



# ON TARGET

INSERT

---

Major C.H. Douglas Speaks  
Published 1933

Speech By Major C. H. Douglas  
At “*The New Age*” Dinner, March 18, 1933

A few weeks ago, I had a visit from a charming American lady of that age which is described in voting papers as “over thirty.” She informed me that advancing years had presented her with the problem as to whether she would derive the more benefit from having her face lifted or her intelligence raised, and that she had decided on the latter. In consequence, at an age at which many people are content to retire from the more active occupations of life she had taken a B.A. degree at one of the better-known American universities and had come over to this country to continue her post-graduate studies and had been asked to address an audience of compatriots on the subject of Social Credit.

On my inquiring of her how this subject came within her programme, she said that it was becoming recognised that the progress of the world could be marked more accurately by the emergence of an idea than by the biography of kings or statesmen and she did us, here in England, the compliment of assuring us that we were providing one of these turning-points to **which** she referred.

I mention this because the drama of events in the world at the present time provides so much to attract the attention of all of us that there may be a tendency to suppose that the action of this man or that, or the enactment of a particularly vivid scene in this great drama of which we are witnesses is a matter of much importance as to sway the issue. Without minimising the immense necessity for the appearance of a personnel commensurate with the gravity of the issues, I do not think that, at any rate at the moment, this idea is wholly true. **What is happening in the world to-day is the clash of fundamental ideas, and those ideas will work themselves out to what may almost be called their inevitable end**, attracting to their service great masses of individuals to whom they are congenitally sympathetic.

At the present time it would appear superficially that, one of these ideas—that of a centralised domination of the activities of this planet—had received through its

mechanism of international finance, serious set-back; I do not think there is any sound ground for this idea. On the contrary, I believe that this conception was never so near to success as it is at the present time, and I am by no means satisfied that a complete success will not be achieved within a very short period of time. That that success will be **short lived I am confident**, not because of the ability of the individuals composing the world's population's to fight successfully against the **stupendous and far-reaching enslavement which is involved in it**, but because of the inherent unsoundness of the idea and the internal disruptive forces which it is bound to set up.

If we recall the history which most of us were taught in our younger days, we shall remember that it was assumed, almost without question, that a narrative of the actions and more especially the battles fought by kings, provided a clue through the maze of history and human development. It is quite possible, but by no means certain, that this may at a fairly remote period have had a substratum of truth, but it is, of course, certainly not true at the present time. **The actions of kings and the fighting of wars are not acts of initiative—they are the outcome of causes lying much further back.** What, I think, is incontestably true is that the great underlying forces which inspire human nature to action do not change substantially, at any rate within the widest period of history which we can span, although, like everything else, they may be subject to evolution and they may change the forms of their expression. A recognition of the truth of this is, **I think, the shortest answer to proposals which involve for their acceptance a radical change in human nature.** We can re-group these forces and we can so alter their reaction to circumstances that we can achieve results just as radical as if we had changed the very nature of the forces, but this can only be done by an understanding of these forces and a conscious use of them rather than a wholly unscientific attempt to change their nature. **All progress in the world, and in some ways the world has unquestionably made progress, has been achieved by recognition of TRUTH**, and the reason that so little progress has been made in the solution of social problems is, to my mind, because in this sphere alone truth has been ignored or denied.

That is what is happening in the world to-day. **We see the great elemental desire for self-preservation sweeping millions of people along the path which leads inevitably not to self-preservation but to self-destruction.** In the East, the circumstances imposed upon immense populations, partly by their artificial restriction into areas fundamentally too small to support them, and partly by the reckless exploitation of Westernised groups acting under compulsion of a defective financial system, are seeking economic safety through the agency of wars, potentially so destructive that the mere idea of safety of any kind is grimly

farcical in connection with them. Nearer home it is common knowledge that Europe is an armed camp, and **that armament factories controlled by our old friend, Sir Basil Zaharoff, are working day and night to supply guns and munitions impartially to every side of the threatened conflict.**

This curious, almost suicidal tendency of the human race to act in such a manner as to multiply a thousandfold the very dangers which it is seeking to avoid has not escaped attention, and has been put down by moralists, together with many other matters as being due to original sin. An audience such as yourselves is hardly likely to accept such an explanation. To suppose that the average man is such a natural born fool that, with the awful memories of the last great war still engraved upon a living generation, there is a real desire to repeat those terrors upon an even more terrific scale, and with the added horrors that science has developed in the past fifteen years, is to ask too much of the credulity of any sane individual. **There is, in my opinion, no doubt as to the true cause of this pathetic misdirection.**

Running through all history like the thread of Ariadne, it is possible to trace a continuous policy which I can only describe as a divorce between **things themselves and the description of them.** A well-known instance of this, of course, is the glamour of war. **War, at any rate modern War, is a dirty, beastly, in-humane, insane undertaking,** proving nothing, adding nothing to the content of human values, and incidentally **definitely dysgenic,** having a strong tendency to kill off the best of the stock, and to leave the weak-ling to carry on the race. Not only that, but the conditions which accompany a war give play to intrigue, corruption, tyranny, and wire-pulling under cover of the suppression of publicity and the necessity for centralised control which are imposed by the exigencies of the struggle. Yet no war was ever carried on with-out a definite organisation to represent it as being in some way magnificent, glorious, and ennobling.

This antithesis is a commonplace, and forms the basis of the misguided activities of pacifists unable to recognise **that without a rectification of the causes of war, the suppression of war** is as likely to be productive of good results as is plunging a sufferer from measles into cold water for the purpose of driving in the spots.

We are beginning to recognise, however, that this constant tendency to present a false picture of what is actually going on in the world extends all through our civilisation. We who are dealing with the problem of finance recognise that the fundamental problem is this false picture presented by finance, of the facts existing in the world today, and we know that finance and the people who operate the financial system regard it as of. the first consequence that they should obtain control of the mechanism of public information, whether through the newspaper,

broadcasting agencies, or the moving-picture, so as to present a false picture of civilisation, bearing only the most nebulous relation to the facts of the world as they do exist.

At this very period in which we live, it is probable that one of the fundamental struggles which is taking place, and one on which the future of civilisation depends perhaps more than on any other, is **the attempt to obtain an atonement**, or as it has been pronounced an at-onement, **between reality and the description of it**. It is the importance of that attempt which justifies the work which is being done by the Social Credit movement, which might be properly described as **a movement for honesty in public life**. It is elemental to say that no progress towards a sane world is possible while the symptoms of its malaise are subject to persistent misdirection. This is the justification for the short examination that I wish to put before you of what is going on in the United States and on the Continent at the present time, an examination which makes no claim to consideration other than that it is not made for any purpose other than to represent the facts as I see them.

The reason that the United States, in my opinion, should properly take priority in this examination is quite a simple one. **From the physical or factual point of view, the United States represents the furthest development of our modern power civilisation**. Simply considered from this point of view, and taking into consideration the lack of complicating factors presented by a continental organisation, containing within its political boundaries almost every raw material and natural resource required for the purposes of the highest material civilisation, we should expect any problems presented by a divergence between facts, and the presentation of the facts, to reach their maximum at this point, and we do, in fact, find exactly what we expect to find. This divergence, the paradox of poverty amidst plenty, has at this time reached such an intolerable stage that action of some sort to deal with the situation was plainly imperative. On March 4, Mr. Roosevelt took office as titular head of a population of 130,000,000 in effective control of a continent stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and from sub-Arctic and sub-Tropical latitudes, and announced his intention of grappling with the situation without delay. His inaugural speech, so far as its denouncement of financial agencies was concerned, might have been made by anyone in this room, and must, I have no doubt, raised hopes in the minds of millions of his listeners all over the world that the doom of oppressive finance had been sounded, and that their cham-pion was speaking to them. **I wish I could believe it**.

No one who has followed as closely as, no doubt, most of you here in this room have followed, the growth of criticism directed against the banking and financial system cannot fail to realise that had Mr. Roosevelt not also attacked

it, he would have been branded at once in the public eye either as hopelessly ignorant and unresponsive to public opinion or as determined to stifle criticism, and the results might have been immediately disastrous. So far from shirking the subject, however, **he delivered an attack on bankers which, in violence, probably exceeded any attack which has ever been made by so responsible an official at anytime, anywhere.** But I should like you to note most particularly that **the attack was made upon persons! It was not made upon a system.**

And further, that the concrete steps which were made almost at the moment of his taking office, and which had obviously been prepared in advance, were all of them steps calculated to strengthen the banking and financial system as such. The problem, as stated by Mr. Roosevelt, before the world, was a **problem of relieving unemployment**, and, as everyone in this room knows, that is not the problem before civilisation at the present time. To descend from the sublime to the ridiculous, I notice that Mr. Lloyd George has emerged from retirement to make what I can only describe as a Vaudeville appearance, in which he has pointed out, firstly, that the United States has just emerged from an administrative control by financiers to the leadership of a man who is free of control from financiers, and, in another speech, that the provision of work is a great moral issue to which the Governments of the world must devote their attention. It seems to me that this was all that was required to round off the picture.

**I find it entirely beyond my powers, of credulity to believe that Mr. Lloyd George is unaware of the ring of financiers who surround Mr. Roosevelt, and with-out whom,** no doubt, he would never had been returned to office.

