



ON TARGET

INSERT

Responsible Government in a Free Society

By Geoffrey Dobbs

Dr. Geoffrey Dobbs was Senior Lecturer in Forest Botany at the University College of North Wales, Bangor when he visited Australia in 1969 while on sabbatical leave. While in South Australia, he addressed an Adelaide gathering of The Australian League of Rights on the fundamentals of a real democracy. '*Responsible Government in a Free Society*' is an expansion of the notes used for the Adelaide address.

RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT IN A FREE SOCIETY

Since nearly all the words dealing with good and useful things in our civilisation have by now been twisted or corrupted in meaning, it will be as well to start with some definitions.

By a *Society* I mean a large, complex and permanent association of human beings for their mutual benefit, and not any sort of collective abstraction which is used to oppose the interests of the individuals who comprise the Society.

By a *Free Society* I mean a society which is characterised by the freedom of the people who compose it - *freedom* being defined as power to choose between real, not artificial, alternatives as they arise; i.e. to choose one thing at a time and not between 'package deals', and to 'contract out' of undesired alternatives. This negative aspect of freedom, the power to contract out, is of immense importance in any thinking about democracy. It constitutes, for instance, the sole difference between employment and slavery.

By *responsible* I mean, answerable for, and experiencing, the results of one's actions. This 'feed-back' or 'return' to a person from his actions is so fundamental to all human, indeed, to all living, activities that we tend to take it for granted. The more firewood one chops, the more one has to burn - naturally! The more successful the business, the bigger the income from it - of course! What a glimpse of the obvious! This is the basis of all education, all improvement, all progress, all science. But it is not so in the modern, financially controlled, centralised state. Here, the worse the financial crisis, the higher the pay of the Government and the Bureaucracy and the leaders of centralised Industry; and, in fact, through the centralised organising of labour, this now applies to a large proportion of the

working population, for whom working harder or longer hours is likely to be a threat to their financial security and bargaining power.

The way to get more money is to sabotage production, or threaten to do so, by withdrawal of labour at a time carefully planned to inflict the maximum damage either to the national economy, or that of the productive enterprise with which they are associated. Ironically, by that process of inversion of meanings which is characteristic of what is known as ‘the reverse technique’ of mind control, this is now known as ‘taking industrial action’.

It is not difficult to see where this is leading, and is intended to lead, namely to an end-position in which the entire working population become multi-millionaires through the complete sabotage of all productive enterprise, resulting in chaos, starvation, revolution, and the breakdown of our civilisation, followed by a take-over by the gang who are quite openly working towards this end.

It is not as if it had not happened, often enough, in half the countries in the World. The important point to note is that it requires the combined operation of two forces, often quite erroneously supposed to be opposed; the top-level manipulation of finance, and the organised control of the working population and of revolutionary and socialistic propaganda.

This brings us to the word ‘*government*’. A government is the administration of a society, but here again there is a confusion between two opposite and incompatible meanings. Any ordinary voluntary society, such as, for instance, a golf club or a scientific society, has to have a number of officers and a committee to organise its activities on behalf of the members; but their sole function is to carry out the *purpose* of the Society, which is the reason why people join it.

If they fail to do so they would normally be replaced by another group of administrators, but if these also fail to further the purpose of the Society, the members would most probably ‘contract out’ and the Society would cease to exist.

Notice that, in this sort of ‘free’ or ‘voluntary’ society, the ‘government’ exists to carry out the policy agreed upon by all the members, who pay the running costs of the society, and are entitled to share in all the benefits arising from its operation.

In contrast, in another sort of human association - a business, Government Department, or other employing institution, it is the employers, represented by the ‘management’ who determine the policy, and pay the majority of the people in the association to carry it out. These people, therefore spend their working lives fulfilling the purposes of others, which may, of course, be excellent purposes, of which they fully approve. If this is not so, they are, at least theoretically, free to contract out and seek other employment, closer to their own desires. But, since they are dependent on their employment for their livelihood and that of their families, in times of financial stringency and unemployment this freedom may be taken from

them, as it is to a large extent in the ‘socialist’ countries, and when this happens, the association ceases to be in any sense voluntary or free.

The point I want to make here is that the Government of a Free Society must be of the first type, existing solely to further the purposes of its members, and must not be any sort of Management, employing and using the population for its own purposes, especially as people cannot contract out of a general society such as a Nation, except at the heavy cost of abandoning their homes and their native environment. But since a nation is not an association for any specialised purpose, but exists to serve the general, and innumerable and various purposes of all its members, it is clear that the proper function of the Government in a Free Society must be to provide those conditions of security and stability which are necessary if people are to live their own lives and to ensure that they gain the full benefits of the association.

THE SOCIETY AGAINST PEOPLE

Most people, even socialists would agree that Society exists for Man, rather than Man for Society; but in practice Socialism means the latter. The Socialist Society is merely a more extreme form of the Managerial Society already represented by the Big Business Corporations which reaches its end-point when the Government becomes the sole Employer of the entire working population, and the Top Bureaucrats become the Management.

Far from being any sort of rebellion against the evils of Capitalism and the Industrial Revolution, Socialism carries them to that insane limit in which the relationship of the factory, the Management-worker relationship, is virtually the only one permitted between human beings. Even in institutions as different as the Universities, Socialists can only see the relationship between teachers and students as a Management-Worker relationship, which means that they see the University as some sort of a factory.

In a Socialist Society ‘private interests’ are quite openly denounced as being contrary to the ‘public interest’. Any sort of property, profit, gain or advantage accruing to ‘private’ individuals, i.e. to actual people, not possessing official or government status, is held to be wicked, greedy, selfish and anti-social, being contrary to the Common Good. In other words, the Good of Society and the Good of the actual people composing it are fundamentally opposed. The other side of the Socialist medal, which treats the ‘private individual’ as the enemy of the State, is that for those who regard the people composing it as more important than any institution. The Socialist State is the enemy of the people.

Few socialists, of course, would verbally agree with this, because they all started off by believing the opposite, namely that the Good of Society meant the Good of the actual people composing it - you and me and the next man, and the Will of the People meant what you and I and the next man actually want. But in the course of time and power-seeking, the People gradually ceased to mean actual people at all,

and became an abstraction, used to cover the personal advantage of those individuals composing the Government and the Bureaucracy.

The difference between this sort of ‘personal profit’ in the form of salaries, pensions, and positions of status and influence, and the ‘private profit’ which is normally made by supplying one’s fellow men with some sort of goods or services which they can accept or reject, is that the former is largely *responsible* i.e. far from being proportional to the services rendered, it is quite often, and increasingly, merely the profit to be obtained from exploiting the power of the State against the people who compose it and are forced to pay for it.

When a business approaches monopoly, or acquires such vast financial power that it can force its products on the people by what might be called ‘brainwash-advertising’, it also becomes an irresponsible bureaucracy; and it is typical of both sorts of irresponsible ‘profiteers’ that they adopt a vastly superior moral tone concerning the ‘inefficiency’ and ‘profit-seeking motives’ of ordinary people who are attempting to make a profitable livelihood out of serving other people in a responsible way. Here again, it can be seen that the most excessive, objectionable and irresponsible profits are those which are made by Big Business in collusion with Socialist Government.

Now it is characteristic of any sort of monopoly, commercial or political, operating against real and individual people, that it always claims a ‘mandate’ from The People, and this ‘mandate’ is always in the form of figures or statistics, and never from any actual human beings. In the case of the Business Monopoly, it will claim that the public demand its shoddy product - not mentioning that it had removed several superior rivals by take-over or a price-cutting war, and that it has to spend millions in persuading people to feel inferior and not ‘up with Joneses’ if they fail to buy it, and, further, that its ever increasing sales are the effect of cunningly built-in obsolescence.

But the degree of force or fraud available for use against the people by a political monopoly, and especially that extreme form of it known as a Socialist government, far surpasses these, since it has control of the entire forces of the State. Indeed, since the Socialist State is the enemy of all ‘private interests’ within it, i.e. of all ‘unofficial’ persons, it is true to say that the socialist idea of ‘freedom’ is much like that of an Occupying Power. Not only are the subject people taxed, bullied, frustrated, managed, and oppressed, but they are permitted, and in a fully socialist State, virtually compelled, to register their agreement with the oppression to which they are being subjected by voting for the oppressors.

In the U.S.S.R., for instance, this reaches its logical conclusion in the choice between voting for the single list of candidates approved by the Party, or registering one’s disaffection secretly with those who will know how to deal with it. In the Western World, we have not quite reached that stage, but are well on the

way towards it. Though we have a choice of Parties, it will be noticed that their programmes differ only in inessentials, or at any rate amount to much the same thing, whatever promises are made and whichever Party is returned to power. The real alternative which most people would choose if they were offered it, is never on the agenda.

THE PHONEY CHOICES

For example, in Britain, where most people naturally loathe the idea of making economic war on the people of Rhodesia, black or white, we were given a choice between sanctions against Rhodesia (Tory) or sanctions against Rhodesia (Labour) or, if we wanted to break right away from the major Parties we could vote for sanctions against Rhodesia with the Liberals, who actually had the jolly idea of ordering the R.A.F. to bomb Rhodesia, no doubt as an expression of gratitude for the help given by Rhodesian pilots in winning the Battle of Britain!

Or again, British entry into the Common Market is openly declared to mean higher food prices, a worsening of our already adverse balance of trade, and above all, the surrender of British Sovereignty, and the direct subjection of the Queen's subjects to anonymous foreign bureaucrats and politicians, with alienation from our friends and relations in the Queen's other Dominions. Naturally, most British people are strongly against the whole idea, as has been shown clearly enough in various Gallup polls.

The Labour Party got itself elected by emitting unenthusiastic noises about the Common Market just before Election time, and then changing round afterwards. So now we are offered a choice between three Parties, all with Entry into the Common Market as their official policy, and whichever of them forms the next Government, it will claim a 'mandate' for this act of betrayal both of the people's will and of their sovereignty.

The most bitter and grievous issue of the day, especially in Australia and the U.S.A., is undoubtedly the Vietnam War, about which the people in both countries are now about equally divided. But here again, it is noticeable that the choice offered is between two evils; to continue indefinitely fighting a vicious war with no intention whatever of winning it, or to withdraw and concede victory to the enemy, and prepare to fight the next war in their own country. The choice which most people would make if they could, namely; to finish the war by winning it as soon as possible, is not on the agenda.

It has been fairly enough said that the choice offered to the elector in these vital matters is like being offered a choice between being kicked in the face or kicked in the belly. Indeed, this analogy is far too mild; and the idea that it is the duty of a responsible citizen to grovel at the feet of his bosses and to choose the form of sadism to be practised upon him, or to choose between the rival gangs of bullies who are itching to practise it, as a pitiful and servile mockery of democracy. It is not surprising that with this sort of choice being offered, voting has to be compulsory in

Australia.

The informal vote does not seem to offer any clear indication of a rejection of the choices offered; and there surely ought to be a place on the ballot form for a *negative vote* which would give the electors an opportunity to refuse to give any Government a mandate for any of the choice of evils offered. The effect of this on a Government elected with only a small minority vote would be to force it to accept full responsibility for its actions, which would mean a more realistic policy.

Under these circumstances very few people actually believe in or approve of the Party for which they vote. Their vote, in fact, is normally a negative vote, a vote to exclude from power whichever Party is deemed to be the most disastrous. In fact, it is this *negative* element in the ballot which alone has any value as an indication of the will of the electors, rather than their mere opinions or state of feeling at the time. For while people, being different, positively want different things, and so can never be satisfied by all voting for the same things, when something is being done, or offered to them which they do not want, they can all agree in rejecting it. In this sense, the negative vote, or veto, is a valid expression of democracy; while it is no sort of democracy at all to be forced, or induced, to choose between alternatives which are unwanted, or even detested.

THE POWER OF PEOPLE

This brings us to that much mis-used word, *democracy*, which means, of course, the power of the people. Once more we have here two diametrically opposed meanings. According to socialists, the sort of power that people want is the power of government i.e. they want a share in the sadistic pleasure and feeling of self-importance which come from pushing other people around, taxing, frustrating and generally interfering with their lives (all for their own good, of course). According to everyone else but socialists, the sort of, power which the ordinary sane man wants is the power to live his own life and to manage his own affairs, without interference or oppression from Governments or anyone else.

This second sort of power, the power to live one's own life without interfering with others, which is the same thing as freedom, is the sort of democracy which liberal, progressive and socialistic movements always begin by promising before they change over to the pseudo-democracy of 'government by the people', which is, in any real sense, an impossibility - indeed, a contradiction in terms; since an administration of a society which consisted of all its members would not be an administration. People therefore have to be cheated into imagining that they are exercising the power of government when they submit to the ballot process of providing the next set of despots with a 'mandate'.

It is worth looking at the precise nature of this 'mandate'; a majority vote based upon the principle of one-man-one-vote. It is in fact, a completely anonymous statistic - a mere summation, not of the will, but of the *opinions* and feelings of a

large mass of people at a particular moment in time, after they have been exposed to electoral persuasion and propaganda.

The underlying assumption is that the *opinions* of every man or woman are of precisely equal value, otherwise it would be meaningless to summate them. But this is blatantly ridiculous! No-one would dream of acting on such an assumption in the relatively simple matters of everyday life. Is everyone's opinion of equal value on how to repair a car, on whether a picture is a genuine Old Master, or whether a person has cancer? Would anyone in his senses accept the verdict of a majority vote on such matters?

It is obvious that in any matter requiring knowledge, the formation of a correct opinion is possible only for the few who have the necessary knowledge, and even they may be wrong, but they are at least more likely to know when they are wrong.

A majority, therefore, is almost certain to be wrong about the facts; but in addition, its opinions are notoriously and openly manipulated by means of the mass media. So that, in fact, a mass vote, far from giving equal weight to the opinions of each voter, is merely a gift of multiple voting power to the manipulators of public opinion.

A majority vote, therefore, is the reward for the cleverest, the most ruthless and the most accurately timed manipulation of opinions, which can fluctuate wildly from day to day, but are supposed to represent the Sacred Will of the People, on a basis of One-Man-One-Vote-One-Value, on One Day every few years when there is a General Election. A successful political Party, therefore, must time its assault on public opinion so that it reaches its maximum effect on Election Day. Spring the trap too soon, and too many of the victims may have time to detect some of the lies, to distrust the promises and to reject the propaganda in the cooler light of consideration. Spring it too late, and it does not matter how the electors would vote the day after the Sacred Day - their views are no longer Democracy. Only on one day in 1000 or more are the views of the ordinary people even pretended to exert some influence on the Government. So that, once it has got its majority on The Day, it does not matter twopence that the measures it carries out are overwhelmingly detested by the people, it has got its 'mandate' from The People, i.e. its anonymous statistic of manipulated opinions on one day, and that is supposed to constitute 'democracy'.

THE UNIT OF MAN-VOTE-VALUE

Of course, even this pitiful and disastrous 'ideal' of One- Man-One-Vote-One-Value is not realised in practice. In Britain, in 1945, 34.6% of the electorate returned the Labour Party to power. In 1951, 40.3%, the highest vote in the Party's history, threw Labour out, but they were put back again in 1964 by the vote of 1,700,000 fewer people, 34.0% of the electorate, the lowest vote since the war. So much for One-Vote-One-Value!

In Australia also there are ‘anomalies’ due to the preference system, which can result in the Party with the highest number of votes not gaining a majority in Parliament. This results in a growing pressure for the strict logical application of the total insanity of majority rule. According to this ‘ideal’, all votes are of precisely equal value, including that of a Mrs. Jones, who made her mark in the wrong place because she had mislaid her spectacles, of Miss Smith, who voted for the Party Leader because she adored his curly hair (not realising it was a wig) and of Mr. Robinson, who tossed up before voting.

Ideally therefore, according to the anomaly-haters, any Party which can secure one vote more than any of its rivals on Election Day, represents the Will of the People, and its government, however vicious, constitutes a Democracy. Whereas, if Mrs. Jones had been able to find her spectacles, it would have been no longer Democracy but on the contrary, Despotism and Dictatorship, against which everyone would have risen up and protested, if exactly the same politicians had taken the seats of Government and had done exactly the same things to the people.

This may seem an absurd theoretical case, and indeed, so it is, but no more absurd than, for instance, the ‘donkey vote’ in Australia (i.e. voting for the candidates in alphabetical order, as they appear on the ballot form). This occurs, even in Britain (i.e. the name at the top of the list may have an advantage) but is accentuated by the need to put the candidates in an order of preference, when many people do not care a twopenny hoot about any of them, and above all by compulsory voting, which drags to the polls people who would otherwise have expressed their indifference by staying at home.

The Democratic Labour Party, whose ‘second preferences’ are said to have returned the Liberal Party to power at the 1969 Election, is accused of exploiting the alphabetical vote in its choice of candidates. Whether this is true or not, the possibility of such a thing shows what a farce the electoral system is, but the absurdity lies not so much in these ‘anomalies’ as in the whole conception of one-man-one-vote-one-value which underlies the ideal of mathematical ‘democracy’, which equates not only the choice of a fool with the choice of a wise man, but a choice made after careful study with a choice made on a whim or fancy, and a choice expressing a passionately held preference with a choice expressing complete indifference.

Such a system, especially when exploited for purposes of power, ensures with mathematical certainty the victory of folly, ignorance and prejudice over wisdom, knowledge and love, not because the majority of mankind are ignorant, prejudiced fools in the matters with which they deal in everyday life, or about which they have concerned themselves and thought deeply, or exercised responsibility, but simply because the anonymous, secret ballot is completely irresponsible. Its consequences are completely lost in the statistical pool, and never return to the individual voter, so

that the manner in which he casts his vote is of no consequence to him whatever.

THE VOTERS' VETO AND THE RESPONSIBLE VOTE

If we want to look at the direction in which genuine democracy might advance towards bringing to bear the actual will (not the fleeting and manipulated opinions and feelings) of the people upon their rulers, this has already been envisaged, in two stages;

1. The negative vote, or *Voters' Veto*, in which the oppressive measures, common to all major parties which attain power, are rejected by the electors, leading on to

2. The *responsible vote*, in which irresponsible anonymity is abandoned, the Parties, like other practical concerns, are expected to publish estimates of the cost to the taxpayer of their proposals, and the elector, as does the purchaser who makes his choice in a shop, knows that he will be taxed proportionately to his recorded choice, for a time after the election.

Just consider what a radical difference that would make to the whole democratic process! Yet some such continuation of the British tradition of progress towards a genuine responsible democracy is quite essential if we are to escape the disastrous consequences of irresponsible majority-voting of the type which, it is often forgotten, quite constitutionally elected Hitler to power.

Meanwhile, it is certainly no answer to our problems to remove the 'anomalies' which, by introducing a random element, upset the mathematical operation of the numerical vote. Indeed, it seems probable that their toleration is due to a subconscious appreciation of the absurdity of the concept: one-vote-one-value; since the operation of some element other than mere number does, at least, give a *chance* of the return to power of some honest man, whose claim to represent the people is not based solely on his vote-catching powers.

Some instinct, for instance, still dimly appreciates the fact that, since people are wholly dependent upon the land for their existence, the land as well as the people, in some sense requires representation, and it would be literally suicidal to allow the ever-growing urban populations, who represent, primarily, the Money-Interest, wholly to dominate through their voting-power, the Land-Interest which sustains them. It is no accident that this idea of 'numerical democracy' of equal units of population took its rise at the time of the Industrial Revolution, with its dispossession of people from the land, and the reduction of them to the status of an urban proletariat, wholly under the control of another numerical power, namely, Money.

This is becoming increasingly detached from any direct relationship with the natural world of which, ultimately, we must admit we are a part. It is hoped that in countries such as Australia and Canada where 'Nature' still dwarfs mankind, the appalling dangers which attend the dictatorship of the city proletariat (which means

the dictatorship of those who control the city proletariat) may be realised in time.

FREESPONSIBILITY

This brings me back to the constructive side of what I have to say, and to real meaning which can be attached to the words; '*A Free Society*'. This is not just a 'free for all', which everyone can do what he likes, irrespective of everyone else, but a Society based upon Natural Law, i.e. upon the nature of things, and particularly of people.

In contrast to the Socialist or Collectivist Society, such a Society exists entirely for the mutual benefit of the people who comprise it, apart from which it has no justification for existence. It follows that there can be no antagonism between the Good of Society and the Good of the individuals who comprise it, since they are the same thing and the chief of these 'Goods' is freedom, which is inextricably linked with responsibility, since in fact they are aspects of the same thing, and ought to be described in one word ('Freesponsible?').

A Free Society is one in which, people are free to live their own lives and develop their own personalities by making responsible choices, the consequences of which, whether good or bad, return to them. A society in which people are constantly making irresponsible choices or decisions, the consequences of which return upon other people rather than themselves is a Slave Society, and both Socialist and Managerial Planning and decision-making, as well as the anonymous majority-vote, are of the essence of it.

Moreover, it is most important to realise that such freedom to develop the personality can exist only within a society. An individual human being inherits certain genetic potentialities, called genes, but these cannot express themselves, or develop fully except in the right environment, which is provided by other human beings - first of all the parents, from whom are derived not only the material, genetic inheritance, but also the main part of that cultural inheritance, which is later carried further by teachers and others.

In other words, the Society, an association with other people of similar genetic and cultural inheritance is a necessity for the full development of the individual i.e. for his freedom and self-expression, while the full development of free, responsible individuals is essential for a stable and balanced society. The two interests are wholly complementary, and by no means opposed. Moreover, when diverse individuals associate together, provided they are not too alien to each other to associate successfully, they can achieve what no-one alone can do. There is a vast *increment of association*, which is the basis of our civilisation.

