



ON TARGET

INSERT

Conservatism is Not Enough

A Memorandum from Geoffrey and Elizabeth Dobbs, Bodifyr, Bangor, Caernarvonshire

We are gravely concerned about the permanent survival, growth, development, and application, as a balanced, coherent whole, of the body of ideas originated by C. H. Douglas. This concern is brought to the point of action by the publicly announced political alignment of the Social Credit Secretariat with the John Birch Society, an American group which occupies a very definite position on the political spectrum. The nature of this alignment, as declared in an article entitled "NO CO-EXISTENCE" in *The Social Crediter* of May 9, 1964, carries with it certain implications for us and for other social crediters.

We are now confronted with the situation in which the Social Credit Secretariat, set up by Douglas to conserve the body of ideas called Social Credit, has taken up the position which is implicit in the following extracts from the article mentioned above:

At this stage, only in America, and only by the methods to which the members of the John Birch Society are dedicated, can the Conspiracy be defeated. But defeat of the Conspiracy is but the immediate and vital task of the Society, because the Conspiracy stands between all people everywhere, and that 'better world' which, as with Social Credit, is the ultimate aim. the one body which knows what has to be done, and how to do it, but which needs every ounce of support it can get, financial and educational and moral, is the John Birch Society.

The Social Credit Secretariat will ... make available the educational material which is being used by the John Birch Society. We ask our readers to contribute as much money as they possibly can to enable us to finance the necessary stocks....

As for the type of politics pursued by the John Birch Society, this is of less importance than the fact that it is not (Douglas-ed) Social Credit politics, although, as with any political movement not divorced from reality, it may have a component in our direction, which may, at this particular time, be judged to be important. As it happens, the John Birch Society is probably the best known and most vigorous of the Right-Wing, anti-Communist American groups, which seems to have had considerable success in using Communist tactics, such as the Front method, in reverse, against the Communists and their allies.

Also, if one judges by the articles by Professor Revilo P. Oliver, a prominent John Birch member, reprinted in *The Social Crediter* in recent months, its tactics include the use of violent or abusive epithets as applied to its political opponents, e.g. parasites, degenerates, criminals, vermin, rabid rats; not to mention, foul brute, bloody beast, unspeakable thing, and purulent blob of antihuman protoplasm, as applied to prominent Soviet communists.

Although one may well sympathise with the urge to express the fury which is daily aroused by the continual betrayal of one's country, this strikes us as a singularly ineffective way of attempting to 'overthrow' a Conspiracy which already controls most of the organs of publicity. Indeed, it is hard to imagine anything which could give more aid and comfort to the Communists and their allies, or do more to push uncommitted people towards the Left, or to ensure that even sympathisers remain neutral. It is a free gift to the other side, and offers an opportunity which naturally has been fully taken for stigmatising the John Birch Society as a Right-Wing extremist hate-group, and so forth, and of restricting its appeal to those who sympathise with this sort of approach.

All this would be irrelevant were it not for the recent alliance of the Social Credit Secretariat with the John Birch Society, and the enthusiastic approval given to its methods, as well as the reprinting in *The Social Crediter* of the articles mentioned above. Whether we agree with this or not, it has the inevitable consequence that the Social Credit Secretariat, instead of, as hitherto, remaining on its own plane above or detached from the political arena, has now descended into it, and will be known henceforth as a Right-Wing organisation, which can remain a channel for Social Credit ideas only for those who can see things from this particular political viewpoint.

A further unavoidable consequence to be that the task of maintaining the universality and independence of Social Credit as a body of thought and action, apart from and on a different plane from the whole political spectrum from Left to Right, can now be undertaken only by social crediters who are not associated with the Secretariat, or have contracted out from it. There need be no dissension about this among social crediters.

The Administration of Social Credit has always had two strings to its bow: Hierarchy, and Contracting Out Mechanisms. Properly operated, these should ensure the pursuit of variations in policy having a different emphasis, with the minimum of internal friction or mutual interference. If we refer to Douglas's 'specification' of 1951 – *What is Social Credit?* (See Appendix) – it is clear now that the Secretariat puts the emphasis on the defeat of the Incompatibles, at the bottom of the Chart; whereas we have always regarded this as secondary to the maintenance and development of Social Credit as a living policy in the world as it now exists, and as a coherent, balanced, independent body of thought and action; in other words, our main pre-occupation has always been with the top of the Chart, with the

philosophy, economics and politics of Social Credit, and their practical application as opportunity arises, on a scale strictly compatible with the resources available.

We are concerned with growth rather than with warfare, with culture rather than with purification, that there should be some wheat among the tares rather than that the tares should be cut down; and if from time to time we are forced to fight, it is always unwillingly (though not always without enjoyment!) and on as limited a scale as possible. To our minds, the answer to Communism is not anti- Communism; it is Social Credit; and if this answer should cease to exist, there would be nothing worth fighting for.

If we accept Clausewitz's definition of War as the pursuit of policy by other means, this implies that there are means other than those of warfare for the pursuit of policy; and since War is the ultimate denial of Social Credit, it is these means which we seek increasingly to use. This no doubt is, in some degree, a matter of temperament, and we do not mean to imply that this is the only tenable view, and that all who disagree with us are therefore necessarily wrong. But we do insist that this is a view which must be held, and an aim which must be pursued, by some group of people in the world, if Social Credit is to survive as a living, whole and independent policy.

The Social Credit movement, stemming as it did from the peculiarly catholic (universal-ed) and detached mind of Douglas, has made its appeal to, and drawn its strength from, a wide range of people with a wide range of background, education, class, income, political tendencies and Christian beliefs. What was common to them all was the integrity, the honesty of purpose, which enabled them to see that the particular problems and difficulties which confronted them, or impressed themselves most deeply on their minds, could be solved only by Social Credit. And this has normally led to some degree of escape from the particular tramlines of thought in which their problems appeared insoluble, into the different dimension of Social Credit ideas.

As Douglas said, when confronted with the statement that no-one is indispensable: "On the contrary, everyone is indispensable." It is equally true that social credit is indispensable for everyone. This need not be taken as a contradiction of the principles of administration: centralised direction (hierarchy) and contracting out. It does not imply that the Social Credit Movement is a free- for-all for people with conflicting aims and policies, all pulling together in all directions! But it is an important counter-balancing factor to bear in mind when applying those principles.

For if, as we believe, Social Credit is a practical application of Christianity, it is for all; and in so far as it is restricted in application, to that extent it is limited and imperfect.

It is true that, as the world is continually driven in the direction known as Left, Social Credit, existing as it does on a different plane which is unaffected by this 'trend', appears to move correspondingly towards the Right. That is one reason why it seems to us necessary to make it clear that this is only an appearance; that we

are not of the Right Wing, or the Left Wing, or of the Centre, or any compromise between them.

Social Crediters offer a more fundamental analysis and resolution of the world's difficulties which the enquirer will find, in complete form, nowhere else.

It is salutary to remember that when Douglas's proposals were first published they appealed mainly to the radical mind, to socialists who were getting dissatisfied with socialism and were looking for something better. Social Credit was, in fact, the sole surviving issue which emerged from all that turmoil of intense mental activity and discussion which centred around Orage and the *New Age* in the early years of the century.

This soon attracted so much support and attention among its members that the Labour Party was forced, in 1921, to set up a Committee to consider the Douglas New Age Draft Scheme for the Mining Industry.

This Committee rejected the Scheme as was inevitable from its membership which included Sidney Webb, G.D.H. Cole, Hugh Dalton and Sir Leo Chiozza Money. As Douglas commented at the time: ***"The Labour Party does not wish to abolish poverty. It wants to continue to represent it."***

The Webbs, in particular, early realised the menace of this new movement to socialism, and the *New Statesman*, which had been founded and heavily financed very largely with a view to smashing the circulation of the *New Age*, ultimately succeeded in doing so.

Meanwhile, the conservatives never paid Social Credit the compliment of serious consideration, but rejected it out of hand as some new sort of cranky socialist nonsense. Their typical reaction to the idea of the national dividend was to say that it would ruin the working class, who would never do a stroke of work if they could get money for nothing. The element of responsibility in the national dividend, as against the doles and 'benefits' of the Welfare State, eluded them, and when the choice had to be made, the vast majority of conservatives have chosen to support an irresponsible socialism, rather than responsible Social Credit.

As a consequence, after several decades of socialistic full employment, mainly under 'conservative' auspices, we seem well on the way towards creating a proletariat of whom it is true to say that they cannot be trusted with leisure, or with an unconditional income, and whose experience has taught them that the only way to get more money, to meet, an ever rising cost of living, is to refuse and to obstruct any form of constructive activity – a clear result of an earlier choice of policy acting on human weakness rather than of the inevitable wickedness of man. As for the 'diehard' minority of genuine conservatives who want to stick to their anti-socialist principles, there is still no sign that they have learnt anything from the past. They continue to exhibit the virtues of courage, integrity, and persistence in that patriotism which has shown itself to be not enough, and are determined to die in the last ditch for their beliefs rather than to recognise that Social Credit offers them an alternative to socialism and a solution to their difficulties.

It remains as true today as it was when Douglas wrote it about thirty years ago (*Social Credit*, 3rd Edition. pp. 197- 8) that:

There is, at the moment, no party, group, or individual possessing at once the power, the knowledge, and the will, which would transmute the growing social unrest and resentment (now chiefly marshalled under the crudities of Socialism and Communism) into a constructive effort for the regeneration of Society.

This being the case, we are merely witnesses to a succession of rear-guard actions on the part of the so-called Conservative elements in Society, elements which themselves seem incapable, or undesirous of genuine initiative; a process which can only result, like all rear-guard actions, in a successive, if not successful, retreat on the part of the forces attacked. While this process is alone active, there seems to be no sound justification for optimism;

So long as the diehards are obsessed with the idea of defeating the communists at their own game, rather than with finding a viable alternative to communism, one can see little reason for hope in them.

With these political warriors, whether of the Left or the Right, it is always jam to-morrow, never jam to-day, “Don't you know there's a War on!” When Capitalism has been defeated, and the State has withered away, then we shall have the happy, classless society of free, responsible citizens.

When the Communist Conspiracy has been overthrown, then we shall have less Government, more responsibility, and a better world (the declared aims of the John Birch Society) – or perhaps even Social Credit! But meanwhile, *seek ye first the defeat of those human vermin who stand in the way, and the Kingdom of God and His righteousness shall later be added unto you!*

Is this really the nature of the Universe, in its political aspect; and are the injunctions to seek first the Kingdom of God, and to overcome, evil with good, mere pious unrealities? In the pseudo-world set up by monetary policy it would seem to be so, and only the social creditor can see through to the reality beyond, because his imagination has grasped the sort of ‘good’ which can overcome ‘evil’, and the sort of ‘constructive effort’ which is needed to ‘regenerate Society’. Without this binding back to reality, which we have learnt from Douglas alone, the things hoped for lack substance, and the faith necessary for effective action fails.

It is not, of course, that the ideas of social creditors, taken separately, are unique or, exclusive. The ingredients of Social Credit, as an effective body of ideas, exist in fragmented form everywhere – on the Left, on the Right, and among the non-political, but only among social creditors are they combined into a coherent whole. Social Credit is rooted in the past: in our religion and our cultural inheritance, and thus fulfills the requirements of the genuine Conservative; it is what Conservatism should have been if the control of policy had never been usurped by the financier and the producer. But it is also a radical movement of new ideas which bear a close, though inverted, relationship to Socialism.

It is what Socialism should have been if it had never been perverted, if the common good had never become the Common Good, and democracy had not become “Democracy” (the domination of the majority).

It is also, in its realistic policy of freedom with responsibility, in both the economic and political sphere, of the very essence of genuine, undegraded, Liberalism.

We dare not attach our tremendous heritage to any one faction in the political arena. Our primary function in Society is not that of fighting, but the resolution of those conflicts which make possible the policy of ‘divide and rule’, without which there can be no overthrow of the Conspiracy which owes its power to the success of that policy.

The Social Creditor (May 9 1964) claims that the economic front of the Conspiracy is invulnerable – that the vulnerable front is the political — and reminds us that Douglas, from 1939 onwards, emphasised with increasing urgency that the ‘international gangsters’ must be exposed and overcome before any progress towards a better world through economic realism could be achieved.

But it is important to remember that the time when Douglas emphasised this point in his writing was limited to the War period (1939-45) which is now as long as that time was from the publication of his first book (*Economic Democracy*, 1920) and that the world situation has again changed since then.

Moreover, Douglas himself moved on to the Responsible Vote, the Constitutional issue, the Realistic Position of the Church of England, and the ‘Specification’ of Social Credit (See Appendix), of which the world has heard practically nothing.

There has been a tendency, we think, for some social crediters to remain in the Anti-Conspiracy phase, without moving on to the more constructive and deeper level of the post-War period, just as, at an earlier stage, many found it difficult to shift their attention from economics to politics. Indeed, if Social Credit is to remain alive, we ought to be moving on and developing the latest ideas which Douglas left us, as we can be sure that he would have done had he lived longer.

But it is true that each aspect of Social Credit thought has its permanent validity though its application may change with the conditions.

What Douglas actually wrote on the defeat of the Conspiracy is perhaps put most concisely in *Programme for the Third World War*, 1943, pp. 42-43:

The Money Power does not, and never did, wish to improve the money system – its consequences in war, sabotage and social friction are exactly what is desired. This, I think, exactly defines the task which society must face and solve, or perish. First, to attack and defeat the Money Power; then consider the re-organisation of the money system.

Notice that it is the Money Power, not merely the communists, which has to be defeated, and it is society, not the Social Credit Movement, the John Birch Society, or any other minority group, which has to defeat it. Douglas never confused the Social Credit movement with society in general.

Our function is to be ‘catalysts’, to precipitate correct action by the diffusion of correct ideas, and with genuine, practical, working examples of their effectiveness on the scale which is within reach of our resources. Our function in society is to exert authority, not power, – the authority which accompanies the glimpsing of a portion of reality, perhaps a small portion, which other people have not seen. We can show other people how to solve their problems; we are not here to take away from them the responsibility for themselves acting to solve them. If we do so, we act prematurely and the effect is ephemeral, without follow-up or cumulative effect.

Before any society can defeat the Money Power it will have to be substantially united, permeated with Social Credit ideas (though not necessarily by that name), and possessed by implicit faith in reality rather than in money, a faith which at present is notably inadequate.

This is no pessimistic conclusion. It is always more hopeful to face the realities of the situation. If ever there was a chance of a quick or early ‘victory for Social Credit’ on a national or a world scale, it is by now long past. But the credit of Society is not a Utopian dream for the future, it is a reality which exists now, and demonstrates its existence every time an inroad is made upon it.

Successful resistance to these inroads can be used as a springboard to generate the faith and will for positive improvements. It is astonishing how quickly correct action can build up from small beginnings to a massive scale. There are many limited objectives which are within reach of our society as it exists now, and towards which social crediters could ‘precipitate’ effective action. Who knows what tremendous results might be achieved in ten years! For it is we social crediters who realize that society is primarily metaphysical, and that it is the metaphysics, in this case the faith, which has failed, and which needs regenerating, and binding back to reality, in the way Douglas taught us.

If we take the title of social creditor, we are claiming to be experts on the faith of society. Fortunately for us, corruption and internal conflict are inherent in Monopoly, and most of the fighting of the Conspiracy can be left to the conspirators themselves, as there is room for only one at the Top.

It is a Law of the Universe that a greater power cannot be overcome by a lesser one, of the same sort, at the point of impact. It follows that the Money Power cannot be overcome by money, nor the Great Conspiracy by a counter-conspiracy. In the unlikely event that we could appear to have achieved such a thing, it would be an illusion, because if we could exert greater money power than the Money Power, it could only be because we had become the Money Power ourselves, and if we could out-conspire the Conspiracy, it could only be because we had ourselves become the Top Conspirators. This, indeed, is the process which is going on all the time, and far from overthrowing the Conspiracy, it continually rejuvenates it. All this is a doctrine

of despair only for those who do not believe that there is a greater power operating in the world than the Money Power. For them, literally, there is not a hope in Hell!

But for those of us who know that the power of money, and of the Conspiracy which has arisen from it, is only a distorted shadow of reality in the minds of people, the prospect is bright with hope, and with an adventurous quest for means of letting that reality through, and of channelling that greater power back into the world.

The problem, we know, is soluble; the task, we are sure, can be done, like every other major task, piecemeal, on the scale in which we live, the nearest bit first. But tackled first upon the world scale, it is insoluble, and for ever beyond our reach.

APPENDIX:

WHAT IS SOCIAL CREDIT?

Social credit assumes that Society is primarily metaphysical, and must have regard to the organic relationships of its prototype.

OBJECTIVE:

Social stability by the integration of means and ends.

INCOMPATIBLES:

Collectivism, Dialectic Materialism, Totalitarianism, Judaeo-Masonic Philosophy and Policy. Ballot-box democracy embodies all of these.

Religion By Geoffrey Dobbs

An expansion of a discussion paper read to the Science and Religion Forum on April 9, 1976, at their meeting at Cumberland Lodge, Windsor Great Park on the theme: Man's Responsibility for Nature.