It is quite clear from these various pronouncements that the main line's of United States action in the present crisis are, firstly, to remodel the American Banking System on the British branch banking system so as further to consolidate the monopoly of credit in a few hands, and, secondly, by means of immense schemes of public works financed by loan credit issued by this strengthened banking system to induce both an increase of employment and a rise in commodity prices. The public debt of the United States **will be enormously increased at the expense of** the private debt held by the industrialists, and industrialists will be reduced to a position which will make it impossible for them to form a menace to the bankers such as they undoubtedly offered in 1929. At any rate, in theory, this will result in raising taxation of various kinds to fantastic heights, but there is nothing in the physical situation to prevent the colossal over-heads being scaled down periodically while leaving the banks in supreme control of the situation. **There is one factor which seems to me not to be provided for in this scheme, and that is the impossibility of continuously employing the population of the United States without sabotage on a scale**

**which can only be provided by war.**

On the Continent of Europe the economic situation has become secondary to the purely emotional situation, commonly called "politics." In Germany much the 'Same kind of destructive criticism as that used by Mr. Roosevelt has been employed to produce a similar dictatorship in essence under Herr Hitler. You will not have failed to notice that immediately the dictatorship was obtained **the denunciation of financiers has died down**, and Herr Hitler has issued a plain threat to his own followers that what he now requires from them is discipline. I feel confident that every effort will be made to compose any difficulties which might lead to war in Europe with which success only time can show. Viewing the whole situation shortly, then, I can only see one stubborn fact which seems capable of resisting the immense political skill which is being employed to retain **the control which finance has acquired over the lives and even the intelligence of the human race, and that is the steady** advance of mechanical progress. Under the existing financial system the retention of human employment as a condition of access to the means of life seems to me inevitably to involve what the professional economists call a "favourable balance of trade." That favourable balance of trade most certainly cannot be obtained by commercial intercourse between highly developed nations, and it would appear essential that those nations under the stress of financial compulsion must compete for such markets as those of China and the undeveloped regions of the Middle and the Far East. **The Pacific, therefore, is, in spite of danger spots in Europe, the real centre of gravity, and it is there in all probability that the future of civilisation will be decided.**

That is the picture which we see in looking round the world to-day, and it would be difficult to deny that it is a gloomy picture. It is the direct result of endeavouring to carry on the business of the world in accordance **with a defective conception or idea.**

Now, it is my own belief, and I might almost say that it is almost my only religion, that there is running through the nature of the Universe something that we may call a "canon." It is the thing which is referred to in the Gospel of St. John as the "Logos," **the "Word"** (Logos: "The Word" or "**Reason**"). [**St. John 1 :1, "The Word (Logos) was with God, and the Word was God." (I am the Word, the Truth, and the Light). Social Credit is based on Truth and Reason.**] It has an infinite variety of names. The engineer and the artist refer to it when they say that they have got something "right." Other people mean the same thing when they talk about **absolute truth**, or **reality**. By whatever name you wish to refer to this idea, it does not matter very much; we all instinctively recognise its existence whether we meet it in something like architectural proportions as say, the

cenotaph, or even in the grim lines of a battleship.

**Genuine success only accompanies a consistent attempt to discover and to conform to this canon in no matter what sphere our activities may lie.** For instance, I have no doubt whatever that there is one single test which can be applied to any financial scheme which is put before you for your consideration, and that is, **whether it represents reality**, just as we know that the fundamental falsity of the present financial system is that it distorts and perverts reality.

In looking round this room I see the faces of many who have been associated almost from the very beginning, with the attempts that we are making to dis-cover and to follow this canon in regard to the matter of **finance**, and I believe that the success which has been achieved up to the present, and the still greater success that I am confident will follow after a period of storm, is due more than to anything else to the single-mindedness of those and many other people unfortunately prevented by distance or other obstacles from being here to-night, who have steadily pursued this idea. I say that **I am confident that single minded-ness of purpose directed to the pursuit of this canon to which I have referred is the only thing of absolutely primary importance in any undertaking.** Given that, forms of organisation and other mechanisms for the attainment of the end, necessary as they undoubtedly are, will, as one might say, provide them-selves both at the right time and in the most perfect form that the necessities of the case require. **Because the canon is a spiritual thing, the forms embodying it are of infinite variety, and, not only that, change from time to time, and a slavish adherence to the form is a certain method by which to miss the canon.**

In a period such as this and in connection with matters so momentous as those with which we have to deal more especially as a measure of success begins to attend us, there are bound to be attracted not only further followers of the **TRUTH**, but others whose single-mindedness of purpose is not so pronounced.

**I am confident, however, that just as departure from the canon has produced the appalling condition of the world at the present time so the existence of a growing body of people who are aware of the situation, and singly devoted to bringing back UNDERSTANDING into relation with REALITY, constitutes not only the great, but the only certainty that eventually a world system founded UPON LIES will give way to one which is formed upon TRUTH.** \*\*\*

## C.H. Douglas Address at Ipswich (England)

*(The following Address by Major C. H. DOUGLAS was given at Ipswich on April 4, 1933)*

I suppose that it is not necessary at this time to stress the fact that what is called the "money question" has become a matter of general interest and controversy, and that the boycott which has been employed in the past to prevent its discussion has largely broken down.

Although this is so, it has, perhaps, only served to bring into sharp relief the fact that before any very effective discussion is possible in regard to the reform of the money system, the vast majority of people require to be submitted to something which I can only describe as demesmerisation in regard to the nature of money itself.

**If we were to judge from the city columns of the London newspapers and that portion of the press which is specifically devoted to money questions, and had no other means of obtaining information, it would be impossible not to imagine that money and the money system are a natural phenomenon of the nature of earthquakes and the tides, and all that we can do in regard to the matter is to observe what happens, and without in any way attempting to control those happenings, by using the information so obtained, to prevent or at any rate to minimise the disastrous consequences which might otherwise overwhelm us.**

It is no exaggeration to say that this describes the attitude of monetary experts, whose views obtain general publicity.

There is a growing circle of opinion which, while not regarding the money system in quite so fatalistic a sense (because aware of the control exercised over it by the banking system), is inclined, like President Roosevelt, to attribute the defects, and, in fact, the promise of irretrievable disaster with which the world is faced as the outcome of the working of the money system, to the stupidity and criminal selfishness of its leading bankers, which attitude can, I think, be paraphrased in the words of the well-known hymn that "Every prospect pleases, but only man is vile."

I believe there are sound grounds for stating that neither of these attitudes can be wholly justified by an examination of the facts; at any rate, my own opinion in the matter, which differs somewhat from either of them, can be quite shortly stated.

**The money system is a wholly artificial system, having in itself nothing corresponding to natural law in its composition. It is a man-made system, and it can be altered to any extent by its makers. It is a defective system for reasons which I propose shortly to indicate, and the chief complaint against the banker at the present time is that, as its defects place him in an**

**extremely advantageous position in regard to the general community, he is resisting either investigation or rectification of it, and is thereby accepting responsibility for its defects.**

I do not think he caused those defects, but I do think that he is opposing their rectification.

Perhaps the simplest method by which a true conception of the money system can be obtained is by some examination of its historic origins, one of which is indicated by our word "pecuniary" from "pecus-cattle." In primitive civilisation cattle were the chief basis of wealth, and were exchanged for grain and other forms of wealth by methods of barter not dissimilar to those which are growing up to-day as a result of the breakdown of the money system. Since an itinerant grain merchant might obviously not wish to take delivery of cattle at the moment that he made his bargain, the custom grew of taking a leather disc representing one head of cattle, and at some subsequent date presenting this disc either by messenger or otherwise and receiving the cattle in exchange.

It may be noted that at a much later date exactly the same process took place in regard to the gold-smiths, who are the lineal ancestors of our present bankers, only that in their case the wealth was handed to them for safe keeping and a receipt was given, the wealth being restored against the delivery of the receipt. Reverting to the leather discs, however, certain most important points should be noted, firstly, that this primitive money was issued "by the owner of the cattle" that is to say, the goods and the money representing the good; originally had the same point of origin, and, secondly, that the amount of money created was exactly proportionate to the amount of wealth in existence, so far as the system was in general use.

Simple and convenient as this system was, it is clear enough that it provided an opportunity for knavery. To understand how this knavery developed into the legalised modern banking system we have to turn again to the goldsmiths.

Originally, artificers in the precious metal, the mediaeval goldsmith, by an easily understood process, developed into the custodians of the portable wealth of their clients, such portable wealth being deposited against a receipt given by the goldsmith himself.

Having the tangible wealth of his clients under his control, the goldsmith rapidly developed into a money-lender against tangible security. But a parallel development took place of immense importance, which was that the receipts for the tangible wealth deposited with the goldsmith, which were signed by the goldsmith, began to pass from hand to hand in settlement of debts, thus forming the original bank notes, since they had to be met upon presentation by the delivery of a specified amount of gold plate.

These goldsmiths' receipts were found to be so convenient that they were used until they were worn out, pasting from hand to hand exactly like a modern £1 note, and were only occasionally used for their original purpose of drawing out the gold plate from the custody of the goldsmith. It is quite easy to see that the bright idea of having two or three receipts for one piece of gold plate and using each of these receipts to obtain the equivalent value of the gold plate in other goods and services would soon occur either to the goldsmith or his clients, and would be quite successful so long as they were not actually used to draw out the plate itself from the custody of the goldsmith.

### THE MASTER OF MANKIND

The essential of the process would be the signature of the goldsmith upon the receipt, rather than the actual existence of the plate in his possession.

You will see how by an almost imperceptible process of transition the power of issuing money passed from the owner of the wealth, firstly, to the custodian of the wealth, and finally to any individual or organisation which had the reputation for integrity and would back that reputation by his signature.

At the present time this divorce between the owners or creators of wealth and the creators of money, or as it is technically called, "effective demand," has become almost complete.

**In the modern world, as we have been specifically told by such a banking chairman as Mr. Reginald McKenna, all but an insignificant fraction, probably not amounting to more than 0.7 of 1 per cent. of the money in circulation, is actually created by the banks and is claimed as their property.**

In technical phraseology, "every bank loan creates a deposit, and the purchase of a security by a bank creates a deposit, and the repayment of every bank loan destroys a deposit, and the sale of securities by a bank also destroys a deposit."

**In plain English, this means that when a bank allows a customer an overdraft or discounts a bill for him, it actually creates the money represented by the overdraft, and lends it to the customer at interest, and when it buys a security, a stock, a share, or a debenture in the open market it gets it for nothing by the simple process of writing a cheque upon itself, which it never omits to honour.**

**Since the orthodox and correct definition of money is "anything, no matter of what it is made, nor why people want it, no one will refuse in exchange for his goods or services," you can see at once that this monopoly of the power of creating money or, as we call it, "the monopoly of credit," means that those who are in possession of this monopoly are the potential or actual owners of everything produced in the world.**

Now by a convention, the origin of which goes back into the mists of antiquity,

a debtor is the servant of his creditor until his debt is repaid, and since the banking system is the origin of modern money and never gives money, but always lends it, and since under our modern money economy we are all of us obliged to have the use of money, we are quite indisputably all of us directly or indirectly the servants of the banks.

I do not suppose that this point requires much emphasis at the present time, but if it does I would merely ask you to consider the effects that have been produced by what is, in fact, merely a moderate deflation or retirement of bank money during the past fourteen years, and to imagine, if you can, the effect which would have been produced had every bank in this country called in every loan which it held upon its books, as legally it was entitled to do.

I feel sure you will agree without further argument that money at the present time is our master, and not our servant.

It will at once occur to many of you to object that, while the money system, with its mechanism of the banks and insurance companies, is plainly, at the present time, the master of mankind, banks, insurance companies, and other financial institutions are like any-thing else, subject to the Governments of the country in which they are situated.