The simplest and most natural form of society or human association is the *family*. This has a tripartite constitution; father, mother and children; three parts each of a different nature and function from the others. This is a stable arrangement. It seems

to be a fundamental fact of the universe that a tri-une structure confers stability.

A tri-pod is the 'first' thing that will stand, you can resolve four or more forces acting at a point into three, but never less, if stability or equilibrium is to be maintained. Matter exists in three forms; solid, liquid and gas. Each of different character, but the same substance.

Now the British conception of the free and responsible man of the Common Law is derived from Christianity, and the British tripartite Constitution of Sovereign, Lords and Commons is a Christian Constitution, developed over many centuries under the influence of the Christian Church.

This was natural and inevitable since Christianity is a Trinitarian religion, and is also a religion of the Incarnation, that is to say, Christians have passed beyond the polytheism of the more primitive religions, and the unitary God of the Jews and Moslems, the loving Dictator of the Universe, who is also the apotheosis of eternal self-love, and have had revealed to them a more realistic and balanced view of the Godhead, as comprising, indeed, the unity of one God, but also the diversity of three Persons, illustrating the eternal principles of mutual love and co-operation in a Society at the very core of reality.

What is so extraordinary is that so many people who regard themselves as Christians can see no practical significance in this tremendous belief. They seem to have no conception that a belief about the ultimate nature of the Universe must work itself out in practice, not merely in that dwindling part of our lives which we call 'private', meaning that the politicians have not yet invaded it, but inevitably in social affairs.

A Christian Society *must* be radically different from an atheistic or humanist Society, and that distressingly large numbers of prelates and other clergy for whom the practical and political implications of the noises they make in church are very much the same as those of an atheistic materialism, are merely confirming to the World that religion, for them, is a ritual without any practical meaning.

If in practice to stand up in church and announce; 'I believe in God the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost' leads to precisely the same social policy as announcing 'I believe that God does not exist and the Holy Trinity is a load of pernicious, mystical nonsense', there is really no point in making these religious noises. As the late C. H. Douglas put it: "It must be insisted that Christianity is either something inherent in the very warp and woof of the Universe, or it is just a set of interesting opinions".

Those who believe that facts, whether concerning the ultimate nature of things, or anything else, are matters of opinion, and that the truth can be established by counting opinions, are not Christians in any practical sense, whatever creed they habitually vocalise on religious occasions. Indeed, the creeds themselves are being increasingly neglected, and especially the Creed called Athanasian which sets out

the central, Trinitarian conception upon which Christendom, and our Christian Constitution have been founded and gradually built over the centuries.

While it is true that Christians, facing the gathering storm of materialistic atheism, have been huddling together under the banner of the lowest common denominator of their religion, a vague, indulgent do-goodism, which appears to be tolerant of everything except any effective resistance to aggressive and unrepentant vice and wrong-thinking; it is by now pitifully obvious that this cannot save our civilisation from disaster. Nevertheless, there are still enough Christians, if they would only apprise themselves of what their religion is, and its implications, to restore the continuity of its progress towards human freedom, and to resist the ever-mounting onslaught of the modern forms of paganism and barbarism upon it.

As a first step towards this, it is desperately necessary for those nations which are so fortunate as to have developed a balanced, Christian Constitution, to realise its immense value, and to defend it, not out of mere conservatism, but with prayer and with passionate conviction, as the will of God and the essential foundation upon which a genuinely free Society may be built. This means going directly in the face of prevailing mass-prejudice, as created by the controllers of popular opinion.

It means always defending and strengthening the weaker, counter-balancing powers of the Constitution, such as the Crown, and the Upper House, rather than slavishly agreeing with the claims of dominant and aggressive powers which seek to sweep away the last hindrances to their monopoly.

It means rejecting wholly, as anti-Christian, the vice of envy of other people's privileges, of indeed all privilege, and instead demanding, with *Magna Carta*, that 'everyman be confirmed in his privileges'.

It means realising that not only our tri-partite Constitution, but our Common Law, being based upon Natural Law i.e. upon precedent and experience of the way things work in human affairs, is a unique expression of the Christian conviction, not only that the World was created by a Higher Power, with which human and statutory law has to conform, but also that this Power is no vast, remote and impersonal Deity, but is concerned with the practical details of human affairs to the point of incarnation as a human being.

BY THEIR FRUITS YE SHALL KNOW THEM

It is this 'binding back' (re-ligare) of spiritual belief to practical affairs which has distinguished Christianity from the other World Religions, and resulted in that humble attention and submission to the precise facts of the matter which characterised the pioneers of modern science. With the abandonment of this religion and of this attitude by scientists, and the increasing pursuit of knowledge for the sake of the power which it gives to control and to dominate other beings.

Science is plunging back into the morass of witchcraft and superstition, providing

clever-clever techniques for outsmarting the common herd with meretricious goods and false explanations, while deploying its brain-power to develop the techniques of control over humanity.

These include how to hold a threat of instant death over all large urban populations, how to brainwash the unco-operative, how to pollute the environment, and how to control the mechanisms of life and heredity so as to produce that insane ideal of the power maniac, the test-tube baby, separated at last from parental love and protection, from its cultural inheritance and all natural influences, Government-produced from an ovum fertilised by the Government, gestated by the Government, brought forth from its glass womb by the Government, so that it can be Government-conditioned and Government-controlled to serve the purposes of the Top People in the Government until, no doubt it is disposed of in a Government Crematorium.

Are these things an alarmist hallucination? How wonderful it would be if they were! The H-Bomb is no hallucination. Pollution is no hallucination. And it is reliably reported that the extra-uterine fertilisation techniques of Dr. Petrucci of Bologna, halted by Christian principles from further pursuit are being followed up on a large scale at the Moscow Institute of Experimental Biology, where another 'scientific miracle' will be announced to the gawping public just as soon as a reasonably normal-looking baby can be produced, which is expected in 1970 or 1971.

That this should be stopped in Italy, where Christianity exerts some influence, and carried on in Moscow, where the official religion maintains that human beings are just lumps of matter, brought into existence by a witless, purposeless, concatenation of physico-chemical circumstances, until the appearance of the Top People, whose superior brains enable them, for the first time, to impose some purpose (their purpose) upon the rest of humanity - this is natural enough. It is, in fact, a true expression of the practical policies of the two religions, of humble respect for the work of the Creator on the one hand, and of arrogant contempt for the product of impersonal forces, inferior to oneself, on the other.

In the face of the present situation there is really no time left for playing at religion in the churches, while adopting the opinions and ideas which stem from atheistic materialism in everyday life, including the fields of science, politics and economics. The Western (or Slightly Freer) World is not far behind the fully Socialist Countries in the pursuit of centralised, despotic control over human life. We are subjected, in the name of progress, to a continuous battering of sex-titillation, with bitter attacks on sexual restraint, combined with a rising scream of panic about the so-called 'population explosion' to provide the excuse for demands for mass-contraception, and even now, mass-sterilisation via the water supply.

Meanwhile, it is only in the ever-growing, vast conurbations, where the population of one-man-one-voters is under the tightest control through the mechanism of the

‘rat-race’ for centrally awarded money and status, that any real ‘explosion’ is taking place. It is significantly the same people who demand despotic measures to control the population explosion, who do everything possible to increase it by depopulating the countryside into the towns, and by insisting that the principle of majority-domination of minorities, (which includes, of course, collective control of the individual) should be applied, particularly to urban domination of the depopulating countryside. They want to use the much-deplored ‘population explosion’ as an expanding means of power over any populations which are not ‘exploding’ - a form of feedback which gives us a one-way street to disaster.

Meanwhile, from the U.S.A. the ‘hope’ is publicised of outdoing the Russians with their test-tube babies by manufacturing men ‘made to order’ by gene manipulation. Nobody seems yet to have asked ‘made to whose order’?

TOWARDS A CHRISTIAN SOCIETY

Now it is obvious that this ‘trend’ has to be reversed, and that, as a preliminary, many vicious things, or attempts to achieve them, have got to be stopped by the *veto* of Christian people. This is often rejected as ‘negative’ or ‘unconstructive’ action, but like putting out a fire, it is nonetheless necessary and urgent for that. Nevertheless, it is true that ‘negative action’ alone, without any positive alternative to offer, is in the end ineffective. The pitiful thing is that Christians, whose professed beliefs carry with them the most wonderful and practical of alternatives to the World’s present miseries, not only on the individual, but also on the social scale, seem to be unaware of the fact.

The Christian conception of the Universe and of its Creator is one of a dynamic balance of diverse powers and beings, exercising different functions, and constituting a unity through their diversity, and not only through their homogeneity. The power which we call Love and which has the function of creating i.e. of uniting and liking these diversities, each functioning freely according to its nature, into a new balance or being, may be seen operating throughout the Universe at every level, including that of chemical linkage, and of the dynamic equilibrium which every sociologist finds when he studies the natural associations of plants and animals.

When men co-operate with nature instead of trying to subdue it wholly, then we see one of the loveliest examples of this creative power at work, as may be seen, for instance, in the English country landscape at its best, dotted as it is with the grey stone spires of village churches, which look as if they grew there (as in a sense they did) so much are they an integral part of the landscape, symbolising as they do the conception of the Universe which created it.

We have seen also that this dynamic equilibrium of diverse powers united by love is to be found also in the human family, and in that balance of political and other powers (including the tri-partite Constitution of Crown, Upper and Lower House) which have been developed gradually in the more Christian nations, and especially

in Britain and the British Commonwealth.

There is a legend, which was regarded as fact by the early Church, that Joseph of Arimathea brought Christianity to Britain only five years after the Crucifixion, and there is some evidence that Britain may have been the very first nation to declare itself Christian, in only the second century A.D.. However this may be, it is quite certain that Christianity has been an effective influence in Britain for virtually the whole of the Christian era. In Bangor, North Wales, for instance, we celebrated the fourteenth centenary of our cathedral and diocese in the 1950's and the Celtic Church was by no means young when they were founded. But we have not yet seen 2000 years since the Incarnation; that is only about 60 generations, far too short a time for its significance to penetrate to all sections of human life and thought. And we must remember that for the greater part of the world, this time is not 60, but perhaps five or fewer generations.

The progress of mankind towards a Christian society has been far from a steady and continuous advance. There have been many setbacks and backslidings, and far from its being an 'outdated creed' (as the current sneerword has it) it is a creed which has been rarely and as yet only partially grasped and applied on the social scale. There has never yet been anything approaching a Christian Society, but among these imperfect attempts at it, the late, and bitterly derided British Empire and Commonwealth was perhaps the greatest in its scope and achievement.

The imperfections of this great association of peoples are not difficult to see in retrospect, and have been much exploited, mainly by people who condone, or support blatant tyrannies, but the fact remains that there never has been, before or since, so large an area of the world governed in relative peace, freedom and justice and held together with so small an element of force, and so large an element of loyalty.

THE PROVEN CONSTITUTION

If ever there was a Constitution which has been *proved*, on a vast scale, in its virtues, it is the British Constitution of balanced powers, ensuring that none of them should become a tyrannous monopoly. Consider, for instance, what power it was, which united in a balanced peace and unity the diverse peoples, races and creeds of India and of Nigeria and what has happened after it was removed. Compare the size of the armed forces, the police, and the bureaucracy, which was necessary to maintain the scattered British Empire with that of the great monolithic Empire of Socialist Peoples republics, whose inhabitants are kept from escaping by the armed guards, minefields and barbed wire of the iron curtain.

No-one supposes that the Christian conception has anywhere achieved perfection, or finished growing, but in the British Empire it was applied with a wonderful flexibility to a wide variety of different peoples at different stages of civilisation - and under it they enjoyed peace and stable government, and moved *towards* greater

freedom and the agreed goal of national independence, which in every case was achieved peaceably, at least so far as Britain was concerned.

The fatal weakness of this great association, in its later days, lay in its surrender of the Christian idea of equality, stemming as it does from revolutionary atheism, denying the unique nature of every man, and reducing him to the status of a political and economic unit.

It is quite essential that everyone should ponder and make up his mind about these two, wholly incompatible, conceptions of democracy, and having done so, act accordingly. Is it democracy that everyone should have an equal x-millionth of a 'say' (according to the size of the electorate) as to which group is to dominate their lives, and that every child should have 'equality of opportunity' in scrambling for the favours of the Top People? Or is it not rather what people mean, and long for in their hearts, when they hear or say the word 'democracy' that every man should be free to live his own life, within the limits of other people's freedom, as determined by a framework of law and order which it is the duty of the Government to maintain?

It should be recognised by Australians, and the members of other, smaller nations, that the independence of their country from the more populous United Kingdom, arises from the second conception, and that the first would be fatal to it. If the metropolitan cities of Australia have a democratic right to dominate the country areas; because there are more people in them, then, surely, the City of London, which alone could out-vote Sydney, Adelaide and Melbourne thrown together, has a democratic right to do so!

In that case, the political separation (or Apartheid) of Australia from Britain was an anti-democratic and reactionary step, and all Australians who believe in one-man-one-vote, should demand a union of electorates with Britain, so that they can enjoy the democratic privilege of being outvoted by 4 to 1, or better still, join the U.S.A., where the Australian vote would scarcely be noticed.

And if this prospect does not appeal, if the distance of Australia from these great voting populations, and its different and unique character, are to be used as arguments for its independence, do not these arguments apply also to the difference between country and town and their people? No-one could argue that the countryside ought to be as independent as a nation, but why, then, did our predecessors try to establish a balance between the two, irrespective of the great voting strength in the metropolitan cities? Was it not that they had a different conception of democracy? And was it not a more valid and practicable one than the automatic dominance of the city mass.

These same considerations apply in every case where the swamping of the smaller group by the larger, the crushing of the smaller mass by the greater, is proposed in the name of 'democracy' - that Europe should swallow Britain, that the U.S.S.R. should crush and dominate Czechoslovakia, that the Australian Commonwealth

should dominate the States, that the Lower House of a Parliament or Legislature should sweep away the Upper House, that Big Business should swallow up small business, that ‘factory farming’ should eliminate the small farmer, that huge ‘comprehensive schools’ should take the place of smaller, well-established schools with a tradition of good education, that universities should swell into vast, impersonal centres for mass instruction; and so on; meaning that, in every case, actual people shall be dominated by the mass, which, in turn, is dominated by fewer, and more remote, Bosses.

All this is familiar enough, but what is so incongruous about it, and confuses people so that they can take no action, is the idea that there is something ‘democratic’, Christian, or in some way good about this ‘trend’ towards Monopoly. Let us at least clear this nonsense out of the way. Every time it is Power talking; the greater Power wishing to extend itself, and to dominate more people. There is no *moral* virtue in the victory of the Big Battalions.

Why, everywhere is the Lower, or mass-elected Chamber, trying to eliminate the other traditional Powers of the Constitution which limit its power to impose its will on the people? Nobody is afraid that the Monarchy, or the Lords (in Britain) or the Senate or State Councils in Australia, are aggressive Powers which might establish a tyranny or a dictatorship. On the contrary, they are jeered at as feeble anachronisms, which should be swept away; since they still interfere to a slight extent with the right of the elected Government to exercise absolute power over the people.

This is the claim that is being made; that the act of election confers the right of absolute dictatorship, limited only in time by the statutory need to have another election, which, as has occurred again and again (and notably in Nazi Germany) can easily be swept away under cover of an ‘emergency’ by an elected Government which is sufficiently obsessed by its sacred right to govern. All this is not an ‘inevitable trend’. It is something into which we are drifting through confused thinking about mass-voting, and ignorance of our traditions, and of the dynamic possibilities which are inherent in them, if adapted and developed to meet a changing situation.

SOME CONSTRUCTIVE PROPOSALS

In conclusion then;

The first step is to get our thinking clear about the two conceptions of democracy, that which stems from Christianity, and that which stems from atheism.

The second is to defend, with passion and conviction, those Powers in our Constitution which check or limit the dictatorship of the Government, and particularly to defend those elements in their origin which provide alternatives to the ‘mandate’ of the popular vote, which has degenerated into a forced choice between detested alternatives, performed under psychological pressure from the mass-media.

These elements include heredity in the case of the Monarchy, which gives a ‘vote’, as it were to our ancestors and our cultural inheritance, since there is no ‘democratic right’ of one generation to squander the inheritance of the next.

To have a President as Head of State, is to erect the principle of election into the sole basis of Society. In the case of an Upper House which is already elected, it is quite vital that the electorate should not be merely a replicate of the universal suffrage that elects the Lower House, otherwise the power-base for a dictatorship remains unchallenged.

The third step is to realise and defend the proper place of the ballot in the operation of a democratic society, and to take the initiative in developing it towards this. The first virtue of the ballot is that it eliminates violence; and it is this aspect which is being side-tracked and attacked by our revolutionaries (who at the same time claim to be acting ‘democratically’). The second is that, if properly used, it can provide an opportunity for the negative vote, the Voters’ Veto on the unwanted alternatives offered by those seeking power over us. Finally, it might be used as a basis for the responsible vote, as suggested earlier.

The fourth step is to look, with confident imagination, into the potentialities for the future of a real democracy, including Constitutional changes to strengthen and revitalise the Powers which revise and, if necessary, limit, the power of the Executive. This might include a power of temporary Veto by the Crown, in order to give the electorate an opportunity to reject oppressive or vicious legislation or interference with their personal lives. Whatever the basis of the Revising Chamber, or Upper House, it must be such as to ensure the *quality* of its members, and also that it is free of the pressure of the mass- majority-vote, so that it is free to present without bias the claims of minorities, such as the rural people, or the vital professions, or any person or group whose oppression, in the name of the majority, should be vetoed by the Upper House.

Ultimately, we should have as our objective the dispersal of such power over their own affairs to the individual citizens as to enable them to control their political and economic servants.

When this happens, we shall, at least, be on the road, not only to political, but to the even more important economic, democracy; which will imply, of course, decentralised financial control, in the pockets of the people, over the vast productive potential of our civilisation, which at present is being so appallingly mis-used, and squandered.

One reason why the progress of Monopoly appears irresistible is that it has a clear idea where it is going and so can formulate its objectives. So far, it has never had to face a body of people with equally clear, but opposite, objectives, which have the invincible advantage of being in keeping with ‘the warp and woof of the Universe’.

Is not this an adventure worth trying? ***

On Target Subscription Payment Details

Post Subscription and Payment Details to
ALOR c/o PO Box 27, Happy Valley, SA 5159

On Target Subscription Payment Details

Post Subscription and Payment Details to
ALOR c/o PO Box 27, Happy Valley, SA 5159

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.

On Target Subscription Payment Details

Post Subscription and Payment Details to
ALOR c/o PO Box 27, Happy Valley, SA 5159

On Target Subscription Payment Details

Post Subscription and Payment Details to
ALOR c/o PO Box 27, Happy Valley, SA 5159

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.

A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Vol. 60 No. 37

27th September 2024

IN THIS ISSUE

Education, Stupid By Will Waite	21
Earthing out! By Neville Archibald	23
Medical Fraud Underpins Australia's Vaccination Policies By Judy Wilyman Ph.D.	27
Nation First - Article Extract from George Christensen MP	28

Education, Stupid By Will Waite

“Nothing is failing in Western societies more completely, and more tragically, than school education” but don’t let that hold us back

Education Minister Jason Clare and Elbow with his best work nothing is failing in Western societies more completely, and more tragically, than school education. This is especially so in Australia. Billions upon billions of new dollars – Gonski funding, NAPLAN funding, state promises, federal commitments – and yet the results, even measured in narrow, utilitarian, technical terms, get ever worse and we sink further down the international education league tables. ¹ That’s Greg Sheridan’s opening salvo in the *Weekend Australian*.

Like any good idealogue when the project is coming apart at the seams the only sensible response is to *go harder*. That’s why the government is promising more education, especially for the young. Their big commitment is called “universal childcare” — “a guarantee of at least 30 hours or three days a week of free or heavily subsidised childcare for 48 weeks a year for every child by 2036.” A big part of the plan is to “change the perception of Australia’s childcare system – from a babysitting service for working parents to an early education service that helps children to thrive.” ²

Thrive, that’s nice. With this image change will come a re-brand and a heap more ‘new dollars.’ Next generation daycare will be called Early Childhood Education and Care (ECEC) services and, according to the Productivity Commission, will cost the taxpayer \$17 billion dollars. (Warning: that’s the same mob that priced the NDIS and “budget blowout” doesn’t quite cover the scale of that miscalculation.)

One of the common criticisms of Russian Communism was that the state took control of raising children while Mr. and Mrs. proletariat worked in whatever

collective undertaking they had been assigned too. In our case, while the state has not appropriated the means and distribution of production, under the steady hand of finance capitalism, creditism or whatever you want to call this thing, we proceed interminably in the same direction. From the *Australian* article:

Many parents prefer to care for their own children before they start school, but most don't have any choice. Some can comfortably afford to stay home; others make great financial sacrifices or have grandparents happy to help out. But 72 per cent of Australian mothers with babies, toddlers or preschoolers also hold down a paid job, in a national work-life juggle. Half the nation's one-year-old children, and 90 per cent of four-year-olds, attend daycare or preschool. For most millennial families, the climbing costs of food, petrol and healthcare, and a doubling in mortgage payments after 13 interest rises in the past two years have forced both parents to work full-time. ³

Is this inevitable? In answering this question it is useful to restate some basic Douglas fundamentals. In *Dictatorship by Taxation* (1937) he wrote "it is essential to begin by a consideration of real i.e. physical economics as distinct from money economics." ⁴

Considering the physical economics there is no suggestion anywhere that the food, housing and clothing required to keep mum and bub is in short supply. When we talk about the climbing costs of living (food, fuel, housing etc.) we are talking about the price system, which can be quite easily overcome — as the daycare industry has aptly demonstrated with its subsidies — by alteration to the "money economics".