** Although the O.E.D. gives the pronunciation of 'religation' with a short 'e' and 'i' as in 'relic'; this so closely resembles the more familiar word 'relegation', which has a contrary sense, that I have thought it justifiable to avoid confusion by pronouncing 'religation' with a long 'e' and a long 'i' as in 'remigration'.*

Our President is on record as stressing the need for philosophical sophistication in the science-religion debate – a need which I cannot supply, but the remark drove me to the dictionary to confirm what I understood by the word 'sophistication'.

Just as I thought, according to the S.O.E.D. it means "*the employment of sophistry, the process of investing with specious fallacies*", although, no doubt, the Bishop meant no more than: "up-to-date and academically acceptable in the use of current philosophical terminology." However this may be, this Forum is concerned with science and religion, not philosophy and religion, and there ought therefore to be room in it for the scientist who is not sophisticated in academic philosophy.

Science shares with religion another dimension, beyond the cerebro-verbal plane of academic philosophy, namely that of the external world, in that its thoughts and symbols must be 'bound back', in detail, to an external, non-cerebral, non-verbal,

reality. It is of the essence of the scientific method that theory must constantly be checked by observation and experiment. It is of the essence of religion that the professed faith must be put to the test of practice, both on the individual scale, and on the more visible, general, social scale. It is of the essence of words and of symbols of all sorts, that their connection with the referent is indirect – entirely through the human mind, and hence easily confused or diverted or even inverted. Hence it is natural enough that a scientist should view with some skepticism and distrust any lengthy or complex verbal process which is not constantly tied back to some observable reality, and to demand of it: “What does this mean in practice?”

And in so far as one applies this to the current state of the world and of our society, it would seem apparent that the currently fashionable and accepted philosophy is widely at variance with reality, and that, wherever else we may look for a correct viewpoint, it cannot be in a direction which could be welcome or acceptable to those who lead the intellectual fashion.

While both complexity and simplicity have their proper and their corrupt uses, it is of significance that the word ‘sophistication’ should have been upgraded from a badword to a fashionable goodword, and that the word ‘simple’ is seldom used in a favourable sense but has been largely replaced by the sneerword ‘simplistic’, which is trotted out almost invariably to discredit any broad outline of the fundamental considerations or policies underlying a complex verbal statement, particularly where sophistication has been used for the purpose of deceiving the unsophisticated.

Philosophy may, or may not, be sophisticated. In the important, practical, and everyday meaning of the word, in the sense of a man’s ‘philosophy of life’, everyone, necessarily, has a philosophy, that is, a conception of the nature of things, or of the universe, whether this is extremely simple, very complex and sophisticated, or even confused and wavering. Whatever it is, it determines his objectives, his long-term aims and the action directed thereto, which may be called his ‘policy’ in life, and it is this ‘binding back’ to reality which is probably the most useful meaning to attach to the word ‘religion’.

In this sense the Christian Creeds, for instance, constitute formulations of a ‘philosophy’, as does Marxist-Leninism, or a vacillating agnosticism or humanism, however vaguely formulated. Inevitably, they manifest themselves, individually, and socially where they are widely enough held, in ‘policies’ of action and inaction, and it is the completed whole which constitutes a religion, while the word ‘religion’ (used, e.g., by Coleridge and Gladstone) may serve to designate the process of ‘binding back’ the idea of reality to the actual reality of the world in which we live.

I cannot stress this too strongly. Unless it is realised that every conception of the universe and of man’s place therein must issue in its resultant policy it is not possible even to begin to consider or discuss or compare the validity of different conceptions, or to study the vital process of religion in any detail or with any understanding.

If the word ‘religion’ is restricted, as it usually is, to the organised Religions, or to a belief in God, or in the supernatural, those who reject these conceptions and adhere to atheistic, humanist, or materialist beliefs are never challenged to formulate their ideas and to relate them to policy, but are allowed to adopt the pose of persons with no commitment to faith or policy, who claim merely to be pursuing the path of reason.

In fact, the policies which most of these people openly pursue are based upon assumptions about the universe and about man’s place in it which are every whit as much based upon faith as are the more precise statements formulated in the Creeds, and unless the nature of this faith is revealed or exposed, its realization in the world of today cannot be followed or ascertained, its ideas and policies cannot be related, and we cannot even start to escape from our present confusion, or to develop, in the Baconian phrase: “a just familiarity between the mind and things”.

Religion in Biology

I come now to the particular theme of the religion of different beliefs to the policies which determine teaching and research in biology – a subject in which a marked divergence of policy has again become manifest in recent years, although, in fact, it has been present, and at least implicit for over a century. That this is, fundamentally, a religious difference is obvious, much as it has been confused by the mass of verbiage expended upon it; and for any attempt at clarification it may be necessary to reconsider the great evolutionary conflict of the last century, as epitomized in the notorious confrontation at the British Association at Oxford in 1860 between T. H. Huxley and Samuel Wilberforce, which resulted in so famous a victory for the evolutionists over the ‘special creationists’ that neither side has yet recovered from it.

It has been said that Evolution expanded men’s idea of the Creation in time as astronomy and physics had expanded it in space; but in both cases the enlargement was too vast, too sudden, too appalling.

For centuries men had worshipped an Almighty and Everlasting God, Creator of all things, but when science lifted the curtain and gave a glimpse of what these words might begin to mean the sight was too much. A reasonable degree of almightiness, such as could create the world in six days and rest on the seventh was conceivable, but when space and time yawned upon us in this awful way, the God who could create such a Universe became inconceivable. Indeed, we had always been told that He was beyond conception, while we satisfied ourselves with conceivable images such as the Grand Old Man enthroned above the clouds; but when the traditional language concerning God was manifestly justified by our expanding knowledge, the inconceivable became the incredible, because beyond the finite scope of our imagination. Perhaps it is not surprising that the awe-inspiring process of Creation, as revealed under its new name of evolution, should have seemed a sufficient object

for worship rather than the Creator.

Meanwhile, the idea of Creation had become identified with a shaman-like process of instant verbal magic, under the terms ‘Special Creation’, in which one recognises what has been called ‘the technique of the essential adjective’. For differentiation is necessarily of the essence of creation, which can mean only that every creature must be ‘special’ – of distinctive character and marked off by distinguishing features – so that ‘Special Creation’ is a tautology meaning no more than ‘Creation’ if taken literally. But when this term is applied to a childish conception of the Creation based upon the literal interpretation of the words of Genesis, which is then superseded by a more mature conception involving time and continuity, it is not only the idea of conjuring into existence by verbal edict which is discredited, but to some extent also the idea of Creation and of a Creator altogether, in so far as the verbal situation is not consciously analysed.

Thus, what for some was the greatest enlargement and enrichment of the idea of the Creator for centuries, for others was the greatest retreat in history. For if ‘Creation’ is taken to mean that all species were brought into existence and fixed for ever by divine edict in 4004 B.C., which we can now see to be manifestly untrue, then ‘Creation’ ceases to be credible, and we must seek another religion. For many scientists this religion has been achieved not only by substituting the fascinating and awe-inspiring impersonal process of evolution for the Creator, but further, since this process is held to culminate in Man, by substituting Man, or the Mystical Lump of Mankind, for God, as the Supreme Being of the Universe.

Man is held to be the Supreme Being because of his power – power, that is to dominate and manipulate and change and impose his will upon all other beings by virtue of his Great Brain, which has enabled him to develop language and numbers and other symbols, and hence abstract thought and cumulative knowledge and method and cunning in imposing those thoughts upon the world around him.

There are many versions and variations of this widespread but unacknowledged anthropotheism, in some of which the Supreme Being is represented by Groups other than the whole of Mankind, such as the State, the Party, the Class, or the Race, and in all of them the power to dominate is the criterion of supremacy, which necessarily results in a built-in policy of progressive centralisation of power in the hands of fewer and fewer, more and more powerful men, operating in the name of the Group, as the Head and Brain, so to speak, of the Collective Being. For the most part these philosophies are illdefined, the most definite being that of Marxist dialectical materialism, though even that is drowned in a mass of chaotic literature; but they are discernible through hints and innuendoes, and by their religation into policy.

Among scientists a vague ‘scientism’, or scientific humanism, is fashionable, which among biologists may take the form of evolutionism, or evolutionary humanism, of the type publicised by Julian Huxley. Whatever the precise form of

this substitute religion, it now dominates science, and especially biology, and in recent years, particularly, has been determining policies in teaching and research in a manner widely at variance with former policies largely determined by a general background of assumptions based upon Christianity.

In view of the dangerous potentialities now deemed to be within reach of biological science, it is urgently necessary that we should take note of the direction in which that science is moving, and relate that direction to the religion of those who are directing it.

But until the science and religion discussion can escape from the distorted myth that the evolutionary conflict was between science and religion, in which, as school children are now being taught by anti-Christian religionists, science ‘debunked’ religion, it cannot begin to get off the ground. To a large extent it has become a contest between two religions, in which anthropotheism made use of nineteenth century science against the prehistoric Chaldean science of the Old Testament, doggedly defended by a small group of Christians. In contrast, it’s even more famous predecessor in the reputed ‘Science vs. Religion’ contest – the confrontation between Galileo and the Inquisition – was not, basically, concerned with religion at all. All the participants were Catholic Christians, and the conflict was between the classical, pagan science of Ptolemy and the then modern, scientific viewpoint, developed under the influence of Christianity by Copernicus, Kepler and Galileo.

Evolution as a Religion

In about half a century of experience of academic biology in various institutions, as student, teacher and research worker, the writer has always been aware of the dominant influence of evolutionary theory which, so long as it has remained what it claims to be: a scientific theory, has usually been constructive and stimulating; but in so far as it has, at certain periods, been held, and taught, as a religious doctrine opposed to that of Christianity, has become a mental prison, stultifying the subject. For instance, one remembers that in the late 1920’s biology was still dominated by eminent professors for whom the great evolutionary conflict of their nineteenth century youth was the chief inspiration, and who, in consequence, could scarcely look with interest at any organism from any other viewpoint but that of speculating about its ancestry and phylogeny. This had a particularly dreary effect upon the branch of biology to which I became attached, namely mycology – the study of fungi – of which, at the time, there was virtually no fossil record, but which, by virtue of certain similarities, were deemed to be a degenerated group of algae which had lost their chlorophyll. This grossly distorted both the teaching and research on the group and delayed the development of the subject until the 1930’s, when the late Professor Reginald Buller broke away from this traditional approach and initiated a lively and direct observation of these unique organisms, which turned out to possess a fascinating and distinctive character and nuclear life history, quite different from

those of plants and animals, which is now widely held to justify classing them as a separate Kingdom.

By the 1930's the dead hand of evolutionism had been, to a great extent, lifted, and most people had, by then, accommodated the facts of evolution in their religion, so that the biological sciences were able to expand, diversify, and explore their subject matter more freely and directly, especially in the fields of physiology and ecology; also in cytology and genetics, although it was a curious fact that, at this period, nearly all the more eminent geneticists were outspoken Marxist-materialists.

It was during this period that the 'New Soviet Genetics' of Hichurin and Lysenko, made its appearance in the U.S.S.R., and drew attention to the power of political 'religion', commonly called 'ideology' to impose its nature upon science. 'Western' Genetics, condemned as 'Mendelist-Morganist-Weissmannite-bourgeois-reactionary deviationism', was 'antidialectical' because of its insistence on the definiteness and relative immutability of the physical basis of heredity, which would impose unacceptable limits on the power of Man, the Supreme Being, to change 'Nature' as he wishes. As the following statement by the Praesidium of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences (quoted from Julian Huxley's *Soviet Genetics and World Science*, 1949) put it:

Michurin's materialist direction in biology is the only acceptable form of science, because it is based ... on the revolutionary principle of changing Nature for the benefit of the people. Weissmannite-Morganist idealist teaching is pseudo-scientific, because it is founded on the notion of the divine origin of the world and assumes eternal and unalterable scientific laws. The struggle between the two ideas has taken the form of the ideological class-struggle between socialism and capitalism.

Ironic as it may have been that committed Marxists and atheists such as Huxley, Haldane and Darlington should have been accused of adhering to the divine origin of the world, in so far as they assumed unalterable scientific laws, the conclusion is quite logical that if there is an external reality, a nature of things not subject to the will of Man, then Man cannot be the Supreme Being. Conversely, if Man is the Supreme Being, then the 'nature of things' must be totally manipulable at his will, and, indeed, exists, and is created, in and by his brain, which, itself, is the highest product of the material process of evolution, and hence comprises and controls all that is 'below' it. There can therefore be no 'things-in-themselves', with their own nature, external to, and or totally knowable and manipulable by Man. This, is condemned as the bourgeois deviation of 'objectivism', the 'crime', particularly, of the scientist who studies his subject matter 'for itself', rather than on the revolutionary principle of changing it for human purposes.

There is a fundamental contradiction in the Marxist claim that their ideological science (even if the ideology is called materialism) puts them in touch with an objective reality external to the human brain, while at the same time they insist that

this reality contains ‘nothing but’ that which can be fully understood and known by the human brain; but a faith in such contradictions is of the essence of dialectical materialism. Marxists, however, are unaware of their own ‘fideism’, but deceive themselves, with Engels, who wrote: “The materialist outlook on nature means no more than simply conceiving nature just as it exists ...”

If this were so, materialist science would necessarily be completely static, having achieved objective truth at its first step in every field; and, indeed, such materialists are liable to the illusion that they know everything – and that “what they don’t know isn’t knowledge”. Their religion is based upon the projection of a property of human language and thought upon the external world.

“Dialectics”, wrote Lenin, “is the study of the contradiction within the very essence of things.” The very word ‘contradiction’ relates only to the use of words, and, if we think about it, we must realise that there can be no ‘contradiction’ in reality. A real thing cannot contradict itself in its being; it is only unreality which can be said to do this. There is no such direction as ‘north-south’, though the words may be said or written, as, for instance of a line running both north and south. There is no such tinge as ‘black-white’, though a thing may be part black and part white, or each in turn, or grey. But reality cannot contradict itself, as God cannot be mocked. Perhaps those two phrases may mean the same thing. In the end, even in the U.S.S.R., ideological genetics, which could maintain itself only by the brute force of the state, had to yield to the greater realism of the monk Mendel, though not until it had imposed imprisonment and martyrdom upon the great geneticist N. I. Vavilov and many of his followers.

It may be that the brutal farce of Lysenkoism did something to postpone the dominance, in biology, of the evolutionary religion; but, in any case, the breakthrough into molecular biology initiated by the elucidation of the DNA molecule by Watson, Wilkins and Crick in the 1950’s, plus the invention of the electron microscope revealing a whole new world of fine structure in the cell, resulted in a sweeping ‘religious’ revival which has transformed many biological Departments, especially those with younger and more ‘withitist’ Heads, into chapels of evolutionary humanism, in which the traditional Christian is made to feel that he is under suspicion of ‘heresy’ or ‘scientific deviationism’, since, by now the evolutionist has lost the power to distinguish between his science and his faith.

Non-Biology

Some of the leading revivalists, however, are in no such confusion. Dr. Francis Crick, for instance, in his book *Of Molecules and Men* (1966) clearly wants to substitute teaching in schools about natural selection and DNA for Christian education. Concerning the borderline between living and non-living he writes: “... only by a very considerable act of faith could one believe that an explanation would be possible in terms of physics and chemistry”, but as a dedicated preacher of

this faith he has done much to determine “the ultimate aim of the modern movement in biology” which is “to explain all biology in terms of physics and chemistry.”

One might add, that if this were the aim of a modern movement in physics and chemistry, it would be a perfectly legitimate application of these sciences. It is only as applied to biology that its implicit reductionism is ideological, rather than scientific, as also is his dogmatic conviction that Christian doctrine is ‘utter nonsense’ and that what he calls ‘scientific values’ should replace ‘Christian values’. Science, in fact, does not deal with ‘values’, and the word should be ‘materialist’, or perhaps, in his case, ‘evolutionist’ rather than ‘scientific’; but the use of the word in this context clearly shows us that science is being used as a ‘cover’ for a clash of religions.

These two religions: Trinitarian Christianity and various forms of materialism tending towards Anthrotheism, religate in widely different ways, both in society at large and, in particular, in the teaching of biology and in the direction of biological research. As the potentialities for disaster inherent in recent advances in biology now rival, and perhaps surpass, those inherent in nuclear physics, it becomes, literally, a matter of life and death that the policies implicit in these concepts of the universe should be understood, and that their religation, or expression in practical affairs, should be studied in detail, and, moreover, studied with integrity and by acute intellects, since the situation is far from simple.

Now that ‘dogma’ and ‘doctrine’ have become ‘dirty words’, there are so many vague ideas passing under the name of Christianity that their relegation has become desperately confused; while on the other hand, most of the materialists and evolutionists have never verbally formulated their beliefs at all, so that in practice the only way of arriving at them is to work back from the real policies which they generate. A further complication arises from the fact that many people suffer from a sort of religious schizophrenia, professing a Christian philosophy which they attempt to religate in their ‘private’ lives, while supporting in public affairs an anti-Christian policy, derived, very often, from dialectical materialism which they have absorbed unconsciously through environmental pressure from their colleagues and from the mass media. The individual case, therefore, if not fully analysed, can be very misleading; but, even so, certain broad outlines in the relation between belief and policy can at least be discerned.