Exactly to what extent this is true in Great Britain in view of the fact that the Bank of England holds its charter from Parliament it is very difficult to say, but there is no doubt whatever about the position elsewhere. Twenty-six new central banks have been founded since the war, not including the Bank of International Settlement, which forms a caping-stone of the international banking organisation. Each one of these contains in its constitution an article specifically placing it outside the control of the Government of the country in which it is situated. During the financial crisis of 1932, Mr. Hoover, then President of the United States, addressed a strongly-worded letter placing responsibility for the crisis on the Federal Reserve Bank system, which largely constitutes the central banking of the United States. Mr. Eugene Meyer, on behalf of the Federal Reserve Bank, replied that the President's views should have consideration. Whether they did have this consideration or not, no action along the lines indicated by ex-President Hoover was taken.

There is, in fact, at the present time in full operation an international government of the world operating through the economic system of every country, not elected, not subject to removal by any of the ordinary mechanisms which we apply to political government.

It is quite obvious that the important questioning regard to this situation is whether the results which are obtained by this international government are satisfactory, and for an answer to this question I think we have only to look around the world at the present day.

The first aspect which strikes us, although perhaps not, in fact, the most immediately important, is what has come to be known as the paradox of poverty amidst plenty. To see this in its simplest form we have again to turn to the United States of America, where real—that is to say, physical—wealth and the means to produce wealth have been developed to an extent probably exceeding that obtaining elsewhere.

Not only that, but the United States is the outstanding example of an immense continental area, free from internal tariffs, producing pretty nearly every-thing required for her own consumption, and apparently in control of her own destiny to an extent not equalled elsewhere. Yet at the present time there are said to be 40,000,000 of people actually faced with starvation, while at the same time immense quantities of foodstuffs and other valuables are being destroyed or wasted because they cannot be used. The same situation can be found in every highly industrialised country. Germany, probably the next highly industrialised to the United States, is a good second in the magnitude of her internal problems. But, while this paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty is serious enough in all conscience, a second problem, arising directly out of it, is in a sense more serious in that it may finally destroy civilisation. I refer, of course, to the threat now so imminent of another great war.

It is now becoming widely understood that the danger, or perhaps, one might almost say, the certainty, of war arises directly out of the conditions caused by the existing financial system. These conditions require that every country shall have what is called a favourable balance of trade. That is to say, that it shall export more than it imports.

It is quite obvious that a hundred years ago, when practically the only industrial nation was our own, and there was the whole world to export to, it was easy to have such a so-called favourable balance of trade.

But as intensive industrialisation has placed the same problem before the politicians of every country, and at the same time the undeveloped regions of the world have been steadily shrinking, the competition for the control of areas in which to dump the exports required to produce this so-called favourable balance of trade has become intensified, and has now reached a point at which for practical purposes China and the Far East generally form the sole prize left for competition.

Failure to compete successfully means an internal so-called unemployment problem, and success in the competition can only be accompanied, as you may see by reading your daily press, by war either with or against Japan.

It is doubtful whether any human action can avert the consequences of this situation in time to be effective, but it is quite certain that only a radical change in the financial system can touch the roots of the trouble.

## GOOD-BYE TO POVERTY!

Let us now see if we can ascertain the main lines such a reformation would have to take.

Let us first begin by realising that the poor are not poor because the rich are rich. If everyone who needs bread to-day had it the rich would have just as much bread as they use. The same argument can be applied to almost every item which goes to make up what we call "a high standard of living." **The very existence** of what has been referred to as the economic paradox-that of poverty amidst plenty-ought to be sufficient to indicate to us that it is a shortage of purchasing power, and not a shortage of real wealth, which is at the root of our troubles.

Another way of putting this, and one which is essential to an understanding of the situation, is that the financial system as it exists to-day presents a false picture of the economic state of affairs in the world. If you will take your minds back to the original money system founded upon leather discs representing cattle, you will remember that there was a strict relation between the number of cattle and the number of discs, one disc one head of cattle. Now there is no such relationship to-day.

The simplest way of realising this is by realising that if you grow a ton of potatoes, you do not in any way grow or produce the money wherewith to buy that ton of potatoes. If you sell your ton of potatoes, you merely get for them the money that someone else had previously. The manufacture and production of goods and services in the modern world is a process fundamentally separate from the manufacture or production of the money wherewith alone they can be bought.

It is in this fact that the germ of the illusion of poverty amidst plenty arises, and the first necessity of a sound money system is that it should present a true picture of real wealth as it exists from day to day.

The second necessity of a sound money system at the present day is one of almost equal importance and carrying with it the seeds of an entirely new civilisation. It arises out of the introduction into the industrial and economic process of solar energy, by which I mean what we commonly refer to as mechanical or electrical power. Most of us in a vague way realise as we put it, that machinery is displacing labour, but few of us who are not 'Specially engaged in research into the matter realise to what an extent this is true.

One of my friends has calculated that without any **marked improvement of process, but merely proceeding** along our present lines, we should by 1940 have over eight million unemployed in this country, for the **same output, and as, at the present time, there are under seventeen million in the employable population**, that will mean that more than half of the employable population will be, as we now phrase it, "unemployed." Personally, I have no doubt that this is an

## **under-estimate.**

I have in my possession curves which I propose to exhibit in the course of a paper to the Institution of Mechanical Engineers at Cardiff on Thursday, which show that the human labour required per unit of average production is decreasing as the fourth inverse power of the increment of time.

If this curve is correct, and I have no reason to doubt its reasonable accuracy, then in ten years' time the necessary work of the world could be carried on easily by about a tenth of the available labour.

You will at once see that this factor renders a distribution system founded on a wage and salary system almost wholly obsolete. If you have nine-tenths of the population unemployed, as we phrase it, even if the other tenth is easily capable of producing all **that** the whole population requires, nine-tenths of the population will not receive wages and salaries, and therefore will not be able to buy the goods that are produced.

It seems to me to be entirely beyond reasonable discussion that this system can only be met by a wide extension of the dividend system, and you will not fail to notice that at the present time the financial system, so far from extending the dividend system, is making it nearly impossible for the average commercial undertaking to pay a dividend at all.

You will realise without much difficulty that, while the main necessities of the situation are largely covered by these two far-reaching modifications, the details become technical and are not, in my opinion, very suitable for elaboration at a public meeting.

I have published a tentative scheme embodying "A Draft Scheme for the Reconstruction of Scotland." This scheme was first published in the "Glasgow Evening Times," and has recently been reprinted in the *New English Weekly*, *The New Age*, and the "Free Man," the latter being published in Edinburgh. Amongst the more general results of putting into operation such a scheme might be mentioned the fact that the general population would be free for ever from poverty and the fear of poverty.

What is known as the "unemployment problem would disappear forever. While foreign trade would still be desirable and would probably, in my opinion, increase, there would be no "financial" necessity for foreign trade, because there would be no necessity as at present for what is called a favourable balance of trade, and as a result of this we should remove forever the fundamental incentive to war.

The labours of our scientists, our engineers, and our organisers have brought us to the edge of a new world - a world of leisure affording opportunities for the expansion of a real culture, such as history has never even contemplated.

If we refuse to accept this opportunity which has been placed before us, and from entering into which we are only prevented by an obsolete, if not iniquitous, financial system, make no mistake as to the issue.

There is no possibility of a peaceful retreat into the age of leisure. The alternative is a world cataclysm, in which this civilisation may easily pass away, as did those of Egypt and Rome, probably from substantially the same causes. \*\*\*

### **International Finance**

*The Necessity For A National Rather Than An International Financial System*

**C. H. Douglas - Address to the Bournemouth Rotary Club, June 20, 1932**

Perhaps the simplest approach to a grasp of a subject which at the present time transcends in immediate importance that of any other, is obtained by observing that finance at the present time is subject to international rather than national control. This control, so far as Great Britain is concerned, may not be so absolute as was the case a year ago, when we were still operating our finances on what was erroneously called the "Gold Standard," which was, in fact, merely an international system with a somewhat nebulous gold backing. But the international element in our finance is still very strong, and our central bank, the Bank of England, is unquestionably swayed by many considerations which are not related to the special interests of the people of this country. It is by no means certain, for instance, that the so-called departure from gold is anything but devaluation of a gold exchange standard.

As a result of the international nature of finance, we find that in varying degree the present economic crisis is a world crisis, and because finance is in a position to control mass publicity (and, in fact, control of finance and control of publicity may almost be said to be interdependent), we notice a general suggestion in the inspired Press that the international character of the economic crisis is inevitable, that the world is now one economic unit, and no nation can be restored to economic health by means of a world-wide character.

Now, whether it be because of the natural intellectual laziness of human nature, or as a result of the collective hypnotism which is imposed upon us by our Press and broadcasting agencies, it does not even seem to occur to people to question the manifest absurdity of such a statement. Yet the most cursory investigation is sufficient to disclose the fact that, at any rate, at present, the world crisis is a money crisis and not a goods crisis that we are starving in the midst of plenty.

I may say at this point that should the sabotage and the breakup of productive organisation continue at the pace at which it is now proceeding, I can easily conceive it as being possible that the money crisis may merge into something

very much more real in the form of a famine of goods and services. At the moment, however, there is not any failure of the productive system, but a failure in the link between production **and** consumption; the other words, the money system. There can be no other possible cause of what is called the " economic paradox," by which the world is starving and in a state of economic crisis amidst a plentiful supply of real wealth of all descriptions. And however far from technical perfection may be the production system, and however far from moral perfection may be either labour or the consumer, it is beyond possible discussion that the control of the situation at the present time is vested in those who control this link which connects the producer and the consumer.

At the annual meeting of the Bank of England in 1930 one of the principal shareholders, Mr. Hargreaves, remarked, "They held the hegemony of the world." Mr. Montagu Norman, the Governor of the Bank, commented on this to the effect that he believed it to be largely true, and that it was the result of the work which the Bank had devoted first of all to the stabilisation of Europe, and secondly to the relationships between the central banks. So that, I think, we are in a position to say that, on its own showing, international finance has been, and, for that matter, is, in control of the situation, and if this is so, the present situation is the direct result of this control, and international finance is responsible for it. What is that situation? Germany, probably the finest technically equipped nation in the world, is in a state of starvation and distress, which may at any moment resolve itself into revolution. Austria, the special object of the attention of international finance, is ruined and despairing. The United States of America, which offer in themselves an example of a continent operating under a single unified currency, complete freedom of trade, almost unlimited natural resources, and a high-trained industrial and farming population, is faced with a situation which, if it is not relieved in the coming winter, will unquestionably break out into armed civil war, in spite of the fact that the late Secretary to the Treasury, now Ambassador to Great Britain, announced a few weeks ago that deflation was proceeding smoothly, and without rioting. The curve of suicides and the curve of bankruptcies compete with each other in their rise to ever fresh record heights, and mutterings of a coming world war can be plainly heard by those who are trained to hear them. Side by side with this situation is an increasing volume of organised propaganda for the abolition of national sovereignty, the international and general detestation of war (not merely as a moral crime, but as a manifestation of world insanity), being capitalised to suggest the surrender of individual, local, and national initiative into the hands of international authorities who, as I have endeavoured to suggest to you, have demonstrated their signal unwillingness to deal with the situation. The argument that war is a result of

the existence of nations and would be abolished by the abolition of national sovereignty is just about as sensible as to say that quarrels between individuals are the result of the existence of individuals and would be abolished by the abolition of individuals.