There are roughly 1.5 million children of daycare age in this country. If the \$17 billion were distributed evenly to families on a per child basis it would amount to more than \$11,000 per child per year. The result would be to restore a fundamental right to those who would prefer to care for their own children. As it is we're all being taxed to pay child care workers who would rather be home with their own kids but are being forced to look after other people's children in sterile, safe spaces called daycare centers. Excuse me, ECEC service centers. But choice is not what this thing is about.

Looking after children is big business and education is a big employer. That's got nothing to do with the wellbeing of your kids. As we learned during the pandemic, schooling frees up millions of slaves (read parents) to 'make money' however they can, which provides collateral for debt and incomes for taxes. The award-winning New York teacher John Taylor Gatto writes:

You must understand that first and foremost the business I am in is a *jobs project* and an agency for letting contracts. We cannot afford to save money by reducing the scope of our operation or by diversifying the product we offer, even to help children grow up right. That is the iron law of institutional schooling — it is a

business, subject neither to normal accounting procedures nor to the rational scalpel of competition.⁵

Education is failing but it's supposed to fail. If we suddenly decided an adequate job was being done there would the gravy train stop and what would happen to education as an instrument for the distribution of incomes in an automating economy?

“Pliant” means easily bent, yielding. Compliant is this quality in relation to other people and institutions. In addition to its economic part the underlying social role of schooling is to create compliant citizens or, to put it differently, to conflate morality with obedience to authority. And the younger the better. Many of us now realise that despite what we are told the distant and inaccessible authorities care nothing for our health and wellbeing. To believe otherwise is not only naive but positively dangerous.

We need remind ourselves of Pilgrim's epiphany in Bunyan's famous work; “Then it came burning hot into my mind, whatever he said, and however he flattered, when he got me home to his House, he would sell me for a Slave.”⁶

Our children need these lessons. ***

References:

1. Sheridan, G. 21.09.24. *Classroom classics revolution could save our failing society*. *The Australian*. Available from: <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/inquirer/classroom-classics-revolution-could-save-our-failing-society/news-story/eb31fd0a34c15fa555d091dc69c9653c>
2. Bitá, N. 21.09.24. *Free childcare for poor families the focus of Productivity Commission Review*. Available from: <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/inquirer/free-childcare-for-poor-families-the-focus-of-productivity-commission-review/news-story/7ecd4afe9d9f6052b71f3bb8647729ba>
3. Ibid.
4. Douglas, C.H. 1939. *Dictatorship by Taxation*. Institute of Economic Democracy, Canada
5. Gatto, J.T. 2002. *Dumbing Us Down*. British Columbia Arts Council, Canada.
6. Bunyan, J. Original 1678. *The Pilgrim's Progress* from this world to that which is to come.

Earthing out! By Neville Archibald

The process of going barefoot, outside on the grass and soil. Reconnecting with the earth and allowing negative stresses to be neutralised.

Also using a ground wire in an electric circuit to protect an installation and it's operators from electric shock. Earthing a circuit can also reduce noise or feedback in equipment, allowing it to function correctly or lessening interference.

Both of these processes describes a way to protect a body from harm. Can this be applied elsewhere in life? Does society need to be earthed, grounded in some way?

During a discussion with like minded friends, this concept regularly raised its head when considering how we are to make changes for the better in our lives. The actions of many people, even well meaning people, often lead to an increase

in stress within our world. People doing the same thing over and over despite the negative consequences that occur, just because they know no different; until they discover for themselves that their actions are not helping, they remain oblivious to it. We discussed the various means by which people came to recognise truth, enough to make a change. The trigger point that fired them to become involved enough to start asking questions.

There are of course reasons for asking this question about trigger points, the main one, being, how do we wake people up enough to elicit a change? What is effective, how do we increase the rate of it happening? We are in a time where many are asleep to the perils that face us. If they are aware, many are not yet concerned enough to actually take action. What will it take?

The advertising industry has used triggers since it first began. To sell you need to first engage a potential buyer, gain his attention. From there the process of selling the product is basically pointing out why it is needed. Things that are not really needed can be dressed up in a way that makes them seem desirable. That is the art of a good conman.

In the days of the snake oil salesmen, peddling fake cures, there were always the gullible who believed. The amount of these “dupes” decreased as their being grounded in the ways of the world increased. Quackery, was often found out by experience, you buy the bottle, but it doesn’t work. Are you fooled the next time? Hopefully not.

The very triggers used by salesmen, then created triggers for the public to see through them. The selling had to become more sophisticated or the population it was peddled to had to be either different, or dumber. I use the word dumb deliberately, as we often refer to the “dumbing down” of society when we consider what is not being taught, deliberately in many cases today. You may not believe this last bit, but explain then the decrease in common sense, the employers lamenting the lack of overall knowledge of potential new school leavers. I would say myself that it was more a lack of information exposure, but the result is the same, they are unprepared. Not their fault.

We discussed this too, from various angles and came to a conclusion that the messages they are receiving are overwhelming anything they might pick up from the world around them.

All this talk of mis- and dis-information is real, but it hasn’t just started with the COVID era, it has been going on a long time. As a population, we have been steadily distancing ourselves from the real world, possibly for generations. Fewer of us have family on farms or out bush that we visit and discover, or more importantly, let our children discover, the joys of “real life”: connectedness to the earth, grounding in a real sense. We rely more on television or screens, a picture with sound, no smells, no touch, no true interaction with that real feedback, response to actions.

We have man made interactions, many of which are biased towards selling something, games, movies even gyms and fitness groups or sports. Often consequences within these events in our lives are not real. You may argue with me that these things provide valuable life lessons, I won't argue, many do. It is a hard thing to see the things you love as being in any way corrupted, but the signs are there if you look. It doesn't have to be corrupted in the true sense of the word, but over emphasis on its importance in life, often covers up or takes time away from other things that should be more important. Bread and circuses in so many different forms! We are just so many Neros fiddling while around us Rome burns.

- Too dramatic?

The questions we pondered related to many topics, but all came back to regaining control of our lives once again. In so many ways we are all feeling the stress of everyday life more and more. Our money does not go as far, our ability to do things that we were once allowed to do getting further restricted, to the point of being forced to join in with the madness of it all. Simple things like my paying for a green bin when I never use it, I compost anything that would go in it. I am dealing with this responsibly, but I am still financially punished by having to pay for a service I don't use. A friend who has to pay for the privilege of a parking space outside his own home, one is allocated but only to one given numberplate. Fines for driving a work car or somebody else's are not refundable unless considerable time and effort is involved to convince authorities otherwise. It goes on!

We all have little details we could offer up and most are becoming too difficult or time consuming to deal with, so we accept it and move on. The point I am trying to make here, is that these things, these stresses, are increasing at a rate that is linked to the rate of globalisation occurring in our management systems, both Governmental and in multinational businesses. How do we reverse this trend? Assuming of course you agree that it needs to be reversed.

There are those whose job includes the enforcement or implementing of these very restrictions, I find it hard to believe that they do not know what they are doing. I realise that it is just work to be done and like so many others they too are subject to this lack of connectedness. Many jobs are disconnected by speciality, the majority of those involved probably don't see the final impact of the work that they are a part of. I would like to believe, that if they did, they would somehow challenge it. They would need a "trigger" to realise this. Once realised, action comes next. The defeatist attitude of "what can I do" or "it's too big for me to deal with" is accompanied by worry about loss of employment if you rock the boat. This means the trigger has to be very large indeed to result in action.

Many that I have spoken to since COVID, have had that "back of the mind" feeling that all was not as it seemed. The trigger of restrictive or coercive government was enough for many to result in action, even if just attending a protest. These people have continued their awakening journey in most cases and have been

able to see more of these impositions as they have been introduced to them. Some have gone back to sleep, but the snake-oil salesman will have a harder job selling his next preparation to them.

I wonder if our job now, is to look for and promote these trigger points when they occur. To mix in and be the voice of reason, pointing out just how far this problem goes. To explain our system of government and how we need to ensure we get true representation at all levels, by electing anyone other than those in the current party systems. A local who stands for Australian values and freedom. Not someone who campaigns on whatever fashionable argument is in vogue in mainstream media at the time. So often, elections are hi-jacked (for want of a better word) by single issues that, in reality, are trivial things to the majority of people. Often things that left alone, would sort themselves out by the natural forgiving nature of our countrymen.

Each trigger point that occurs will awaken a different cohort, a group who are concerned. This needs to be translated from the “I recognise,” to the “I will do something” stage. An awakening of social responsibility.

How do we help this along? By being available to:

- help with knowledge or by providing access to it. Each time focusing on bringing the questions back to reality. How does it affect the real world, the individual. Does it add or detract from our freedom to pursue our lives as we want?
 - explain our position, our opinion and make it lucid. It must be simple and clear. What it's expression in the real world will look like.
 - act like a coach, offer to help improve the teams ability to be effective. If not you, at least make a suggestion to have them look at creating a coaching team of their own to examine outcomes and how to do things better.
 - help them to know what it is they actually want. Challenge them to write down five or ten basic principles that will make our society a better place, a vision of what we can see as better. This also shows what has been lost and despite that negative, should provide a better reason for trying, than just the original trigger alone.
 - I wonder if by waiting for triggers to react to, are we too late? Should we anticipate and be the trigger by pointing things out?
 - the concept of shopping for triggers and utilising them. Being pre-prepared to confront/challenge, at that point bringing it back to real life, showing what the conclusion would look like in the real world.
 - if the big issue is the individual and their freedom; is part or all of the solution some form of evangelising? Moral and spiritual education. Eric Butler always said, “from the grass roots”. If this is so, individual responsibility must be fostered to turn it around. Maybe a big part of this solution is using the triggers to instil a personal responsibility and action component in our fellow Australians.
- We must be the grounding wire to provide a true earthing out, to help them to look for answers in the real world. ***

Medical Fraud Underpins Australia's No Jab No Pay No Play Vaccination Policies By Judy Wilyman Ph.D.

Did you know that it is unethical to trial drugs/vaccines on pregnant women?

At least that was what I was told by the authorities in 2010 when I asked for the *evidence* proving that it was safe for pregnant women to use vaccines. Consequently, the government **did not provide** any evidence of safety and I was informed by the head of the WA Health Department, that it 'would be unethical to prevent anyone from receiving a vaccine'. **Really?**

In other words, it is not unethical to claim that a vaccine is 'safe and effective' without providing any evidence to support this claim. I call that an unmonitored experiment.

Here is the evidence that governments **do not require** proof of safety or efficacy of vaccines *before* they promote them to healthy people as 'safe and effective'. And they do test them on pregnant women:

1. This short 10min video clip provides the evidence from the COVID19 vaccine manufacturer, **Pfizer**, that they knew in 2020-21 that these COVID 'vaccines' were linked to adverse events, miscarriages and infertility in pregnant women, and strokes and heart issues in other healthy people - **Graham Hood brings an Urgent Appeal to the Australian Government: 'Politicians you must listen'**
2. The claimed, godfather of vaccines, **Stanley Plotkin**, has confirmed that there is a *lack of safety data* to claim that childhood vaccines are safe **'Stunning Reversal': World Renowned Vaccinologist Publishes Paper Admitting Lack of Vaccine Safety Studies.**
3. **No Jab No Pay No Play Australian Government Policy:** Independent MP, **Russell Broadbent**, is campaigning to bring back conscientious objection to vaccination. This campaign is based on the knowledge that vaccines, (a category of drugs), are not proven safe by *using true inert saline placebos*. Conscientious objection to vaccination was removed in 2016 in Australia, when the Liberal government brought in a policy called '**No Jab No Pay No Play**' in the **Social Services** department - not the Health Department. This is a *coercive* vaccination policy that was linked to children being required to use 12+ vaccines before they were considered 'vaccinated'. (Did the Murdoch media's, News Corp, explain this in 2016 when they promoted the policy to you?)
Childcare welfare benefits and childcare places are withheld if a child does not receive all 12 vaccines ~ 24 doses of which are given in the **first 12 months of life**. **Scott Morrison** was the *Minister for Social Services*, who brought in this policy (signed off by **Christian Porter** in November 2015), and they called it '**Choices for Families**' as they removed a parents choice in the number of vaccines they use in their child; a policy that should be dependent upon family genetics. *How Orwellian!*

Please support Russell Broadbent’s campaign to repeal this legislation. Here is a link to find out more about his campaign - ‘**No Jab, No Pay, No Way!**’ **Campaign** and please also see the response’s he has already had from parents ‘**Unjust Parent Penalties**’ (2 mins).

4. **Mark Zuckerberg**, recently admitted that the ‘**Feds asked Facebook to Censor True COVID Information**’

My Journey in Exposing the Fraud in Vaccination Policies:

Recently I did an interview for the Substack ‘**Lies are Unbekoming**’ describing my journey in providing the historical medical literature that demonstrates that vaccines were not the main strategy to remove the risk from infectious diseases. Here is my interview Judy Wilyman PhD and my book **Vaccination: Australia’s Loss of Health Freedom**, (that was published in 2020 as everyone was being locked down) can be purchased from my website <https://www.vaccinationdecisions.net> ***

Nation First - Article Extract from George Christensen MP

Former Queensland MP, George Christensen has set out the five areas where we are losing freedom due to plans to introduce parliamentary measures in Australia but designed at the top un-elected One-World –Government bureaucracies. You must help stop Australia going down this path.

- Global elites are rolling out measures designed to control and enslave us.
- Censorship laws are silencing dissent under the guise of “misinformation” and “hate speech.”
- Digital IDs are setting the stage for constant surveillance and denial of essential services.
- Central Bank Digital Currency (CBDC) allows governments to track and control your financial life.
- 15-minute cities are designed to restrict your freedom of movement under the cover of convenience.
- The WHO’s Pandemic Treaty threatens your personal health choices and bodily autonomy.
- We must reject these systems, use cash, speak out, and fight back to protect our freedoms.

This isn’t a hidden conspiracy—it’s happening in plain sight. Across the world, measures are being introduced that undermine our autonomy and centralise power in the hands of the few.

Let’s break down the five biggest ways they’re working to control you and what we can do about it.

1. Censorship Disguised as ‘Anti-Misinformation’ and ‘Anti-Hate Speech’

What they call “anti-misinformation” or “anti-hate speech” is really about controlling what you can say. Governments across the Anglosphere and Europe are passing laws to shut down voices they don’t like. They claim it’s about protecting you from harm, but in reality, it’s a weapon against dissent. If you speak out against

their narrative, you're labelled a troublemaker or worse. And if you think this won't impact you, think again. Today, it's a political voice or conservative group being silenced; tomorrow, it could be you for simply disagreeing. Once they control what you can say, they control what you can think.

2. Digital ID: The Ultimate Surveillance Tool

Every move you make—monitored. That's what Digital ID systems are leading to. Governments in Europe, Australia, and the UK are pushing for Digital IDs under the guise of making life easier. They say it'll streamline access to services. But here's the problem: once you're logged into this system, your every action becomes trackable. Who you associate with, what you buy, where you go—it's all data for them to control. If you don't comply, they can simply cut you off from essential services. This isn't about convenience—it's about surveillance. Digital ID is just the first step towards total control.

3. Central Bank Digital Currency (CBDC): The Government's Financial Control

Imagine a world where every financial move you make is watched and controlled. That's what a Central Bank Digital Currency (CBDC) is designed to do. It's being mooted as a replacement for cash in countries like the UK and Australia. But here's the catch: unlike cash, CBDCs are fully traceable and programmable. Governments can see where you spend every cent and can control whether you spend it at all. This goes beyond tracking—if they decide you're supporting the wrong cause or speaking out too loudly, your access to your own money could be restricted. It's about keeping you in line.

4. '15-Minute Cities': Restricting Your Freedom of Movement

The push for 15-minute cities is gaining traction, particularly in Europe and the UK. These so-called "sustainable" cities claim to make your life easier by keeping everything you need within 15 minutes. But look a little deeper, and it's clear this is about restricting your freedom to move. What happens when you want to travel beyond your designated zone? Expect restrictions, permits, and penalties. This is sold as a solution to climate change, but it's really about locking you into controlled zones. Once they control where you can go, they control how you live.

5. The Global Pandemic Treaty: Giving Away Health Sovereignty

The World Health Organization's Global Pandemic Treaty is a direct threat to your personal freedoms. Governments across the world are considering signing on to this treaty, which would give the WHO the authority to impose global health mandates, lockdowns, and restrictions. This isn't just about managing pandemics—it's about taking decisions out of your hands and placing them in the hands of unelected bureaucrats. The right to make personal health choices is fundamental, yet this treaty threatens to take that power away from you. If governments sign on, they'll be handing over control of your health decisions to global authorities who don't answer to you. This isn't about public safety—it's about control.

How We Can Push Back

So, how do we stop this agenda of control? It starts with action—your action.

Refuse to comply with systems that strip away your freedoms.

The biggest fight on our hands is the fight for free speech. If we lose that, it could be all over. Leave no stone unturned in the fight for free speech, especially when your government cooks up some hair-brained censorship measure such as the Australian Government is doing with its so-called “Combatting Misinformation & Disinformation Bill”. **Sign petitions, alert others, attend protests, see your local politicians and demand action.**

With Digital ID, just say no. Don’t sign up for one, and refuse to do business with companies that require it. Make it clear to those businesses that you’re walking away because they’re siding with control.

For CBDs, the solution is also simple: use cash whenever you can. The more you use cash, the harder it becomes for them to eliminate it. Refuse to shop at cashless businesses. Make sure cashless businesses are customerless. If your bank decides to go cashless, move to a bank that still values financial freedom.

On 15-minute cities, get informed and stay involved. Local councils are already moving forward with plans to implement these restrictive zones. Be vocal. Make your opposition known, and stand up for your freedom of movement.

When it comes to the Pandemic Treaty, your voice matters. Contact your local politicians and demand that they reject this treaty. Let them know that you won’t stand for any infringement on personal health decisions.

This isn’t some far-off dystopian future—it’s happening right now. The global elites are pushing an agenda that aims to control your speech, movement, money, and even your body. But you have the power to stop it. The key is staying informed, refusing to comply, and pushing back wherever you can. They may want to control you, but you can take control of your own future. Stand firm, and don’t let them take away your freedoms.

Unfortunately submissions to the Committee closed in September but it is now important to contact your MP’s with your protest.

Key Arguments to Make:

In your submission, highlight these points:

- **Government Overreach:** *The Bill gives the government **unprecedented power** to control what is said online. This sets a dangerous precedent for future censorship.*
- **Threat to Free Speech:** *Unelected bureaucrats should not have the power to decide what constitutes “misinformation”—this is an attack on **free speech** and the right to challenge government narratives.*
- **Undermining Democracy:** *Open debate and dissent are critical to a healthy democracy. This Bill stifles public discourse and erodes **our democratic freedoms**.*

Annual Subscription to ‘On Target’ \$75.00 pa - **printed and posted monthly.**

On Target is printed and authorised by Arnis J. Luks

13 Carsten Court, Happy Valley, SA.

A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Vol. 60 No. 38

4th October 2024

IN THIS ISSUE

Why Douglas Social Credit Has Such Trouble Getting Known By William Waite	31
Down the Rabbit Hole! By Neville Archibald	34
There Shall Be Wars, and Rumours of Wars By Arnis Luks	37

Thought For The Week: A tragic failure of American education in this century has been a failure to teach children how to read and write and how to express themselves in a literary form. For the educational system this may not be too distressing. As we shall see later, their prime purpose is not to teach subject matter but to condition children to live as socially integrated citizen units in an organic society—a real life enactment of the Hegelian absolute State. In this State the individual finds freedom only in obedience to the State, consequently the function of education is to prepare the individual citizen unit for smooth entry into the organic whole.

However, it is puzzling that the educational system allowed reading to deteriorate so markedly. It could be that The Order wants the citizen components of the organic State to be little more than automated order takers; after all a citizen who cannot read and write is not going to challenge The Order. But this is surmise. It is not, on the basis of the evidence presently at hand, a provable proposition.

(p.13 - A.C. Sutton - *How The Order Controls Education* 1985)

“Thou shalt have no other gods before me...”

and Why Douglas Social Credit Has Such Trouble Getting Known By William Waite

In his classic *Varieties of Religious Experience* (1922), Harvard Psychology Professor William James offers this definition of religious life:

Were one asked to characterize the life of religion in the broadest and most general terms possible, one might say that it consists of the belief that there is an unseen order, and that our supreme good lies in harmoniously adjusting ourselves thereto. This belief and this adjustment are the religious attitude in the soul. ¹

Douglas made clear that this religious point of view was at the base of his view of life. In a speech in Sydney in 1933 he said the following:

“... it is my own belief, and I might also say that it is almost my only religion that there is ... a ‘canon’”.

(...)

There is running through the nature of the Universe something that we may call a “canon”.² It is the thing which is referred to in the Gospel of St. John as the “Logos,” the “Word”. It has an infinite variety of names. The engineer and the artist refer to it when they say that they have got something “right”. Other people mean the same thing when they talk about absolute truth, or reality. By whatever name you wish to refer to this idea, it does not matter very much; we all instinctively recognise its existence whether we meet it in something like architectural proportions as, say, the cenotaph, or even in the grim lines of a battleship.

(...)