As Dr. Crick makes very clear, what he would call the ‘modern’ biologist, and I should call the atheist-materialist biologist, is not primarily interested in biology, in the sense of the study of living organisms as such, since his ‘ultimate aim’ is to explain them all in terms of physics and chemistry. This is no mere theory, for in recent years it has been working through quite blatantly into University syllabuses and modes of teaching.

Another natural tendency for anthropocentric, rather than theocentric, science, is to impose the fashionable opinions of influential or 'top people', often exaggerated in importance by the careerist and political set-up, upon the reality which is the subject of study. Thus in recent years, the vogue for the Unity of Biology has inverted the order of teaching, so that first-year students are introduced first to the most advanced and complex aspects of the subject, such as DNA and electron micrographs, which can be genuinely studied only with the use of expensive and complicated apparatus far beyond their scope, while, very often, an elementary introduction to the actual organisms is postponed until the Final Honours year, or even omitted altogether.

So University Departments are now turning out graduates with Honours Degrees who lack even a commonplace general knowledge of the common organisms in that branch of biology in which they are supposed to have been specialising. Living beings are deemed to be 'nothing but' lumps of DNA, mitochondria, etc. illustrating the Unity of Life. Their immense variety and peculiarities are considered just a crashing bore which interests no one but amateur naturalists and out-of-date theocentric biologists.

The anthropocentric fashion is for anything which will distract from the actual study of the living things themselves, but which imposes abstractions of the human mind upon them: surveying, plotting, mapping, making mathematical models, and elaborate statistical ordinations of vegetational patterns, with little interest in the plant itself, or in its real, complex and remarkable associations with fungi and other microorganisms on and around its roots, which is regarded as an eccentric, minority concern of a handful of old-fashioned and amateurish naturalists.

Abstractions such as 'population', 'competition' and various 'parameters' are studied rather than 'whole plants', animals or fungi, which merely furnish material for the studies. The cruder the departure from reality, the more complex the techniques, and the more complicated and expensive the apparatus required, the more prestigious the research.

There was a time when mathematics was regarded as the 'handmaid of the sciences', though a very necessary and useful handmaid. Now it seems to have become the tyrant of the sciences, or perhaps the usurper of the sciences, and particularly of biology. To be sure, the sciences of physics and chemistry could not exist if it could not be assumed that one atom = another atom of the same isotope, and that one molecule = another molecule of the same substance.... But when it comes to organisms: bacteria, for instance, it cannot be assumed that one bacterium = another of the same species. One has to be certain that they are also of the same strain, that they both originated from the same unicell culture; and, even then, there may have been mutations. The proposition that one oak tree = another oak tree is obviously absurd, unless, indeed, they are heavily managed plantation trees. As for the proposition that one man = another man – this is, probably, the ultimate denial of humanity.

Life, Mathematics and the Pseudo-World

There is an obvious carry-over, in both directions, between the dominance of number and quantity in biological science and in politics and economics. The concept of ‘numerical democracy’ in politics, and the dominance of credit finance, by now a form of mathematics barely connected with any physical reality, but exercising a virtually absolute rule over politics, commerce and, incidentally, science, can scarcely be unconnected with recent trends in scientific education and research, especially since, in Britain, the State now exercises a monopolistic control, mainly through the medium of finance, but increasingly, also, with political overtones.

It has been forgotten that ‘statistics’ was a political tool from its inception, in the form of military ‘logistics’ under Frederic the Great. The idea has been fostered that to substitute ideal and imaginary, equal and identical ‘units’ for the complex realities of the living world, and to manipulate those units, is in some way more ‘objective’ than direct observation. To be sure, such manipulations sometimes suggest relationships which were not observed at first sight, and may be useful tools in helping to eliminate certain sorts of bias, but it cannot be denied that they take the observer several steps away from the external objects with which he is concerned; quite often with ludicrous or disastrous results which are contrary to common sense, if they are not checked by direct observation.

The social sciences now provide a continuous ‘bridge’ between the outlook and practice of politics and of the natural sciences, especially biology, not only because a high proportion of social scientists are open adherents of the Marxist religion, but even more so because, whether they are professed Marxists or not, they apply the methods of collectivism and dialectical materialism to human ‘material’ in the name of ‘science’ (which is also what Marx thought he was doing). It is, indeed, the application of the quantitative methods which have been so successful in the physical, inorganic, sciences, to those which deal with living organisms, and even more, with humanity, which is characteristic of that blind destructiveness which now pervades the scene.

The ‘higher’, the more complex the entities dealt with, the more limited the application, and the greater the distortion and error, implicit in the treatment of them as mathematical units, and therefore, by assumption, equal and identical in character. This elementary and fundamental fact used to be rubbed into the mind of every child who was taught that ‘you cannot add apples and oranges’.

The trouble is, of course, that mathematical processes need have no relation to reality, and there is no difficulty in carrying out the almost meaningless summation of x apples + y oranges = $x + y$ somethings, but what?

In this case, perhaps, we can find a single, very specialised meaning under the heading ‘dessert fruits’. But add marrows, potatoes, sloes, beetles and pebbles, and we can add them up to z ‘objects’ = a summation which has no reality whatever, but is merely an imaginary collection or ‘set’ which I have made in my mind and transferred to words on paper; though I could, if it were not far too much trouble, impose my imaginary ‘set’ upon the real world by physically assembling the things in one fatuous heap, an action with real consequences in waste of time and energy, probably annoyance to other people, and waste of some of the perishables.

My point here is that the modern teaching of mathematics, which introduces young children first to the concept of number by causing them to assemble and count ‘sets’ of non-integrables (even if they are later taught to sort them out into sub-sets with some common characters) is a process, of ideological (or religious) indoctrination which has the deepest consequences.

It is a conditioning exercise in the imposition of ‘mathematics’ upon reality, rather than the use of ‘mathematics’ in the understanding of reality. It is a first step in a process which leads on to the imposition of mathematical models upon the real, and especially upon the living world, and the gross tyranny of numbers, of bureaucratic and financial control and ‘numerical democracy’ under which mankind now increasingly groans.

The summation: 1 person + 1 person = 2 people is an imaginary ‘set’ more remote from reality than any assembly of heterogeneous objects which a child might make in infant school, because the differences between the two ‘units’ have a vastly wider amplitude.

To be sure, it has its strictly limited uses in relation to their basic human physical properties. If I invite x people to dinner I must provide x dinners, x places at table and x chairs. If they are old friends, i.e. ‘persons’ to me, I shall know what they like to eat or drink, and who to seat where; but the larger the numbers, the more they have to be treated as identical units, the more I shall have to impose my ‘mathematics’ upon them. By the time personal contact has been completely lost we are in a never-never land of imaginary ‘sets’ of human units, mentally ‘collected’ and categorised for identical treatment, such as, for instance, the various categories of ‘labour’ which, it is now completely taken for granted, must of course be allotted ‘equal pay’ in numerical units of currency for their equal and identical units of ‘work’.

It should be noticed also that the application of this ideology does, necessarily, result in the maximum standardisation of the ‘labour’ with its dehumanising and collectivising consequences and its inevitable conflict with the humanity of the ‘labour’.

Finally, we reach the ultimate absurdity in the situation of the ‘set’ of voters’ opinions, with its implicit assumption that every unit vote is precisely equal to every other unit vote, which in turn implies a similar uniformity among the electors. Here again, the means dictated by the ideology tend to realise the condition assumed.

The only point at which all choices become equal is that at which they become pointless and valueless (just as human equality is finally achieved only with death) and it must be admitted that most of the ‘Western Democracies’ are approaching this point, while in the so-called ‘People’s Democracies’ of the East, where there is only one Party list to vote for, it has already been reached.

It should be noticed also that in the ‘West’, though there may be a choice between Parties, there is no choice concerning the single overriding policy which the Party elected has to carry out. This is dictated by its creditors by means of the ingenious numerical device of ‘credit’ (or ‘debt’) finance whereby the whole economy, and its consequent politics, is controlled and held in the mathematical vice of imaginary ‘credits’, issued in such a way that they can be cancelled only by the issue of larger ‘credits’. Mathematics being purely ideal, there is no limit whatever to this process, but there is a real limit to the material processes which this numerism imposes upon the people.

As for the one tiny degree of freedom allows to the equal and identical units of the electorate in the choice of Parties dedicated to the pursuit of conflicting ‘interests’ which do not challenge the overriding policy – the effect of this is frequently to divide the electorate so equally that its fate is often determined by minimal mathematical differences.

A two per cent swing in the feed-back to party propaganda can change a Government, and, as at the time of writing, important Acts, interfering with, or abolishing age-old or popular customs or institutions, can be passed by one parliamentary vote, which my little calculator makes equal to 0.0015748 of the total number of units of elected lobby-fodder.

When this sort of dictatorship by minuscule mathematical differences is represented as the Will of the People, which the Revising Chamber has no right to hold up, because it does not represent some similar decimal of a mathematical difference in snap unit preferences on a particular day, the idiotic game becomes more than a joke.

Whatever else the Will of the People may be, it is not something which requires mathematics to decipher, it is something which manifests itself very clearly whenever the people are given a chance to choose what they want, or even more, to reject what they do not want. But this, the Party choice between versions of the same policy never gives them.

Logistics, Statistics and Social Engineering

This rampant numerocracy has its repercussions throughout the whole of our Society, especially in the bureaucracy, and in that terrible interface between politics and sociology in which vastly important and intimate matters affecting the personal life are decided or interfered with on ‘statistical’ grounds. Usually, also, the ‘statistics’ are childishly incompetent, the data unconsciously selected for a purpose, but that is by the way.

It should never be forgotten that statistics was a technique originally developed in Prussia under Frederic the Great, for the purpose of what is now called ‘logistics’, the collective handling of troops and their materials, i.e. of expendable units of human personnel, centrally manipulated in bulk as a fear-sanction, used to impose the policy of their controller upon others. The transfer of this treatment and attitude of mind concerning people from troops to the whole population, in peace as well as war, is now taken for granted; its origins are forgotten, and its implications ignored.

The following quotation, taken from the O.E.D. under the word ‘statistics’ illustrates the next step:

1798 SIR J. SINCLAIR Statist. Acc. Scot. XX App. P. xiii.

In 1780, I found, that in Germany they were engaged in a species of political inquiry, to which they had given the name of Statistics; and though I apply a different idea to that word, for by Statistical is meant in Germany, *an inquiry for the purpose of ascertaining the political strength of a country, or questions respecting matters of state*; whereas the idea I annex to the term, is an inquiry into the state of a country, for the purpose of ascertaining the quantum of happiness enjoyed by its inhabitants, and the means of its future improvement; yet, as I thought that a new word might attract more public attention, I resolved on adopting it.

Doubtless ‘the liberal mind’ would regard this as a move towards ‘humanizing’ statistics, instead of, as it must be, towards ‘dehumanizing’ humanity by the substitution of a quantifiable abstraction called ‘happiness’ for the real human condition which is completely non-quantifiable and incapable of being described in the language of numbers, appropriate as this may be for the accurate designation of the quantum of ammunition to be issued to military units, or even the quantum of to be dished out to all hands.

We then move on to Jeremy Bentham’s: “The greatest happiness of the greatest number is the foundation of morals and legislation.”

So now, having quantified happiness as a statistical property of the units of population, we see morals and legislation established on the same basis as military logistics. Clearly ‘happiness’ has now become something ‘dished out’ by the Government to the population, for which the preferred word, nowadays, is ‘welfare’. ‘Health’, ‘wealth’, ‘education’, and certain numbered and specified ‘freedoms’ are

now included, not one of which, in any real sense, can be numerated or quantified, which means that the realities concerned are inevitably overridden and crushed and distorted by the imposition upon them of imaginary statistical abstractions.

On the negative side also, we find a political sociology which concerns itself mainly with numerical abstractions, under such headings as ‘crime’, ‘social violence’, ‘delinquency’, ‘illegitimacy’. With what ‘factors’ are these associated? And so on.

What is so alarming is that all this should be taken for granted. “Why not?” I am constantly asked. “Why should not this valuable technique of statistics, so useful in the state of war, be used also for the better purposes of peace?”

“Why should not mathematics, with its proven, astounding and world-changing success in the field of inorganic science, be applied also to human welfare?” All I can reply is that means and ends are inseparable, and that the use of inappropriate means for alleged ends with which they are not connected is always disastrous.

Hot steel bars can be rolled out into sheets very effectively in a modern roller-mill, but to ask why, therefore, should not the same process be applied to an organic material such as timber, would be mere foolishness; but a far less disastrous form of folly than to ask why, if the numerical treatment of unit quantities has proved so successful, therefore, why should not the numerical treatment of living, idiosyncratic beings be equally successful.

The application of ‘numerism’ to the forces of inorganic nature has made enormous power available to mankind, but its application to humanity has concentrated that power in a few hands, and those, necessarily, the hands of power-lovers.

The process which started with military logistics, and was then extended to all the powers of the State over the people, has now reached something approaching its logical conclusion in the rival arrays of nuclear-armed IBMs programmed to destroy the main industrial and population power-centres of the rival State, eliminating in the process most of the units of human population – not to mention all other forms of life – which, being, as our ‘modern’ biologists inform us, merely the product of a purposeless concatenation of evolutionary occurrences, have significance only as units contributing to the collective power of the State, the Super-State, and ultimately of Planetary Humanity.

Policy, Finance and the Ecological Movement

It should be noticed also that the necessary vast numerical ‘credits’ necessary to finance this programme have always been forthcoming, as they have been also for the parallel programme of centralization of domestic and industrial energy-sources, with its policydrive towards an ultimate plutonium economy, providing not only

the physical basis for the maintenance of current world-terrorism, both official and unofficial, but also imposing indefinitely upon future generations a burden of toxic waste which will enforce the maintenance of a collectivised nuclear technology for the sake of sheer selfpreservation.

Welcome as is the growing awareness and reaction against all this, which has resulted in the allocation of some relatively petty sums to the development of decentralised sources of energy-income, it must be remembered that, whatever evolution is deemed to be, finance is by no means a random process. It is wholly centralised and man-controlled, and, when on a major scale, it is always a matter of carefully thought out and deliberate policy. The idea that these astronomical sums could have been created, and the consequent debts imposed and accepted, and committed to the cause of developing and maintaining the technology of a permanent World Terror, by mere chance, or in pursuit of such commercial aims as might influence a local branch bank manager, is quite childish.

What we have here is the relegation of a 'philosophy' or conception of the nature of the Universe and of mankind's place in it, expressing itself as a religion of human power, and aiming at a World hegemony not only over people, but through the statistically and collectively controlled human population, over all other forms of life and, indeed, even of inorganic nature.

One point that I want to bring out here is that the application of a form of statistics which implies a collectivist outlook upon, and treatment of, the living world is not a legitimate extension of the branch of knowledge known as mathematics, but the extension of a power-technique used by the rulers of mankind upon the masses of humanity. The form of this technique known as finance is a particularly effective tool in the manipulation and control of human purpose, and no one, I imagine, at the present time, could deny its effectiveness in controlling the general direction of scientific research, including biological research.

The illusion that the direction in which we explore the universe at a given time does not matter, because all knowledge is good, unless misused, is an example of very superficial, generalised thinking.

Because means are linked to ends there is always a correct direction to move, or a correct order in which to act. To walk down a cliff path is the correct means of getting to the bottom. To jump off the cliff may be said to be another means of achieving the same end, and much more quickly; but this, as we know well, is a piece of verbal nonsense which could be said only as a joke, because the 'end' is crippling or suicide, as compared with which the other is a petty irrelevance.

Unfortunately, when nuclear reactors are described as a means of supplying electrical power to the Grid, or the use of an entire public water supply to raise the intake of fluoride by children is described as a means of reducing dental caries, it is

not said as a joke nowadays, although past generations would have seen and rejected such proposals as the outrageous absurdities they in fact are.

The chief, overwhelmingly most important ‘end’ of the use of nuclear power is the accumulation of dangerous radioactive waste for many centuries or millennia and human generations to come, compared to which the mere supply of some current for contemporary use, for a few decades only for each ‘station’, is indeed a petty irrelevance.

The chief end of so-called ‘fluoridation’ is the permanent raising of the intake of this already widespread pollutant by the entire population, against the declared wishes of many of them, plus the establishment of a precedent for such an insanity and the encouragement of the development of medical ‘science’ in this direction under the headings of ‘public health’ and ‘preventive epidemiology’.

As compared with these consequences, an alleged and statistically dubious correlation between the fluoride content of the water and an abstraction called the DMF (decayed, missing, filled) Index in children's teeth, which no one has even claimed to solve the problem of dental caries, is a footling absurdity. The deplorable fact is that these two examples merely illustrate the type of verbally clever thought and language which are being used by the ‘pundits’ of officialdom and of the mass media progressively to detach the minds of the ordinary people from reality and from their innate common sense.

Both of these examples involve a permanent assault not only on people but on the rest of ‘nature’. The growing volume of ‘hot’ radioactive waste must isolate and sterilise any place in which it is kept, and the power-stations themselves have, so we are given to understand, a very limited safe life. As for the wildly insane objective of the fluoridebroadcasters, namely, the conversion of insoluble fluorine minerals into soluble form on a scale sufficient to pour them continuously through the piped water systems of the civilised world into our rivers, at a rate about ten times that which maintains the present earth-sea-air fluorine cycle, while at the same time innumerable and growing industries, which have now discovered how to handle this violently active element, pour more and more of its compounds into the atmosphere, one is reminded of a General Workers Union, and the County Council.