Now, since there is no question of the existence of a very considerable measure of internationally controlled finance, and we daily have evidence of systematic propaganda for its extension in the face of the conspicuous lack of success which attends its efforts to the extent that they are directed to the advantage of the individual, it may perhaps be worth a few moments' attention to consider what are the probable motives behind such a policy. In the first place we can, of course, put out of our minds any material advantage to its protagonists, who are for the most part in potential possession of all the material wealth that the world can afford. The first objective is, I think, unquestionably that which has always been operating in a certain type of mentality through historic times—the desire for power. As at present constituted, finance is the preeminent agent of policy, and financial control of the world would mean control of policy of the world; in other words, a world dictatorship.

But I do not think that this fairly obvious explanation either goes quite deep enough, nor does it, in fact, provide us with a sufficiently broad basis for criticism. When we accuse the world's great financiers of being merely conscienceless buccaneers, there is a sense in which we do them less than justice, and at the same time fail to recognise the deadly danger which they embody. The great financier is in most cases a great idealist, and sooner or later constructs a Utopia which it is his constant endeavour to impose upon the world. Now the point I wish to make to you, and which I feel sure will at first have a tendency to shock you, is that society is never in more deadly danger than when it is committed to the mercies of the idealist, and particularly the Utopianist. The fact is that there is no single Utopia which would give satisfaction to more than a very small percentage of us, and that what we really demand of existence is not that we shall be put into somebody else's Utopia, but that we shall be put into a position to construct a Utopia of our own. And this idea of a centrally controlled world in which everyone lived under uniform conditions, elaborated on the basis of statistics, either of the Census or otherwise, is at the back of the drive which is being made to induce us to believe that the world can be considered as a single unit.

Cultures, climate, tradition, race, and habit, all give the lie to this idea, and as the human personality develops, it becomes more individualised and specialised in its outlook, and less and less amenable to one universalised set of condition. It is, therefore, I think, permissible to say, even if we assume an extraordinary high level of administrative integrity detached from all possibility of sectional

influence, that a world finance, which means in essence control of world policy, is wholly unsound in principle and based upon what can only be called in the most moderate terms, a complete misconception both of human nature and successful organisation. There is not, however, to be brutally frank, any sound ground of experience for assuming that such detachment is reasonably possible. To anyone with knowledge of the League of Nations at Geneva, or the Bank of International Settlements at Basle, it is beyond reasonable question that those institutions from their very inception have been the focus of intrigue and wire pulling, apart from their conspicuous failure to achieve the results for which they were ostensibly created.

It is not my intention to touch at any great length upon the purely technical side of the problem, but there is one aspect of it which is easily grasped and which is of first-class importance, and that is the one which was expounded with great ability by Professor J. W. Scott, whose views, which I endorse, may be given in his own words. "If the country's money is peculiar to itself, and sells abroad purely as a commodity, the British manufacturer can henceforth have no rivals in the home markets except his own countrymen, even when the country's ports are free." The reason for this is this, of course, that the British manufacturer will only accept payment in British currency, and the purchase of foreign currency by British currency does not mean that so much trade has permanently **gone** abroad, but, on **the** contrary, means that the money which went to buy the foreign currency must eventually return in return for British goods, as it is only at that point that it is available for purchasing power.

To any unbiased observer of the condition of **the** world at the present time it must be obvious that the populations of the world are becoming increasingly dissatisfied with the outcome of the policy of delegated responsibility.

We have delegated our personal quarrels to the law, and the law has become so encumbered and expensive that the wise man is prepared to accept almost any injustice rather than to invoke it. We have delegated our agriculture to the forces of international speculation, and our agriculture is ruined, and we are liable to starvation in six weeks' time if a blockage is established. It seems to me that the delegation of finance, which has already been wrested from the control of the individual, to a **de facto** international government, or to some international organisation which would be completely outside the control of every individual whose interests were at its mercy, would be equal to setting up a nightmare tyranny beside which the dream of world dominion attributed to Napoleon and the last Emperor of Germany would be attractive. \*\*\*

## A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Vol. 62 No. 01

16<sup>th</sup> January 2026

### IN THIS ISSUE

'Formerly Great Cities All Over America By Neville Archibald	19
Is Hate Violence? By Neville Archibald	25
Hate Speech Legislation and Letter Template & List of Senators	28

### **'Formerly Great Cities All Over America Are Turning Into Open, Festering Sores' By Neville Archibald**

*Amazing how a great nation (and others, of course) can be brought to ruin by mere abstraction having nothing to do whatsoever with reality. Quite sad and quite mad. How can people be so utterly blind and naive as to accept that they cannot engage in real activities because of a shortage of monetary figures of account?*

*When will the denouement emerge into the light of day? When will the wreckers of civilization be exposed and their policies discredited to be replaced with those of realism? Citizens can look all around to see vast natural wealth and unused human resources and yet become paralyzed by a delusion that they cannot access these resources because they do not have enough "money"! We truly do live in a lunatic asylum.*

*"Where will the money come from? Where will the money come from?" Well there is never any problem creating it for war--for which "noble" and "patriotic" cause it flows unfailingly like water. Yes, the people need to wake up but equally important they must know what to do or support those who do know. Wallace Klinck, Canada January 2012*

This thought for the week, going back into 2012, is as appropriate now as then. We look around the world at what our major population centres have become, the out in the open nature of the violence and casual disregard being displayed on a daily basis, is overwhelming. Even in a country like Australia with our laid back nature, the average Aussie is seeing this change too. How is it that we have let it happen?

Wallace goes on to talk about the cause being lack of adequate finance, and the things we are forced to do because of that.

Sometimes it is hard to see the actual cause and sometimes the solutions are presented as having other reasons for their implementation. Quite often the true cause (money and power) are pushed to the back, out of mind, out of sight. Until someone brings them up.

That the violence and unrest on our streets has increased is undeniable. Examining the root cause is hampered by political correctness, and will be further hampered by the implementation of the new proposed 'hate speech' laws. Why do I say this? If we cannot now discuss the 'obvious to all but the politicians' problems we face with unrestricted multiculturalism; it will only get worse. Those trying hard to inject some sanity and clarity into what is really going on, will be further accused and potentially locked up for pointing out the truths, most of us can already see.

Bringing in migrants is said to be for humane reasons, to get them out of bad situations in their own countries. Or it is pushed as needed for reasons, including a lack of skilled workers here. The economic and voting side of this is rarely mentioned. Money must be spent to house, feed and provide for them. Borrowed into existence in a way that our own citizens would otherwise not see. It must be done for reasons of compassion, and added to our debt. We cannot deny compassion and help, it is our soft spot, we don't complain (unless you are in England at the moment). This money helps to keep our faltering economy going as it is spent with no real production being created to be consumed; but it is still on the never-never of our national debt card. The other point is (and it has been pointed out in parliament recently) the way these new arrivals vote in elections, favouring the big parties who are seen as providing for them. The argument between Labor and Liberal over this has actually reached the papers.

For the public, probably the biggest concern has been the resultant street violence, as people from war torn countries bring their arguments here with them. People with expectations of keeping their own cultures alive despite them being at odds with our national culture. These very words are probably enough to get me cancelled or worse, but they must be examined for what they are. We have seen the gang violence, we saw the long held hatreds between cultures at Bondi. What more do we need to see before we begin to openly talk about it. It is not your average legal gun owner going out and shooting people, or your professional gardeners, running amok with machetes in the suburbs is it? Of course not! Yet these are the very people being targeted by these new laws. Those of us who also try to point these things out are also in the firing line of the hate speech laws, in case we offend someone who doesn't want to look at these realities.

We have, without doubt, some really good migrants arriving, who do wish to leave everything behind and embrace the freedoms this country used to offer. It is not them I am bringing to notice. People of all types have made Australia what it is today, but all have done so while adopting our ideals of freedom to do as we please under our basically Christian derived culture. We have given women not only the vote, but equal status and respect. We are in a process of continual advancement for fairness in this culture no matter who you are – to do so means we must also keep up these expectations so that they will apply to all who make this – our home – theirs. Importing other cultures may seem great on the surface, the bright clothing and food of the glossy advertising, does not encompass all the luggage potentially brought with them. As we saw at Bondi, old hatreds can be hard to extinguish. There is a reason why we had a policy of compatible cultures being our main migrant intake (often confused as the "white Australia policy"). The very word compatible must be at the forefront, or as we are seeing, we will continue to see division and cultural clashes. If the clash of these cultures is not visible enough here, then we must look abroad at the issues in Europe, Great Britain and even the USA. Many of these countries are facing far worse than we have yet seen, it is a certainty that these things will come to pass here too, if WE do not start to discuss and decide what we are expecting of our future.

Politicians on all sides have continually embraced the failed concept of multiculturalism even as it's failures have played out. We must address this. When these obvious signs of failure appear on the streets, they wave it off, as though it is still needed for our embracing of the New World Vision they all seem to adhere to. If that is their new vision then I want no part of it. Give me my laconic laid back attitude and the 'she'll be right' attitude, coupled with our quiet achiever abilities. This grew from convict beginnings (a fresh start) to become a people who just did what was needed. We need this conviction again, to do what is needed! We need to throw out those whose vision includes acceptance of this violence as a part of becoming 'more worldly'. If they promote it, they no longer represent us and should be kicked to the kerb of political life or retired to some globalist retreat, to spend their days questing after the impossible on their own time and money and including the problems they wish to envelop in their own homes and back yards, not ours!

A no nonsense approach to offenders, removing those who violate our socially accepted values would include deporting any who breach these things. No immediate citizenship given, until a proven track record be established. Perhaps no asylum given either for those who wish to bring their war torn hatreds with them. If they wish to fight for their country of origin, send them

back to do so, a one way ticket to make change where their heart obviously lies. The idea of forgiving and forgetting the past tragedies in their lives to make or forge a new beginning should be their driving ambition. To make it better for their kids, including their female children. To continue on a legacy of female suppression in this country would be totally at odds with what we as Australians are striving for, why should we accept it being brought in to our country, to multiply and divide our current hard won status. We should not be apologetic for our advances, nor should we be content to see them regress back to those very things we pride ourselves on having mostly removed.