Genuine success only accompanies a consistent attempt to discover and to conform to this canon in no matter what sphere our activities may lie.³

While this process of discovering and adapting ourselves to the unseen order has been the norm over the vast sweep of human history it is no longer at the center of our culture’s motivational structure. We don’t believe in anything unseen, and it follows that one can’t be obedient to something one doesn’t believe exists. This is what it means to be a materialistic society.

I was thinking about this when I was in Sydney last week. Undoubtedly coming from the country makes such mundane experiences more curious. The day was awful, dull with rain and wind, yet thousands of people, and what seemed like even more cars, were moving around with the most frantic energy. There were people from all over the world, all colours and shapes, but fitted out in the same style and determination. They were all working, going to work, on a break from work, between workplaces. “Making” money. It struck me how in a materialistic society, compelled to find its answers in things, economics becomes the organising social force.

This, I think, explains why it is so difficult to convey the Douglas Social Credit message. An alternative social organisation which doesn’t orbit around the concept of trade and money can hardly be imagined. “What would people do all day?” No sense of the “canon” or “unseen order” exists in people’s minds to suggest an alternative focal point to organise ourselves around.

In this light an excessive focus on Douglas’ economic ideas is to put the cart before the horse. People do not obey the dictates of the economic system

because they understand economics. It's demonstrably irrational. Rather, their obedience indicates their *belief* in it, and what follows, sometimes with bizarre results, is a confounded attempt to adapt to the belief. Conformity to the economic world order is very largely a question of faith, which is only to say, as Douglas did, that money has taken the place of religion.

The problem runs much deeper than economics. It is that, as a culture, we are guilty of the sin of idolatry, which Douglas defined in *Warning Democracy: I should define idolatry as the practice of taking some object or virtue, and without understanding or even trying to understand its true nature, investing it with attributes which do not belong to it.* ⁴

This is precisely what we have done with money. Idolatry is the first prohibition in the ten commandments and, as everything crumbles down around our ears, a few of us are beginning to remember why. It was the only transgression which the Ancient Greeks would have considered sinful, in the sense that we use that word. They called it *hubris* and it meant, "a failure of that proper subordination, a breaking of that due order of things upon which life in this world must be founded." The consequence, they believed was "certain punishment." ⁵

In the *Development of World Dominion* Douglas wrote "Social Credit is Christian, not primarily because it was designed to be Christian, but because it was painstakingly "dis"-(-un)-covered reality." ⁶ In other words it is a product of this process of apprehending the unseen order. A revelation derived from the development of a religious impulse.

"No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon." ⁷ Is there anyone willing to argue about where we land in that pair? What is needed, above all else, is a spiritual revolution which would provide people with the far-sightedness required to grasp the meaning of what Douglas uncovered for us.

Why did the great literary critique and Social Crediter A.R. Orage leave his editorship of *The New Age* in 1922 to take up with the mystic George Gurdjieff? "To find God" Orage recalled, adding "I only wish that my motives could be as clearly conscious as that would imply." T. S. Eliot thought his economics had a lot to do with it. Orage, he said "saw that any real change for the better meant a spiritual revolution; and he said that no spiritual revolution was of any use unless you had a practical economic scheme." ⁸ -- Food for thought.

References:

1 James, W. 1982. *The Varieties of Religious Experience*. The Penguin Classics, The United States of America. p. 53

2 Canon /noun/ a body of principles, rules, standards, or norms

3 Douglas in Heydorn, O. 2016. *Social Credit Philosophy*. International Academy of Philosophy Press, Spain. p. 37

4 Ibid. p. 94

5 De Selincourt, A. 1962. *The World of Herodotus*. Little brown and Company, Canada p. 60

6 Douglas, C.H. 1969. *The Development of World Dominion*. Tidal Publications, Sydney.

7 Definition of Mammon/ noun / wealth regarded as an evil influence or false object of worship and devotion

8 Taylor, P. B. 2001. *Gurdjieff and Orage: Brothers in Elysium*, Weiser Books, Maine. ***

Down the Rabbit Hole! By Neville Archibald

Mesmerised:

“to have someone's attention completely so that they cannot think of anything else: I was completely mesmerized by the performance.” (Cambridge Dictionary.)

“If you are mesmerized by something, you are so interested in it or so attracted to it that you cannot think about anything else.” (Collins Dictionary)

This sums up the state of the world in many ways. With the advent of television and computers and more especially now, the mobile phone, we have disappeared down a virtual rabbit hole of existence. Poor old Alice is no longer alone down there.

It is not hard to see it in others as they walk along, staring down at a screen, or they sit and chew, the flickering colours of the television, casting a sickening hue over their meal. The attraction of, just checking “Facebook” or, checking for bargains on “marketplace” can take hold of us all. Once it was just turning on the radio to check the scores, footy or cricket, it didn't matter. Now it is at the point of rudeness, answering a phone or replying to a message while trying to hold a, ‘one on one’ conversation. We see this in our personal lives everyday, it is but one part of Alice's adventure, the first part, Distraction.

Shall we follow Alice on her journey and see if there are other points to relate to? I hope Mr Carroll is not offended by my interpretations, as these are my personal reflections on his enjoyable book.

The White Rabbit is late, very late. Alice must hurry to catch up, make her decisions in haste or be left behind (not at all familiar).

She cries because she cannot fit through the door to a beautiful garden, where she thinks the object of her desire (the rabbit) has gone. So she modifies herself, shrinks to fit. Consumes the things around her without understanding what they will do. This process of joining in continues throughout the whole story, she drinks without knowing what she is drinking, eats mushrooms to get bigger or smaller, she gets angry, frustrated, cries or becomes distraught when she can't fit in. Only by experience does she gain some control, like us all.

There are some that think this is just an example of a “literary nonsense genre” fiction/fantasy. To me there are classic signs that the author knew much of what he was saying. Maybe I am wrong, but the points I make may well amuse you for a while at least, then make your (own-ed) conclusion. Either way I am not bothered, it is after all, just my opinion.

We try to fit in, belonging is an important part of the human psyche. When all around you is lunacy or shallowness it can be hard to keep oneself separate. Alice struggles with the nonsense she is surrounded by and it raises points for her. Perchance for her and her distracted studies, one of the reasons it was suggested it was written, to me it works for a collective as well, a democratic country slowly going under.

Apart from trying to fit in she continually bumps into characters who have answers for her. The Dodo, when they are trying to dry out after the flood of her tears, suggests a caucus race. They are to run around in circles, starting and finishing whenever they like, so that everyone wins.

Caucus as defined in my pocket oxford, “Local committee for political party organization (chiefly as a term of abuse suggesting machine politics & wire pulling)”.

Gee! Is that familiar? Politicians running in circles? A solution from an extinct species to achieve faster what would happen naturally, awarding prizes to themselves and leaving just a thimble for poor Alice (who had supplied all the prizes in the first place).

At the mention of her pet cat eating them, for they were mostly birds and small animals, they then found reasons to be elsewhere.

Her next adventure is with the rabbit again, who orders her to fetch gloves and fan from his house like a servant. She obliges and while there, drinks to make herself big, bigger than them but she is stuck inside. They throw stones or pebbles at her which turn into cakes that once she eats one, again shrinks her, so she ends up running away. The power in the house to achieve things is shrunk by those throwing things until her power is negated, do I see popular Independents or small parties in parliament being represented here. Not a part of the group already there, they are belittled and verbally derided until eventually forced to run?

She then meets with a puppy who is far too big for her to teach tricks, but she does like it. Is this a failed or removed independent, trying hard to satisfy the eagerness of a rising group of followers (the puppy), finding his movement or support is not enough to meet its expectations. Will they ever be the right size? Big enough to elicit a change?

Then the wise old caterpillar asks her who she is, but she does not know. Is this what we are asking, if we know who we are, will we know what we want from life? A confusion of questions begin as she tries to find out and gets frustrated and angry. At all times in life we should be asking these questions, if only to remind ourselves, to help us identify our journey forward, where we want to be in the future.

He recites a poem (a parody of Robert Southey’s poem, *The Old Man’s Comforts*.) There are those who say it is a nonsense parody, but it draws your attention at the finish when the Caterpillar says it’s wrong from beginning to end. Why was it chosen? Seems to me, the Question of Alice, is about wisdom and how to obtain it. Going from last to first, Father William is telling his son (the usurper) not to underestimate him,

I can still kick you downstairs.

I have a steady eye for the slipperiness of an eel.

I know there is a pointlessness about arguing law to the wrong person.

I am supple in the way that I go about things, capable of avoiding scams or misleads. Standing things on their head does not improve things, to do the opposite of what is

suggested won't always help. For I still have a brain, I can work it out.

(My paraphrasing or comment on the original)

Coupled with the original poem (by Robert Southey), I believe the intention is to show a rational approach, knowledge, and respect for god given things (reality).

The Caterpillar then gives Alice advice on how to change sizes as she needs to, she can be in control! Take a piece of mushroom, he says. One side makes you larger and one side makes you small. I guess the question here is the Mushroom, whether you recognise that you are being kept in the dark and fed on bullshit and have awoken to reality? Or the other side of that, is not recognising it and staying powerless to the effects. (Or maybe it is just that mushrooms can do that? - or so I believe).

Alice then meets with her conscience, The Cheshire Cat, who tells her everyone is mad in this world. Some like the March Hare, the Mad Hatter and the Dormouse, stuck in a perpetual tea party as the world goes on around them, the Duchess and her baby pig, and the cook, over peppering the soup, playing their roles to their utmost, larger than life, faster and faster on the treadmill to keep up.

By the use of a piece of mushroom she finds her way back to the first garden she wanted to visit, as it looked nice. She finds it populated by a King and a Queen of hearts and many other long suffering peers/servants and enforced by a deck of card soldiers. All playing a ridiculous game of "Obey the Queen", no matter what she says, or "Off with their Head!"

The Cheshire cat appears and offends the king, who wants to -"off with his head", but since the cat is just a head with a grin, the poor King cannot figure out how to do it. Our ideas are like that. What is in our head is ours and cannot be removed, only masked by outside influence, distraction, some form of mesmerising. It still remains ours to keep if we can. Misinformation, disinformation and thought police notwithstanding, truth is ours to keep, remember that!

Then there is a short interlude where Alice visits a mock turtle to ask more questions and find answers. His story is of his schooling. Arithmetic taught by a Tortoise (taught us), ambition, distraction, uglification and derision. Are these meant to add up to the tools being used to re-educate us? To take us away from a Christian path, all are sins and they certainly fit the bill. Mystery: ancient and modern, from a Conger Eel, seaography (how to effect what we see, a pretence of doing something but not really) I know it is a parody of geography but the other also fits. Drawling, (making it hard to understand?) stretching, (the truth) and fainting in coils (a play on words perhaps 'feinting', proposing a bad law then modifying it, so that it is only a little bit bad, or pretending something has gone away, only to bring it back again, until it is implemented (as so many odious laws have been). I find the quotes and nonsense comments reveal different things as I think them through. The vision may well be just mine alone, but I can and do tend to draw parallels.

The ending is also of interest in that it concludes with a trial for something petty, the stealing of tarts. When Alice is called to the stand she points out that it is all a

nonsense, like so much of what she has seen. The judge (the king) invokes Rule 42, the oldest rule in the book. “All persons over a mile high ...”, to which Alice objects and accuses the King of fabricating rules,

“It’s the oldest rule in the book,” said the King.

“Then it ought to be Number One,” said Alice.

Lewis Carroll, *‘Alice’s Adventures in Wonderland.’*

Alice with her growth mushroom realises her potential, grows up and knocks down the whole pack of cards that this regime is made up of and wakes up back at home.

Inspiring!

So many interesting things go on. What is reality and how do we use it to make the world that we want. The Queen of hearts and her minions may have a hold over us, but only if we are not wise enough to see through the lies and bluffs, only if we do not exercise our right to be properly represented. We can be mesmerised by a tale or captured by a game that we allow ourselves to be a part of, or we can wise up and knock down a false house of cards. One that does not represent any picture of truth. We have the power if only we will wield it. Eat your mushrooms!

There Shall Be Wars, and Rumours of Wars By Arnis Luks

Prior to this current East Coast tour I came across a file from Higher Ground Labs – Political Technology Industry Landscape, which included two PDF downloads providing flowcharts that went some way to explaining the detail of public mind manipulation on offer from commercial entities. Dan Andrews was not alone:

<https://highergroundlabs.com/>

While social-media and the mainstream-media were included within the flowcharts, they each provided only a small but distinct service, separate from the other in order to control the crowd. Based on this illustration and reports, I want to place my thoughts on the table of how and why I don't trust any politician to do the right thing. You may have your favourites and are prepared to argue against my position which makes for lively conversation, but it won't readily change my point of view, nor I expect yours.

<https://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/article/2024/aug/26/gerard-rennick-quits-lnp-liberal-national-launch-people-first-party>

Gerard Rennick quits LNP and reveals plan to register 'People First' party

The Queensland senator announced on Sunday that he was leaving the LNP party ... in the lead up to the next federal election...

<https://www.theaustralian.com.au/nation/politics/senator-fatima-payman-could-launch-political-party-in-matter-of-weeks/news-story/ba028b2e2d33df6f2269b3525efe02db>

Payman Political Party on verge of becoming a reality within weeks

West Australian senator Fatima Payman is set to establish and launch her own political party as early as next month...

Both these two senators are starting new political parties, while their stories of disquiet and ostracism from their major parties is similar. They both held a point of view differing from the parties, and they both took distinct and differing messages out into the community. They were both suitably punished by their party leadership and found themselves on the outer, while the likes of Sen Alex Antic, who was often alongside Sen Gerard Rennick campaigning on almost identical platforms received no such rebuke. Why was Antic awarded front row billing on the SA Liberal Senate ticket while Rennick was excommunicated? Was this a strategy to expand the drifting-voter-base back to the majors via these two senate candidates?

The dirty game of political power is also very much one of smoke and mirrors. Travelling through Queensland and Western Australia, I believe has provided some clarity on this important question.

Queensland and Western Australian folk are politically active several degrees greater than the SA folk. I'm only assessing, but I believe both major parties are well on the nose in Queensland and Western Australia, while South Australia holds a well-entrenched and rusted on approach to the major parties even after Covid under Morrison and the current federal Labor fiasco across only one term.

Any movement across the South Australian electorates may still result in the major-party election, whereas Queensland and Western Australia have a good chance of preferencing (in favour of) independents against the majors.

My feelings, after having toured both states and staying on a little while in each to gauge the feelings of the people, is that these two 'rogue' senators have every likelihood of upsetting the balance of major party power, even at the expense of PHON Sen Malcolm Roberts. It's a dirty game this business of political power.

Where the real loyalty lies from these two aspiring for re-election senators will be revealed in the next and subsequent Parliaments, whether the major political party strategy of excommunicating them both has been sufficiently effective to continue the entrenchment of the duopoly or not. Will they both just be another disappointment (in the public's efforts to gain effective representation) is the only question to be answered.

Two Peas from The Same Pod

"The Liberal-National Coalition opposes the current Labor Misinformation Bill (due to the public backlash), but initiated a similar Bill on 21 March 2022. Communications Minister Paul Fletcher then announced, "The Morrison Government will introduce legislation to combat harmful disinformation and misinformation online." ...

These things are easily forgotten and the entrenched MSM would not lift a finger to highlight this disparity nor humbug.

I want to iterate the futility of relying only upon the political vote to achieve a change of policy. The major parties have stitched up control of our parliaments. They meet in secret in their respective party rooms to vote on policy. All their hidden

discussions and debates are never recorded for public consumption.

A bare majority achieved in the party room, is transposed (via the party whip across the floor of the Parliament) into another law inflicted upon the public.

The people have a significant task before them of regaining control, if they ever had it, of parliamentary democracy. This enemy (of the machinations of the party system) is but one of many. This must be undone for Parliament to function according to our Limiting Constitution. This can only occur from an informed and active public working tirelessly to regain the political initiative, wrestling this power away from the political party machinations. Starting up yet another party will not achieve this important end of representative democracy. This must be wrestled from all political parties back to its rightful place - with the people.

There Is No Quick Fix

The political lobbyist is in the enviable position of being financially supported to carry on the task of haranguing our political representatives to yield to the interests of others including the transnational corporations. This is a fact that must be accepted. While writing a letter, or accosting the representative in the street over any issue, is a method, it is mild in comparison to the constant stream of political lobbyist/s at their Canberra door pushing and shoving them to consider the best interest of others, including the transnational corporations. Our representatives yield to this unrelenting pressure, rather than perform their primary function of representing the people of their electorate.

The political parties receive generous financial and other support, not from the electorate, but from the likes of the mainstream media with favourable articles that improve their chances of re-election. Liberal policy, particularly under John Howard, allowed this monopoly of mainstream media to occur. Don't ever forget that.

The selling of the Commonwealth Bank and allowing overseas banking interests to dominate the financial policy of Australian banks was Labor policy under Paul Keating. Don't ever forget that. These two important monopolies, MSM and Finance, have cornered control of our political processes.

Are They Building Social Cohesion, Or Are They Tearing Society Apart?

During this current and previous tours I have attended quite a few 'freeman of the land' meetings. The folk are quite sincere in their approach, unfortunately some have lost a lifetime worth of accumulated assets, going down this pathway. I have spent some time looking at this question of what they are saying and subsequently sent a 580-page document for a legal opinion. The Legal opinion is important, in that it finds nearly all of what is being espoused does not hold water in our courts, therefore relief will not be found going down this pathway.

The website 'freemandelusion.com' is important as this was the source of the 580-page document. Debates over which is our flag, the red or the blue Ensign further divide us as a cohesive people. We must come together - unite to regain the initiative and control over our own governments and institutions.

In Summary

Dr David Mitchell has provided five excellent videos on our constitutional arrangements located in our 'Video Archives', which I recommend to all. Prof Anne Twomey, from my perspective, reinforces Dr David Mitchell's position. While I have watched only 15 of the more than 100 Prof Twomey's videos located on Youtube, I have yet to recognise any conflict between her position and that of Dr David Mitchell's on constitutional matters. Yet to be totally honest, I am not a constitutional expert, nor any type of acceptable legal mind. I just don't see any issue of conflict there. I will be pleased to be corrected on this issue of conflict of legal opinion between these two important legal people:

<https://www.youtube.com/@constitutionalclarion1901>

Demanding To Make A Difference

I recently received a copy of a 'demand' letter, originally from an early Australian Douglas Credit group. The important point about the 'demand letter' is that, once those folk were convinced there was a legitimate 'issue and resolution' provided by Douglas, they insisted on effective representation. Their belief - faith, that they could achieve a more just result with this approach was their demonstration of commitment to achieving greater freedoms for society. The letter of demand has been placed onto our website for consideration and download here:

alor.org/Storage/Library/electors_demand_letter.docx

Debt As The Weaponised Mechanism

Debt, more accurately referred to as 'the weaponised money system', is designed to confiscate the assets of the entire world into only a few hands. The ever-expanding levels of Debt are irredeemable. No matter how long we work for, we will never find relief from Debt. Nation after nation has become increasingly insolvent to the point where public assets have been removed from the public and handed to the purveyors of Debt as an Equity Swap. Jeremy Lee referred to this phenomenon 30 years ago in his many videos: *<https://alor.org/Storage/navigation/Library5.htm>*

If you wonder why our High Country, Forests and National Parks are all locked up with little or no public access, and people are being herded into bigger and bigger centres, it is because those who hold those government Debts (Bonds) wish to have unfettered access to exploit the mineral and timber reserves held in these previous public spaces. Changing government flavours will not change this policy until the general public become sufficiently informed and energised into making a difference to our political plight. After the fire, how convenient, the Victorian government allowed the 'old growth forests' to be harvested. Or the water of the Murrumbidgee pumped dry to produce cotton, from which little or no royalties from either are paid into the public purse, are each a reflection of the same policy of Debt For Equity Swaps. Like a giant open pit, Australia is certainly being exploited, but this time by a hidden foreign power operating behind the scenes of government and our defenses.

A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Vol. 60 No. 39

11th October 2024

IN THIS ISSUE

Travel Report By Arnis Luks	41
I Thought Discrimination Was a Dirty Word By Neville Archibald	44
An Enormous Apparatus of Persuasion By Will Waite	47

Thought For The Week: A majority of councillors in Port Hedland, in WA's north-west, have voted in favour of a motion calling for an "immediate suspension" of mRNA COVID-19 vaccines... The motion cited unverified claims that Pfizer and Moderna vaccines damage people's DNA.

<https://www.abc.net.au/news/2024-10-14/wa-council-port-hedland-approves-anti-covid-vaccine-motion/104471064>

Travel Report By Arnis Luks

Having completed the east coast tour of more than five weeks duration, and having traveled nearly 10,000 km, I make the following report.

Many have asked "what to do next?"

Port Headland Council have voted to expose DNA Contamination in mRNA vaccines...
https://oxgmcxo.substack.com/p/breaking-news-port-hedland-council?publication_id=1993254&post_id=150158677&isFreemail=true&r=wmnxm&triedRedirect=true

In the United States of America, a Californian court finds that there is an unreasonable risk of injury from the current levels of fluoride injected into the public water supply, allowing US citizens to petition the Environmental Protection Agency to go back to the beginning from which the neurotoxin 'fluoride' was originally introduced into the water supply...

<https://storage.courtlistener.com/recap/gov.uscourts.cand.310380/gov.uscourts.cand.310380.445.0.pdf>

Both of these vitally important issues are ample justification for a militant citizenry to bring the bureaucracy and the government into account. However, if another Canberra demonstration was held, and if over 1 million people attended from around Australia, that in itself will not cause any change of government policy. Nor if we vote this government out of office at the next election, in itself will not cause a change of government policy. The French 'Yellow Vests' have been demonstrating in their streets for over six years with no change in

their imposed bureaucratic policy. Demonstrations and voting of themselves are insufficient mechanisms. We must find other mechanisms to achieve relief from this bureaucratic initiated tyranny.

