right people in the right rooms in the right buildings.

There is only one practical way of doing that—not to worry about electing a Government of your own. What you have to do is to make the life of every existing member of the existing constitution a misery till they do as you want. This can be done, if you really mean it.

Question 10. Will your system ensure economic freedom for the individual so that each is free to express his own life in his own way, providing that it does not interfere with the welfare of the community?

Yes. There will be a very large number of things that will still want doing in the world when the financial problem is satisfactorily settled. But I am absolutely certain that none of them can be done till the problem is settled. It is a problem of priority.

When you have the individual free from all the artificial stresses which are brought to bear on him by the control of the press, the constant pumping into him of ideas not grounded on fact, when you have the B.B.C. controlled by the Bank of England, you cannot hope to solve any problem. The problem is not even stated, with any hope of its being understood.

This financial problem is so difficult because it is not humanly possible for any but a small number of people to understand it. When the financial problem has been solved, you will be at Stage One in which the provisions of this Question will have reasonable hope of fulfilment. ***

The Social Significance of Plenty - CH Douglas - *Approach to Reality*

...The abolition of poverty in the midst of plenty, important as that is, is not the core of the problem. It is conceivable that people might be provided for as well-fed slaves. It is fundamental that the freedom inherent in things should be conditioned only by the nature of the world, as one might say. The moment that conditions are made about making people wealthy, you are not making them wealthy in accordance with the wealth they might have from the free play of invention and progress and organisation. You are making them wealthy only according to somebody's conception of what should be the conditions under which they should be allowed to be wealthy. That is quite a different thing.

Of course you must have a certain amount of organisation in the world and just as in regard to the economic system you must make money reflect facts, so that you can choose what to do instead of being forced into doing what you do not want to do, so with your governmental system. It should reflect the fundamental relationships of human beings to each other.

When you receive a sheaf of buff papers at the beginning of the year, followed by blue ones and then a little later on, red ones, all of them stating you have received a lot of money you have never seen, and that further money must be produced, or unpleasant things will happen, the gentleman who signs these notices signs himself, on the first two at any rate, "Your obedient servant." What I am proposing is that he should be exactly right.

There is only one sane objective of government and that is to make it easier for everybody to do those things that are possible. That is the only justification for government—that by organisation and doing things according to certain rules you can do things more easily and comfortably. To imagine that we are born into the world to be governed by something not inherent in the cosmos is one of the most astonishing pieces of hypnotism that has ever afflicted the world...

Editor's Note

Giving over the financial power to bureaucrats to ration out any new credits, especially via CBDC's - central bank digital currency, a monitoring and controlling mechanism, would be the ultimate form of governmental tyranny. Constitutions limit power within clearly defined bounds. Why enhance bureaucratic power further?

Whitney Webb By William Waite

About a year ago I came upon the work of Whitney Webb who is behind the website www.unlimitedhangout.com. Webb reports on a range of topical issues but her speciality is the labyrinthine underworld that links intelligence, business, organised crime and government. In 2022 she published a two volume exposé titled *One Nation Under Blackmail* which begins at the end of the second war and details the sordid backstory to the Jeffrey Epstein scandal. It is meticulously referenced. Chapter citations run into the hundreds with source material drawn mainly from mainstream media, official reports and investigations.

Webb's work looks behind the thin veil of business, government, intelligence and organised crime connections almost never breached by mainstream news media. What she reveals is a cesspool of dirty deals, blackmail and criminal behaviour at the highest levels. A veritable web of corruption and deceit which in large part explains the disintegration of our public and private institutions. Reading Webb one wonders how salvageable they are.

In my opinion there are at least two things which make Whitney Webb's work exceptional. Firstly, she does not allow herself to be preoccupied with endless analysis of the false paradigm that is left-right politics. To her the political spectrum is the "uniparty", merely a clever device for keeping the public locked into a manufactured conflict while the powers-that-be pursue their aims behind the charade. Their economic policies she calls the "uneconomy" which describes the endless oscillation between regulation and government power on the left, and deregulation and corporate power on the right. The same phony dichotomy projected into the economic sphere. Secondly, she understands the central importance of finance. This is a central theme in her book tracing the misdeeds of the leading personalities right back to their lines of credit. Banking, as we know, is at the middle of the story.

As an entry point I recommend this podcast from unlimitedhangout.com *The PayPal Presidency Pt. 1: Biotech and Biosurveillance with Max Jones* which is typical of Webb's analytical style and may help shed some light on the somewhat bewildering events taking place in the United States. ***

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.**