The cesspits of violence and fear that our cities have become is in part, a result of these differences, and a direct result of imported feuds, sometimes centuries old. Often promulgated by religions whose devoted words call for an eye for an eye, or by stoning to death the unbelievers. Poverty and drugs also play a part; but, these things we are allowed to talk about, even if no action is taken.

When it comes to cultural incompatibilities we are supposed to stay quiet.

You can cry out about how these things are mere words and not the actions of those whose religion it is, as much as you like, the words, the intent is still being spread from places of worship today. If our leaders were honest, the reports on this from the people tasked to look into it would be read and acknowledged for what they are. It would be a concern that had consequences for those peddling such views, which are incompatible to our own. Part of becoming Australian is giving up these views! There can be no separate society within our own, which has such alien beliefs. Ours is founded on the concept of Christian love for one another, not hatred because of difference. I readily accept those who wish to live within the boundaries of our hard won freedoms, but do not feel the need to accept those who refuse. It is, in the end, our decision to make. Be a part of us – or not. If not, and you wish to retain practices that are not acceptable here, then I do not feel the need to welcome you in my home, my country, for it is Australia, and it is what we have made it. It will be what we make of it as the future moves forward. If you are content to let others water down our expectations in the name of ‘global identity’, then that is what you will get. Violence and division will be the normal outcome of daily life. Choose carefully.

If you want to think about why we are keen to hold onto our ideals, consider the play *Romeo and Juliet*. First written by Shakespeare it has been adapted so many times into popular film and book culture that it is now a classic theme. Boy meets girl from different backgrounds, but by love and faith in each other and the reconciling of family they eventually merge. In the love stories they make it, in the tragedies they don't. What is highlighted in almost every case are the similarities, what the future could bring if prejudices are set aside. The basis for

this expectation comes out of Christian philosophy. It finds the common links and desires in the case of the successful romance, and emphasises the disparities in the tragedies. We long for the successful romance, the bringing together; but we weep over the irreconcilable. That which stops a successful union. The play or story highlights the reasons we must forge ahead to create some thing better. If those whose hearts do not long for this, those who wish to keep the old way, despite possible progress, keep to the old then we will be worse off, we will not find that common ground to make life for our decedents a better one.

### **The hidden cost of alternative power.**

Given the fire prone nature of our country, and the extent of bushfire damage we see each year, the newest additions to our landscapes are also at risk. This risk brought on a discussion around damaged solar farms and the implications they may have on land use. Fire damaged or hail damaged panels (take your pick) release shards of glass, aluminium and more importantly, heavy metals. Lead, Cadmium etc are some of those often used in panels that will become an industrial style pollutant. Rendering land unsuitable for further food production. Water run-off also becomes an issue, large tracts of this land, once contaminated, will have an effect on local creeks and waterways, and further, because other agricultural practices rely on this catchment water. The question here should surely be: how is this contained on-site, and who is responsible to make sure it goes no further? Is it a risk we are prepared to accept?

The location of many of these sites, sees them in amongst prime agricultural land. Have our eager to please pushers of this addictive technology taken all this into consideration, or have they just looked at the quick fix benefits and vote catching ability they provide. As an example, the creation of a set of storage units in town requires judicious design for catchment and treatment of run off water, before going into the town water management system. It can be an expensive addition to a build. One hopes that these considerations have been enacted when it comes to the environmental and human consequences of the inevitable risk if damage occurs.

The USA and other nations have already seen some of this devastation, we have a fire risk that ensures it is only a matter of time before we see this too. It may have already happened. What impact will this have, has it been considered and how does it compare to the so called pollution effect of coal burning, which is the other argument used to dismiss our concerns? We need to be wary that we are not swapping one pollutant source for another which may well end up far more destructive in the long run. Like many things where money is the prime consideration, our alternative energy future must be assessed for all of it's long

term impacts as well as it's possible savings.

To add to these thoughts, I include an extract from [Reneweconomy.com.au](http://Reneweconomy.com.au)

*"Can lead seep out of solar panels? What about other heavy metals? And if they can, is it enough to poison a whole river? And can the very idea of this poison a whole community's attitude to a proposed solar project?"*

*These questions don't typically take up much time in solar project planning applications, because the answers to the first three questions (only under extreme conditions, no, and no respectively) usually get in the way."*

<https://reneweconomy.com.au/how-a-water-agencys-debunked-concerns-about-solar-project-helped-poison-minds-of-local-community/>

The article presents a calming intent, with assurances that all is really okay.

I don't entirely disagree – in normal circumstances!

The article goes on to assure us that what can possibly escape would pose little or low level risk. Assuming that all clean up or disposals are tickety boo according to health and EPA requirements.

*"here are three scenarios where lead leaching might, theoretically, be possible: if the panels are damaged by a combination of fire followed by acid rain; severe breakage; or fragmentation in landfill when panels are crushed or shredded before disposal and are also subject to acidic fermentation."*

The down-play of risk in the case of rarity of acid conditions (which enable the lead ions to dissolve), might be unusual in other 'International areas', but Australian wetlands are often acidic as are billabongs and eucalyptus contaminated black-water in waterways after floods (which quite often follow fires). In the research that I have had access to, solar farm development is often only erosion and run-off during the build. After construction concerns seem centred on not altering or making a big impact on previous water flow.

I could not see any consideration of what to do after a fire or hail event and the management process then. I would be more than happy to find it exists and has been seriously considered in something other than just the CFA guidelines. See page 30 for recommendations for battery storage facilities.



### **CFA (Country Fire Authority)**

<https://www.cfa.vic.gov.au/ArticleDocuments/1933/250611%20-%20CFA%20DGM%20Renewable%20Energy%20Facilities%20v4.4.pdf>

All of this rapid roll-out has many concerned. With the high rate of change of ownership of these new companies involved in this industry, I would like to be sure the buck isn't being passed along instead of being dealt with. I don't condemn solar power, I condemn the 'push it at any cost' attitude that seems to be taking forefront of policy. The usual 'bigger is better' is winning out over a more sensible decentralised possibility that for some reason (possibly monetary) is not being considered.

We need to look carefully at the real world here for a minute and ask some relevant questions. Firstly, low level contamination after damage, means there is still contamination. Ongoing exposure to this is cumulative and we have a lifetime to gather it, especially if we live around it. So low, plus low, plus low, etc, will be a problem we did not have prior to it's addition. Someone will have it. Contamination by various means in various areas means different environments and conditions. The "unlikely events" mentioned in the international research used to calm us about the potential risk don't always remain unlikely, especially when there are always other factors in play. Disposal of contaminated material is not always done in the best way. Monetary consideration more often than not, plays a big part – and we have seen where that goes before.

Contacting your representatives on every matter that concerns you remains your first, your primary action. All else is great for educational purposes, but re-engagement and application of correct political procedure (including the election of a true representative of your electorate community) by enough people can still make a difference. Individual politicians are still dependant on individual votes before anything else. Selection as a candidate, party ties etc only mean something if the electorate supports them. Turning away from the current system, does not have to mean non-participation in the process. Just don't participate in party politics or vote for those who put party before community. Be selective, discriminate carefully! \*\*\*

### **Is Hate Violence? By Neville Archibald**

The biggest thing facing us at this moment, is the proposal to adopt hate speech laws. The recall of parliament, to push through hastily put together legislation addressing so called hate speech and gun control laws is a knee jerk reaction to the devastating incident at Bondi. Instead of asking what went wrong with our system to allow this to happen, our leaders are attempting to lock us all into little cages, that includes the law abiding among us, who were just as horrified that something like this could happen in our own country. We are not just talking law abiding gun owners either. The inclusion of the Orwellian concept of hate-speech, is something that can be used to target anyone whose opinions differ with whatever politically correct version of life is currently in vogue.

Those of us with strong beliefs of a political or spiritual nature are also to be targeted. Forget the extremist element, there are already laws in place to deal with incitement and violence in that sphere, and have been for many years. We all now face the possibility of being subject to legal proceedings, arrest or targeting, for what we previously saw as robust discussion. If feelings are hurt over a foot in mouth comment, made in the heat of the moment, it will now be a possible gaol term. If someone who 'hates' you or your ideals wishes to, they will

be able to report you and do so anonymously. No facing your accuser. I do not wish to get bogged down in the nitty gritty of this legislation, that would be the intent of those who have framed and are pushing it, I wish to address the over-riding direction this sort of thing is doing to us, as a nation. Framing legislation to control every little facet of our lives, is the ongoing process we are facing. Have we seen this before in history? The answer is yes! It led to murder!

The Scribes and Pharisees of Christ's time were just such people. Rules and punishments existed for every little thing. Man was not free to follow God in his own way, but was captured in a rigorous system that allowed the strong to rule the weak under the pretence of God's will. Christ came to free his people from these corruptions and set them again on the path of individual redemption, not regulated into adhering to God's will, but personally accepting responsibility for their actions.

He was crucified for this belief, murdered.

Two thousand years later, we find ourselves again fighting for that society, where the individual has the freedom to live their lives under that one basic rule: love your God and your neighbour as yourself. To be made subject to rules for thought control, for rules over what discussion can take place, and to have these rules subject to the whim of the current ruling class just drags us backward. Once again we will be submerged in a sea of petty legislation. Each time we come up for air, new ways will be created to keep us from emerging, stopping that individual expression of this concept, denying us the freedom to flower and grow.

Let us not be afraid here to realize our intention. Are we trying to allow the best to come out of us all, or are we to cater for the lowest common denominator and force all to follow a restricted path. One that is restricted by the very type of man that we see controlling our parliaments, pushing their own barrows and not admitting to failures of the system that already was in place and should have done it's duty.

Again I am not wanting to play the game of further restriction by legislation. If a royal commission is to be held, it should be entirely conducted to ask why current laws were not up-held, why the failure was allowed to happen. The perpetrators of this crime were known to our authorities, and as far as I can see, were not being made subject to the laws that I have personally seen used to take guns off innocent gun owners (though they got them back thankfully). So much is wrong with this way of responding, it is difficult to know where to start. Like Port Arthur and 9-11 after it, fear, anger and disgust are being hijacked to add in control mechanisms for other forms of political unrest. We have seen a rise in political participation in this nation, as people become more and more fed

up with the poor outcomes our governments are giving us.

People are raising their voices in protest at increasing loss of freedoms and what is seen as blatant mismanagement of taxes. Overspending on steroids - for previously unimaginable things. Promises by successive governments, both Liberal and Labor that have not just been broken, but denied after-ward.