The opposition consisted of some local farmers and residents and some conservationists, whose objections concerning such matters as the extent of pollution, unemployment, noise, and the traffic burden on the island's bridges, were brushed aside like so many flies. Obviously, the highly paid professionals of the Company concerned ought to know better than these amateurs what they were going to do and what its effects would be. But in the event, most of the objections turned

out to be rather timid understatements of the truth, while the impressive quantitative estimates, which were used to crush them were shown to be a mere exercise in public manipulation.

To give but one example, although the objectors had grave doubts about the figure given for the biggest possible fluoride effluent from the smelter, they would never have dared to suggest that it would be exceeded by some 55 per cent.

Every way one looks at it, it seems clear that our Society is now dominated and controlled by people with minds and beliefs which are widely estranged from reality. They live, or imagine they do, in a pseudo-world of symbols – of figures, especially monetary and voting numbers, and words, especially political and other promotional power-verbiage.

They believe that, Man being the Supreme Being, and they being the Supreme Men, ‘nature’ including human and other biological natures, must adapt itself to this imaginary ‘world’ which they have created and imposed upon the ‘undermen’, rather than that the human mind must humbly bend itself to grasp and accommodate itself to the nature of things, which is the posture of mind which, hitherto, has been responsible for the great achievements of science.

But this posture was originally inspired by the belief that this ‘nature’ is the work of a Creator, whose will is the ultimate reality to which we must adapt ourselves, or die.

With the weakening of this belief and its abandonment by many, especially scientists, we are in a lag phase in which the belief in the reality of what the natural scientist studies is also weakening, and getting overlaid by what looks like the far more dominant ‘reality’ of the pseudo-world of words and numbers which superficially seems to control his life, but which the Created Nature is now telling us, with its manifold voices, is dangerously at variance with the real world.

It has been said that the Ecological Movement has not yet found a ‘soul’ – that is, a consistent philosophy or religion. It is largely a movement of protest and of somewhat puritanic doom-prophecy, reacting against the insane squandermania of our civilisation without any clear vision of the alternative. Such protest movements are notoriously vulnerable to being taken over and used, as tools by the very people the people against whose actions and ideas they are protesting, since those people, at any rate, have a practical philosophy which they are carrying out.

It is not all too clear that this is what has been happening since ‘environmentalism’ became a ‘bandwagon’. Now we have a Department of the Environment, and every major Conference on the subject is dominated by the representatives of Government and of Big Business. A protest against the dreary squandering of vast resources of

energy and materials and human effort on phoney imitations and substitutes for the real things of life can easily be twisted round with the aid of current financial policy to become an attack on the quality of life: on the life more abundant and all that belongs to it, on growth and reproduction and expansion and initiative and on the consumption of what people really need and want, which is the only legitimate reason for the expenditure of energy in production.

In so far as some of the environmentalists have allowed themselves to become associated with this perversion, they have changed sides. They are contending against life itself. The cure can lie only in looking closely at their true objectives, and deeply at their philosophy of life and its relation with reality.

In recent years there has been a strong tendency to turn to the East for this philosophy, in the belief that its spirituality and contempt for material things will provide the needed antidote to the gross and witless materialism of the West; but this is no antidote, merely the other side of the same false coin.

In broad terms, if the one religates to a life of overfed comfort and convenience, based upon a plethora of shoddy and wasteful throwaway gadgetry which we pay for by mortgaging the future, the other expresses itself in that terrible apathy and indifference to the most ghastly extremes of human poverty, misery, sickness and starvation which come as a shock to every traveller from the West on his first visit to the East.

Man is not a witlessly evolved matter-lump with an enlarged and clever brain, which has given him an epiphenomenon called 'mind' that enables him to dominate the Universe; but neither is he a spirit, temporarily inhabiting and imprisoned in a coarse material body, from which he strives and yearns to purify himself and to escape into the ultimate nirvana.

We Christians have been taught that he is a triune being: body, mind, spirit, three in one, made in the image of a Tri-une God, and in this belief there lies that balance, that stability, that peace which quite clearly passes our understanding, now that the churches are largely abandoning it or reducing it to a mere formula.

Quicumque Vult

There seems to be a disastrous tendency among contemporary theologians and leading Christians to retreat from the immense revelation of the nature of the Godhead implicit in the concept of the Holy Trinity which it is fashionable to refer to as 'hellenistic', into a re-judaized religion which is constantly referred to nowadays as 'Judaeo-Christianity'. Ironically enough, this is commonly represented as 'modern' and 'progressive' rather than, as it clearly is, wholly retrogressive.

That ‘Confession of our Christian Faith, commonly called the Creed of Saint Athanasius’ and formerly said in the Anglican churches on thirteen Feast Days during the Christian Year, is now said only on Trinity Sunday, and then may be ‘explained away’ in a sermon as an ingenious verbal formula thrashed out in the Councils of the Early Church for the confounding of heresies and the defence of the Unity of the Godhead, with no mention of the Diversity.

Sometimes the word ‘persona’ is translated as ‘an actor’s mask’ rather than as ‘character’ or ‘personality’ so that the faithful are given a picture of the tribal god of the Jew, blown up until he becomes the Monolithic Dictator of the Universe, play-acting with humanity by appearing in different ‘guises’.

The Creed goes to elaborate lengths to place precisely equal stress on the Unity and the diverse Trinity of God; “*And the Catholick Faith is this: That we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity: Neither confounding the Persons; nor dividing the Substance.*” So this Creed has to be ‘phased out’ before our religion can be brought ‘up-to-date’ and in line with the modern obsession with centralised Power, which is the characteristic of Unity not balanced by diversity.

If we think in practical terms, rather than verbalisms, about the Created Order, we see that unity-in-diversity and diversity-in-unity are of its very nature.

A simple, unitary God, who does not comprise Diversity within his Being, cannot be a Creator; for the act of creation is the act of diversifying. However, if the Personae of the Godhead are but masks, then the man Jesus is a mask; and whatever that may mean, it cannot mean that he is the Incarnate Deity.

One or other of the ancient heresies must be revived: either he was a mere simulacrum of a man, temporarily used by the Divine Spirit at a certain time in history, or he was a true man, and only a man – a Jewish prophet of such exceptional merit that he may be said to have had a special relationship with God, which by some verbal legerdemain might even be stretched to include some participation in the Godhead.

In either case, the co-eternity of the Son becomes an incredible nonsense, and the Love which He gave dwindles in its very nature to a mere exhibition of supernatural Power.

The Holy Spirit also proceeding from the Father and the Son must be lost also to the faith of those who share this thinking.

Why then are we so often given to understand that the *Quicumque vult* is nowadays mainly of historical and academic importance, scarcely applicable to the World of ToDay; that the heresies of the past which it was devised to meet have little bearing on the thinking of to-day; and that the tremendous doctrine concerning the eternal nature of God which emerged was a matter of temporary applicability to the

circumstances of the time which we must now regard as expendable?

Why are we scarcely ever shown that the World is now increasingly dominated by very much the same types of wrong thinking, wearing, indeed, contemporary ‘masks’, and especially the dualism of dialectical materialism which is the modern form of Manichaeism?

And why, with all this talk about adapting our theology to the current situation and the new knowledge which science has brought us, has not this new knowledge been used to enrich our understanding of this historic revelation rather than to impoverish it or even to destroy it?

These questions are not merely rhetorical. They are asked in the hope of a reply from those who ought to know the answers, but there seems little hope of receiving one from those who are operating the current factory for ‘situational theologies’, manufactured to fit a world dominated by the atheology of human power.

What is so difficult for a practical scientist to grasp is the sort of verbal thinking which seems to dominate this whole field, varying abruptly with the current fashion or ‘trend’ which in turn is probably based upon the temporary dominance of a particular author or ‘school’ in the printed dialogue selected by the editors and publishing houses. I shall probably be asked – at least by implication – whether I am up-to-date in current theological verbalistics, with the further implication that if I am not I am merely making a fool of myself in expressing my inexpert and unimportant opinions; which may well be true, but is of no significance as compared with the idea implicit in this criticism that the nature of God and of Man is a matter of opinion rather than of reality.

Science, at least since the Renaissance, has been based upon the belief that facts are not determined by thoughts and symbols, but are subject to the tests of the real Universe. It is not a matter of opinion as to whether water is correctly represented by the symbols H_2O or HO_2 because this deals with realities which can fairly quickly and easily be tested. Because the supreme questions of the ultimate nature of the Universe and of Man’s place in it are not subject, by their very nature, to such simple tests, must this imply that they are less real than the chemical nature of water? If indeed the water molecule were HO_2 the practical consequences would be catastrophic. But is it a matter of no practical consequence as to whether God exists, and if so whether He is a simple Unity, or a Trinity-in-Unity or whether Man is essentially a Hebraic duality of body and soul, or a tri-une being of body, mind and spirit?

This would appear to be a question which invites the answer ‘No – of course not!’ But the whole trend of the current writing and discussion on the subject seems to carry the implication that such matters are matters of opinion, of expert scholarship, of linguistic interpretation or historical analysis, of anything but their practical consequences.

We are led to believe that radically different and opposed beliefs about the nature of Man and the Universe can lead to similar results; and not only that the road to Hell can be paved with good intentions but the road to Heaven with wrong ones.

Is it surprising that when the vision is so confused and detached from reality the people are on the way to perishing?

How can Man be responsible for Nature if he has no idea of what Nature is or how to treat her? The English countryside at its best is the product of centuries of belief that Nature is the Creation of the Love of God in whose Trinitarian Nature the principle of balance, of equilibrium, of unity-in-diversity, is made holy.

In the deserts of North Africa (created by the Roman latifundia), the dust bowl of the Middle West, the slums (vertical and horizontal) of our great cities, the dreary blocks of workers' flats in Moscow and the vast collective farms of the Russian Revolution may be seen the product of the belief that Nature is a chaos engendered by an impersonal play of forces, upon which Man alone can impose order, and the Masters of mankind their supreme will, whether by the operation of financial or of political power.

So much of the argument and discussion about Man's responsibility for Nature is futile, because it covers a fundamental difference of belief about Man, about Nature, and even about responsibility. Particularly since our nation has been made into a multiracial, multicultural, multi-religious conglomeration of humanity, with no common ground to work from except a common subjection to money and employment and to the State and its controls and its universal, compulsory education, it has become vitally necessary for Christians especially, to make clear the basis of belief from which they operate, since this can no longer be taken for granted, and to seek to apply it, in full, here and there, so that it may be known by its fruits, its results may be seen and its example may be followed by others.

Dr. C. Geoffrey Dobbs (- 1996) was a senior lecturer in Forest Botany, specializing in the ecology of soil fungi (mycostasis), at the University College of North Wales, Bangor, U.K.

He was a devoted advocate for Douglas Social Credit and contributed many addresses and published articles to the advancement of that cause.

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

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

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

BSB 105-044

A/c No. 188-040-840

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

Telephone: 08 8322 8923 eMail: heritagebooks@alor.org

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

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

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

Essential Reading:

Communism is Treason

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

Communism in Australia

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

An Introductory Course on the

Real Communist Conspiracy

https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Butler%20ED%20-%20bew0Real_Communist_Conspiracy.pdf

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. 33

30th August 2024

IN THIS ISSUE

Right Thinking By Arnis Luks	31
Soils and Us - Soils, Growing Food and Stuff By Will Waite	36

Thought for the Week:

Message to Youth

“To follow reason, however arduous be the way; to accept such truth as may be revealed to us, however unpalatable; to refuse to put a rose-pink veil between ourselves and reality; to see life as it really is, without flinching, and without flinching to see oneself as one really is; this is the life for men, this is to be of the aristocracy of earth, let who will wear a crown or the mitre. As for the poor creatures who shrink from the cold blast of reality - those who must needs look at the world through drug-dimmed eyes, those for whom thought is too strenuous, and the truth too dangerous - leave them to their picture shows and their crooners and their comforting sermons and their games - sympathise with them if you will, pity them as much as you like, but - come out from among them! If I were on my deathbed, that would be my last word to young Australia.”

Walter Murdoch - Great Australian scholar and writer

Right Thinking By Arnis Luks

This week I have been immersing myself within some written works by Jack Lang, to better appreciate what communism is, and the levels of infiltration and subversion within our own hallways of political and bureaucratic power. ‘*Communism in Australia*’ was one title, ‘*Communism is Treason*’, another. Each literary effort reveals the inner workings, tactics, and primary objective of the Communist Party of Australia - being in full alignment with the Socialist International. This (alignment with the Socialist International) was also confirmed by the Australian Labor Party in their *1982 Platform, Constitution and Rules*. It took another title ‘*Why I Fight*’ to emphasise the dialectical-nexus between International Finance and International Communism, both pursuing the same goal of complete world conquest. It is from this dialectical perspective, of the ‘High Road of the Few’ being the Fabian Socialist policy of transferring absolute power

to International Finance; with the ‘Low Road of The Many’ being the policy of International Communism, also transferring absolute power to International Finance, with both placing the common people under a world-wide totalitarian dictatorship. Eric Butler explains :

Steps Towards The Monopoly State by ED Butler 1947

The Policy Behind Bank Nationalisation

The plan to create a government monopoly of credit in Australia is an important aspect of the totalitarian war being waged against this and other British countries. If the directors of this war are to be defeated, it is first essential that their identity and methods of warfare be widely exposed. Since the Canadian spy trials and the publication of the Canadian Royal Commission’s report on Communist infiltration tactics, there can be no disputing the fact that Communism is an international conspiracy, the most effective agents of which are undisclosed Communists working in government departments and universities.

But not only the Communists use the technique of infiltration: the English Fabian Socialist Society, the fountain-head of the “planned-economy” idea, had its programme advanced by permeating other organisations. One of the original Fabians, Mr. Bernard Shaw, outlined the technique as follows: *“Our propaganda is chiefly one of permeating. We urged our members to join the Liberal and Radical Associations in their district, or if they preferred it the Conservative Associations. We permeated the Party organisations, and pulled all the wires we could lay our hands on with the utmost adroitness and energy...”*

The London School of Economics

In 1921 the Fabian Society brought into being the London School of Economics, Sidney and Beatrice Webb, both ardent pro-Communists, being primarily responsible. When Lord Haldane, who said that his “spiritual home” was in Germany, was asked why he persuaded the famous financier, Sir Ernest Cassel, to finance this institution, he replied: *“Our object(ive-ed) is to make this place an institution to raise and train the bureaucracy of the future Socialist State.”*

(Professor K. H. Morgan, K.C., in *English Quarterly Review*, Jan., 1929).

That the objectives of the sponsors of the London School of Economics LSE are being achieved can be seen in the fact that “key” members of Government bureaucracies in all British countries are products of this hot-bed of Socialism and Communism. A study of the statements made by such economic advisers as Dr. H. C. Coombs, a London School of Economics LSE product, reveal that these “advisers” are working to implement a “planned economy” run by a centralised bureaucracy. The more centralised and complicated government is made the greater the control of policy by the bureaucracy. Thus, the persistent attempts to expand the powers of the Australian Federal Government. A prominent instructor at the London School of Economics is Professor Laski, no less than 67 of his

pupils being members of the British Socialist Government.

In his book, *Democracy in Crisis*, Laski said that a Socialist government would: “Take vast powers and legislate under them by ordinance and “decree,” and “suspend the classic formula of normal opposition.” This is exactly what the British Socialist Government is doing. The same procedure for destroying responsible government is being used at Canberra. Dr. H. V. Evatt wrote in the preface to his book, *The King and His Dominion Governors*: “I am also under obligation to Professor Laski of the London School of Economics ... for much encouragement and advice.” Laski expressed disappointment when Dr. Evatt’s 1944 referendum failed. However, Dr. Evatt said the fight to increase the Federal Government’s powers would go on. Surely the real purpose of nationalised banking is now clear.

The great tragedy of these critical times is the manner in which sincere idealists can be used to further policies the ultimate object of which would terrify them if they but knew them.

Socialism in Practice

The idea of a “planned economy,” which centralised control of financial credit is designed to advance, may, in theory, sound very nice. But if this policy of centralisation is to continue unchallenged, if the Federal Government is to obtain more power and delegate it to an increasing army of officials, what will be the ultimate end of the individual? He will be merely a cog in a machine. Those controlling the machine will argue that it cannot be endangered by cogs having any freedom of movement. This means RIGID COMPULSION.

Asked how Socialism worked in practice, Mr. Bernard Shaw replied: “Compulsory labour, with death as the final penalty, is the keystone of Socialism.”

(English Labour Monthly, October, 1921)

The chief speaker at the Fabian International Bureau’s Conference in 1942 said: “*There is not much basic difference between the basic economic techniques of Socialism and Nazism.*”

It is totalitarianism that is being imposed upon us by (Australian PM-ed) Mr. Chifley and the Labor Party. We cannot walk the same road that the Germans walked and reach a different destination. For our own salvation we must make open war upon all totalitarian ideas, no matter under what guise - Fabian Society, National Socialist, Communist - or by what political group they are advanced...
end

AJL: Debt requires interest plus principal payments, of which our Reserve Bank of Australia board is responsible for setting the base-rate of interest. Interest payments are, simply put, a confiscation of spending-power gleaned from the public.