<https://www.abc.net.au/news/2024-10-14/wa-council-port-hedland-approves-anti-covid-vaccine-motion/104471064>

The mainstream media is making 'light' of these issues, as did the West Australian Premier's - 'stick to knitting' comment to that local government council over the jab and increased and sudden morbidities. We must find other mechanisms.

The impertinence of the bureaucracy and our elected representatives towards these issues is quite telling. The gloves now appear to be off, and it is time to play hardball against any expressions of 'the will of the people'. This phenomenon is an opportunity to gauge those who are 'managed dissent', OR, 'the controlled opposition' to readily separate the 'real wheat' from the 'pretending chaff'.

This battle is of a spiritual nature - influencing public perception of what is, in fact and deed, our ancient rights and freedoms to control our own bodily autonomy. Should the Premier of Western Australia have the authority to impose a medical procedure on the entire population or not? He seems to think in no uncertain terms, he should, at the behest mind you, of big Pharma - being selected rather than elected.

No progress For Aboriginals Since The Voice Vote

<https://www.skynews.com.au/australia-news/politics/move-over-senator-jacinta-price-scolds-labor-counterpart-for-making-no-progress-one-year-after-failed-voice-referendum/news-story/6d8b980cfa7a306f5d8c4bae1725d156>

This report is another point of departure from the correct 'rules of association', of the devolution of illegitimate power currently being vested in the remote bureaucrat rather than placed at the feet of the individual where it rightfully belongs. Even with the likes of that honourable woman Sen Jacinta Price administering Aboriginal policy from Canberra, the policy outcome will equally be just another disaster.

The well-intentioned bureaucrat administering these 'centralised-policies' is the major contributing factor towards disaster. Whether it be medical intervention of fluoride into the water supply, or the jab mandated for all, or some other perceived anomaly like Aboriginal issues within the local communities, the natural law of devolution overrules human thought, even well-intentioned thought.

This natural law is that the individual is given a free will, and while assistance from the local official may be required, whether it be a doctor or a social worker working with those individuals in community, both will come to a far superior answer-locally and being better suited for each individual case. The rules of association transcend human thinking and can be defined just as readily as the rules of bridge-building; and departure from each of these natural laws equally disastrous.

Devolution is the statutory delegation of powers from the central government to govern at a subnational level, such as a regional or local level.

It is a form of administrative decentralization.

The 1967 Referenda to place Aboriginal policy into the hands of our Federal Government located in Canberra have failed those practicing traditional-Aboriginal-custom, and will never achieve any real improvement even under Sen Jacinta Price's nurturing hand. The Natural Law of Devolution cannot change, even with

the very best of intentions from the Utopianist - the natural law of 'devolution', to be placed at the lowest-levels-possible - must be upheld to avoid a political tyranny while evading or avoiding personal accountability for both, the individual and the administering bureaucrat. Aboriginal affairs, just as with personal health, are equally-reflected within the same natural law of devolution.

Nationalised Medicine and the NDIS National Disability Insurance Scheme

I originally took out medical insurance some 48 years ago, which lasted for only one year. In that time a child was born, and a minor operation was performed. I then did the maths and found that the insurance premiums paid-over broke even with the medical bills incurred. From that point onwards I have never taken out medical insurance. Nor have I paid hospital insurance, even to my financial detriment. The principal of national health, to my mind, is and always has been wrong.

I know there are arguments about not being able to afford significant medical expenses should that ever occur, but my counter to this approach is that a cavalier attitude to incurring medical expenses, coupled with the imposition of mandated jobs and neurotoxins injected into the water supply are the end positions of this policy. As the legitimate alternative to a neurotoxin being injected into our water supply, my household collects rainwater and has sunk a bore, rather than inflict the neurotoxin.

We make it our personal business to eat healthily, to seek out our own medical information from a variety of sources, and to practice (just like a doctor practices), a personal and tailored approach to our own health and well-being. This does not eliminate medical issues but does maintain a vitally important personal perspective. In summary, we hold ourselves personally responsible for our own health.

Free, Moral, and Responsible

It is the overzealous bureaucratic intrusion into our personal well-being that is at issue, not the other way around. Had the Premier minded his own (health) business instead of defending the product (without any personal recommendation towards a Royal Commission into Adverse Events and Morbidity), the Council of Port Hedland would have been given a legitimate 'platform for redress' against untimely deaths. The MSM protects its own source of revenue, just as the bureaucracy does as well - unaccountably. Would that they be held to account for policy decisions, then perhaps there may have been a little more prudence in their zealotry.

Many Have Asked 'what to do next?'

Utilising the correct 'Rules of Association', support every candidate, aspiring or otherwise - to voice this principal, that if anything can be done locally (to the benefit of the individual against bureaucratic tyranny), then this is a suitable policy-pursuit and needs to be followed. Premiers and bureaucrats alike, are all subject as we also are, to all natural law, with divergence from any natural law just as catastrophic.

Should there be a pod-caster willing, or a pamphleteer, or a writer, or a convener of public meetings willing and able to discuss these and other issues, use every available opportunity to bring into the public's consciousness this natural law, that: what should be effectively dealt with at a lower level, must be done so. ***

I Thought Discrimination Was a Dirty Word By Neville Archibald

The politically correct among us would have you believing that discrimination is a dirty word. In the next breath they are telling you that the information you are allowed access to is going to be selected for you. They then do the discriminating, making the distinctions for us of what is right and what is wrong. They will throw out the inappropriate material. We know they already do in many cases, just by not including it. If they have something to hide, what could be better than restricting it. We have seen what damage the Freedom of Information Act has done to corrupt actions, are they frightened and looking for another way to hide stuff? Why?

Not many people know of Otto and Gregor Strasser, even fewer know anything close to the real story. Their story is a unique one, part of the German government at the time of Hitler's rise to power, they opposed him, to the point that Gregor was murdered and Otto had to flee. It is an important story in itself, as it shows that there were people in power in the western world (supposedly against the rise of Hitler) who played a different part than you would expect, and they would rather you didn't know it. The memory hole, into which much of this type of information disappears, swallows what would otherwise reveal that their preferred theory of history, the accidental, is really a planned theory of history. In other words, that everything happens for a reason.

I had a play around with Chat GP, which is an AI (Artificial Intelligence) to whom you give basic instructions. It then writes an article for you. I must say it does write something, admirable attempts even, and for listing dot points or a how-to manual, it would make a good start. I asked Chat GP to write something about the Strassers, and got a cobbled version that was at odds with what I have read and found out about them between the wars and after the rise of Hitler. The repository of knowledge that it takes it's facts from is obviously limited by what is in it's library. I must say, like all computers, it has the same limitations. Garbage in equals Garbage out.

Like a computer our society is no different. If the information fed to it is wrong or faulty, then the outcome will be influenced at best, wrong, and faulty at worst. The arbiters of what is the "truth" and what is potential "misinformation", would be happy to select that which agrees with their intentions. This is the danger we are now facing.

This garbage in, garbage out, theory is also influenced by what garbage is allowed. Which information is considered mis or dis or mal. The memory hole of history, into which much that is "undesirable" is dumped, is akin to Hitler's book burning. Ray Bradbury, wrote about book burning and it's consequences in his Novel, *Fahrenheit 451*. He said, 'You don't have to burn books to destroy a culture. Just get people to stop reading them.' In the same way, if we do not have them to read, we cannot use them. Like glasses they help us to see the truth of what has gone before or might come again. This focus on controlling our ability to access information is being

done, by both people with the intention to rule over us and by those who just follow their orders. It is important to realize this and to identify if you are inadvertently one of them, or you know someone who is. When we allow others in our community to implement these restrictions and we do not point out to them the damage they are inflicting on us, we are enabling them. We are helping them to get away with it, helping them to justify their behaviour. Allowing our culture to be destroyed. This of course has been done before.

Otto, served in the first world war, witnessed and was subject to some of it's atrocities. On the German side, he fought with vigour for his vision of Germany (an interesting one to read compared to what you may believe). He encountered something that we too suffered from. Non-Commissioned officers! At the time a difference that showed itself in the ill treatment of those under them, who were expendable.)

“Strasser was passionately a soldier at heart, but regards the non-commissioned-officers of that day as the most repulsive beings he has known. Among the 300 men in his unit were some 180 students, and the non-commissioned-officers vented their especial spleen on these in ways which left him with an ineradicable loathing of a class of man now best represented among the senior Brown Army commanders.” Douglas Reed, *Nemesis* page 34-35

(We saw this with the senseless “over the top or be shot” style of leadership that so many Aussie diggers rebelled against. This is what led to the making of a “larrikin” spirit and a defying of pompous authority that Diggers became famous for.) Towards the end of the first war there was a large distinction in Germany, between the types of officers, those who rose up through and were accepted by the ranks, and those whose treatment of soldiers under them became the template for the SS and Hitler's brown shirts. This latter group were despised by the true leaders of the time and many of these true leaders would be identified and neutralised by Hitler during his coming to power. By winnowing his followers into that category, Hitler's will was maintained and furthered. They could get away with murder, as they did!

Otto And Gregor both found this out. Gregor was murdered by Hitler's minions and Otto fled but continued to fight, against what he saw as the worst of Germany as it rose. For this, his story has been effectively dropped down the memory hole. Imprisoned for a time in Ottawa, Canada, when seeking help to overthrow Hitler, the ruling powers in the west at that time did little to help and more to hinder him. More importantly, the lessons of what he saw, went with him but for Reed's books.

Douglas Reed, was often condemned for writing about the things he saw, and was largely ignored by politicians leading up to the second world war even though he was a foreign correspondent in Europe. Having fought in the first war and then made a career in journalism between the wars, he had his finger on the pulse of what was going on. His interviews with many important leaders, Royalty and some of the major players in greater Europe meant he could anticipate what was coming. He interviewed Otto and Gregor, the Chancellor before Hitler and others.

His warnings went unheeded and the result was what we all know as the second world war.

In his third book, in the very first chapters, he equates and compares Otto's experiences with those he saw happening in England as the second war was beginning. We must read this and ask ourselves is this happening again now? Instead of the rise of Nazism or fascism or any other regime we are familiar with, replace it with globalisation, the WEF (World Economic Forum) and their young leaders programs. Think carefully, don't accept my premise.

The callous and immoral who became the SS and Brown shirts in Hitler's day, I see as similar to those among us now, willingly enacting and enforcing the laws that violate our freedoms and the moral fabric of our society. If you think this is too harsh, consider carefully the end result we will see if it continues the way it is going.

“Many writers have shown that the events leading to this war, and the war itself, could be exactly foretold: it was their trade, and they were as well able to do this as a doctor is able, from specific symptoms, to foretell the course of some diseases; and Lord Halifax, though he expressed in this phrase the average state of mind of many Britishers, only clothed a fallacy in words that sounded convincing when he once said 'We distrust people who forecast precisely the course of coming events'. This is a useful phrase to justify procrastination and non-exertion, nothing more.”

Douglas Reed, *Nemesis*. Page 9

“I could not understand the way the country, on the one hand, passively allowed itself to drift towards an avoidable war, and, on the other hand, permitted an enormous influx of unassimilable aliens whose intention clearly was, when that war came, to burrow into the places vacated by the young men of Britain who would again be sent to fight.

Already, the state of England after the war that loomed ahead was full of menacing shadows, but there seemed as little hope of awakening public opinion to these dangers as there had been of awakening it to the oncoming peril of war itself. The things that were best in England were being buried under an imported, alien way of life and way of thinking that made itself ever more master of literature and the Press, the stage and the films, radio and the menu, art, parliamentary debates - everything.

We were going to war again to keep England's shores inviolate, and at the same time we were opening these shores to an alien influx the like of which they had never seen. Maddest of all, the craziest thing that I ever saw even in the madhouse Insanity Fair, we were about to give these newcomers preferential treatment in our own land over the country's own sons; they were to be put into posts liberated by the young men who went off to war, and at the price of 'joining-up' themselves they could even acquire British citizenship - but the condition of that 'joining-up', set out in black and white, was that they never should be sent to the front! Their lives were to be preserved at all cost, so that they could live

in peace and prosperity in England after the war; and simultaneously the lives of young Englishmen were once more to be squandered.”

Douglas Reed, *Nemesis*. Pg 17-18

There will be those who condemn Reed for his words, and relate it to race hatred, without once ever examining it for what it was. A man being out of his country for years and coming back to find a strange land, with different concepts of what is right. I too see this distinction in our countries of the west. Once proud bastions for freedom and for the individual to pursue their own form of independence, we now are subject to the laws of others who seem to know only how to repress and control us, for their own ends. And we are accepting of it.

Who among you wish for global control that benefits only the wealthiest and the most power-hungry? Who of you are doing their bidding, “just following orders” and who among you are recognising this out of control group of people yet still voting them into power, federal, state or local. If we allow the removal of facts our leaders don’t like, or consider bad for us, if we continue to let the political manipulation of the words we use influence us, then as communities, we will become corrupted. We will lose the ability to see the truth in what is happening around us.

It is our job to hold the line, to draw the line, to say enough! The metaphorical Brown Shirts in our society will end up enabling a tyranny whose intentions are no better than any other dictatorship, no matter what name they place on it. It is not “toxic masculinity” or “right wing” or any of those other labels they are so fond of using, to stand firm in your beliefs, your vision for what Australia should look like. It is your home too, you have a say in what you want to see. We still out number them at the ballot box, (*or anywhere else-ed*) if we are willing to do so. ***

An Enormous Apparatus of Persuasion By Will Waite

"satisfy your greed, satisfy your sensuality, that is the purpose of life."

I have wondered how to follow last week’s post about ours being a culture of idolators. For Christmas this year my Mum gave me a collection of articles, interviews and sermons by Malcolm Muggeridge that centre on his thoughts regarding faith. ¹ In it I found the following excerpt from a sermon he delivered in 1967 which I think fits nicely with what I was trying to say.

For those of you who don’t know who Malcolm Muggeridge was, if he is remembered at all, he is not remembered as a preacher. Among other things he was a journalist, in one form or another, for more than 40 years. In 1933, reporting for the *Manchester Guardian* and without political permission, he travelled to the Ukraine and broke the story about the systematic starvation of the Ukrainian people by the Stalin regime. He later featured in a documentary about the Holodomor in which some 7 million Ukrainians were starved to death. You can watch it here on Rumble, or, if you’re happy to provide an ID, a photo of yourself or a credit card (it won’t be charged) to verify your age, on YouTube.

It is Muggeridge's experience in journalism which gives him special authority on the "Frankenstein monster" which is our "enormous apparatus of persuasion." It was a freak when Muggeridge spoke these words in 1967, it is even more so today. As an example I would draw your attention to the discoveries made by Robert Epstein, concerning what big tech has been up to. Epstein's program, *America's Digital Shield*, has collected and analysed data from more than a hundred million "ephemeral experiences" exposing systematic political manipulation and "indoctrination of our children." Ephemeral experiences are the fleeting, unsolicited suggestions ubiquitously entwined in the online experience. They include search results, predictive text, go-vote reminders and video recommendations. Among Epstein's startling discoveries is a direct and quantifiable link between big tech bias and how people vote. Though even more disturbing is what these ephemeral experiences are exposing our kids to. YouTube recommends highly sexualised and violent material to children; and the reason? "It's titillating and highly addictive,"² says Epstein.

It's interesting to see what YouTube does not require age verification for. Here is a sample of what they are recommending to children from Epstein's, *America's Digital Shield*.³

This snip from his conversation with Rogan discusses the sneakiness and sophistication of big tech's methods of addicting children to pornography and violence through "ephemeral experiences." Epstein is "Speaker 3"⁴:

Speaker 3: The key, though, is if you scroll along the bottom of the image, you'll see this graph that kind of shows you where people watch the most. And the reason why parents generally are not aware of this is because a lot of these gruesome things are very, very quick.

They're very quick. But you'll find very often a peak there, you know, because that's what's drawing a lot of attention. That's what the kids are playing over and over again. And that's what leads to the addiction.

Joe Rogan: so the reason why they are suggesting these images to kids is because they know if the kids click on them, they're going to get more engagement.

Speaker 3: It's this, yes. And so the number one variable for profitability is called watch time. So engagement, whatever you want to call it. Yeah, this is one of the ways that they addict people now, I'm sure you've heard of Tristen Harris. Maybe he's been a guest.

The freakishness of this "apparatus of persuasion" and the economic lunacy that it was created to support has proceeded unabated since these comments by Muggeridge. It's a misery machine and its feeding on our children. The utopian dream is turning into a nightmare and if the waning welfare of our kids won't wake you up in despair, then nothing will. Though the techniques have changed somewhat

the message has stayed the same “Satisfy your greed, satisfy your sensuality, that is the purpose of your life.” That is the lie of materialism.

Without further ado I give you this excerpt from Malcolm Muggeridge’s sermon, *Am I a Christian?* delivered at Great St. Mary’s Church in 1967.

I would suggest to you that Western Man has for the last hundred and fifty years lived through a period of utopianism, collective utopianism, that, from the time of Darwin particularly, he has believed that it’s possible to construct for himself a Kingdom of Heaven on earth. When I was young, we believed that that Kingdom of Heaven on earth had been constructed in the USSR. There are those good earnest people who believed that that Kingdom of Heaven on earth could be constructed by means of a Welfare State through the Labour Party. (I would hope and believe that the present Prime Minister has effectively put paid to [ended] those hopes!) The people who crossed the Atlantic to America went with the idea that they were going to find a Kingdom of Heaven on earth in America.

Now what has happened, it seems to me, is that these utopian hopes — and it was perfectly human that they should have been entertained — have been completely demolished, and we are confronted with a sort of emptiness. The very material success of our world adds to that effect. We have everything that we want materially, and it ought to make us happy, but for some reason, it doesn’t. It should be the case that the places where all these material things are most available, and where the pursuit of happiness (that most absurd and ironical phrase) is most ardently undertaken, should also be the places where human beings are most happy and most purposive and most zealous in their lives; and in fact it’s not so. Something has gone wrong. It hasn’t worked. The idea that human beings can achieve fulfillment on earth by satisfying their fleshly appetites and their egotistic impulses has simply not worked, and where it’s most possible to satisfy them is precisely where it’s worked least. This situation is of course enormously intensified by virtue of the fact that, at the same time, we have created like a Frankenstein monster an enormous apparatus of persuasion such as has never before been known on earth.

Now I’ve spent the last forty years working in this apparatus, and I know exactly how it works. I know the people who operate it and the aims it pursues; and what is the effect? The effect is simply this, that it says to those whom it influences — and its power is fantastic — it says to them in effect, ‘Satisfy your greed, satisfy your sensuality, that is the purpose of life.’ You have a situation which is so fantastic that it would be difficult to believe in it if one didn’t know it existed, and which posterity will certainly find difficulty in believing in, if there is any posterity. You have in a small area of the world an economic system which only works in so far as it constantly increases its gross national product. This is our golden calf, and year by year it must get bigger. In order that its getting bigger shouldn’t create chaos, people must constantly consume more and want more, so that we must dedicate some of our most brilliant talents and a huge proportion of

our wealth to making them want what they don't want. It's the most extraordinary state of affairs. At the same time, while this is going on this part of the world, in another part of the world people are getting poorer and poorer and hungrier and hungrier.

When I was in Detroit, Mr Reuther said to me that every year they must sell nine million new automobiles in the United States or the place goes bust. Imagine it, you must persuade nine million people to want a new automobile in order to survive. This is a completely crazy situation, and the sense of its craziness is precisely what is creating in human beings so tremendous a spiritual hunger. They know that it's not true, that if you satisfy all people's material and physical wants you will make them serene and happy. They know that it's not working out, and so this produces in them a sense of total lostness and bewilderment. It seems to me absolutely clear that either they must recover a sense of what those early Christians had when they too found themselves in a world which was running into destruction and ruin, or the process goes on and produces a catastrophe.

1 *Muggeridge, M. Collection* edited by Kuhne C. 2005. *Seeing Through the Eye*: Malcolm Muggeridge on Faith. Ignatius Press, San Francisco.

2 The Joe Rogan Experience. 2024. #2201 Robert Epstein. Transcript available at:

<https://podcasts.musixmatch.com/podcast/the-joe-rogan-experience-01hp4c6gdxz064yk1cyc1qym1k/episode/2201-robert-epstein-01j7mcx2178gm74fvdd5vezy95>

3 America's Digital Shield. Available at: <https://americasdigitalshield.com/>

4 The Joe Rogan Experience. 2024. #2201 Robert Epstein. Transcript available at:

<https://podcasts.musixmatch.com/podcast/the-joe-rogan-experience-01hp4c6gdxz064yk1cyc1qym1k/episode/2201-robert-epstein-01j7mcx2178gm74fvdd5vezy95>

BASIC FUND

The Basic Fund closes shortly, which will be on October 30th for this year. I am making a special call to all those who have planned to make a donation but maybe have over-looked doing so.

The fund has not filled this year so it will be wonderful if we can receive those last minute donations. As always, we appreciate the contributions, no matter how large or small. Each donation is really a vote of thanks for the work of the League and a tribute to the dedicated work of those in the 'engine room'.

Please note the appropriate address and/or banking details in the advert on the following pages to send a contribution.

BEQUESTS

Apart from the Basic Fund, the League is also a recipient of bequests from supporters who remember us in their Will. These extra dollars help a lot and while we are grateful, it is unfortunate that on those occasions we are unable to personally express our thanks.