This rise in debate is healthy, the debates on this country's direction going forward, is also a healthy thing, yet the people seem to be at odds with the parties who rule. Now the parties wish to dictate via 'hate speech' regulation, exactly what can be debated. If you have not read *1984*, the time to do so is now; because it is soon to be no longer just a fictional account of what could be, it will be, and is, fast becoming reality.

Despite having some of the strongest gun laws in the world, and despite having removed what we were told were the deadliest of them, an incident has still occurred. Off the back of this, more draconian legislation has been drafted. We are effectively being told we are not responsible enough to enjoy the freedoms our forefathers took for granted. We are no longer mature enough to engage in public discussion about the desires we have for this nation. We are not 'educated' enough to decide for ourselves what we dislike and like about the happenings in this country. All this must be put into laws to frame our thoughts and desires, to stop us from earnest discussion under fear of punishment.

All members of parliament must be contacted and asked to oppose this draconian move. Ask them instead, why were our current adequate laws not used correctly? what went wrong? Ask whose decision it was to ignore the threats posed? Hold them accountable. Shake them up to do the job they already have permission to do.

While you are about it, ask also why we must accept into our lives, cultures that openly preach hate for our ways, why are they allowed to remain here, to be given asylum here. Ask why we are not allowed to question this most important of all subjects, how we retain some form of social cohesion! If you put the lid on this debate now, it can only get worse. Like an ostrich with its head in the sand, life still goes on around it while it refuses to see it. It must be dealt with by public discussion. Australia is our home and as such it should be we who decide what sort of society we want. Putting a lid on it will only cause the pressure to rise. \*\*\*

## Hate speech legislation

We must be ever wary of any legislation being put to parliament, even more so when it curtails our right to openly ask questions or engage in debate. The Bondi tragedy has brought out the knee jerk political response that always accompanies such horrific events. Ill considered reaction to garner favour with voters seems to be the immediate sound bite that all clamour to take part in. What they do not seek, are the real reasons behind why it was allowed to happen. I don't believe I have heard anything at all about a true enquiry into why these two individuals were allowed access to guns.

As I opined in the first article, we need to address our future as a nation and the direction we wish to take. This can only be done when no one is worried that what might be said during that conversation. Of course culture and religion must be brought up, of course international issues will be mentioned, and of course the reasons behind incidents like this will be discussed; this is healthy and necessary. To limit what can be said will only lead to frustration and resentment.

'Sticks and stones will break my bones, but names will never hurt me.' was the expectation we used to have. If we are too scared to bring up any concerns we have, then not only have we lost free speech, we have also lost the right to self determination. The right to decide our own future. This seems to be the direction much of our political policy is taking us in. The policy makers are the very people we elect to represent us. With this in mind it is even more crucial now to write to them and express your concern.

The latest on the 'hate speech' legislation, is that Albanese has put it back to the parliament; asking what do they want? Doing the usual Fabian two step, the proposal is far too much, but while the introduced compromise ends up looking better, it could still be a step in the wrong direction.

Now that the whole of parliament is being asked to look at it, every one of your representatives, (your senators and your local members) will be in a position to speak. You have access to them and you need to make sure they know how you feel.

A short two sentence letter (or longer if you want) is all it takes to make your concerns known. The backing down by the P.M. may well have been because of the amount of push back; but, make no mistake, censorship of free speech will still be pushed. We have seen dissenting voices silenced during COVID and on matters of legitimate immigration concerns that many protests have endeavoured to show. Each time the debate is squashed, to now criminalise it would be a happy day for those wanting total control. Let's not give them their happy day. Write or email them now.

As an example of what you might say, try this example from Ken Grundy.  
(using your relevant state Senators list and your local member) :

=====  
=====

To the Hon Senator for South Australia

Dear Hon Senator

When considering legislation on Hate Laws, I expect to be critical of any country which claims some territory from their neighbour without the neighbour's consent. I will presume it is a right for me to be critical of such moves, whether it occurs in Indonesia, Pakistan, Mexico or between Israel and Palestine. Nothing less will suffice!

Please ensure this fundamental right.

*Yours faithfully*

Or similar with this as the body:

*"A free society does not require enforced agreement. It requires open debate, robust disagreement and the freedom to challenge prevailing orthodoxies without fear of punishment."*

*"I call on the Parliament to reject speech policing laws and to affirm freedom as a constitutional guarantee."*

(taken from an excellent article from Senator Babet.)

Let's Talk About It - Senator Babet <[senatorbabet@substack.com](mailto:senatorbabet@substack.com)>

=====  
=====



THE PARLIAMENT OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA  
THE SENATE

## LIST OF SENATORS

**Senator P.J. Allman-Payne**

PO Box 5304 Gladstone QLD 4680

**Senator M. Ananda-Rajah**

PO Box 2293 Wattletree Road PO VIC 3145

**Senator A.C. Antic**

398 Main North Road Blair Athol SA 5084

**Senator W.A. Askew**

Opposition Whip in the Senate  
PO Box 97 Launceston TAS 7250

**Senator the Hon T. Ayres**

Minister for Industry and Innovation  
Minister for Science  
PO Box 3306 Redfern NSW 2016

**Senator R.D. Babet**

United Australia Party Whip  
Suite 2, 77 Victor Crescent  
Narre Warren VIC 3805

**Senator S.F. Bell**

Pauline Hanson's One Nation Whip  
GPO Box 36 Sydney NSW 2001

**Senator L. Blyth**

107 Sir Donald Bradman Dr. Hilton SA 5033

**Senator A.J. Bragg**

PO Box 156 Paddington NSW 2021

**Senator S. Brockman**

Deputy President, Chair of Committees  
U4, 1 Harper Terrace South Perth WA 6151

**Senator the Hon C.L. Brown**

GPO Box 376 Hobart TAS 7001

**Senator R.P. Cadell**

Ground Floor, 28-30 Bolton Street  
Newcastle NSW 2300

**Senator the Hon M.J. Canavan**

Nationals Whip in the Senate  
PO Box 737 Rockhampton QLD 4700

**Senator the Hon M.C. Cash**

Leader of the Opposition in the Senate  
PO Box 1966 West Perth WA 6872

**Senator C. Chandler**

PO Box 250 Richmond TAS 7025

**Senator the Hon A.D. Chisholm**

Assistant Minister for Regional Development  
Assistant Minister for Agriculture  
Assistant Minister for Resources  
PO Box 1117 North Lakes QLD 4509

**Senator R. Ciccone**

Suite 12.01, Level 12, 1 Collins Street  
Melbourne VIC 3000  
Senator the Hon R.M. Colbeck  
PO Box 603 Devonport TAS 7310

**Senator J. Collins**

Deputy Opposition Whip in the Senate  
GPO Box 36 Sydney NSW 2001

**Senator D. Cox**

PO Box 53 Applecross WA 6953

**Senator L. Darmanin**

Deputy Government Whip in the Senate  
Level 3 North, 4 Treasury Place  
East Melbourne VIC 3002

**Senator J. Dolega**

PO Box 360 Devonport TAS 7310

**Senator R. Dowling**

PO Box 320 Kingston TAS 7050

**Senator the Hon J.R. Duniam**

Manager of Opp. Business in the Senate  
GPO Box 453 Hobart TAS 7001

**Senator the Hon D.E. Farrell**  
Minister for Trade and Tourism  
Special Minister of State  
PO Box 6338 Halifax Street SA 5000

**Senator M. Faruqi**  
Deputy Leader of the Australian Greens  
72 Campbell Street Surry Hills NSW 2010

**Senator the Hon K.R. Gallagher**  
Minister for the Public Service  
Minister for Women, Finance, Govt. Services  
Vice-President of the Executive Council  
Unit 3, 40 Corinna Street Phillip ACT 2600

**Senator V. Ghosh**  
PO Box 190 West Perth WA 6872

**Senator the Hon N.L. Green**  
Assistant Minister for Tourism  
Assistant Minister for Pacific Island Affairs  
Assistant Minister for Northern Australia  
PO Box 4716 Cairns Post Shop  
Cairns QLD 4870

**Senator K.A. Grogan**  
Deputy Government Whip in the Senate  
265 Churchill Road Prospect SA 5082

**Senator P.L. Hanson**  
Leader of Pauline Hanson's One Nation  
GPO Box 228 Brisbane QLD 4001

**Senator S.C. Hanson-Young**  
Manager of Aust. Greens Bus. in the Senate  
Level 7, 147 Pirie Street Adelaide SA 5000

**Senator the Hon S. Henderson**  
PO Box 821 Geelong VIC 3220

**Senator S. Hodgins-May**  
1 Eastbourne Street Windsor VIC 3181

**Senator the Hon J. Hume**  
PO Box 224 Richmond VIC 3121

**Senator M. Kovacic**  
GPO Box 36 Sydney NSW 2001

**Senator J. Lambie**  
PO Box 256 Burnie TAS 7320

**Senator K.J. Liddle**  
Level 2, 31 Ebenezer Place Adelaide SA 5000

**Senator the Hon S. Lines**  
President of the Senate  
PO Box 1322 West Perth WA 6872

**Senator the Hon J.R. McAllister**  
Minister for Nat. Disability Ins. Scheme  
Suite 501, Level 5, 54-66 Wentworth Avenue  
Surry Hills NSW 2010

**Senator the Hon M. McCarthy**  
Minister for Indigenous Australians  
PO Box 1596 Darwin NT 0801

**Senator S.E. McDonald**  
Deputy Leader of the Nationals in the Senate  
PO Box 2185 Townsville QLD 4810

**Senator the Hon J.A. McGrath**  
Deputy Manager of Opp. Bus. in the Senate  
PO Box 772 Nambour QLD 4560

**Senator the Hon B.G. McKenzie**  
Leader of the Nationals in the Senate  
172 High Street Wodonga VIC 3690

**Senator N.J. McKim**  
Australian Greens Whip  
GPO Box 896 Hobart TAS 7001

**Senator A.L. McLachlan CSC**  
Level 1, 97 King William Street  
Kent Town SA 5067

**Senator C.M. Mulholland**  
PO Box 2350 Chermshire Centre QLD 4032

**Senator J.S. Nampijinpa Price**  
Deputy Opposition Whip in the Senate  
PO Box 40021 Casuarina NT 0811

**Senator D.M. O'Neill**  
Suite 3.12, The Platinum Building, 4 Ilya Avenue  
Erina NSW 2250

**Senator M.A. O'Sullivan**  
PO Box 3466 Success WA 6964

**Senator J. Paterson**

Ground floor, 63 York Street  
South Melbourne VIC 3205

**Senator F. Payman**

Australia's Voice Whip  
GPO Box B58 Perth WA 6838

**Senator B. Pocock**

Level 1, 110 King William Road  
Goodwood SA 5034

**Senator D.W. Pocock**

Independent ACT Whip  
PO Box 705 Gungahlin ACT 2912

**Senator H. Polley**

PO Box 1223 Launceston TAS 7250

**Senator M.I. Roberts**

PO Box 228 Brisbane QLD 4001

**Senator the Hon A.S. Ruston**

Deputy Leader of the Opp. in the Senate  
PO Box 1671 Renmark SA 5341

**Senator P.M. Scarr**

GPO Box 228 Brisbane QLD 4001

**Senator D.N. Sharma**

GPO Box 36 Sydney NSW 2001

**Senator A.V. Sheldon**

Chief Government Whip in the Senate  
PO Box 21267, World Square Post Shop  
Sydney NSW 2000