Ever rising prices also provide a further contributing factor towards confiscation. Interest payments, and ever rising prices, are a one-two punch against the public's ability to work and pay their way out of debt, leading on to financial impoverishment as the result. The RBA is no better than agency for international central bank policy.

Taxation is another form of confiscation of the same spending power being gleaned from the public.

If ever there was a legitimate hockey stick illustrating the logarithmic increase of interest payments on debt it is this: https://www.aph.gov.au/About_Parliament/Parliamentary_departments/Parliamentary_Library/Budget/reviews/2023-24/AustralianGovernmentDebt

Personal and Private debt; no different from Government debt; rising logarithmically.

We are swimming in debt with no Australian statesman prepared to bring this subject up, let alone pursue a policy of debt-redemption-retirement and/or a sinking fund to progressively clear all historical debts. While the political class and the bureaucracy have shored up their own retirement booty with the Future Fund, the average Australian is left to flounder in projected poverty. Little wonder the bureaucracy is increasingly detached from the real world of increased suffering experienced by the average Aussie - The Low Road of The Many.

If we were all in this together it may be different, but with vastly differing circumstances, the projected outcome must surely be divisive, leading on to ill-feeling between peoples, and civil breakdown.

National Sovereignty At Stake

Labor Treasurer Jim Chalmers is enticing the Coalition Leaders - Shadow Treasurer Angus Taylor, to align with Labor (bipartisan) over the *2023 Reserve Bank Review*, to ensure policy will not change across any future Government – Coalition or Labor. No doubt the outcome of this concerted arrangement will affect the monopoly-MSM's approach to any prospects of achieving the next government. Letting The Fox Amongst The Pigeons – a monetary policy that allows private banks to run roughshod over Australia, her people and her assets – without political oversight – yea go for it Lib/Nats/Lab/Greens!

What say ye Malcolm and Pauline – or are you missing-in-action as well?

https://rbareview.gov.au/sites/rbareview.gov.au/files/2023-06/rbareview-report-at_0.pdf

Recommendation p.252/294

1: Affirm the RBA's independence and clarify its statutory monetary policy objectives

1.1 The RBA should continue to have operational independence for monetary policy. The Government should remove the power of the Treasurer to overrule the RBA's decisions.

The Government and the RBA should clarify these issues in the Statement on the Conduct of Monetary Policy, including a statement that the Government will not use its overrule power and the RBA will not use its power to determine the lending policy of banks.

1.2 The Government should amend the Reserve Bank Act 1959 such that:

* The RBA has dual monetary policy objectives of price stability and full employment.

* The ‘economic prosperity and welfare of the people of Australia now and in the future’ is an overarching purpose for the RBA rather than a separate objective for monetary policy.

1.3 The Government should remove the RBA’s power (in the Banking Act 1959) to determine the lending policy of banks.

The Communist objective, as detailed in the ‘*Communist Manifesto*’ is summarised in the statement: the abolition of private property. The Reserve Bank of Australia board is ensuring this policy is being increasingly met. I wasn’t surprised to read of the educational qualifications of board members predominantly coming from the LSE London School of Economics, the IMF, the Bank of England, and other central banks. I didn’t read of any traditional and loyal Aussie bloke or sheila in amongst this lot controlling financial policy for Australia.

What isn’t clearly stated is: ‘who holds ultimate control of the results of this confiscation of all private property’ - Klaus Schwabb perhaps, or is he just another front man for central bank policy!

This is where ‘they’ are taking us, into a Socialist State whereby all private property will be confiscated - through irredeemable-debt, inflation and taxation that increasingly services government debt. We will all be financially bankrupt...

Responsibilities and Duties of a Member of Parliament

The Australian High Court case (Horne v Barber, 1920, 27 CLR, p.500)

“When a man becomes a Member of Parliament, he undertakes high public duties these duties are inseparable from the position: you cannot return the honour and divest himself of the duties. One of the duties that of watching on behalf of the general community conduct of the Executive, of criticising, and, if necessary, of calling it to account in the constitutional way by sensor from his place in Parliament - sensor which, if sufficiently supported, means removal from office that is the whole essence of responsible government, which is the keystone of our political system, and is the main constitutional safeguard the community possesses. The effective discharge of that duty is necessarily left to the Member’s conscience and the judgement of his electors, but the law will not sanction or support the creation of any position of a Member of Parliament where his own personal interest may lead him to act prejudicially to the public interest by weakening (to say the least) his sense of obligation of due watchfulness, criticism, and censure of the administration.”

Lord Shaw of Dumfermline stated inter-alia:

“Parliament is summoned by the Sovereign to advise His Majesty freely. By the nature of the case it is implied that coercion, restraint, or money payments, which is the price of voting at the bidding of others, destroys or imperils that functional freedom of advice which is fundamental in the very constitution of Parliament.”

How Bureaucracy Works

Pythagoras Theorem has 22 words

The Lord's Prayer has 70 words

Lincoln's Gettysburg Address has 271

The 10 Commandments have 321

The US Declaration of Independence has 1338

But the *2023 Review of the Reserve Bank of Australia*, which contains 113,608 words, handing over the responsibility of running the financial-system of our nation to central banking interests through the RBA. ***

Soils and Us - Soils, Growing Food and Stuff By Will Waite

I've been working with our soil now at pretty close range for the last 10 years. I don't know a hell of a lot about the inner workings of soil especially when you get into areas of scientific description but I can tell you some things I've learned about its food production function.

Soil is powerful stuff. This winter we've harvested tomatoes, radishes, brussell sprouts, beetroot, carrots, cauli, broccoli, pumpkins, oranges, lemons, limes, tangelo, mandarins, peas, snow peas, salads and cabbages of various types, silverbeat, ginger and winter herbs. At the same time, we've been eating the tail end of autumn; passionfruit, persimmon, sweet potato, bananas, guavas and some stuff you probably haven't heard of. Then there are the preserves from previous seasons, eggs from the chooks and meat from the paddocks.

The following are some fundamentals for productive soils.

The basic material is essentially decomposed rock and the properties of soil will vary depending on the underlying geology. In the Northern Rivers our soils are basalt spewed out of Mount Warning a long time ago, and it is the source of the region's innate fertility.

This pulverised, and dissolved stuff provides the base elements and generally takes a long time to accumulate. Added to this is the organic component of soils. Some of it is alive, much of it is dead and decomposing. You need a microscope to see most soil biology but earthworms, ants, fungus, beetles and their larvae are visible signs of a vital soil.

Another indication of soil health is its porosity, that is the pore space in the soil. Porosity basically refers to its capacity to absorb and hold air and water. Good soil porosity has a crumb structure which is the work of soil biota generating a moist,

oxygen rich habitat. High porosity is also a good indicator of a soil's resilience to climatic extremes, drought and wet. Good soils take longer to dry out and they're harder to flood.

Any good gardener knows that with all this life and structure soils are fragile. It should be treated with care and, if we intend to grow food, it should be provided with what it needs to develop and condition.

Permaculture's definition of sustainable agriculture is simply a system that builds soils. Mollison lists "the only places where soils are conserved or increased"¹:

- In uncut forests;
- Under the quiet water of lakes and ponds;
- In prairies and meadows of permanent plants; and
- Where we grow plants with mulched or non-tillage systems

There are various ways to build soils in food production systems. The essential ingredient is organic material cycled and recycled by plants and animals. Mulch of wood and grass can be brought in or, even better, grown and processed on site. The more variety in the mix the better. Manures can be added directly to beds, aged, composted or processed through worm farms. Plant mulch can be grown on site to provide a diverse supply of ready mulch and compost materials, and beds can be planted with green manures that contribute to soil organic matter above and below ground. All of this increases the carbon constituent in soils which is the most basic food stock of life on earth.

Minimum intervention is a good principle. No dig and low tillage systems minimise soil disruption and are conservative of soils and labour. Ensuring soils are covered to avoid them drying out, blowing or washing away is also essential. Since plant roots and residues are essential to healthy soil ecosystems, carefully thought-out gardens that integrate perennial trees, shrubs and groundcovers with short-lived crops are ideal. Broader scale strategies are available.

It is no secret that the careful cultivation and increase of healthy, living soils is not the business of our industrialised agricultural system. Quite the opposite. Tillage and crop systems remove between 40 and 500 t/ha² of soil per year. Conventional agriculture essentially replaces the biological approach of growing food with heavy reliance on tillage, chemical fertilisers and biocides. A decline in food quality goes along with the deterioration of soils treated in this way.

Douglas said some interesting things about our relationship to the land which are worth thinking about:

...the world in which we live is an organism and men and animals have intricate relationships with the earth – not amorphous but specific and infinitely varied, which can only be disregarded at the peril of both men and the earth they live on. I do not mean in the least by this that a universal back to the land movement is either necessary or even desirable, but I do think that the idea that the earth is merely something to be exploited and "lived on" is quite fatal.

The second and antithetic idea, is that the world is merely raw material for a

factory, that the nearer agriculture approximates to Mr. Ford's conveyer belt principles, and towns emulate Stalingrad, the better we shall be. I do not think I am unduly squeamish, but I have to plead guilty to a wave of real nausea at the description, as progress, of egg factories in which hundreds or thousands of hens are kept under electric light from birth to death, confined in little boxes, never allowed out, laying eggs. I don't want to eat those eggs, and I have a strong conviction they are not good to eat, whatever their superficial taste may be.³

The family farm is being phased out by corporate agribusiness and absentee landowners. Anyone who lives on the land can see it happening. There is plenty of propaganda about the "new" agriculture. Lots of technologists, machine operators and debt — not so many dirty fingernails. Don't be fooled. It's only the most recent twist on "Ford's conveyer belt principles."

I don't know if a universal back to the land movement is necessary or desirable. I tend to think it is but it would appear that the course of agriculture for the near future is set. Dominated by the bean counters it involves a detached method of ploughed monocultures hooked on artificial fertilisers and poison. It's a formula for disease, dependence and dust. The material and method for a decentralised economics is at hand in the soil. Alternatives exist.

1 Mollison, B. 1988. *Permaculture: A Designer's Manual*. Tagari, Tyalgum, NSW.

2 Ibid.

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

Beware False Prophets: Deputy Gov of the RBA Andrew Hauser gave a paper to the Economic Society of Australia (Qld) 12th August this year. I read his notes and also the questions and his answers from this presentation. I hold no confidence that debts will come down, nor our manufacturing be restored to protect Australia's national and strategic interests. Affordability of home ownership and a secure economic future for our children, were also not on of the agenda. Graphs and charts and models were there in abundance, but where the actual rubber hits the road, all I saw was desolation and poverty. Allowing an unbridled-RBA to manage our economy, without any real world experience of running businesses-for-profit is delusional. The economy is in free-fall and the prophets are looking at chicken entrails, while all current and projected debt levels are heading into the stratosphere. Australia is bankrupt and no one is talking about it. - AJL

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

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

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

BSB 105-044

A/c No. 188-040-840

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

Telephone: 08 8322 8923 eMail: heritagebooks@alor.org

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

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

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

Essential Reading:

Communism is Treason

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

Communism in Australia

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

An Introductory Course on the Real Communist Conspiracy

https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Butler%20ED%20-%20bew0Real_Communist_Conspiracy.pdf

A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Vol. 60 No. 34

6th September 2024

IN THIS ISSUE

The Territorial Imperative - Love, Land and Debt By Will Waite	39
A Welcome Discussion That Must Be Had By Arnis Luks	44
Reconstruction By Neville Archibald	48

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

References

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

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

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

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

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

Step-by-Step Calculation with Compound Interest:

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

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

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

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

Let's break this calculation into parts:

- Part 1: $(1+r)^n(1+r)^n(1+0.0025)^{360} \approx 2.448(1+0.0025)^{360} \approx 2.448(1+0.0025)^{360} \approx 2.448$

- Part 2: Calculate the numerator $0.0025 \times 2.448 \approx 0.00612$
 $0.0025 \times 2.448 \approx 0.00612$

- Part 3: Calculate the denominator $2.448 - 1 = 1.448$
 $2.448 - 1 = 1.448$

- Part 4: Calculate the monthly payment MMM $M = 3,000,000,000,000 \times \frac{0.00612}{1.448} \approx 3,000,000,000,000 \times 0.00423 \approx 12,690,000,000$
 $M = 3,000,000,000,000 \times \frac{0.00612}{1.448} \approx 3,000,000,000,000 \times 0.00423 \approx 12,690,000,000$

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

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

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

Calculate the Number of Work Hours and Work Years

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A Welcome Discussion That Must Be Had By Arnis Luks

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

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

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

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

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

Successful Section 128 Referendum

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

Successful Section 51 Without Referendum

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

Section 51

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

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

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

Differing Approaches – Differing Nations

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

p.186

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

Differing Crowns

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

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

Free To Think -

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

Section 52

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

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

Running Policy Into The Long Grass

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

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

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

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

Secret Men's Business - Smoke and Mirrors

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Reconstruction By Neville Archibald

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

So used to being allowed to view it as their own to command, the real ownership of this credit (by the people) needs to be enforced.

The 1st Attempt at criticism will be that it is ridiculous! It has always been ... etc. on close inspection it can be seen that it is not at all ridiculous but reality that has been skewed.

The 2nd Attempt will be that of accusing us of failure to understand the financial system. The long and complicated explanations that have even to this point, resulted in a failure to manage our finances without boom and bust cycles and increasing un-payable debt. The natural tendency to believe that because it has been that way, that it is right, despite their very failure.

The 3rd will be the failure of people to recognise and appreciate the physical possibilities of the monetary system as distinct from its currently purported financial features.

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

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

League Objectives

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

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

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

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

BSB 105-044

A/c No. 188-040-840

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

Telephone: 08 8322 8923 eMail: heritagebooks@alor.org

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

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

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

Essential Reading:

Communism is Treason

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

Communism in Australia

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

An Introductory Course on the Real Communist Conspiracy

https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Butler%20ED%20-%20%2bew0Real_Communist_Conspriracy.pdf

A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Vol. 60 No. 35

13th September 2024

IN THIS ISSUE

Why the Fight against Monopoly Capital? By Neville Archibald	53
Economic Control - What Does it Look Like? By Neville Archibald	59

Why the Fight against Monopoly Capital? By Neville Archibald

Andrew Fisher is probably best known as one of Australia's early Prime Ministers. Many do not know much about the figures they often equate with, "Privileged Old White Men" as I have often heard them being referred to. A simplistic version of history often suits the "flavour" of the day rather than the realities of the time. I can see a time where the Constitution will be denigrated rather than considered, indeed it is happening in schools now when it is mentioned. The truth becomes the first casualty in any war; propaganda and the whipping up of indignation become useful tools for manipulation – by both sides! Our understanding of history is crucial in seeing through this, David Day's outstanding biography of Andrew Fisher, was the prompt for this article. I knew much of the intentions of our founding fathers from my previous reading but this brought home, just how far we have gone down a road I, for one, do not wish to travel.

In the lead up to Federation, the Australian colonies had their own battles they were fighting. Many of the newly arrived colonists were from areas of unrest and poverty. Unable to make a difference in their home country due to restrictive political practices and a wealthy political elite maintaining their monopoly of power, they emigrated to a new country that had the promise of being different. Andrew Fisher serves as an example. Being more vocal than most, or perhaps more convinced of needed change, his life story is an interesting reminder of what we could be striving for today. Not so different as he saw it back then.

Residing in the Gympie area of Queensland in the years after his arrival from Scotland in 1885, he took up the family profession of coal-mining. He became involved with the Church and the Australian Labourers Federation where he found common ground.

After growing up in Scotland and witnessing his father and grandfather fighting for better conditions, (private ownership of coalmines and the miners subject to repression and strike breaking abounded in Scotland) he recognised the similarity of the disputes with monopoly capital here in Australia. It is with this in mind that so many had come for a better life, only to find more of the same.

With the big Shearers strikes of the 1890s and various miners and other working class strikes, large sections of the community were wondering what lay ahead. Voting at the time was restricted, and not all workers had a right to participate.

Wealthy land owners, had the right to vote in as many electorates as they had land. Blacklisting of people for work if they dared to speak out was common.

The rise of the Australian Labourers Federation was on the basis that:

“delegates adopted a political platform which pointed to the ‘social wrongs’ suffered under capitalism by Australian workers and the increasing concentration of economic power in the hands of monopoly capital, such that the struggle to live is becoming hard and bearing its’ natural fruit in the extremes of wealth and want”

Delegates of the constituent unions were asked at the time to authorise the executive, *“to declare that the present industrial system, commonly called the competitive system, is destructive, pernicious, and altogether evil, and must be replaced by a social system which will not leave it in the power of one man to take advantage of the necessities or disabilities of another, and which will provide for all workers opportunity to avail themselves of the bounties of nature and to partake fully of the fruits of civilisation and to receive full benefit of their share of the common toil.”* These words could be seen as socialism and were indeed labelled as such by some at that time.