Best details for establishing a bequest are available from Head Office. - ND

On Target Subscription PAYMENT Details

Post POSTAGE and PAYMENT Details to
ALOR c/o PO Box 27, Happy Valley, SA 5159

On Target Subscription PAYMENT Details

Post POSTAGE and PAYMENT Details to
ALOR c/o PO Box 27, Happy Valley, SA 5159

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.

On Target Subscription POSTAGE Details

Post POSTAGE and PAYMENT Details to
ALOR c/o PO Box 27, Happy Valley, SA 5159

On Target Subscription POSTAGE Details

Post POSTAGE and PAYMENT Details to
ALOR c/o PO Box 27, Happy Valley, SA 5159

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.

A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Vol. 60 No. 40

18th October 2024

IN THIS ISSUE

The Psychology of Modern Cults By Arnis Luks	53
What is an Antivaxxer? By Judy Wilyman PhD	56
“Australia’s past is a foreign country” - How they wrecked Australia By Will Waite	58
I Smell Gingerbread By Neville Archibald	61

Thought for the Week: “A fundamental difference between modern dictatorships and all other tyrannies of the past is that terror is no longer used as a means to exterminate and frighten opponents, but as an instrument to rule masses of people who are perfectly obedient. Terror as we know it today strikes without any preliminary provocation, its victims are innocent even from the point of view of the persecutor. This was the case in Nazi Germany when full terror was directed against Jews, i.e., against people with certain common characteristics which were independent of their specific behavior. In Soviet Russia the situation is more confused, but the facts, unfortunately, are only too obvious. On the one hand, the Bolshevik system, unlike the Nazis, never admitted theoretically that it could practice terror against innocent people, and though in view of certain practices this may look like hypocrisy, it makes quite a difference. Russian practice, on the other hand, is even more ‘advanced’ than the German in one respect: arbitrariness of terror is not even limited by racial differentiation, while the old class categories have long since been discarded, so that anybody in Russia may suddenly become a victim of the police terror. We are not concerned here with the ultimate consequence of rule by terror—namely, that nobody, not even the executors, can ever be free of fear; in our context we are dealing merely with the arbitrariness by which victims are chosen, and for this it is decisive that they are objectively innocent, that they are chosen regardless of what they may or may not have done.”
— Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*

The Psychology of Modern Cults By Arnis Luks

September 11, 2001, multiple related incidents occurred in New York, in a forest in Pennsylvania, and the Pentagon, (located in Arlington County, Virginia, across the Potomac River from Washington, D.C.), which will be embedded into most people's minds as an attack against the United States of America by extremists.

In 2004 the movie '9/11: In Plane Site' came out.

[9/11 In Plane Site - Directors Cut](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=igX7Z8VstN4)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=igX7Z8VstN4>

Three years after the actual 2001 events significant information was released into the public consciousness which generated an array of questions to be asked against the official version of those events from the United States Administration. An important point about this is the passage of time being approximately three years after the events occurred, and then the release of vital information to the public.

A close associate, back then in 2004, informed me that they had just gone to watch the movie, and their point of view had subsequently changed. I asked a simple enough question – 'okay, your view has now changed after watching the movie. What are you going to do about it?' The reply was most telling – 'well, nothing'. Their own 'line in the sand' against tyranny had not yet been reached, even though I considered them to be loyal and personally brave towards Australia and upholding our traditional rights and freedoms.

What this showed me, in psychological terms, was that even though the public can become informed about the 'misinformation and disinformation' emitted from official government circles, they will personally do nothing about it and continue life's journey as if nothing had changed. The psychology is the point. Life continues as if nothing has changed, even though the official narrative given was fictitious, for other's personal benefit of massive profits.

A similar phenomenon occurred in 2020 with Covid. An existential threat to the whole world supposedly occurred, the government's official narrative came through the WHO channels, as did the TGA response of the jab. Both these existential threats of 9/11 and Covid resulted in massive profits for the military industrial complex which includes big Pharma. More than three years has now passed since Covid, the lockdown and the jab, and vital information is again now being released into the public realm, Covid morbidity, the efficacy, or physical harm being inflicted.

The *modus operandi* is the same, in that the realisation of this knowledge of the contamination and potential injury from the jab will do little to change public perception of the events of 2020 (as being an insider run job for the benefit of the transnational corporations and central banks who are financing them). Life goes on – for some. This article is not for them. This article is for those others, whose line in the sand has been crossed and wish to do something positive to regain our ancient rights and freedoms from those who would impose tyranny over us.

Last week's *On Target* identified the important lesson of utilising the correct 'Rules of Association', being Devolution - placing legitimate power at the lowest level possible to achieve the best results for each individual concerned. This week I wish to emphasise the principal, or natural law of 'Unity amidst Diversity'. Lenin identified the importance of 'cells' of actionists, to the point where 'information of strategy' was only released based on 'those who need to know would be the only ones allowed to know'. The Rhodesian SAS, as recorded in the title 'The Elite',

demonstrated on the ground how important this principle of diversity (of action), and unity (of purpose or policy) can be in an environment of guerrilla warfare.

The primary policy for us all, to me, is quite clear: upholding our ancient rights and freedoms, and, shoring up the clearly defined limiting powers over the federal government (and bureaucracy) as recorded in our constitutional arrangements. I hold the view that the current Australian Constitution is the most superior, most thought through, with the greatest potential to, not only re-state, but uphold, the restoration of our ancient rights and freedoms.

The task set before us for all those whose line in the sand has been crossed, to my mind is this primary policy. Yuri Bezmenov offers some guidance in his *'Love Letter to America'*. Regaining influence over each representative is essential, so that the Parliament can perform correctly - as envisaged by the writers of our limiting constitution. Having a pocket edition of our Constitution always at the ready is a good start. Reading it regularly emphasises the balancing of differing powers across the three branches of government - the executive, the administration and the judiciary. The Federated relationship identifies further divisions of powers across the three levels of government - local, state, and Federal or Commonwealth. Further, each Parliament (except Queensland) consists of the lower house, the upper house (or Senate), and the monarch's representative as governor (or Gov general). Queensland dissolved its upper house as an act of state Parliament in 1922.

<https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/cx2kvewx8l7o>

<https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/c869x38lgn9o>

<https://labour.org.uk/change/serving-the-country/#constitutional-reform>

These articles from Britain show a consistent Labour desire to move away from hereditary peerage. Britain has been doing quite a bit of soul-searching in recent times, emasculating the house of lords from rejecting any Bill before Parliament, to now, at most causing a delay of little inconvenience - *1911 Parliament Act*.

The second stanza to this British constitutional soul-searching is the pursuit from Scotland, Ireland, Wales and now Cornwall requesting a greater say in the political processes – essentially a desire to achieve a federated relationship.

In the 1920s Queensland suffered from an appointed Upper house, as far as the lower house was concerned, being obstructionist. The appointed Upper House was strategically flooded by new Labour appointees to achieve a majority which readily voted for its own dissolution.

The following links show some political consideration into the re-establishment of the upper house in Queensland. While they are somewhat dated, the political machinations are important to consider in the light of the principles of divisions of power - *unity amidst diversity* - and *devolution* as a legitimate policy pursuit.

The ups and downs of the Legislative Council October 12, 2011 —

<https://www.brisbanetimes.com.au/national/queensland/the-ups-and-downs-of-the-legislative-council-20111010-1lhex.html>

LNP abandons upper house push - October 12, 2011

<https://www.brisbanetimes.com.au/national/queensland/lnp-abandons-upper-house-push-20111010-1lhot.html>

No current government dares to ever raise a voice against central banks and their financial-controlling policy (of purchasing government bonds). Where do they get their money from to purchase these bonds except by creating it out of nothing – thin air. Such is the inordinate financial and political power held by them, of issuing and then underwriting their own credit, having already been surrendered by every nation.

Ukraine's Zelensky has handed over state banks for IMF control here:

<https://richardsonpost.com/howellwoltz/37517/ukraines-zelenskyy-the-worlds-greatest-traitor/>

Confessions of an Economic Hitman by John Perkins is available here:

https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Perkins%20J%20The_Confessions.pdf

However, our Commonwealth Constitution does provide some relief within the

Legislative powers of the Parliament - Sect 51:

...(xiii) Banking, other than State banking; also State banking extending beyond the limits of the State concerned, the incorporation of banks, and the issue of paper money:

Being a layman as I am but having some imagination as to the ramifications of those words ‘other than State banking’, allows my thoughts to identify the separate states as constitutionally able to re-institute (as was) their state banks to provide the necessary financial relief to operate their state budgets debt-free, providing the necessary creation of new credits is processed and spent within the limits of the State boundaries concerned. How fortunate our forebears have already thought this through, to mitigate against further centralising policy emanating from central banks (and being administered by our Commonwealth Parliament and the Canberra located bureaucracy). Much work to do while there is still some daylight.

Further Reading: *Australia's Hydra - Undeclared, One-Sided Civil War Against Itself* By Arnis Luks OT Vol. 56 No. 07 - 28th Feb 2020

Restructuring of Australia By Arnis Luks - NTS Vol 21 No 02 – Feb 2020

What is an Antivaxxer? By Judy Wilyman PhD

An ‘antivaxxer’ is the derogatory word used by the government and medical industry to dismiss people who are critically thinking about the evidence for vaccines. They are people who are interested in seeing the type of evidence that governments are using to make claims of ‘safety, efficacy and necessity’ for each vaccine. Remember, just because you think one vaccine is beneficial doesn’t mean that every marketed vaccine has benefits that outweigh the harm.

Who is doing the risk assessment for each vaccine and the combination of 16+ vaccines in an infant? The pharmaceutical companies that profit from the these vaccines (PhD Ch 6).

The word ‘anti-vaxxer’ is used as a term of ridicule in the media. It is a form of bullying or hate speech, and it is used by the government to incite others against your opinions that are based on researched information. This is done to ostracise you in the community or workplace to prevent others from questioning the government narrative. They are manipulating your behaviour so you believe in vaccines - without viewing any evidence.

The government and powerful medical-industry lobby groups use this term in the media to stop people looking at the evidence (or lack of) supporting government claims about vaccines. They also use the label of ‘conspiracy theorist’ as hate speech to manipulate people’s understanding and use of vaccines.

When society is unable to have open and transparent scrutiny of the evidence in public debates it is no longer science. It becomes propaganda or a form of religion. The government wants you to trust the claims they are making so that you will believe in vaccination and they manipulate your behaviour with propaganda and by calling those that think critically - ‘anti-vaxxers’. This word has been weaponised.

The government’s narrative became a religion when they started vilifying parents/ professionals with name calling to attack their educated arguments three decades ago. Even the official channels for debate, the vaccination conferences, select against our arguments by claiming it is ‘anti-vaccination material’, instead of openly debating the evidence.

In Australia you are vilified if you say that you do not vaccinate. The Liberal government, in 2016, implemented policies in the Social Services Department (not the Health Department), that ensure people lose their jobs, their welfare benefits or are discriminated against in the community, if they have an educated view supported by university research, and do not vaccinate. These policies are being continued by the Labor Party.

So Do Universities Matter?

The New Anti-Vilification Laws in Australia

The Australian government is bringing in new Anti-Vilification laws and the state of Victoria has proposed that the offense of ‘inciting hatred against, serious contempt for, revulsion towards or severe ridicule of a person or group based on protected attributes’, will lead to up to five years in jail. These protected attributes include sex, gender identity, race, religion, sexual characteristics, sexual orientation and disability.

So if the new laws are properly applied anyone denigrating people for their beliefs about vaccines, with inciteful language, such as ‘anti-vaxxer’, will go to jail. In this case universities do matter.

However, if the Anti-Vilification Laws do not include vilification against scientific and political opinions, even when the government promotes these issues in a religious fashion, (that is, with propaganda and without scientific debate), then universities will no longer matter.

Currently, the vilification of professionals and academics with the words ‘anti-vaxxer’, ‘conspiracy theorist’ and many other labels, for example, telling parents to ‘grow a brain’ (WA Premier, Mark McGowan 2021), means that university degrees are worthless.

How is the Australian Prime Minister (or Premier-ed) going to enforce these Anti-Vilification laws with consistency when he and his ministers are using hate speech to create a religious belief, and not educated opinions, about vaccination?

My own journey of investigating vaccines at university for 10 years (2004-2015) demonstrates how degrees no longer matter because journalists, comedians and politicians are permitted to vilify and denigrate academics and professionals when they speak against the government narrative.

In 2004 I began researching the evidence supporting the government's vaccination program. However, when I graduated in 2015 with a Masters of Science Degree (Population Health) and a PhD analysing the evidence underpinning the government's vaccination program, I was not allowed to debate my university research in public forums or national conferences. I was ridiculed by government health officials as an 'antivaxxer' and a 'conspiracy theorist', and powerful industry lobby groups ensured that our events in council venues were cancelled by claiming 'anonymous complaints had been made' and by providing false information about us in the media.

The people who are pro-vaccine are trusting (blind faith) that the government is telling the truth and hence vaccinating has become a religion in our society. My book *Vaccination: Australia's Loss of Health Freedom* is based on my PhD research at Wollongong University and it describes the political strategies that have been used to prevent the public from having a voice in government vaccination policies ever since 1986 when the pharmaceutical companies gained indemnity for any harm that is caused by a drug called a 'vaccine'.

Information Sources: https://judyp.substack.com/p/what-is-an-antivaxxer?publication_id=1731650&post_id=150244940&isFreemail=true&r=1h49yq&triedRedirect=true

Independent MP, Russell Broadbent, interviews Dr. Melissa McCann on the Class Action for thousands of COVID Vaccine Injured. This legal action for compensation is based on exposing the government lies about the safety and efficacy of COVID 'vaccines': <https://www.youtube.com/watch?app=desktop&v=j7PCEaXViHk>

Independent MP, Russell Broadbent, Vows to Revoke the No Jab No Pay No Play Policies (implemented by the Liberal party in 2016) that discriminate against healthy children: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iBvNedT5NKA>

My Interview on *Lies are Unbecoming* discusses the spread of false information by the mainstream media, about my research and reputation, and the control of political information on Wikipedia and other social media platforms by powerful industry lobby groups with vested interests:

https://unbekoming.substack.com/p/interview-with-judy-wilyman-phd?r=3wcfesz&utm_campaign=post&utm_medium=email&triedRedirect=true

A critical analysis of the Australian government's rationale for its vaccination policy University of Wollongong NSW PHD thesis available for download here:

<https://ro.uow.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=5550&context=theses>

"Australia's past is a foreign country" How they wrecked Australia By Will Waite

This week is a follow-up on an article I wrote a couple of weeks ago called *Debt for Consumption*. In that article I explained how, since Douglas' day, the money creation scene has changed significantly. Before about the 1970s the heavy lifting of money creation was done by businesses taking on debt to fund production.

This is not the situation today. At least not in Australia. Rather than money creation coming through debt taken on by businesses producing things, in the last 50 years or so, debt is increasingly being taken on to fund consumption directly. This debt-for-consumption machine turns over in a couple of related ways.

Firstly, the government draws on its powers to tax and increase the national debt, spending money into circulation through infrastructure spending and growing the public service. We've seen plenty of this in the Albanese term. Since June 2022 the public sector has swollen by more than 570,000 positions roughly 320,000 of them in the so-called "care economy."

The second avenue of getting debt-dollars into circulation is through property debt and this has been the heavy lifter over the last couple of decades. This mortgage approach to growing the money supply is at the center of Matt Barrie's recent analysis of why the Australian economy is completely rooted.

Matt Barrie, businessman and tech entrepreneur, is worth listening to because of an unusual willingness to say the quiet part out loud. ¹ In an interview on the Equity Mates Podcast, ² Barrie does an admirable job of laying out the problem for us. He explains how over decades of mismanagement (and sabotage WW) the political class has facilitated the almost complete dismantling of our real productive capacity, except for a few primary industries, mining being one of them. We are, in truth, hardly an advanced economy at all. In its place successive governments have chosen the path, of what he calls "easy, relentless growth." By this he means "pumping the housing market to the mother of all bubbles."

Pumping up bank credit for residential purchases gets the prices up and insane levels of immigration is the strategy for keeping them there. Current levels of migration are completely out of step with historical rates. According to the ABS "In 2022-23, the number of migrant arrivals increased to 737,000, up from 427,000 the year before." ³ Migrants with ready deposits and students with daddy's money promise to keep demand in both sales and rental markets red hot and ensure "young Australians [are] permanently gazumped by new buyers from other countries." ⁴ This is especially true in an income to price environment where just to save a deposit can take twenty to thirty years.

But migration is not the only method for keeping the cash cow of real estate lumbering along. With soft money-laundering laws that don't require buyer identification; ⁵ unchecked bank greed which takes the income of prospective borrowers and just multiplies it by five to calculate borrowing limits; and the superannuation "fly-wheel" that has a percentage of the nation's wage bill routinely invested in bank stocks, with the increased equity going to underwrite more property lending, ⁶ there is no limit to how high property prices can go. Or is there?

Barrie calls inflated real estate prices the "original sin" which is driving costs across the economy. Increased rents, interest rates and mortgage costs must all come out in inflated prices. The RBA gets around this uncomfortable fact by not counting interest rate increases in CPI. ⁷

I realise that many of my readers have heard variations on this theme over and over but there is every reason to believe that this debt-funded fiasco is coming to its logical conclusion. As Barrie says "the Maths just doesn't work." After the exorbitant price of housing and the cost of living there is little left for anything

else. We are already in the worst per capita recession since the depression ⁸ and it is difficult to see how things can go anywhere but backwards — rapidly.

It's impossible to predict what the outcome will be and what sort of shock treatment we are in for. To some extent we are in the middle of it now. These economic settings are causing serious social damage. The last 6 months has seen a record 6600 small businesses fail. ⁹ The National Suicide Prevention Australia community tracker ¹⁰ says that 74% of Australians are feeling “elevated levels of distress beyond normal levels compared with last year.” The top five stressors are:

- Cost of living and personal debt (49%)
- Family and relationship breakdown (24%)
- Housing access and affordability (24%)
- Unemployment and job security (22%)
- Social isolation and loneliness (22%)

Three of five are directly related to our topic.

What is going on here? The Australian project is now firmly in the grip of people who care nothing about the national project called “Australia.” To the monied, international set, national loyalties, laws, culture and values are an obstacle to the profits and access of internationalists in pursuit of a global order. There is simply no value which represents the culture, health, and wellbeing of Australian people in the calculus of bankers, politicians and international bureaucrats.

The truth is that there is an alternative to the decay inherent in a money supply rented from banks, and there will be no lasting solution until we can get some community consensus that a big part of the problem is our failure to confront the monopoly-of-credit.

References:

1 The title is the opening remark from: Barrie, M. 10.18.24. *Put another Aussie on the Barbie*. Available from: https://medium.com/@matt_11659/put-another-aussie-on-the-barbie-f298c21b5bf9

2 Equity Mates Investing Podcast. Expert: Matt Barrie - *Why house prices are the cause of today's cost of living crisis*. Available from Spotify.

3 Australian Bureau of Statistics. 2022-23-financial-year. Overseas Migration, ABS Website, accessed 14 October 2024.

4 Barrie, M. 10.18.24. *Put another Aussie on the Barbie*. Available from: https://medium.com/@matt_11659/put-another-aussie-on-the-barbie-f298c21b5bf9

5 Martini, M. 2017. *Doors Wide Open: Corruption and Real Estate in Four Key Markets*. Transparency International. Available from: <https://www.transparency.org/en/>

6 Barrie, M. 10.18.24. *Put another Aussie on the Barbie*. Available from: https://medium.com/@matt_11659/put-another-aussie-on-the-barbie-f298c21b5bf9

7 Waite, W. 2024. *Why Monetary policy doesn't and can't work for anyone but the banks*. Available from: <https://alternativesx.substack.com/p/why-monetary-policy-doesnt-and-cant>

8 Barrie, M. 10.18.24. *Put another Aussie on the Barbie*. Available from: https://medium.com/@matt_11659/put-another-aussie-on-the-barbie-f298c21b5bf9

9 Chambers, G. 08.10.24. *Small business profit crunch amid record insolvencies surge*. *The Australian*, Available from: <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/nation/politics/small-business-profit-crunch-amid-record-insolvencies-surge/news-story/da8851f14697b4b8a350008007f271de>

10 Suicide Prevention Australia. 10.09.24. *Young Australians struggling as Advice on the National Suicide Prevention Strategy released today*. Available from:

<https://www.suicidepreventionaust.org/young-australians-struggling-as-advice-on-the-national-suicide-prevention-strategy-released-today/>

I Smell Gingerbread By Neville Archibald

Any trip to the woods can be fraught with danger. If you are hiking on a journey in largely unknown territory and you do not stick to the map, the biggest danger is getting lost. Avoiding the snakes, drinking clean water and being careful not to twist your ankle when the going gets rocky is a good start. If the map reader of the group is not competent, or has a secret destination, he or she may misread the signposts or try to convince you that one mountaintop is the same as another. Imagine the group's surprise then, when your long trudge with full backpacks, ends in a clearing and the map reader welcomes you into her gingerbread cottage.

Our journey through this pandemic has been much the same, it is crucial to find the best way forward, charting the dead ends and dangers we have encountered will allow us to make a map which could help us through the next one (for they keep telling us there will be more). In making this map we have to debate the many issues we encountered and while there have been some forums of discussion since the pandemic's beginning, most have been severely restricted in what is allowed to be discussed. The guides or in this case the cartographers pushing for this map have been part of the gingerbread conspiracy, or they have shares in the bakery.