**Senator D.M. Shoebridge**

Suite 201, Level 2, 1A Lawson Square  
Redfern NSW 2016

**Senator D.A. Smith**

PO Box 40 Madeley WA 6065

**Senator M.F. Smith**

T1 10 Park Terrace Bowden SA 5007

**Senator J.A. Steele-John**

Office 1.19, Level 1, 140 William Street  
Perth WA 6000

**Senator G. Sterle**

Units G2 and G3, 150-152 Riseley Street  
Booragoon WA 6154

**Senator J.N.A. Stewart**

PO Box 75 Reservoir VIC 3073

**Senator L.A. Thorpe**

Independent VIC Whip  
PO Box 1526, 186-188 Smith Street  
Collingwood VIC 3066

**Senator T.M. Tyrrell**

Independent TAS Whip  
PO Box 1087 Launceston TAS 7250

**Senator C.G. Walker**

Commonwealth Parliament Offices  
Level 27, Festival Tower, Station Road  
Adelaide SA 5000

**Senator the Hon J.C. Walsh**

Minister for Early Childhood Education  
Minister for Youth  
PO Box 233 Brunswick East VIC 3057

**Senator L.J. Waters**

Leader of the Australian Greens  
Locked bag 3004 Paddington QLD 4064

**Senator the Hon M.P. Watt**

Minister for the Environment and Water  
GPO Box 228 Brisbane QLD 4001

**Senator P.S. Whish-Wilson**

PO Box 5194 Launceston TAS 7250

**Senator E. Whiteaker**

PO Box 531 Belmont WA 6984

**Senator T. Whitten**

PO Box 369 Belmont WA 6984

**Senator the Hon P. Wong**

Minister for Foreign Affairs  
Leader of the Government in the Senate  
PO Box 6237, Halifax Street  
Adelaide SA 5000

## A WEEKLY COMMENTARY



- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Vol. 62 No. 02

23<sup>rd</sup> January 2026

### IN THIS ISSUE

Thought for the Week By Louis Cook	33
Did we see a Liberal betrayal of Parliamentary Process? By Neville Archibald	35
Letter to the Editor By Ken Grundy	39

### Thought for the Week: Australia Day - Something to Celebrate

*Dear Reader,*

It is interesting to note the mutterings of a few people each Australia Day, giving vent to their ignorance of Australian History when they complain of the date, 26th January, as the day to celebrate nationhood. It is not the date that offends but Australia Day itself. They will not be happy until all of our cultural celebrations are consigned to the 'black hole' of 'white' memory.

Australian history and the building of this Nation since 1788 is something to really celebrate!

The early settlement was part of a deliberate plan, driven by pseudo economics, as European countries sought to protect and expand their trade routes. It is still happening today with Asian and other Nations.

The early settlers brought with them, their political, religious and cultural beliefs and were ordered by the King of the day, George III, to befriend any indigenous people as they settled the new land - this they did!

The convict element were also selected for the skills they could contribute to developing the new land ... yes, it was a form of conscripted labour but many were far better off than they would have been in the old country. You would not think so reading the socially engineered history taught today.

The American War of Independence started in 1776, two years before Governor Philip sailed into Botany Bay with the First Fleet. The bloody French Revolution of 1789 signaled great change in Europe. World events moved along with the Battle of Trafalgar in 1805 and then the Battle of Waterloo in 1812.

Meanwhile the early settlers here were building a home for future generations- to quote the words from the National Anthem- "*it was wealth for toil*" and they did toil!

America had a destructive Civil War in 1861 and some of the survivors made their way here to begin a new life. Australians have never experienced that type of war horror but came close in Darwin during 1942.

To celebrate Australia Day is far more than a form of 'beat-up jingoism' but recognition of a Nation with a system of government that allows dissident views while welcoming foreigners to live here under our rules. Australia is one of the first countries to offer help to countries in need - compare that to the record of others!

There is much more to tell but the modern socialist indoctrinated historian can only write about 'invasion day' and 'black wars' but never a mention of the work of Daisy Bates, Ion Idriess and other writers who lived through the times.

Don't take my word for it-read *Botany Bay: the Real Story* by Professor Alan Frost or *Journey to Canberra: By road from Sydney in search of history and curiosa* by Frank Clune. Be selective with your historical education because there is much written coloured by 'Marxist theory' and it is all red. Australia has much to celebrate and may have some perceived imperfections but please show us a better place to live, and then share it with the 'boat-people'

In the meantime, the Prime Minister is making another call for a republic-look around-there is not one republic on the planet worth emulating. Heaven forbid-we could finish up with one of that lot in Canberra as the first president.

Yes, celebrate Australia Day, look out for your friends and neighbours, and reject the political correctness fostered by the new elite as you sing with great gusto, "Australians all let us rejoice". **Louis Cook *Numurkah Jan 2018* \*\*\***

## **Did we see a Liberal betrayal of Parliamentary Process?**

**By Neville Archibald**

How do you reconcile the political machinations of the leading parties with the idea of good governance. How do you stay out of the debate on who is really running this country and for whom are they running it? How do you come to accept that the policies being implemented are effectively destroying our communities. Changing the very nature of the way we live?

Whatever happened to self determination?

I made a mistake believing that due process would happen! When our PM Anthony Albanese, said to the opposition, what do you want? (in regard to the hate speech and gun restriction laws that were pushed through at warp speed), I figured the liberal response would be due consideration.

Labor's bill was criticised for both it's content and the speed of it's implementation. It left no real time for discussion, let alone the perusal of the 7,000 odd submissions made about it. Labor put the ball into the oppositions court and we then found that these criticisms didn't mean anything in reality. Once the liberals had the ball, they also rammed it through, with only minimal discussion. Within the coalition itself, the modifications and intentions were

given limited time for discussion. Complaints from many quarters about the 'party' making executive decisions and leaving all others to follow. The coalition is sounding more and more like the Labor party. This has led to the Nationals splitting away, due to this inability to have themselves heard.

I expected the opposition to allow debate, to look carefully at submissions. Sadly they reacted exactly as had Labor. 'We know best', 'this is it', no true discussion allowed. Party room elites deciding the changes, with no time for the average person to react or complain (not even time for their national party colleagues to properly address concerns). The liberals had the potential to do the right thing by the voting public, they chose not to. They betrayed us!

I must admit, I was not as shocked as many others, especially the Nationals - so it seems. My disgust at both major parties goes back decades, but I did expect more than the two day scrutiny that eventuated. I was also hoping that the retrospective nature of this bill would be a bigger sticking point for the coalition.

Then I watched as David Littleproud was being grilled over the nationals decision to opt out. *Sky* agenda, the *ABC* and many others then focused on pushing this divide. When they couldn't make a lot of mileage out of that, they began to focus on placing the Nationals in the bad light, as though they created the split. The media was aggressive and seemed more interested in playing party against party, instead of focusing on the betrayal of the process of parliament. The fact that little real oversight of the resultant bill was allowed for, and on how it would have been impossible to read all of the 7,000 something public submissions, let alone understand the concepts expressed. That our legislators were happy to force through a wide reaching and potentially very destructive of free speech bill. They attacked the very people that stood up for proper parliamentary process.

This interview was particularly obnoxious as far as I am concerned.

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

*Sky news*, who usually present a slightly less biased view, totally failed to come to terms with the political issue here on this bill, instead, attacking Littleproud and driving home the wedge between National and Liberal. I had to turn it off, it sickened me that the real issue was not even discussed: the dangers of a rushed process which gags true debate. These are laws that will be used to limit freedom of speech, and the legal right to own guns. This far reaching potential should have set off alarms in a truly free media. Social media is reacting big time, but the established lot, what can I say? Are they really that owned?

It is the fundamental right of all representatives to read and understand incoming proposed legislation. To make any sort of decision, time is needed. When the Party system corrupts this process and simply instructs the direction of the vote, your representative must follow or risk losing a portfolio or the right to pre-selection in the next election. The Senators in the National party who held positions, felt obliged to offer resignation over this issue, to try to force the Liberal powers to re examine their haste. We saw where that went!

Whatever happened to the constitutional concept of it being illegal to coerce the vote of a sitting member.

*Interference with a Member of Parliament (MP) or Senator in the discharge of their duty—which includes voting—can be treated as contempt of the House.*

• **Intimidation:** *Threatening, bribing, or attempting to influence a member's vote through threats or harassment is a contempt.*

(This from Parliamentary Privileges Act 1987.)

While I am not a constitutional lawyer, if the Senator or member who is representing me is 'coerced' in such a fashion by the 'party' to vote against his/her belief of what their constituents want, is that not a bad thing! Does that not make a mockery of the reasons we elect them.

As far as I am concerned, Parliament has degraded itself to the point where it little resembles any form of the original intent to be voice for the people of this nation. It seems to be now a law unto itself and no longer cares for the very people who elect it. There are still a few who try to do the right thing, but now even the media (who should be trying to report the truth) no longer seem to uphold the peoples right to have a say. The arguments around this whole debacle seem concerned to push the idea that the party rules us, rather than they rule according to the wants of people of this nation. Reporting on the power play within this corrupted system and the personalities, becomes the 'show' instead of treating politics as the intention to uphold the desires of the population.

A book written in 1911, by Hilaire Belloc and Cecil Chesterton, entitled *The Party System*, expands on what was seen even then, as a corruption of the ideals of proper democracy in action. Why we still have such a system doing it's damndest to place power in a small group rather than expand the process to be a better representation of the desires of a nation, begs the question of just how we have allowed this to continue for more than a century, when the clear evidence of it's corrupting influence was seen even then. While the book deals with English parliament, the concepts and recognitions are still entirely valid.