They make quite a mouthful, and yet nothing said then could not be said again today. In a truly Christian society looking out for one another is a duty. To exploit others is a sin! The people of this time were far more likely to attend a church or read a bible than now, far more likely to profess a Christian outlook on life, yet exploitation was rife. A corrupt system of government, largely attending to the interests of monopoly control had emigrated out with them.

The Queensland Samuel Griffith Government (Liberal/National) had sent thousands of heavily armed troops and police to suppress the shearers strike. The use of harsh prison sentences and the threat of non-European labour being brought in, was reminiscent of the action against striking miners in Ayrshire and elsewhere in the home countries.

This had a great deal of influence in the decision to wrest control of colony governments, so blatantly serving the interests of monopoly wealth.

Andrew Fisher would have seen all this – his role in the labour movement led to him being a part of the first labour convention in Brisbane as a representative for Gympie. Although not playing a leading role in debates, he took part and could see the benefit this would make if implemented. Such actions by a controlled government was Scotland all over again. He could clearly see the need to push for

better democracy.

The over-dominating upper house in Queensland (seen as undemocratic due to it being composed largely of representatives of pastoral companies) had no time for a vision of small farmers and workers who were seen as a potential workforce rather than individuals.

Fisher blamed a lot of Queensland's parlous state on being governed by banks, squatters and land gamblers. The banking collapse, following not long after the 1893 floods, saw banks and building societies close their doors. The collapse was a culmination of the property investment frenzy of the late 1880s and the subsequent drop in values, which if I dare to guess, suggests someone benefited. The use of this medium of control is still ongoing, we are seeing very similar monetary manipulation right now.

Interestingly at that time, the much maligned 'White Australia Policy' grew out of the fact that these wealthy manipulators were pursuing a policy of employment of non-whites and Europeans to "break" the common man, whether shearer, miner or other worker. People were disenfranchised and blacklisted (as Fisher was a number of times) for speaking out or standing up for their own rights. It is often said that much of this white bias was purely racial in nature – yet the obvious thing to me here, is the cheap labour brought in by the very manipulators, who used this tactic over and over again (and are still doing it in one form or another). Then demonising their opposition for being racist, an easy slander to make which doesn't fully cover the reasons, does it? Fisher had seen that in the use of impoverished Irish labour in Scotland, and later the cheap and plentiful non European imports used for breaking miners strikes for better conditions or pay. Social manipulation brings with it these things, the threat of loss of livelihood by migrants who are prepared to work for less or in appalling conditions – consider those who push for this even now, and ask yourself why? It is a repeated observance in so many countries of the western world right now, with open borders and the subsequent repression of an increasingly fed up voter base. How much of this "so called" racial hatred, is created to give advantage to those doing the manipulation of society?

The important thing to realise here, is that many of these striking people came from a background of exploitation already and had been unable to fight successfully in a corrupt British country. The colonies had been used by the large trading companies, like the East India company, to exploit material wealth and increase the wealth and influence of the owners at home. Business's got bigger and the ruling elite grew more confident in their suppression of the "lesser beings" who worked for them. Almost a century of clearings and dis-possession was in the background of those who sought a fresh start. (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Highland_Clearances). They had come for a promise of a new life and found that the old was already firmly entrenched. They were not going to move again. The known world had been discovered and for many, this would be their last chance to escape the brutal restrictions they had already suffered.

Again, are we not seeing this same thing now? We have billionaire companies and groups of companies whose global presence and wealth, rule over a largely compliant workforce. While our standard of living is not as bad now, it is still within the “just able to put up with it” stage, is it not? Imported workers fill many jobs and are happy with lower incomes. The threats by big companies of moving offshore also hamper wages and conditions negotiations. Small business (especially agriculture) finds itself at the mercy of the consumers of their products, be it engineering or fruit growing. It is the big unaccountable global concerns that decide to buy or not in many cases.

As a resident of a fruit growing area, I have often seen plantings of a particular variety put in at considerable expense of money and time (more than a 5 year wait for any real production in many cases) only to find the company no longer wants it. The vagaries of fashion aside, a livelihood is ‘make or break’ in this way. The constant chase to stay ahead of changing demand, input costs and decreasing end value means leisure or community participation time has been reduced. The “nose to the grindstone” approach even with a huge production capability, still sees this leisure never realised. It is desirable to keep us too busy to push for change.

The capable people who create such a business (a family smallholding) would have been the ones previously, who would have used this leisure time in support of family /community betterment: the creation of local facilities, standing for council, or even being more politically engaged.

When time is scarce, you portion out what you have as you see fit. The good among us start with family first, local community next and there never seems enough time or energy left over to do more than vote when it comes to the important issue of state or federal government. Once again we see the wealthy, or those supported by the wealthy, being at the advantage.

This is what Fisher found. Elected to Queensland parliament in 1893 he was one of 16 MP s representing the common man, the worker. He had had to overcome gerrymandering and voter restrictions (they did not have full voting rights across the community at that time). Not only that, but in an effort to make it harder, the incumbent government had slashed the MPs’ salaries from £300 to £150, partly to dissuade working class candidates standing for the labour cause. Well off candidates or those backed by wealth, were well supported by vested interests (any different today?)

There will, of course, be those who look at Fisher and see “Labor Party”. The truth is he was also called a socialist, and a racist for his opposition to imported labourers. Labels are interesting things, the names one can be called during your lifetime and after, are often unrepresentative of reality. The lumping together of similar people to tar them or to degrade their intentions is a normal occurrence – we all like to be able to put people in categories.

Fisher was as far from today’s Labor party as he was from the pastoralists and big business owners of his day. To me, the intentions of the Labour Party of his day was

to overthrow the restrictive money powers. Jump to present time and we see a Labor party of bankers, and big business associates. Very few have ever been a ‘worker’ in the 1890s sense! The policies of this current party are a pale reflection of its original intent. Paul Keating’s deregulation of the banks, allowing open slather to milk us dry, is not in keeping with the actions of anyone involved back then.

The scare of a successful rise of the working class led to some interesting tactics in the next election. Fisher was to lose his seat for a number of reasons. There were claims of neglect of his electorate, there were worries of the vote not being secret which could find supporters blacklisted from mining jobs, the loss of mines due to flooding and interestingly the accusation of socialism in the *Gympie Times* by the opposing candidate. Politics, is what it is, at all times. The use of sectarian accusations was also brought to the fore when an aspiring Catholic candidate hopeful was rejected in pre-selection. Fisher had been made out to have said he would rather run with a Methodist than a Catholic. His accuser confronted him on stage at one of his campaign meetings and what may well have been an off the cuff remark (Fisher was a strong protestant) was then used to increase sectarian hostility. This combination of scares meant he lost his seat.

In today’s climate these things are also easy to see. Unfounded claims of links to groups, or comments made and taken out of context, are often used in this way. Not much changes. (The Moira Deeming debacle in Victoria is a classic example of this, albeit in the Liberal party.)

The next election saw Fisher elected as a Labor MP in Gympie. All the drama of the time led to another hotly contested campaign and instead of giving up after his previous defeat he plugged away. Unable to get work in his profession of mining due to being blacklisted, he took other jobs and sold his house in town. There is much that could be said about the negative things we see when looking back on these times; arguments about race, religion, and political bent. Each one of you could find something that today you could be offended by. Is it really any different now?

Although we are tolerant in our outlook, in some ways we are even more intolerant when looking back. Each period in history, needs to be judged by the time it existed in; too often we find the attitudes of now, being used to interpret those times. A need to immerse yourself in the thinking of the day and in the previous history of their forebears, is a must to understand them. (Highland clearances and the resultant Scottish immigrant attitudes paints the picture very well).

The intent and progression from bad to better is what you should be looking for. Was the overall change during that period for better or worse? During this time many factors influenced outcomes and many dubious claims were made on both sides; but, the end result was furthering of the democratic principles of a vote for all and increased support for votes for women. The reduction in manipulation by the wealthy elites of the time and a fair go for all, in the Aussie way, was being created. A vision of reducing class privilege and economic control over ordinary Australians so that we could develop as individuals.

Fisher's general push for restrictions on monopoly control of all things, also included banking. Part of his continued platform was that of the establishment of a Commonwealth Bank. The depression of the 1890s and the ability of Australia to manage its own monetary affairs, rather than continually being manipulated by outside sources was one of the main early policies of the fledgling Labour Party. There was concern of many of his colleagues that he should not mention Commonwealth banking for fear of election loss and more. Billy Hughes predicted that, "the men who lend money will be aroused & desperate: credit will become alarmed. Overdrafts called in: every string pulled that goes to make a financial crisis. Or the fear of one which will be so far as we are concerned the same thing" David Day: *Andrew Fisher* pg167.

How far have we come? How far are we to go back? Fear of monetary restriction drives us even now. Our current "Treasurer Jim Chalmers says he will no longer push ahead with the idea of abolishing the federal government's power to overrule a decision by the Reserve Bank Board." (ABC News) Up to this point his desire and that of many in parliament is to remove the governments ability to control our finances, that is so far from the intention of the original Labour Party it is not funny. It appears that they want us to be controlled by international finance with no democratic ability to reflect what we want or need, we will be at the whim of the Globalists if they end up achieving this.

In reading history we see that not much changes, monopoly control is never associated with individual freedom or the betterment of a society. Monopoly capitalism such as we see today, is only destroying us and taking us back to the very things our early activists tried to change when creating this Nation. Do we need to revisit these bad times before we react? Surely our vision for the future should be similar to that expressed by Fisher, (during a speech in Gympie in the late 1890s) he was about developing the continent's "natural resources ... to make and sustain a happy and prosperous people" and "the makings of a race that will probably equal any other seen on the globe." David Day, *Andrew Fisher* pg 84

These next two quotes come from a small booklet on Social Credit.

https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Stones_W-Social_Credit_Text_Book.pdf

I do not need to rewrite anything here, What C.H.Douglas was saying in the 1930s is still as relevant for the problems we face today as they were then. William Stones, the author, is pointing out what we, Social Creditors, believe DSC to be the solution. The "real" next step to free the Individual to achieve his/her full potential.

"What are we aiming at? What are we trying to get? We are endeavouring to bring to birth a New Civilisation. We are doing something that really extends far beyond the confines of a change in the existing financial system. We are hoping, by various means, chiefly financial, to enable the human community to step out of one type of civilisation into another type of civilisation, and the first and basic requirement, as we see it, of that is absolute economic security."

... *“if we clothe the skeleton of Economics with living flesh; if we humanise it, make it what it should be - an examination of the circumstances of our daily lives, the reasons why we are poor or rich, employed or workless, well fed or undernourished, free to choose or regimented to serve, armed for war or stripped for peace - in short, the why and wherefore of how we live and move and have our being - then economics becomes one of the most vital and engrossing studies that can occupy our minds and give direction to our activities.”*

To this end I implore you to seek to understand more about the true reality of the wealth and plenty that surrounds us and how we can take back our inheritance for ourselves. <https://alor.org/Storage/navigation/Library1.htm>

Editor’s Note: We see today’s Liberal/National as Libertarians: Peter Dutton insists on not being called conservative, as Laissez-Faire, of the same type as the Protectionists during the Andrew Fisher era. The question is of ‘social responsibility’ in this ‘machine and advanced technology age’, of providing a living wage for all while these machines do the work- the National Dividend proposed by CH Douglas. This must be answered, or we will repeat the same failed lessons of history. Modern Labor is aligned with the Socialist International, the flip side of a dialectical path to the same destination; both misnamed liberal or labor, I call totalitarian-communism.

Economic Control - What Does it Look Like? By Neville Archibald

You have a lovely coloured card in your hand, maybe through the blood, sweat and tears of a large mortgage, it's silver, gold or even platinum. Everywhere you go you tap or swipe this piece of plastic or maybe even the very phone in your hand is now your square of plastic.

One day, in the not far away future, you find it doesn't work. The machine throws up an error code. Maybe you are going to fill your car with petrol, the code reads insufficient credits. You know you have money in the account, how can this be? After an indeterminate wait online, you find the code is for carbon credits. You have used your allotment, to get more, the price goes up, or to cover your current need, a one-off payment is allowed this time only.

Or you are shopping for a party perhaps, you’ve been careful not to exceed your allowance, but it has been arbitrarily changed due to bird flu. The roast chicken you are having tonight is no longer your right, they killed 400,000 birds yesterday and now you must wait till next month for a further update on chicken availability. They're still on the shelf, just not for you.

What is it about money that people don't seem to equate with reality do you think?

We have come a long way from Barter, or even a cash economy, to a point where I now think it's safe to say, a great percentage of our community no longer handles cash on a daily, or in some cases even a weekly, basis. Their faith is in the electronic,

the unseen of a bank. Do they ever check their purchases with their accounts do you think? In the early days I did, religiously! I know I have slacked off somewhat, but I still look carefully at the list when I get it. When you are tapping everything, how do you remember if you bought three coffees that week or four?

The other part of this continual tapping, of course, is the unseen charges that are regulated at the whim of the banks. A consumer charge to the buyer, only a small percentage, higher on coffee than on supermarket food, and then the provider charge, a percentage for this transaction too, so as that goes up, so too does the price of your coffee to cover these costs. Who controls this? Who allows this taking of a few cents from each of you, consumer and provider. For no apparent reason do you think? or do you justify it by saying some things must always be paid for, the convenience to you.

Do you imagine that in some back room at the Bank headquarters, there are hundreds or thousands of little fingers, scanning credit card documentation to make it all legitimate. That they must be paid, it's a service after all, give us pay for that! No it is Automated! As a service fee, it is charging you for using your own money. Banks are continually making obscene profits, despite poor performance and they would appear to be no stopping them. They are de-regulated! Thanks Paul!

What do all these examples, and more, add up to? It is a picture of economic control! Each time you use this plastic it is recorded. The date, time and place as well as the item purchased. There is no anonymity! If your wife regularly checks the accounts to keep the budget, how do you prebook an anniversary surprise? If you just want to get away for a while or you are fleeing domestic violence with only one account, how are you ever free of a controlling spouse? By your purchases you are visible, by the very taking out of cash, you become visible (if cash is still a thing).

I so often hear the words, "if you've got nothing to hide ..."
When in your life have you felt restricted by legislation, by government imposed controls? If you have tried to go camping in New South Wales parks and found you needed to book beforehand. Even if there is no one there, just to go into the forest. Fines apply if you don't. So you sneak in and sleep overnight, (no reception to book online, server down or phone flat) or you move on.

Did you put up an illegal small shed in your back yard, because council wants planning permits, building permits and engineering reports. (All for a small bike shed for your kids). Do you comply?

You wish to drive home from a party, but you're not entirely sure what blood alcohol level you are. You swear it would be okay, but that nagging legislation makes you get a taxi only to come back and pick up your car later, not worth the risk.

As much as you would like to think that this last one is justified, there is a reason I included it. At what point is the limit for something enough? Who decides what that limit is? and why? Maybe there were too many drunk drivers on the road, maybe it was time that particular problem was addressed. Who then decided on the zero

alcohol required for truck-drivers, taxis, forklifts and heavy machinery? These were imposed as a decree, not as a scientific study. I guarantee that there are more things that can affect the driver than a simple glass of beer the night before. Emotional state for one, deadlines imposed by employers or work quotas to be met.

While I agree you shouldn't be allowed to come to work under the weather, you never have been! Now if you're in this position, you cannot have even one beer the night before. If you're on a possible call out, that is your restriction for that whole time. At what point is this acceptable control over your life? This is a small example and one you may or may not agree with but now extrapolate that into other areas.

Once a law is imposed – each can be revised and there is nothing to stop these restrictions from being made harsher until you are doing exactly what they say, because it is your job or a large fine if you don't. Creeping, creeping towards complete control over our lives.

Again I bring up enforcement, it is one thing to say “you've got to be caught first” or “I'll take the risk, I never see them at work or on the road.” You have to have a card to swipe onto a forklift now in many places, this is linked to your licence, you can be cancelled. Your credit card status can also be cancelled out of certain areas! You camp overnight without paying or do something that the powers that be decide is not appropriate and you find yourself on a 90 day ban from camping anywhere in the New South Wales.

Perhaps due to some agreement between states or federal it stops you from camping in any public related place. It is all there waiting for you, if you comply with this digital control, this economic control.

We have established that it is possible! Now we ask who has that control?

There are several versions of this, banks, bureaucracy and parliament are included. Who has control over these? We most certainly do not, I think that is fairly well established. Who will have control is the better question. The way it is going it will be global concerns, the UN, the WEF, the International banks, all working together for their often stated dream, “you will own nothing ...” These are the people who will control you.

Welcome to the Future!

So when you go home to your respective electorates, local, state or federal, you must organise and vote differently. Anyone who has a party affiliation is out! You must avoid these people like the plague. You have seen how they come together when we protest their overreach, they join together to implement what we have said we don't want. So we don't want them!

Independent, strong-minded individuals who you would gladly invite around for a meal. People who do not want any more centralisation or UN involvement. People who do not want to see a digital ID/credit card system. That is probably the biggest issue.

While they control your very spending (and they will under the guise of climate

change and/or carbon credits) they will control you. I can see a time coming when they'll declare that they are bankrupt, or the banks, one by one will claim insolvency. To get your money back, or some portion of it, you'll need to sign up for this digital credit and lock yourself into it, then they'll have you. There will be no alternative.