Now, there are many more groups/forums taking place as the haste, due to a sense of urgency, eases off and allows time for considered reflection. People are looking for justification for the restrictions and controls they perceive as having gone too far. These discussions are wide ranging and focus on so many things that it is possible that the true problem will be lost; we will lose sight of the forest for all the trees. Very few of these debates focus solely on the correct question. We need to remember that this whole debacle started somewhere and rapidly led to a world wide implementation of an untested technology. What has been said to be the biggest drug trial in history. It has been done and we can't undo it. The question now is, was it a success? What are the trial results, scientifically considered, double checked, compared to a placebo or control group! Was it worth the pain!

All through this shamaozzle we heard the deafening cries of, "follow the science", the insistence on rigorous double-blind testing for other potentially helpful drugs was demanded. (Hydroxychloroquine, Ivermectin, vitamin D) Well respected and previously safe drugs with a long history of use, suddenly became the target for exemplary trials while the preliminary trials being conducted on the novel new ones were being fudged. Fast forward to the present day and the test results of the world's biggest trial are being found to be so badly lacking in accurate data, that a control group doesn't even exist. The only potential group of people who could be this group, are maligned and condemned as anti-vaxxers or covid deniers. In what scientific reality are these "vaccine safety researchers" living?

Legitimate questions about the true effectiveness, side effects and long term dangers are treated with contempt, scorn and an attitude of disbelief that we can even

consider asking these things. Their novel new mRNA technology didn't have any existing history of use(able) safety data behind it, nor does it seem that they have set in place adequate provision for recording their trial data. A lot of the debate going on is as much about the quality of the data recorded as it is about what was actually recorded. Getting a clear picture of the trial's outcomes is almost impossible, and vague, "it would have been worse without them", declarations ring hollow. The first real question to be asked is whether or not the trial was a success, not how we can do it faster or better next time.

We have seen the push for this truth in many forms, the COVID inquiries that are taking place around the world are opening up debate. The recent Stanford Pandemic Policy Conference, opened with remarks about the disappointment many felt about the shutting down of debate in science during the COVID pandemic. A laudable sentiment. The president of Stanford University, John Levin, said in his introduction that he wished to bring together people with different views to discuss the outcomes of COVID. He was disappointed that even now getting participants to agree to come to the forum was difficult and how the conference was attacked in some media before it even began. After four years, feelings are raw and views are divided, but he expressed the need for Universities to be a model of how to come together and have robust and thoughtful debate, (as they were conceived for) especially if this is what is expected of the students. I am paraphrasing his remarks and I agree with his expressed sentiment, for if we cannot discuss openly the outcomes of actions taken we can never hope to find truth.

"Jay" Bhattacharya, a professor with some forty years at Stanford, who was outspoken through the pandemic, then spoke. Saying that the management of the pandemic was a tragic disaster, he went on to say there was a need to foster dialogue and not to destroy those who disagree with you, that no one has a monopoly on truth. All these opening remarks sound great.

I have watched these sessions, as I have watched many other forums, and have not been entirely comfortable with the discussions. Many who speak believe that the vaccines were a good thing, openly suggesting that in the next pandemic they will be able to develop and roll out new ones, faster. Little comment is made of the actual harms created by these trial vaccines. Little discussion centers around the results of this vaccine trial. It is like they have fully accepted this technology without waiting for the breakdown of the results, without even asking for them. Where are the peer reviews? The whole concept of it being, in effect, a trial is being swept aside and no consideration taken of the damages inflicted by adverse reactions. I guess this is not too surprising to me, since I have found comments of many prominent "alternative researchers" of the pandemic, to be more focused on better methods of implementation of controls, rather than, do we need them? Were they safe? They seem to deny the long term damage and lay much of the ongoing issues people have, at the feet of "long covid". I may be wrong in this assessment, but to me they seem more of apologists for vaccines and rather more critical of the other parts of the

control regime.

The overall feeling I get is one of groups of people trying their best to come out of a bad situation with as little taint as possible. Some are quite open about mistakes made, but seem content to brush them off as being caught unprepared. I find this strange, as most nations had some form of pandemic response policy already in place. The global action of throwing these out the window left a world littered with previous policy as they looked to the WHO and global think tanks to give them advice instead. No boy scouts here!

I wonder if this global regime has set up many of these forums or at least infiltrated them to be the navigator, the guide to direct answers for those who want the excesses of the pandemic controls addressed. By bringing what appears to be both sides of the argument together (even a little biased towards the critical element), they can pretend to look at the problems and derive some solutions. The underlying issue, that of a failed, and dangerous, to my mind, new technology for vaccines, is not really addressed. Did the trial in question create more damage than it did defend? Is it a safe and effective solution going forward? Just saying so, over and over, does not constitute proof. I know many whose lives have been changed forever by severe reactions, and the evidence of long term damage, being touted as “long covid” fits the vaccine reactions better than the disease spread itself.

To my mind, we are looking at a problem similar to that which we saw in the recent floods, where the flood enquiries (I attended one and read others) focused almost exclusively on response and what could be done better next time. There was little focus on why previous flood control strategies were ignored in allowing storages to be so full as to have no ability to act as the buffer they were also designed for. The core problem is not being addressed in either case.

Apart from success or not of the vaccine, the other issues of gain-of-function, or whether science should be dabbling in the weaponization of a virus in the first place, are being virtually ignored. It has been brought up but is still being defended by some as research critical in combating the rise of the deadly new diseases, in some cases it would appear ones they have helped to create. This too becomes a moral issue worthy of open discussion in public and another serious reason to question our leaders intentions.

Free speech and allowing science to be debated was a session in the Stanford forum, where there was a push by one participant for a specific piece of legislation dealing with elements of this. Legislation, ever the answer of the bureaucrat, is restrictive in nature and not something that is needed in free speech. Underlying these comments was the desire of most participants to re-establish trust in the medical system and public health in general. It was admitted that this had taken a beating, dropping in the USA to only 30% confidence now. The biggest reason for this, seemed to be the insistence that, in the next pandemic (and all seemed to agree it was going to happen) it will be crucial for us, the public, to have trust that what is proposed is going to be good for us. i.e. more rapidly developed mRNA vaccines.

“Oh yes we did things wrong, we realise this, but we can now do it better and roll out injections faster and without any testing really needed,” at least that is my impression of the way many of the participants spoke. Not everyone mind you, but most appeared to have one foot in the accepted narrative to retain the confidence in what I see as a dangerous new conclusion, that we will become pincushions for under-tested and dubious value drugs when there is a whiff of possible virus in the air.

I look at the continued scare mongering going on with bird flu and other animal diseases that they keep flogging us with, and wonder just how far they will go to implement these things. There are mRNA factories being built to produce designer vaccines for everything and mandatory use on farm animals is currently under discussion. Do we really want widespread use of this technology in our foods while we are still waiting for proof that it actually worked, or proof that it did no long term damage? With the lack of proper safety data and no real long term overview, this rush to make more is beyond reckless in my view. If the complete over-reaction and wiping out of huge numbers of animals that goes along with this disease control ideology, is indicative of their thinking, I hate to think how some of these people view us poor plebs.

The real issue at hand is not the pandemic preparedness and response they seem to believe they need to tweak, but the catastrophic damage inflicted on a world population with the roll-out we have just been through. The dust has yet to settle and the accounting not even started, and they are (already) looking towards how to do the next one better. There does not seem to be any real analysis of the effectiveness or otherwise of the vaccine, let alone any remote indication that the excessive deaths from side effects is anything other than normal. In a post pandemic world, where the sick and elderly have been thinned out already, the excess death figures should drop below expected norms for several years following. This has not happened and in fact the deaths from “turbo” cancers, heart attacks in the younger age groups, and strange calamari like clots in the circulatory system, noticed by many embalmers around the world, are being quietly swept under the rug. In a previous time these things would have raised considerable concern and much investigation. The fact it has not, only reinforces my view that there is more to come and they do not want us to realise just what it is they are up to. Mistakes can be made and people often try to cover their tracks, but the magnitude and vehemence with which they defend their actions and promise to repeat them is the biggest admission of guilt yet.

"Jay" Bhattacharya seems to be one of the key figures involved in bringing the Stanford group together and in that aspect he has done well to get them. Maybe his real view of the mRNA vaccines is kept quiet to so as not to scare anyone away. Or perhaps he has not had the chance to look at the true death or disablement figures arising from the vaccine use. If he has not compared those with the true Covid death figures, then maybe it looks better to him than the many others doing the leg work to find the real truth.

The actual death tolls from Covid, are inclusive in many cases, of people who died without any proper identification of actual cause. Excess death figures for many countries show no real rise in deaths before vaccine introduction, something that should have spiked early, given all the hype; with footage of people dropping like flies before-hand, the insistence on how deadly it was supposed to be being spouted at every turn. These excess deaths, according to actuary observers (insurance actuaries keep a close eye on these things), only started to rise dramatically after the roll out of the vaccines. The narrative tries to cover itself here by blaming the rise of variants. This again leads to something that goes against standard practice, that of a vaccine of different variants. Each year flu vaccines are supposedly ineffective or not as effective as they thought due to a different strain of flu occurring than that predicted. Never once did the variant difference seem to concern the push for more jabs, the same original variety was used. Now perhaps this new technology eliminates this problem, but the conversation around the vaccines inability to stop infection, often included this uncertainty as to it's value for each variant, but the push still went on. Rising deaths and adverse reactions were gas-lighted and kept quiet for the most part, the word 'rare' developed a new meaning and the fight for recognition still goes on today.

As for the rapid spread, the instance of faulty testing with a reliance on a not fit for purpose PCR test, whose inventor came out early in the piece and declared just that, that they were abusing the test's parameters to find something that couldn't really be said to be there. Standard medical diagnosis went out the window and asymptomatic disease became the flavour of the day. In many cases simple symptoms or no symptoms at all, just a positive test result became the virulent disease running amok. The absence of colds, flu and other similar outbreaks for that whole period is something that stands out as remarkable. Never before has the incidence of these diseases dropped so completely off the radar. I smell a fish market here, does gingerbread go off?

A thorough investigation into all these anomalies must take place and the truth of the world-wide response must come out. Far too many died of things other than the supposed pandemic for it to be otherwise. People were actively suppressing legitimate questions from day one. If ever there was a case for calling something a conspiracy, it was this whole sorry mess. Many of the behind the scenes players (and many of those out front) have a global agenda, have an admitted depopulation desire and a bent for instituting controls over populations for a "better world". It is no small wonder that confidence in the establishment is so low. What more do you need to see?

There is the smell of gingerbread on the breeze and the trees are thick here, but I see a faint path and a few people who, like me, are all for escaping the fumes. I can pick the guides I wish to follow, their maps are not upside down.

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.

"All that is necessary
for the triumph of
evil is that good
men do nothing . . ."
— EDMUND BURKE.



THE NEW TIMES SURVEY

THE AUSTRALIAN

LEAGUE OF RIGHTS

Vol. 25 No. 10

October 2024

IN THIS ISSUE

Some Critical Comments Re: "The Money Myth Exploded" – Otherwise known as "Salvation Island" By M. Oliver Heydorn	68
Reconstruction By CH Douglas	73

Some Critical Comments Re: "The Money Myth Exploded" – Otherwise known as "Salvation Island" By M. Oliver Heydorn

One of the first attempts by Louis Even to explain the Douglas Social Credit analysis and remedial proposals was written in the mid 1930's and is known as "*L'Île des Naufragés*" or "*Island of the Shipwrecked*". It is, in essence, a fable that is intended to explain in an easy to understand format the basics of the Social Credit message to the newcomer. The Pilgrims of Saint Michael, a Catholic organisation that Louis Even had established and which has been promoting Douglas Social Credit for many decades now, continues to employ this story to this day in their promotional materials under the names of "The Money Myth Exploded" and/or "Salvation Island":

<https://www.michaeljournal.org/articles/social-credit/item/the-money-myth-exploded>.

It was indeed through the efforts of the Pilgrims that I first became properly aware of Douglas Social Credit in the early 2000's and "The Money Myth Exploded" was one of the first documents which I had read. For their zeal and dedication, I am eternally grateful, but my further in-depth studies of the Social Credit doctrine accomplished in the intervening years have now obliged me to provide the following caveats. Whatever its merits, and there are many, a too literal or out of context reading of "*The Money Myth Exploded*" can lead the reader to some erroneous and seriously misleading conclusions. It is therefore necessary to explain what these are in some detail so that any such deviations can be scrupulously avoided.

What the Story Gets Right:

Before proceeding to the critique, however, it will be instructive to emphasize the key points which the fable gets right.

1. Yes, the private banks do create the bulk of the money supply in the form of bank credit and inject it into the economy whenever they make a loan or other purchase.

2. And yes, it is the real wealth of the community (which is owned by the citizens) which allow the banks to create this money. That is, the real wealth of the community (and not gold, as was alleged during the days of the gold standard) is the ultimate asset which backs or gives value to the money that the banks create. Without these goods and services, or the raw capacity to produce them, all of the gold, or any other conceivable forms of money present in the universe, are of no value whatsoever.
3. To further complicate matters, it is also true that the banks do make an implicit claim that the money that they create is their money (even though the real wealth over and against which they create this money is not theirs) because they expect the money they create to be paid back or otherwise returned to them.
4. It is indeed obviously true that the banks do charge interest on these loans and various service fees for this and their other services, that these fees can be, and often are, exorbitant, and that failure to pay debt and interest can lead to the confiscation of the collateral that was put up as a guarantee for the loan.
5. It is likewise true that all loans cannot be paid back in the aggregate, but not for the reason that is cited (i.e., the charging of interest) ... more on this later.
6. It is correct that real wealth consists in goods and services that answer to human needs: food, clothing, shelter, etc. Real wealth is not gold or paper money, or any kind of money at all. Money is, or should be, just a token, a representation of real wealth.
7. It is true that if there is insufficient money to catalyze production, a country's economy will be paralyzed to the extent that money is lacking, as was notably the case during the Great Depression.
8. In general, it is incontrovertibly correct to assert that the money system that is set up in any nation should serve the inhabitants of that nation on an equitable basis and not the interests of an oligarchic plutocracy at the expense of the common good. It is also the case that, while Douglas Social Credit would embody the ideal of the former arrangement, the current financial system reigning the world over is an exemplification of the latter category. There is a need for a new National Monetary Policy that would put the interests of the general community first and not those of bankers.
9. The political implications of the fable are also incontestable: whoever controls the money system must control the economy, the nation, the world, etc. Given the way our civilization is currently structured, i.e., its dependence on a fundamentally dishonest and dysfunctional (but wealth & power-centralizing) financial system, the Money Power must be the Supreme Authority. We run our economies, in the first place, to serve the overriding interests of financiers and under the conditions they deem appropriate (for themselves).

To maintain that control, control of information, of the media, is vital. This political control of information is used to keep people in ignorance, to discredit legitimate criticism, to prevent it from arriving in the first place, and to distract people's attention from the real issues. One particularly effective method of achieving this latter aim is to use propaganda, i.e., publicity, to divide the population into two or more warring camps on the basis of some false dichotomy: "Liberals vs. 'Conservatives'" in Canada or "Republicans vs Democrats" in the USA is a prime example ... ditto 'capitalism' vs. 'socialism', 'libertarianism' vs. 'authoritarianism' and so forth. Each faction has its own newspapers, TV channels, internet influencers, and so on. This also prevents the people from ever uniting around the real issues and exerting effective, intelligent pressure on the existing authorities to resolve problems in favour of the common interest. The possession and control of money affords all the sanctions necessary to take control of the media and to (mis)direct the factions vying ostensibly for power in the conventional political landscape.

10. It is true that, because of the problems with the existing monetary system, taxes are high and this creates conflict between those who pay the most compared with those who paid less and whose incomes or other benefits are subsidized by the richer. In the same manner, people under the pressure of high taxation look for ways to compensate for their losses by raising prices, exploiting workers, etc. The effect of this on the general morale of a nation is to lower it substantially, with people blaming others, their poor work ethic, or alleged lack of virtue, etc., for the problems that the money system is, in fact, causing. The system tends to bring out the worst in human nature and this has a tendency to ruin the harmony and progress that would otherwise characterize community life.

11. Under the debt-money only paradigm, it is also the case that the richer a country becomes in material terms, i.e., the more it develops its productive capacity and seeks to make use of it, the more indebted it tends to become. The real reasons for this are not so clear in the story, but this will be discussed later. For now let it be stressed that this is a curious state of affairs. It is as if a nation is punished under the existing system in debt terms for its success in terms of real economic development. The total societal debts, including the national debt, are indeed unpayable in the aggregate under the existing system and the grand totals tend to increase exponentially over time.

12. Finally, money is, or should be, just a form of accountancy that represents a) the real capacity to produce goods and services and b) the flow of real wealth in the form of goods and services. Douglas Social Credit merely insists that this system of accountancy should be so structured and should so function that it would provide an accurate reflection of these realities. In other words, it should be an honest system of accounting. If production increases, the volume of money available in the form of consumer income should also increase accordingly.

What The Story Gets Wrong:

Whatever its merits, and there are many, there are four fundamental flaws which characterize the “Salvation Island” story if any attempt is made to apply the story to the economy as a whole. There is a sort of fallacy of composition at play. What may have been true of the Island under the terms or conditions stipulated by the story is not an accurate description of what is actually occurring in any established conventional economy.

Firstly, contrary to what the fable might suggest, the charging of interest is not the main cause of the price-income gap in the economy and, in fact, it does not contribute to the gap in the way that the story suggests. Rather, whatever contribution interest does make to the gap is indistinguishable from the contributions that are made by any profit-making enterprise.

Allow me to explain ... in section 9 of the story we read the following: “ ‘Can the population of the island taken as a whole’ he mused, ‘meet its obligations? Oliver issued a total of \$1000. He’s asking \$1080 in return. But even if we were to bring him every dollar bill on the island, we would still be \$80 short’ ”. ¹ This may be a valid concern within the context of the story, if we assume that Oliver never spends any of the interest he receives, in an attempt, I suppose to bankrupt someone and seize their property. But this debt-virus hypothesis is not an accurate representation of how things work in the real world. In the real world, banks spend money into existence (which they create) every time they pay their own operating expenses. This money finds its way into the community via the wages and salaries of bank employees and contractors. This consumer income can thereby help to offset the interest charges and other fees that banks levy on loans and their other services. Beyond that, a certain proportion of the profit which banks make is also returned to the community via the distribution of dividends or employee bonuses, etc. We are not now dealing with the equity of this arrangement in terms of income distribution or whether, to what extent, or under which conditions, bank profits are ethically legitimate. We are simply emphasizing the fact that the bank is distributing money to offset some significant proportion of its costs and so the gap that is caused by interest is really only that proportion that is undistributed profit.

Secondly, the main cause behind the price-income gap, as per the Douglas analysis, is entirely ignored by the story. The gap exists in the first place due to the presence of real capital in the production process and the charges that are levied in its name under existing cost accountancy conventions. The creation of money as debt is, apart from any question of interest, only a problem because the cycle of debt-creation and its re-imburement is out of sync (it occurs in a shorter period of time) as compared with the cycle of price-generation and the subsequent price-liquidation. For every 100 dollars, let us say, that is being created by a bank, lent to a

productive agency, and then returned to the bank via other companies or individuals in payment to cover various production costs, only a proportion, say 60 dollars is being distributed in the form of wages, salaries, and dividends. It is the presence of these capital charges (for depreciation, maintenance, capital loan repayments) which generate costs and prices without, simultaneously, in the same period of time, distributing consumer incomes with which those costs and prices could be met. It is the costing of real capital, in other words, which delinks the two accountancy cycles by generating the gap in the rate of price generation vs. income distribution.

The basic flaw in the current financial system is therefore technical in nature. It is this technical problem which makes the debt-only paradigm an inappropriate ‘software’ programme for running the economy. The system creates debts that are in excess of existing consumer credits to liquidate that debt, but the only solution it can offer is to fill that gap with more debt-money borrowed into existence from itself. But this does not liquidate any costs once and for all; it merely transfers them. It replaces one debt with another. Naturally it is impossible to borrow yourself out of debt. The unrepayable mountain of ever-increasing debt thus emerges as a result of the attempt to fill the price-income gap with debt-money and not from the charging of interest as the story suggests.

Thirdly, while the accounting system introduced in section 17 may be entirely appropriate for a small community of people who are trading their production with one another, it is not an accurate model of how a Douglas Social Credit system would work on the level of the society as a whole. Most production in the modern economy is not individual production but group production involving multiple stages and entities, suppliers, etc. Thus, we need a money system that will allow all of us, including those who do not work, the ability to draw on the central pool of wealth and to arrange for the transfer of raw materials, intermediate products from one firm to another.

Furthermore, because we are dealing with large units and not individuals who know each other, it is entirely appropriate that the discipline of debt be employed in the case of money that is advanced for production. This will help to ensure that money and resources are not wasted on things consumers do not wish to purchase. The use of debt-money for production (and production only) is also one of the key ingredients that generates the price-income gap and thus allows for us to fill it with debt-free consumer credits in the form of the dividend and the discount. Eliminate the use of debt entirely and you eliminate part of the gap. Eliminate part of the gap and we cannot create as much money in the form of a National Dividend or National Discounts to fill the gap.

Contrary to what the accounting model presented in section 17 suggests, the money supply in a Douglas Social Credit system is, generally speaking, not permanent but temporary. Money is created and advanced for production. Some of it is transformed into consumer incomes, and some of it into business revenue. When spent in conjunction with the newly created debt-free dividends and discounts, the consumer income is destroyed in the repayment of producer loans at the retail stage.