All you really need to is to look at the direction we're headed. What each law they have introduced does to the individual. It is all about control over us. Do not, for a minute, think otherwise. They had the police with rubber bullets at the Shrine of Remembrance, shooting into the crowd. All over some people who refused to be coerced to taking the experimental vaccine. We can pretty much all see it was a failed vaccine, one that caused and is still causing a huge amount of damage in the community.

Those who saw the dangers and tried to warn others, were treated with contempt by all parties and political activists. A good look at who was the nastiest is a good start to realise just who we cannot trust.

Forceful control over us is not always going to be visible, when it comes it won't always be the police or stazzi knocking at your door. It might just be (will be) the refusals of credit at your next restaurant booking. Looking into it will probably throw up a given code for the refusal, too much red meat, carbon related, or at the petrol pump, swipe before filling, it's coming don't say it's not. You've exceeded your allowance of carbon credit for this month.

It could well be at the supermarket, some items won't scan, the code will pop up. All these things are possible now, they have prepared them before. Credit cards issued in some areas, the chronically unemployed, limited what it could be spent on. No cigarettes, no alcohol, the system is already set up and proven to work. There are ways around it, they know this. If cash is allowed to be refused at some places now, it will multiply. The workarounds will become very limited and many will just throw up their hands and comply, just like last time. While we do not push back, while we continually re-elect party machine candidates we will continue to get more controls placed over us.

Think very carefully about what you should be doing for your future. ***

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

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

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

BSB 105-044

A/c No. 188-040-840

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

Telephone: 08 8322 8923 eMail: heritagebooks@alor.org

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

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

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

Essential Reading:

Communism is Treason

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

Communism in Australia

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

An Introductory Course on the Real Communist Conspiracy

https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Butler%20ED%20-%20bew0Real_Communist_Conspiracy.pdf

A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Vol. 60 No. 36

20th September 2024

IN THIS ISSUE

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

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

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

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

Untapped Potential By Neville Archibald

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

We are seeing this now!

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

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

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

While most farms in Australia are family owned its not really freehold is it? Agricultural land is loaded with debt. The least indebted livestock farmers are those raising sheep with an average business debt of \$329,000. Cattle farmers carry significantly more at \$570,000.² A third of dairy farmers owe up to \$300,000, a further third between \$300,000 and \$1.3 million and the most indebted third are north of that.³ In 2022 - 23 the average interest bill for dairy farmers was \$89,000. It’s a treadmill from which there is no escape.

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

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

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

Like everything else, the Australian farming scene has changed dramatically over the last 40 or so years. Since the 1980s the number of farms has halved⁴ and, since the year 2000, the average price of farmland per hectare has quadrupled⁵. Its a hard game to break into. Increased equity in land values means that farmers can access more debt, and they are, but this does not necessarily mean that their businesses are more profitable. Economy of scale is the strategy for those choosing to stay on,

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

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

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

Hint:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

References

1

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

2

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

3

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

4

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

5

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

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

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

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

BSB 105-044

A/c No. 188-040-840

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

Telephone: 08 8322 8923 eMail: heritagebooks@alor.org

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

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

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

Essential Reading:

Communism is Treason

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

Communism in Australia

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

An Introductory Course on the Real Communist Conspiracy

https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Butler%20ED%20-%20bew0Real_Communist_Conspiracy.pdf

*"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. 09

September 2024

IN THIS ISSUE

Douglas Social Credit and the Categories of Constraint By M. Oliver Heydorn	75
How a Conservative Should Oppose Socialism and Liberalism By Sir Roger Scruton	79

Douglas Social Credit and the Categories of Constraint **By M. Oliver Heydorn**

After a recent conversation with Arindam Basu, it occurs to me that there is yet another method of explaining the Douglas Social Credit approach to our financial and economic systems for the benefit of newcomers. This has to do with the notion of constraints. There are natural constraints, i.e., constraints that are built into the very nature of things and are of a physical or metaphysical nature, and then there are artificial constraints, i.e., constraints that arise merely because of arbitrary (or not so arbitrary) human conventions that can be, at least in principle, abandoned, replaced, or altered at will.

Now, before we talk more about constraints, the two categories I have adumbrated here, and how these apply to finance and to the economy, it is first necessary to bring the concept of purpose, indeed the concept of a true or normative purpose, into the discussion. If we take as our point of departure the idea that the financial system is a tool that was designed by human beings in order to serve some purpose, we can ask: what is that purpose?

Perhaps one of the easiest ways of answering that question is by way of analogy; i.e., we can compare the financial system with another tool, one that we are all very familiar with: a thermometer. The purpose of a thermometer is to read the temperature, whether it be of a room, a turkey in the oven, or a human body, etc. In line with the teaching of Aristotle on functionality we can note that a good thermometer would be one that fulfills that purpose, the reading of the temperature, well, that is to say, accurately. If it is 27 degrees Celsius outside and the thermometer reads 27 degrees, then we have an accurate reading and the thermometer is functioning well and serving its purpose. It is a reliable instrument which can then enable us to make appropriate decisions, like dressing appropriately according to the temperature reading when going outside.

In the same way, a good financial system would read the physical economic reality accurately. More specifically, a good financial system would provide

sufficient producer credit to catalyze all desired goods and services so that the population can survive and flourish. If there are 100 million dollars' worth of goods and services that fall into that desired category and the economy is physically capable of delivering that volume, then the financial system should automatically supply the money needed to catalyze it and to thereby bring it into being. In the same way, a good financial system would ensure sufficient consumer buying power (without inducing any excess or surplus debt) to cover in full the remunerative prices of the goods and services that are being delivered to the consuming public. If 100 million dollars' worth of good and services are coming on to the market, then 100 million dollars in income should be distributed directly or indirectly (on behalf of) consumers so that business can meet all of their costs of production and consumers can clear the market of all desired goods and services.

Unfortunately, not all thermometers are good thermometers, just like not all financial systems are good financial systems. A thermometer which systematically, because of some faulty design or malfunction, underestimated the temperature it was intended to measure would be a faulty thermometer. If, instead of reading 27 degrees Celsius when the temperature outside is indeed 27 degrees, a thermometer read 17 degrees Celsius, it would be providing us with false information and, on the basis of that false information (which we might take to be real if we didn't have any way of, or any reason for, double-checking the thermometer's reading) we could make inappropriate decisions, such as wearing spring clothing when what is needed is actually summer attire. The thermometer that reads 17 degrees in place of 27 degrees is a bad thermometer that fails to fulfill its due purpose well.

Unfortunately, our present financial system is like this faulty thermometer. Because of the way it is designed, the picture that it paints of the physical economic reality in the virtual world of numbers systematically underestimates our real capacity to produce goods and services, as well as our ability/desire to consume freely in full whatever it is that we do produce (i.e., without necessitating the contracting of more debt and hence of more work in the future in order to pay off that debt). The financial constraints projected by the financial system do not mirror the real constraints, but instead they anticipate prematurely the real constraints by painting a false and limiting picture of the physical world. When we look at the world through the lens, or the medium, of this artificially limiting and distorting financial system, it imposes alien constraints that are not there in reality. As a direct result, we are hamstrung in our economic activity. So we limp along, when we could and should be, metaphorically speaking, 'flying'. In fact, it is worse than that, because the system also makes us do things we would not otherwise be doing and so to 'artificial limitation' we must add the misdirection of our economic activities and the consequent misdirection of everything else which depends on those activities (i.e., the political, social, and cultural spheres, and indeed life itself). The waste and sabotage involved in this misdirection is colossal.

To make matters more concrete, consider the following illustrations of what we have been talking about. The current financial system works like this: instead of automatically providing the sufficient financial credit needed to catalyze the 100 million dollars' worth goods and services that fall into the desired category from our previous example, the current financial system may only supply enough producer credit to catalyze 60 million dollars' worth. And, further, of that 60 millions dollars' worth that has been produced, it might only automatically supply say 40 million dollars in consumer income with which that 60 million could be bought. The system typically compensates for this gap by relying on some economic agent: governments, businesses, or consumers to borrow the remaining 20 million that is needed into existence from the banking system. That is the condition for distributing the flow of real wealth in full and for covering all the costs that businesses must recover in sales if they are to remain in business. Because we assume that the 'thermometer' of the financial system is telling us the truth, we are then forced to make decisions in line with, or rather on the basis of, those underestimations and to try to compensate for them in the only ways which the system will allow. It is from this attempt to 'make up' for the deficits of the system using the only means made available by the system that the misdirection arises.

What are the nefarious consequences of the artificial limitations and subsequent misdirectioning which the current financial system imposes on our economic activities? They are legion: the instability of the business cycle, constant inflation (mostly cost-push, but also demand-pull), the misuse of economic resources, economic inefficiency, waste, and sabotage alongside forced economic growth, an ever-increasing mountain of societal debt that is, in the aggregate, unrepayable, recurring financial crises, heavy and often increasing taxation, wage and debt-slavery, servility, the usurpation of the unearned increment of association by the private banking system, the centralization of economic wealth, privilege, and power in fewer and fewer hands, forced migration, cultural dislocation, unnecessary stresses and strains, social conflict, environmental degradation, and international economic conflict leading to war, etc., etc.

So what makes the difference between a good thermometer and a bad thermometer, between a good financial system and a bad financial system? In a word, it is the truth that makes all the difference. A good thermometer tells us the truth; it accurately reflects the physical economic reality as regards to temperature. A good financial system would also tell us the truth; it would accurately reflect the physical economic reality as regards our capacity to produce and our ability to consume.

Another way of putting this is to say that under a good financial system, which would be a structurally honest financial system, financial constraints on production and consumption would automatically mirror the real constraints found to exist out in the physical world. This is the relationship between the financial system and

the real world which Douglas (and common sense) would hold to be the true or correct relationship if we want a fully functional economy and a sane civilization, a civilization worthy of its name.

What it means is this: if there are no resources or insufficient resources to produce something, or the resources exist but there is no consumer demand for that thing (both capacity and need or desire are required for real credit to exist in the economy), then there is no justification for creating any money to catalyze the production of that thing. Similarly, if certain concrete goods and services have not been produced, or, having been produced, have been destroyed by accident, war, or an act of God, there is also no justification for distributing any additional consumer buying power so that what doesn't exist or no longer exists can be distributed. However, if the resources and correspondent desire/need do exist, then sufficient money should be automatically issued to catalyze the requisite production up to the limit of those resources. Likewise, if the goods and services are available, the financial system should automatically provide enough consumer income to distribute that flow of real wealth and to meet the associated costs of production on the part of business owners in full. In all of the aforementioned cases, the financial constraints would be mirroring the real constraints; the virtual 'facts' would finally correspond to the facts of the real world.

The Douglas Social Credit monetary reform proposals are simply aimed at this: that the financial system should be transformed from a dishonest system, which imposes artificial restraints on production and consumption, into an honest system which accurately mirrors the real constraints of the physical economy. While artificial constraints on our physical ability to produce and consume make it impossible, in practice, for an economic association to fulfill its true purpose to the extent that this is physically possible: the delivery of goods and services that people need to survive and flourish with the least amount of labour and resource consumption, financial constraints that mirror the real constraints would free the economy, liberate it, so that it can fulfill its purpose to the full extent that this is physically possible. Finance would then become a humble servant of our real potential, rather than being the master who rations access to our real potential on self-serving terms at the cost of our own immolation.

What would be the beneficial consequences of an honest financial system which mirrors the physical constraints and thereby reads the physical economy accurately, just as a good thermometer reads the temperature accurately? Well, within the context of a technological advanced, modern society, where machines are continually displacing labour, steadily intensifying the price-income gap, and generating more and more technological unemployment, these benefits would include: the establishment of absolute economic security for every citizen in place of poverty and the threat of poverty, increasing leisure in place of servility (i.e., freedom from wage-slavery, debt-slavery, and useless, witless, and/or destructive employment), the elimination of society's chronic and unrepayable debt burden

and the interest charges that accompany it, the decentralization of economic wealth and power to the individual, the elimination of economic waste and sabotage, continual reductions in prices instead of inflation, much lower taxes, much less government regulation and interference, economic co-operation instead of ruthless competition, social stability, the transformation of civilization based on the unfettering of the creative impulse and the flourishing of both folk culture and high culture, environmental protection, conservation, and repair, and mutually beneficial international trade providing a sound foundation for world peace.

What we are talking about here is an economic order that would finally fulfill the true purpose of economic association well, to the degree that this fulfillment is objectively possible given the nature of the real constraints. Whatever is physically possible and desirable should be financially possible. All that is required is to alter the financial system so that it accurately represents the physical facts and potential of the real economy.

How a Conservative Should Oppose Socialism and Liberalism **By Sir Roger Scruton**

In response to liberalism, it is necessary to work for the restoration of the concrete circumstances of justice. But the concrete law that I have been advocating is very unlike anything that either a socialist or a liberal would approve. It preserves inequalities, it confers privileges, it justifies power. That, however, is also its strength.

Post-war intellectuals have inherited two major systems of political thought with which to satisfy their lust for doctrine: liberalism and socialism. It is testimony to the persistence of the dichotomizing frame of mind that, even in Eastern Europe, the “world conflict” that endured for seventy years was frequently seen in terms of the opposition between these systems. And because they are systems, it is often supposed that they are organically unified—that you cannot embrace any part of one of them without embracing the whole of it. But let it be said at the outset, that, from the standpoint of our present predicament, nothing is more obvious about these systems than the fact that they are, in their presuppositions, substantially the same. Each of them proposes a description of our condition, and an ideal solution to it, in terms which are secular, abstract, universal, and egalitarian. Each sees the world in “desacralized” terms, in terms which, in truth, correspond to no lasting common human experience, but only to the cold skeletal paradigms that haunt the brains of intellectuals. Each is abstract, even when it pretends to a view of human history. Its history, like its philosophy, is detached from the concrete circumstance of human agency, and, indeed, in the case of Marxism, goes so far as to deny the efficacy of human agency, preferring to see the world as a confluence of impersonal forces. The ideas whereby men live and find their local identity—ideas of allegiance, of country or nation, of religion and obligation—all these are, for the socialist, mere ideology, and for the liberal, matters of “private” choice, to be respected by

the state only because they cannot truly matter to the state. Only in a few places in Europe and America can a person call himself a conservative and expect to be taken seriously. The first task of conservatism, therefore, is to create a language in which “conservative” is no longer a term of abuse. This task is part of another, and larger, enterprise: that of the purification of language from the insidious sloganizing which has taken hold of it. This is not a simple enterprise. Indeed, it is, in one sense, the whole of politics. As the communists realized from the beginning, to control language is to control thought—not actual thought, but the possibilities of thought. It is partly through the successful efforts of the communists—aided, of course, by a world war which they did not a little to precipitate—that our parents thought in terms of elementary dichotomies. Left-Right, Communist-fascist, socialist-capitalist, and so on. Such were the “terms of debate” that we inherited. To the extent that you are not “on the Left,” they implied, then to that extent are you “on the Right”; if not a Communist, then so much nearer fascism; if not a socialist, then an advocate of “capitalism,” as an economic and political system.

If there is a basic dichotomy that presently confronts us, it is between us—the inheritors of what remains of Western civilization and Western political thinking—and the purveyors of dichotomies. There is no such opposition as that between Left and Right, or that between communism and fascism. There is simply an eternal alliance—although an “alliance of the unjust” who are always ready to violate the terms that bind them—between those who think in terms of dichotomies and labels. Theirs is the new style of politics, the science which has in truth replaced “politics” as it has ever been known. Theirs is a world of “forces” and “movements”; the world perceived by these infantile minds is in a constant state of turmoil and conflict, advancing now to the Left, now to the Right, in accordance with the half-baked predictions of this or that theorist of man’s social destiny. Most of all, the dichotomizing mind has need of a system. It seeks for the theoretical statement of man’s social and political condition, in terms of which to derive a doctrine that will answer to every material circumstance.

Each system is also universal. An international socialism is the stated ideal of most socialists; an international liberalism is the unstated tendency of the liberal. To neither system is it thinkable that men live, not by universal aspirations but by local attachments; not by a “solidarity” that stretches across the globe from end to end, but by obligations that are understood in terms which separate men from most of their fellows—in terms such as national history, religion, language, and the customs that provide the basis of legitimacy. Finally—and the importance of this should never be underestimated—both socialism and liberalism are, in the last analysis, egalitarian. They both suppose all men to be equal in every respect relevant to their political advantage. For the socialist, men are equal in their needs, and should therefore be equal in all that is granted to them for the satisfaction of their needs. For the liberal, they are equal in their rights, and should therefore be equal in all that affects their social and political standing.

I must say at once that I have more sympathy for the liberal than for the socialist position. For it is based in a philosophy that not only respects the reality of human agency, but also attempts to reconcile our political existence with the elementary freedoms that are constantly threatened by it. But—whatever its worth as a philosophical system, liberalism remains, for me, no more than that—a constant corrective to the given reality, but not a reality in itself. It is a shadow, cast by the light of reason, whose existence depends upon the massive body which obstructs that light, the body of man’s given political existence.

This given political existence defies the four axioms of liberalism and socialism. It is not secular but spiritual, not abstract but concrete, not universal but particular, and not egalitarian but fraught with diversity, inequality, privilege, and power. And so it should be. I say that it is spiritual, for I believe that the world as man understands it—the *Lebenswelt*—is given to him in terms which bear the indelible imprint of obligations that surpass his understanding. He is born into a world that calls on him for sacrifice, and that promises him obscure rewards. This world is concrete—it cannot be described in the abstract unhistorical language of the socialist or liberal theorist without removing the skin of significance that renders it perceivable. The world of the socialist and the world of the liberal are like dead skeletons, from which the living skin has been picked away. But this actual, living, social world, is a particular thing, a vital thing, and it must, if it is to flourish, distribute its life variously and unequally about its parts. The abstract equality of the socialist and the liberal has no place in this world, and could be realized only by the assertion of controls so massive as to destroy themselves.

In order to justify, and indeed to win, its war with reality, the intellectual mind has developed an annihilating language with which to describe it. All political realities are described a-historically, as though they could be established anywhere, at any time. Thus the peculiarly *Polish* phenomenon of “Solidarity” is squeezed into the abstract forms dictated by the theory of “liberal democracy.” It is even seen as a kind of socialism, especially by French intellectuals for whom nothing is good which cannot be given a socialist name. The example is minatory. If we are to return to reality, we must search for a language that is scrupulous towards the human world. One generality, however, is useful to us, precisely because, behind it, a thousand particularities lie hidden. I refer to the idea of legitimacy. To their immense credit, liberals have tried to provide an alternative idea of legitimacy—one with which to challenge the historical entitlements that were to be extinguished by the triumph of their system. The first, and final, condemnation of communism is that it has dismissed the whole idea of legitimacy with a cavernous laugh. It is not my concern to argue with the liberal, some of whose ideas must eventually be incorporated into any philosophical theory of legitimate government. I wish only to suggest a non-liberal alternative, that will be free from the contagion of theory.

Among the many dichotomies that have pulverized the modern intelligence, that—due, I suppose to Weber—between legitimacy and legality, between

“traditional” and “legal-rational” modes of authority, has been the most damaging. Only if law is misunderstood, as a system of abstractions, can legality be regarded as an alternative to—rather than as a particular realization of—legitimacy. But abstract law is, for that reason, without lasting force.

Legitimacy is, quite simply, the right of political command. And this right includes the exercise of law. What confers this right over a people? Some would say their “choice.” But this idea overlooks the fact that we have only the crudest instruments whereby choices are measured, and these choices concern only the most fortuitous of things. Besides, what leads people to accept the “choice” that is thrust upon them by their fellows, if not a prior sense that they are bound together in a legitimate order?

The task for the conservative is to find the grounds of political existence concretely, and to work toward the re-establishment of legitimate government in a world that has been swept bare by intellectual abstractions. Our ultimate model for a legitimate order is one that is given historically, to people united by their sense of a common destiny, a common culture, and a common source of the values that govern their lives.

The liberal intelligentsia in the West, like the erstwhile Communist intelligentsia in the East, has persistently refused to accept the given-ness of human existence. It has made life, and in particular political life, into a kind of intellectual experiment. Seeing the unhappiness of man it asks, what has gone wrong? And it dreams of a world in which an abstract ideal of justice will be made reality. It looks everywhere for the single solution that will resolve conflicts and restore harmony everywhere, whether on the North Pole or at the Equator. Hence, the total inability of liberalism to provide a solution to those who are afflicted by totalitarian illegitimacy. The liberal begins from the same assumption as the totalitarian, namely, that politics is a means to an end, and the end is equality—not, it is true, material equality, but moral equality, an equality of “rights.” Democracy is the necessary result of this liberal ideal, since democracy is the final realization of political equality. For the liberal, the only way to oppose the totalitarian is by slow, steady democratization of the social order.

Who can doubt the appeal of that idea? But it neglects the one, inescapable fact. I cannot see my own life as the liberal wishes to see political life. I cannot see my own life as an experiment. Nor can I regard my obligations as created entirely by my free, responsible actions. I am born into a situation that I did not create, and am encumbered from birth with obligations that are not of my own devising. My basic debt to the world is not one of justice but of piety, and it is only when I recognize this fact that I can be truly myself. For only in relation to my given situation can I form those values and social perceptions that give me strength, at last, to experiment with freedom.

Any genuine account of our sentiments of legitimacy must begin from the

recognition that piety precedes justice, both in our lives and in our thinking, and that, until we have attached ourselves to a place and people, and begun to think of them as “our own,” the claims of justice, and the superstition of equality, are entirely without meaning for us. But this attachment to place and people is not chosen: it is not the outcome of some liberal reflection on the rights of man, nor is it conceived in the experimental spirit that is so important to the socialist program. It is given to us, in the very texture of our social existence. We are born into the obligations of the family, and into the experience of ourselves as parts of a larger whole. Not to recognize the priority of this experience is to concede the major premise of totalitarian thinking, which is that political existence is nothing but a long term experiment. There is a particular view, still popular among left-wing intellectuals in the West, that the Soviet system was “socialism gone wrong.” This thought expresses precisely the major political danger of our times, which is the belief that politics involves a choice of systems, as a means to an end, so that one system may “go wrong” while another “goes right.”

The truth is that socialism is wrong, precisely because it believes that it can go right—precisely because it sees politics as a means to an end. Politics is a manner of social existence, whose bedrock is the given obligations from which our social identities are formed. Politics is a form of association which is not a means to an end, but an end in itself. It is founded on legitimacy, and legitimacy resides in our sense that we are made by our inheritance.

Hence, if we are to rediscover the roots of political order, we must attempt to endorse the unchosen obligations that confer on us our political identity, and which settle for a Pole that he cannot be governed from Moscow, or for a Falkland Islander that he cannot be legitimately governed from Buenos Aires.

It is worth pausing to mention another, and rival, generality that has been of some service to the left-liberal intellectual in our time, in his endeavor to wipe out the past, and to find a basis for political obligation that looks only to the present and the future. This is the idea of the “people,” as the fount of legitimate order. The idea is usually combined with the fantasy that the intellectual has some peculiar faculty of hearing, and also articulating, the “voice of the people.” This self-delusion, which has persisted unaltered since the days of the French Revolution, expresses the intellectual’s concern to be reunited with the social order from which his own thinking has so tragically separated him. He wishes to redeem himself from his “outsideness.” Unfortunately, however, he succeeds in uniting himself not with society, but only with another intellectual abstraction—“the people”—designed according to impeccable theoretical requirements, precisely in order to veil the intolerable reality of everyday life. “The people” does not exist. Even if it did exist, it would be authority for nothing, since it would have no concrete basis on which to build its legitimacy. Nobody can speak for the people. Nobody can speak for anyone. The truth, however, strives to be uttered, and may find expression, now on these lips,

now on those.

Unlike “the people,” the nation is not an abstraction. It is a given historical reality. It is made particular and immediate in language, custom, religion, and culture. It contains within itself the intimation of a legitimate order. This, I believe, should always be remembered, even by those—and that includes most of us now—who hesitate to adopt the straightforward nationalism that emerged from the Congress of Vienna and which at first pacified, but subsequently destroyed, our continent.

But surely, you will say, is there not another source of legitimacy—one that does not require the support of those pious obligations that seem to commit us to so much on the basis of so little? Is there not a legitimacy to be found in democracy, that will one day *replace* the appeal to piety?

That is a large question. But two things need to be said in response to it. First, “democracy” is a disputed term, and nobody knows quite what it means or quite how to secure it. Should we wait until all the paradoxes of social choice have been resolved before formulating our political commitments?

Second, what people have appreciated in democracy is not periodic collective choice—for what is so estimable in the fact that the ignorant majority every now and then chooses to be guided by a new party, toward goals that it understands no better than it understood the goals of the previous one? What is appreciated are certain political virtues, which we rightly associate with British and American democracy, but which existed before democracy, and could be established elsewhere without its aid. These virtues are the following:

- (i) Limited power: no one can exercise unlimited power when his projects stand to be extinguished by an election.
- (ii) Constitutional government: but what upholds the constitution?
- (iii) Justification by consent.
- (iv) The existence of autonomous institutions, and the free association that makes them possible.
- (v) Rule of law: in other words, the possibility of adjudicating every act, even when it is the act of an official—even when it is an act in the name of the sovereign power.
- (vi) Legitimate opposition: in other words, the right to form parties, and to publish opinions, which oppose the government; and the right to contend openly for power.

Political theorists are familiar, of course, with those matters, and this is not the place to discuss them in detail. But it is worth summarizing their import. Taken together, those six features of government mean, not democracy, but rather constitutional limitation. To put it more directly, they denote the separation of the state (which is the locus of legitimate authority) from those who hold power by *virtue* of the state. Those who wield power can be judged in terms of the very offices that they hold.

This is surely an essential part of true political order. It is also an indispensable part of any fully elaborated legitimacy. Indeed, we can see legitimacy in the modern state as composed of two parts: a root, which is the pious attachment that draws people together into a single political entity; and a tree which grows from that root, which is the sovereign state, ordered by the principles that I have advocated. In this state, power is held under conditions that limit it, and in a manner that makes it answerable to those who may suffer from its exercise. This state shows the true flowering of a “civil society”—a public life that is open, dignified, and imbued with an instinctive legality. Such legality grows from and expresses the legitimacy that is stored in its root. It is this upper, visible part of the legitimate polis that is so evidently destroyed by the political doctrines of our time. But its destruction is made possible, not so much by the elimination of democracy, as by the stifling of the spontaneous source of legitimate sentiment from which it feeds.

Democracy can, of course, sustain the six political virtues that I have listed. But it can also destroy them. For all of them depend on the one thing that democracy cannot provide, and which is hinted at in the question that I have added to number (ii): authority. What prompts people to accept and be bound by the results of a democratic election, or by the existing law, or by the limitations embodied in an office? What, in short, gives rise to the “public spirit” that has so signally vanished from the institutions of government in much of modern Europe? Surely it is respect—for institutions, for procedures, for the powers and privileges that are actually enjoyed. This respect is derived from the sense that these powers, privileges, and procedures reflect something that is truly “ours,” something that grows from the social bond that defines our condition. Here lies the authority of the actual: that it is seen to contain within itself the residue of the allegiance which defines my place.

What now is true legality? I have already hinted at a distinction between abstract and concrete law, and have implied that only the latter can truly fill the vacuum of legitimacy that presently lies before us. Concrete law is exemplified at its best in the English tradition of common law—law made by judges, in response to the concrete problems that come before them, and in which principles emerge only slowly, and already subject to the harsh discipline of the actual. Any law that is the upshot of serious judicial reasoning, founded in precedents and authorities, bears the stamp of an historical order; it also remains responsive to the reality of human conflicts, and constitutes a genuine attempt to resolve them, rather than to dictate an intellectually satisfying solution which may be unacceptable to the parties. This kind of law encapsulates the true source of legal authority, which is the plaintiff’s belief that justice will be done, not abstractly, but in his particular case, in light of the particular circumstances that are his, and which are perhaps even uniquely his. For concrete law to exist in any form, there must be judicial independence. And once there is judicial independence there is all that anyone has reasonably aspired to under the banner of “the rights of man.” For there is the assurance that justice may be done,

whatever the power that seeks to extinguish it.

There are two major threats to concrete law. One is the abolition of judicial independence. This was accomplished by the Communist Party, in the interests of an “abstract” justice—an “equality” of reward—which must inevitably conflict with the concrete circumstances of human existence. The second threat is the proliferation of statute law—of law by decree, law repeatedly made and re-made in response to the half-baked ideas of politicians and their advisors. All such law is fatally flawed: the Communist Party rested its entire claim to legality in the generation of such laws, while removing the only instrument—judicial independence—that could make them into genuine *laws*, rather than military injunctions.

Liberalism has always appreciated the importance of legality. But liberal legality is an abstract legality, concerned with the promotion of a purely philosophical idea of “human rights.” What value are human rights, without the judicial process that will uphold them? And besides, in resting one’s faith in this beguiling abstraction, does one not also give to one’s enemy another bastion against the recognition of his illegitimacy? Is it not possible for him to say that he upholds human rights—only different rights? (The right to work, for instance, or a right to a stake in the means of production.) If one looks back to the French Revolution, one sees just how easy it is for the doctrine of “human rights” to become an instrument of the most appalling tyranny. It suffices to do as the Jacobins did—to abolish the judiciary, and replace it by “people’s courts.” Then anything can be done to anyone, in the name of the Rights of Man.

In response to liberalism, therefore, it is necessary to work for the restoration of the concrete circumstances of justice. But the concrete law that I have been advocating is very unlike anything that either a socialist or a liberal would approve. It preserves inequalities, it confers privileges, it justifies power. That, however, is also its strength. For there always will be inequalities: there always will be privilege and power. Those are nothing but the lineaments of every actual political order. Since inequalities, privileges, and powers exist, it is right that they should coexist with the law that might justify them. Otherwise they exist unjustified, and also uncontrolled.

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.

Essential Reading:

The Money Trick

<https://www.alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/the-money-trick.pdf>

What Has To Be Done

https://www.alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Pinwill_C-What_Has_To_Be_Done.pdf

The New World Order - and the Destruction of Australian Industry

<https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Lee%20J%20%20-%20New%20World%20Order.pdf>

I Believe... A Tribute to Charles Pinwill By William Waite

Sep 16, 2024 It saddens me to report the passing of one of our oldest and best Douglas Social Credit soldiers, Charles Pinwill. To me Chas was a friend and mentor.

Chas spent his life thinking, speaking and writing about Douglas Social Credit. The last twenty or so years of his life was given almost exclusively to the cause of ensuring the preservation of the the Douglas Social Credit message and spreading awareness of it. My own modest contributions are the fruit of his efforts.

A sometimes thankless task, I once asked him what kept him at the Social Credit grindstone. Referring to our financial arrangements he simply replied “some things are just not ok.” I think the following, written in his early years, provides the details as to what he meant. It is taken from one of his two books of essays, *Different Essays*.¹

I Believe: A Creed for the Practical Christian By Charles Pinwill

I believe that God the creator, Lord and Giver of life, author of all things visible and invisible, has provided a world wherein His truths transcend human thinking, and that God has given men free will to seek those truths, either obeying or disobeying them.

I believe that, to the extent that man discovers and bases all his actions on those truths, he will achieve peace and harmony in human affairs, and that if he rejects those truths, he will bring retribution on himself.

I believe that God’s law is above the laws of all nations and societies binding at all times and in all places; that governments belong to individuals, not individuals to governments; and that all governmental policies must conform to God’s law.

I believe that when Christ Jesus, the Son of God, taught that man should pray that God’s will “be done on earth as it is in heaven,” He was teaching that individuals should strive to create a world in which God’s laws are expressed in all spheres — social and personal.

I believe that faith without works is dead, that by works is man’s faith made alive and justified, that those who sayeth but doeth not are engaged in sin, and that those who would follow Christ must heed His advice to let their light so shine before their fellows that their good works might be seen as an example to be followed.

I believe that Christ holds every individual — irrespective of his or her status in life — to be a unique person in his or her own right, made in the image of God, and that, through Christ’s revelation, he or she can seek to know, and serve God; and that a Christ-oriented society is one wherein the Sabbath and all other institutions — political, economic, financial and social — exist to serve the individual person.

I believe that whereas man, who is by his God-given nature a social being, requires government for the peace and good order of his community affairs, Caesar must not be allowed to take so much from the individual that he has little or nothing to render unto God.

I believe that Christ came so that man may have life more abundant; that in teaching man to pray to the Father for his daily bread, Christ was drawing attention to a universe of immense abundance; and that, this being so, technological advance should be thankfully accepted as the manifestation of a heritage God has made available so that all may live in material security with expanding freedom.

I believe that, all monopoly violates God's law, robbing the individual of the freedom to choose, and that if freedom of choice is removed from the individual, his faith in himself atrophies, together with his sense of personal responsibility.

I believe that whereas man cannot worship both God and Mammon, and whereas the love of money — a man-made system of symbols — is the root of all evil, it is a denial of Christ to tolerate a financial system that permits the creation of society's money to be an exclusive private monopoly that only ever temporarily rents it to society, which elevates money as a commodity subject to speculation and usurious interest, created as an ever-increasing debt, producing in turn unjust taxation and a monetary inflation that is both immoral and socially destructive.

I believe that a Christian society is one in which all power is decentralized, with the meek inheriting the earth, and that a follower of Christ must — as Christ did on the high mountain in the wilderness — always resist the temptation of power, knowing that it corrupts both he who wields power over his fellows and those over whom power is wielded.

I believe that he who would follow Christ must accept personal responsibility for his actions in every sphere — not only in his relations with his fellows but also in the use of his material possessions, his money, and his political vote.

I believe that my first loyalty is to Him “Whose service is perfect freedom”² and that, by humbly asking God for His support, I can at all times and in all places be His humble and obedient servant and aspire to His friendship. (See John 15:15)

The Kingdom come... **On Earth** as it is in Heaven

Thy will be done... **On Earth** as it is in Heaven

Eternal rest grant unto them, O Lord, and let perpetual light shine upon them.

May their souls and all the souls of the faithful departed, through the mercy of God, rest in peace. Amen. ***



1. Pinwill, C. 2021. *Different Essays, They're Certainly Different*. Balboa Press. Bloomington Indiana.

2. Quote probably first attributed to the prayer of St Augustine of Hippo who lived 354-430AD