The business revenue is destroyed directly or indirectly (through investments) in the repayment of capital loans or lines of credit or is used to restore working capital. Thus the Douglas Social Credit monetary system is debt-free only in an analogous sense. Debt is still employed for the purposes of production, but all production debts can be fully liquidated with an adequate flow of consumer purchasing power, thus debts are dynamically liquidated without requiring the contracting of additional debt to fill the price-income gap (is the case at present).

Now, perhaps the potentially most scandalizing correction has to do with a statement made in section 16 “A Priceless Bit of Information”, where we read: “Never at any time should interest be paid on new money”. To my knowledge, Douglas never actually stipulated that interest would not be levied on production loans in a Douglas Social Credit system. Certainly, as there would be no more need for compensatory public, business, or consumer debts involving the creation of new money to fill the price-income gap, no compound interest could ever be levied on those debts. This would reduce the interest burden considerably. However, banks would still have to charge clients fees in one form or another in order to cover their costs and, if they serve the public well under a new National Monetary Policy, to make a reasonable profit. There is no reason, apart from aesthetics or friendly public relations perhaps, that these fees could not take the form of simple interest (compound interest is admittedly problematic). ***

1. One of the most unfortunate aspects of “*The Money Myth Exploded*”, however – at least from the point of view of the present author – is that the name of the exploitative banker is Oliver. I am happy to report that his name was not “Olivier” in the original French version, but was “Martin” instead.

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: hub@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.**

Reconstruction by C. H. Douglas 1991

Introduction to the 1991 edition

The Social Credit Secretariat in Australasia presents to its readers almost sixty years after it first appeared in the Glasgow Evening Times, a reprint of three articles written by C. H. Douglas. It is considered as an opportunity to counter the many confusing claims of experts on why we have the depression a Commonwealth Treasurer told us we had to have. Who 'we' are and why it was necessary was not revealed.

The impossibility of such a series of articles as those written by C. H. Douglas being published in a daily newspaper today is an indication of the grip international finance holds on the public media.

In the almost sixty years since 1932, as the world moves steadily towards the complete monopoly of credit and news, the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank have been established to control and distribute debt to all countries, while the Reserve Banking System ensures local obedience in all countries where it has been established. At the same time the United Nations Organisation promulgates regulations covering all aspects of living, except finance, which are binding on all members who ratify the all-embracing charters issued by that body. Meanwhile the final steps in the path to World Dominion, a proposed International Trade Organisation waits in the wings to follow G.A.T.T. when the present round of talks most likely ends in indecision and recriminations.

The widest possible distribution of RECONSTRUCTION should be attempted in the hope that confusion concerning the financial dilemma present in Governments and businesses may be clarified and a realistic solution accepted.

RECONSTRUCTION - 1943

The three articles here reprinted from *The Evening Times*, Glasgow, appeared in that newspaper on the 6th, 13th and 27th May 1932, as a sequel to publication by the same journal of an article, also by Major Douglas, outlining a plan for the application to Scotland of the credit scheme which he has put forward as a means of social reconstruction.

While the '*Social Credit Scheme for Scotland*' is still available for those who are both willing to study its provisions and able to assess their practical social and economic consequences, it has become very markedly apparent since 1932 that it is not the absence of a plan that inhibits the carrying into effect of technical measures adapted to the reconstruction of social life on lines capable of leading to general satisfaction. Power to execute plans of any description, designed to implement any policy, is monopolized by a small minority of individuals, of all countries or of none, not inaccurately identified as those in control of International Finance.

During the present phase of the world war, this fact has become plain to many, if not the majority, of intelligent newspaper readers, who are still, nevertheless, confused concerning what are the relevant economic facts of the present world situation, and thus fall an easy prey to planners whose objectives are hidden, to every eye but the expert's, under a disguise of pleasant appearing devices propagandised at immense expense in terms of current abstractionism. e.g. the 'Four Freedoms' of Mr. Roosevelt and the single 'Freedom from Want' of Sir William Beveridge. The disposition of the public to 'fall for' vast schemes, emanating, without any doubt, from a single centralised source, and obviously requiring for their imposition the further expansion of the gigantic wartime bureaucracy, has been noticeably corrected by that same public's growing resolution to free itself from the menacing grasp of this monster if it can, and as soon as it can.

In consequence, a lusty crop of subtler devices to trap the elector may be expected within a very short time, and, indeed, organisations are already appearing, bearing obvious signs of attention to the recommendations of Major Douglas and his followers concerning the correct lines along which to work to obtain results. Of these some can be distinguished as unsound only by close inspection of the histories and affiliations of the individuals promoting them. Their true character remains to be revealed when enthusiasm for their supposed objectives has risen to such a point as heavily to discount any revelations of the kind.

Unsteadied, the public mind swings from one error of judgment to its opposite. The remedy, if there is a remedy, obviously lies in proceeding steadily to inform the public along as many lines as possible at once, with due regard to the greatest danger of the moment. At the present moment, a great, if not the greatest danger is that the root facts of our situation may be lost sight of. The articles of 1932 go far to make these clear to the widest circle of readers, and, not unnecessarily to limit this appeal, a specific reference to the Scheme for Scotland introducing the original articles has been removed. There has been no further alteration.

References to the glut of produced goods, even now only partially in suspense, have been retained. 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.

References to time present, while they are in all cases references to 1932, are relevant to 1943, a circumstance which in itself reveals how little the realities underlying world events have changed even in these years of change usually dubbed momentous, and the exceptional power of the author to penetrate to their real meaning.

RECONSTRUCTION 1932 By CH Douglas

CAN WE HAVE TOO MUCH WEALTH?

Now I suppose no one would suggest that, even at the present time, there is any serious shortage of actually existing consumable goods - that is to say, food, clothing, and, with certain reservations, shelter from the weather. I have never met a tradesman even yet (although I may if the present situation persists) who complained that his difficulty was that he could not get delivery of the goods on order.

His complaint is always that he cannot sell, certainly not at a profitable price. So that it is quite certain that if the general population had more purchasing power they would get more goods than at the present time, even if no more goods were produced. That is to say, there is an actual surplus of consumable goods at the present time, quite a considerable amount of which surplus goods are wasted, or sold at a loss to the producer.

IMMENSE SOURCES OF REAL WEALTH

But having said this, we have only touched the fringe of the situation. For every loaf which is baked, and for every suit of clothes which is made, there probably exists the potential capacity, even at the present time, to produce three or four times as much, even without the installation of fresh machinery. So that behind the actual surplus of existing consumable goods there is a surplus (in some cases such as let us say, that of shipbuilding and machinery making, a colossal surplus) of unused potential products. But even this is not all.

Behind the unused surplus of existing consumable goods and the unused potentialities of existing productive capacity there lies a huge undeveloped capacity to extend our productive capacity. If anyone doubts that, let them consider the immense destruction of productive capacity which has been systematically carried out in this country since the war by the breakup of industrial undertakings and the decadence of industry. It is probable that the productive capacity of Great Britain has been cut in half since 1920 by the deliberate policy of sabotage pursued by the Bank of England, and it would have been still further decreased had not inventive capacity, organisation and engineering skill still further improved and increased the output per manhour of labour employed.

So that there are three planes upon which it is true to say we possess immense undrawn-upon sources of real wealth.

THE 'SCARCITY COMPLEX'

Now the first trap into which we are likely to fall in considering this matter is, in my opinion, not so much as to whether we have at our disposal the means to become

materially wealthy, because I believe that anyone who will regard the matter without prejudice along the lines that I have just indicated can have no doubt as to the truth of that suggestion. It is to what extent, and for what fundamental purpose, we wish to draw upon the capacity.

Remember that, thanks to the illusion that a scarcity of money is the same thing as a scarcity of wealth, we are nearly all of us under the spell of what the psychologists call a 'scarcity complex'. We cannot believe that it is possible to have too much wealth of a material kind.

But it is easily possible to have too much wealth. We could, for instance, no doubt enormously increase the industrial capital value of Scotland by developing every waterfall and every salmon river into a water power for hydroelectric purposes, but I think myself that that would be a sad day for Scotland. We could each and all of us have a powerful loudspeaker in every room, but I hope we never shall.

So that we have to be very careful to see that we run our productive system for the purpose of supplying all the tangible wealth that we can, as individuals, use with profit to ourselves, and do not, as at the present time, allow it to be run for a number of ulterior purposes amongst which we might instance that of a moral discipline, a hidden government, or a system of rewards and punishments.

THE MONEY-PRODUCING SYSTEM

Now it must be plain, from the co-existence in the world at the present time of material poverty, economic friction, a struggle for markets and other scarcity phenomena on the one hand, and the real and potential wealth I have just indicated above on the other hand - first, that money does not represent wealth, because there is a scarcity of money and there is not a scarcity of wealth; and, secondly, that our primary concern is not with the wealth-producing system but with the money-producing system.

Or to put the matter another way, it seems very difficult to deny that the first problem in dealing with the situation is to make finance, or the money system, reflect facts and to cease to let it control them.

The facts, as we have seen or can ascertain, are that a given amount of material wealth can be produced with a diminishing amount of human labour, but that when this wealth has been so produced the general public cannot buy it because it has not enough money. Since probably well over 85 percent of the money which is distributed in industry is distributed in wages and salaries, it is easy enough to see that the problem of the mere distribution of purchasing power through the agency of wages and salaries (as apart from its total amount) becomes increasingly difficult as we get more and more production with the aid of less and less labour.

MONEY AND PRICES

But we also find that apart from this question of the distribution of purchasing power there is not enough purchasing power distributed to buy the goods which are for sale if the production of these goods has been financed by ordinary methods. There are many contributory causes to this situation, but it is probable that the main cause is due to the reappearance in prices of the same sum of money several times, a state of affairs which is rendered possible by the splitting up of production into a large number of processes.

If each one of these processes was financed by a fresh creation of money, which money remained in circulation until the goods in respect of which it was distributed were finally destroyed (which is far from the actual case), this situation would not arise. But, unfortunately, even then we should be subject to other technical difficulties connected with what is called the 'quantity theory' of money, which would result in prices rising very considerably above costs where the public had sufficient money to pay these increased prices, thus robbing every wage-earner of part of the value of his wages. In other words, a large additional issue of money by existing methods would tend to produce the phenomena of what is called 'inflation'. Many banking authorities, having for years quite incorrectly described my own proposals as 'disguised inflation', are now calling for undisguised inflation and a rise in prices. So that we have to find some method of issuing the money in such a way that it does not cause a rise in prices.

II

THE CASE FOR THE SOCIAL DIVIDEND

It has frequently been stated that it is impossible to issue money in such a manner as to cause a reduction in prices. Perhaps the shortest answer to this is that it is being done all over this and many other countries at the present time. If I, having a capital of a million pounds manufacture an article of which the cost of manufacture is £5, and by reason of bad business methods, economic depression, or other causes, am forced to sell the article for £4, I am applying my private store of credit, which I call my capital of a million pounds, as a subsidy in aid of a reduction of price to the extent of 20 percent, and I can go on doing it until I have sold a million articles at a pound below cost. And I can continue to do it if my bank will give me an overdraft.

So, to put the matter another way, it is always possible to arrange that the price of an article can be paid for from two sources, one source being the person who buys the article, and the second source the person who sells it, if he sells it below the cost to him. Now, if we imagine the general credit of the country (which is the source from which the banks provide overdrafts) to be substituted for the private credit of

the individual, the question as to whether we can, at one and the same time, issue credit and lower prices is obviously only limited by the question of the quantity of credit we can issue.

BANK CONTROL OF CREDIT

We know quite well that the mechanism for expanding credit to a very large extent exists at the present time, but we also know that this mechanism is at the present time controlled by the banking system, that every grant of a loan by a bank creates a deposit (or an expansion of credit), and every repayment of a loan destroys a deposit.

Also every purchase of a security by a bank expands credit. That is the same thing as saying that when a bank buys shares or War Loan it gets them for nothing, since the payment is made by drawing a cheque upon itself. With certain reservations it is quite obvious that a bank will not dishonour a cheque signed by itself. When this cheque is paid into some other bank again it creates an increase in deposits, which is again an expansion of credit.

The same thing is true of the purchase of gold by the Bank of England, which is merely paid for by a draft upon the credit of the bank, the real value of this credit being dependent on the willingness of the British community to supply goods and services in return for the credit and not upon any tangible value owned by the bank which is handed over in exchange for the gold.

But the question will obviously arise in the mind of the reader as to the limits to which this expansion of credit, under proper conditions, can be carried. He may say reasonably that there must be some limit to the creation of money, and he would be quite right. What is that limit?

DYNAMIC ECONOMIC SYSTEM

Now at this point we approach a somewhat more difficult aspect of the subject, because the economic system is not static, it is dynamic. Production and wealth and consumption can only properly be measured in rates. If we attempt to look at the matter from a static point of view we are sure to make the mistake which formed the starting point of the story regarding the committee of 'scientists' who, it is said, were asked to report upon the nature of the hum in a 'humming top'. Their report was that the whole subject was nonsense, as they had taken the top carefully to pieces and were able to report that there was absolutely no sign of the existence of any hum!

If we grasp this idea, we shall not find it difficult to accept the statement that the wealth of a country, and therefore the basis of its financial credit, is not so much in the things that it actually possesses as in the rate at which it can produce them. Now, the rate at which it can produce them is a composite thing, because side by

side with production we always have consumption, so that we can say that the net rate of production is the gross rate of production minus the rate of consumption, and it is also possible to say that the absolute cost of all consumption is the rate of consumption divided by the rate of production.

INTERESTING STAGE

We are now getting to a very interesting stage, because it is only a step further to say that if we issue money at a rate corresponding to the rate of production we ought not to take it back at the same rate (which is what we do at the present time when we charge all costs into prices), but we only ought to take it back at the rate of consumption, which results in the startling conclusion that we ought to charge less than cost for articles sold, even if the rate of consumption as compared with the rate of production remains constant.

But we know that it does not remain constant. Every improvement of process, machines, and the application of power to industry increases the rate of production without necessarily increasing the rate of consumption, so that not only ought we to have prices of goods below cost, but we ought to have them decreasing in relation to cost.

At that the rate at which we can issue additional credit is easily seen to be dependent upon the rate of increase of productive capacity, while the rate at which we take back existing credit and the new credit should be dependent upon the rate of consumption.

USE OF PURCHASING POWER

So much for general principles by which it is possible to issue additional purchasing power, while at the same time allowing prices to fall. What shall we do with this additional purchasing power? Obviously there are two things to be done with it. First of all we have to make up the loss to the producer which he would incur by selling his product below cost and to allow him a reasonable remuneration in the form of profit. But we shall, I think, find that we have to do more than this, bearing in mind that every improvement of process for a given level of consumption means the displacement of labour. Leaving all humanitarian principles out of consideration, it is not sensible to produce more goods with a decreasing number of individuals employed, unless we make provision that the increasing amount of goods is consumed. So that we have to find a method of providing what we call 'purchasing power', so that those individuals displaced may get the goods which they are not required to produce, and I think there is no doubt that the conception of the dividend provides a perfect mechanism for this.

NECESSITY FOR DIVIDEND SYSTEM

If anyone doubts the necessity for the dividend system in addition to the wage and salary system, they will, no doubt, have a perfect explanation for the fact that as

a result of the failure of many industrial concerns to pay a dividend during the past few years purchases of consumable goods of various kinds have declined to such an extent that unemployment has increased, and the amount distributed in wages and dividends has consequently decreased. So to put the matter another way, it has been demonstrated, in my opinion quite beyond contradiction, that you cannot keep the modern productive system even moderately busy unless you have an increasing number of people who are not employed in it, but are using its products.

That is the justification for the social dividend. If I have made myself clear it will be seen both that it is required, and can be provided, by methods which are fully understood at the present time.

III

THE MONOPOLY OF CREDIT

To realise the nature of the powers conferred upon the holders of the monopoly of credit is to realise at once that, human nature being what it is, any suggestion designed to release the man in the street from the power of this monopoly is certain to be actively, if not openly, resisted. The monopoly is in itself so indefensible, however, on the grounds of reason or equity that a realisation of its nature is quite sufficient to induce the banker (who in many cases is a thoroughly well-meaning member of society) to admit in private that it cannot continue.

At the current meeting of the Scottish Bankers' Association a resolution was carried instructing the committee to consider the terms which bankers should ask on being confronted with nationalisation, it being considered that this was bound to come. If for the word 'nationalisation' the phrase 'socialisation of credit' were substituted I should agree.

TYPES OF CRITICISM

The criticism to which schemes designed to effect the socialisation of credit (by which is meant its distribution to individuals as distinct from its monopoly by bankers) are subjected can in general be separated into three classes. The first type is anonymous, frequently disingenuous, and, in the main, relies upon an attempt to make the subject ridiculous rather than an appeal to reason. From its nature, and probable origin, there is not very much to be said about it.

The second type of criticism arises in the main from a complete or partial failure to understand the existing financial system, and a quite natural tendency to disbelieve that the extraordinary state of affairs which does, in fact, exist has not been exaggerated by its critics. An exhortation to further study seems to be the only

reply to this class of objector.

The third type of criticism is in general based on a failure to appreciate the physical possibilities of the modern economic system as distinct from its financial features. Related to this latter class are most of the serious criticisms which have been advanced against the Scottish scheme of reconstruction, which appeared in the pages of *The Evening Times* of 11th March. One correspondent based his criticism on a suggestion that the Scottish capital account could not be properly constructed so that a 1% dividend upon it would provide the national dividend mentioned in that scheme.

CAPITAL VALUES

Now, I confess that the first clause of that scheme was specifically drafted to induce exactly that criticism. There are many ways of arriving at capital values, and fundamentally there is very little doubt that the correct method of arriving at the capital value of any property is not so much what it cost to produce as the increased production which results from it. We are accustomed to measure production in monetary values, but if the dependence of monetary values upon monetary policy is understood, there is no difficulty in grasping how illusive is such a method.

If I have a shipbuilding plant which cost one million pounds to build, and it is making a loss of £100,000 per annum, I may value the plant at one million pounds, but it is certain that nobody else will. On the other hand, if by a change in monetary policy consequent, let us say, on the outbreak of another war, I am able to make an annual profit of £200,000 instead of a loss of £100,000 it is quite possible that numbers of people will agree that my plant is now worth two million pounds.

Now, the figures of the value of real assets are consistently written down as a result of the operation of a number of factors, none of which are realistic and all of which are financial. In the first place, rating values are based not on what a property cost but what it will let for, the owner doing the repairs. Further, at the instance of banks and insurance companies, there is a tendency to depress capital values of real assets so as to increase the amount of collateral security which has to be provided by an applicant for a mortgage, which is another way of saying that the maximum amount of property passes into the hands of the financial system if or when the mortgage is foreclosed. Much the same forces are at work to ensure that real property and plant is held on the books of financial organisations or even big industrial concerns at figures much below its real value for productive purposes. It is probable to take one instance only, that the buildings belonging to the five great groups of banks and their associated insurance companies are shown upon the books of those institutions at not more than one tenth of their value.

So that in estimating the capital values of the assets of, let us say, Scotland, there

are two main ideas to be borne in mind. In the first place, these values have been consistently written down for reasons which are not physical but are financial. And in the second place, their earning power is conditioned not by their physical utility but by financial policy, which again produces an illusion of diminished assets.

SIMPLE QUESTION

So that we really come back to the problem of giving an answer to a very simple question. Suppose we give, as an initial step, the additional income mentioned in the Scottish scheme to all families entitled to receive it, and suppose that they spend it in buying goods at the reduced prices which would be provided for everyone by that scheme, could those goods be produced? I have no doubt whatever that they could and, if space allowed, I do not think I should have very much difficulty in proving that statement conclusively.

But what is quite indisputable, I think, by everyone is that more goods could be produced than are produced at the present time.

Is there any sane person who does not want to produce more goods than are produced now? Certainly it is not the farmer nor the manufacturer, always supposing they can get remunerative prices. Certainly it is not the large bodies of unemployed who, if we believe what they themselves say, are anxious and willing to return to work on any reasonable terms. Certainly it is not the shareholders in those companies whose reduction in turnover is the direct cause of their failure to pay dividends. Certainly it is not the large landowner, whose land by means of penal taxation is being appropriated, not for the profit of the man in the street, but for the benefit of financial institutions who are coming into possession of all those parts of it which are valuable enough to sustain a mortgage.

ONLY ONE CURE

With the best will in the world to find a more complicated explanation of an extremely complicated world situation, I find it impossible to arrive at any conclusion other than that I endeavoured to put before my kindly Scots audience at St. Andrew's Hall, and that is that the main cause of the world's economic difficulties at the present time is the same in every country, and may be found in the annexation and unjustifiable claim to the monopoly of public credit by financial institutions.

And fundamentally there can be only one cure for this situation:

**to place that credit at the disposal of those from whom it arises
- that collection of individuals which we agree to call 'the public'.**

On Target Subscription PAYMENT Details

Post POSTAGE and PAYMENT Details to
ALOR c/o PO Box 27, Happy Valley, SA 5159

On Target Subscription PAYMENT Details

Post POSTAGE and PAYMENT Details to
ALOR c/o PO Box 27, Happy Valley, SA 5159

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.

On Target Subscription POSTAGE Details

Post POSTAGE and PAYMENT Details to
ALOR c/o PO Box 27, Happy Valley, SA 5159

On Target Subscription POSTAGE Details

Post POSTAGE and PAYMENT Details to
ALOR c/o PO Box 27, Happy Valley, SA 5159

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.