[https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Belloc\\_Chesterton-The\\_Party\\_System.pdf](https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Belloc_Chesterton-The_Party_System.pdf)

*'The object of this book is to support the tendency now everywhere apparent and finding expression, a tendency to expose and ridicule as it deserves,' to destroy and to supplant the system under which Parliament, the governing institution of this country, has been rendered null.*

*We write to show why governments suddenly abandon causes which they have enthusiastically espoused, and why Oppositions tolerate such abandonment and lend themselves to such manoeuvres. The former are less obliged to consider the will of the people than to consult the sense of the Governing Group of which they are for the time the representatives, while the latter are less anxious to overthrow their rivals than to preserve the system which in due course, and by the connivance of those rivals, will bring to them also the opportunities and emoluments of office.*

*A sincere conviction common to a rapidly increasing number of men that, under the present international and domestic condition of England the game is not only farcical but perilous, has supplied our chief motive .'*

There has been an increase in the despair created by party politics (or it could be more an awareness of the fact that they are acting as a uni-party) which has seen primary votes fall. With this dissatisfaction comes the parties ever increasing reliance on manipulation of the preferential vote to keep or obtain power.

In 2013, the Liberals came in on 45.5% primary vote. In the last News-poll survey this has decreased to 21% primary. The Labor party figures are not much different. This in itself is an encouraging sign. How we wake up those voters who just don't see it - is anyone's guess. Perhaps the very actions of the parties themselves will be our saviour!

Continuing on with this Party theme!

Are we seeing the death of the party system? I sure hope so!

Perhaps it is time for the failed concept of Party politics to leave the stage. Bow out before the gong is sounded. What should be embraced by all, is a return to true representative governing. Where the first allegiance of a member elected to parliament, is the constituency. The very people of the electorate that gave them their job.

The very clash of the coalition has been for this basic reason. The Nationals believed that their constituents would not have wanted them to vote as the Liberals were asking them to. One step further, takes us to the original concept expressed in our system, that each member is beholden to those who elected them. Not a party or a small group of power brokers, the population entire – as best they can. Why is that so much to ask?

In another short book, *Our Sham Democracy* (A bit newer this time, written in 1946), by James Guthrie, he discusses many of the things we are still seeing today. Of the party system, he says:

*'Both parties have helped and encouraged the growth of monopolies and cartels, and large trade unions wherein the individual has become a mere cog in the machine having practically no say in the policy of those vast organisations. The determined policy of both parties has been to deprive individuals of any chance of establishing their independence and to force them to be dependent on the charity of the State as administered by the party boss and his henchmen.'* pg 9

and

*'The apparent detachment of the party leaders from the needs and wishes of the people is astonishing; and the inability of the people to get any relief from the simplest of political ailments is a matter of history. Accordingly, the sigh of relief when one government is voted out of office is only equalled when its successor shares the same fate.'* also pg 9.

What else does he say about the actions we have just seen in our parliament?

Remember, this was written in 1946.

*In theory, the people are supposed to have a free choice of candidates, and candidates, when elected, are supposed to represent the people in parliament. These representatives are supposed to discuss problems in open debate in parliament, and then to vote on them as their electorates wish them to vote. That is the theory. In practice, of course, nothing like this happens. What does happen is that the party candidates are selected before elections, and they depend on the backing of the party machine for their success. When elected, they also depend on their party bosses for promotion, for the right to sit on committees, and for other perquisites of office. For any representative to vote against his party would be, in all but a minority of cases, to commit political suicide.*

*Armed with these powers of coercion, the party bosses experience little trouble from rebels, and decide beforehand how the voting shall go in parliament. Parliament, therefore, is no longer the place where the laws of the country are made; even the debates therein are unheard and unread by the public. For all effective purposes, parliament has almost ceased to exist.'*

All the way through this 60 page booklet are gems of observation. Coupled with the now somewhat dated historical facts, it paints not just a picture of what we have seen happen; but, also allows us to see today's parallels in them. By page 26, Guthrie begins on the international journey, with the Bretton Woods agreement. For many the beginning of Internationalism.

In offering some constructive advice, he starts by laying out principles of self government. Putting forth the understandings we must have to both recognise and react to how we keep it honest and truly representative. Rather than waiting for a mob, or Party to do this reacting for us (as they like to say, on our behalf), he insists that:

*"... power to do things and to move things is still essentially a personal matter, and individual initiative is still the most dynamic thing in this world. A few men in each State who know what they are about, and who are willing to fight for their beliefs, would, I believe, transform any State—and do so in a very short time. What is necessary is exact knowledge, competence, and the will to fight."*

Of course, getting control of parliament back into the hands of the populace is only a small part of changing the direction we are travelling in. A necessary one indeed, we need it to make a start on rebuilding our world in a better way, a more human friendly way. The other part is understanding exactly what we want. In understanding just how much of a difference we could potentially see. The whole world is in flux at the moment, and if one Nation can make a better go of it, then others will follow. The fact that our wealth is being monetised as a debt to be repaid, makes a mockery of what I call Gods increase. That which is

just an extension of the natural world. One kernel of corn gives us a plant with a minimum of two ears, each having around a thousand kernels each. Does this not make a mockery of everything as a debt. A 2,000 fold increase! This example is but one small part of the life of plenty that could be achieved, given a correct view of reality, coupled with a monetary system that reflected it.

While we seem to 'harp on' about Social Credit, and the Douglas solution, it is only because that very concept of a life more abundant is a real one. The false scarcity of Keynesian economics puts us all in a slave state and denies us our own ability to advance. Until you look at the possibilities of what could be, you will never know the reality of what might be.

Keep reading!

In a world with an infinite ability to create and produce, more so than ever before, why do we tolerate poverty.

[https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Quigley WH Why-Tolerate-Poverty.pdf](https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Quigley%20WH%20Why-Tolerate-Poverty.pdf)

Ezra Pound and a short discussion on the reality of what money really is.

<https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Pound%20E%20-%20WhatIsMoneyFor.pdf>

Peter Lewis with an idea on a peoples constitutional convention and where it may lead!

<https://alor.org/Storage/Library/Lewis%20P%20-%20SA%20Constitutional%20Convention.htm> \*\*\*

## Letter to the Editor By Ken Grundy

*Dear Editor*

I have noticed the publication from the Limestone Coast Local Health Network regarding Australia Day. It is similar to other efforts from various groups, both those bearing some aboriginal blood and others with no aboriginal ancestry.

My concern firstly is, what is an opinion on Australia Day to do with a body such as Limestone Coast Local Health Network? The relevance would be compared to the Chemist sharing his concerns with customers, about how many fowls per square metre should be permitted in the barns! There is no connecting relevance. It is in fact an abuse of their job description.

Critics of recognition of Australia Day celebrations should be driven from individuals or groups established for such a purpose.

Apart from the above, I ask the critics who emphasise unfortunate events which occurred during white settlement, to consider what better overall things should have occurred. In practical terms, what would they have done in the circumstances?

Further, have they any positive things to recognise which the white population has provided?

Have they any appreciation of:

- The developed agricultural system providing our food.
- The refrigeration technology which allows the food to be kept for more than a day or two.
- The clothing and housing for comfortable living.
- The roads and vehicles assisting travel.
- The communication facilities - phones, radio and television.
- The medical support for health and comfort.
- The list is endless.

All of the above have been established by the white population. Would anyone prefer these things not to have been provided?

It would appear to most in the wider community, that looking at the overall situation, it must have been a great day when the British arrived at Botany Bay.

Let us appreciate what we have today and give thanks to all who helped with the development. *Ken Grundy* Naracoorte SA January 26 2026 \*\*\*



“  
[W]hether consciously or not, there is a widespread feeling on the part of executives of all descriptions that the only method by which large masses of human beings can be kept in agreement with dogmatic moral and social ideals, is by arranging that they shall be kept so hard at work that they have not the leisure or even the desire to think for themselves.”

**C.H. Douglas**  
Social Credit (1924)



thepeoplescredit.com.au | socred.org | C.H. DOUGLAS (1879 – 1952) | SCPL-30

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. 62 No. 03

30<sup>th</sup> January 2026

---

### IN THIS ISSUE

Can we govern without the Party system? By Neville Archibald

41

---

### Can We Govern Without the Party System? By Neville Archibald

Life is to be lived. While it can take many forms, our own interpretations of who and what we are shapes not just us, but the very people we live with. It shapes our family, our community and on a grander scale, our world.

Whether our world view is small or expansive, we must realise that we do make a difference. How much of a difference truly does not matter, for just as the last straw make break the camels back, so too does the capstone, that singular last stone out of over 2.3 million, complete the final structure. Key blocks during the build are also such, that if one or two were missing, the structure may well be at risk of falling down.

In society it is no different, it takes only a few to destroy the faith we have in our systems and unless we are astute enough to set in motion the actions needed to amend, or deal with, these faulty few, the result can be complete collapse. The ones who work outside our considered systems, who use phrases like, 'it's only business', or those who avoid being a part of a community while taking out huge profits, are the hedonistic, out for themselves types. Their considered world view is at odds with the very reasons we developed our social structure.

Because these few do it and get away with it, others follow. They see no way to combat it, so they join in. Those of us with greater ideals than that, are left to pick up the pieces as others suffer. If we do not rise to the occasion and sort out the sins against our philosophy, then we see larger and larger numbers fall prey to the destruction of all we have been striving for. We see tolerance, fairness and equality of opportunity, wither and die. We see virtual slavery and a wider division between people in the community, leading to anger, frustration and a descent into the very class warfare we were so keen to rise above.

If we look at history (and we must), we see that civilization has moved forwards and backwards over the centuries as this cycle has repeated. The defining points have always been when the collective voices of the community have aligned with a greater purpose. The arguments between religion and state, or religion and kings, has wavered back and forth, with the high points being when a balance has been achieved. This high point just ending (unless we can arrest it in time) has allowed us to end slavery and create a society whose very concepts lie within the 'love your neighbour as yourself' attitude of Christianity.

As the Roman empire fell from within due to a largely hedonistic population, forgetting and ignoring their previous higher callings, so too are we heading in that same direction. How we govern ourselves is at the crux of the matter, for our laws and direction are decided by the method we use to bring about these discussions and then make decisions on them. If we divorce ourselves from this procedure, we allow others to choose direction and as a consequence, we also forget what it was we were really aiming for.

The party system has been one of those problems. Every direction, every argument has been packaged up for us and presented as if it were one thing. Two parties - two things. Yet our lives consist of a myriad of decisions every day, each with sometimes far more than just that one answer.

We have been tricked into believing that this is the only way to 'win' government. In reality, it seems we are not 'winning' at government, but that government is winning over us.

So are there alternatives?

Here it would be good to reflect on what has been before. The main purpose of history, I contend, is to learn from it, such that we do not repeat the same mistakes again. We often find today's versions of history are cheapened and viewed as entertainment or a competitive overview, like a game. The true lessons are rarely discussed. The criticism of the party system in our governmental process is not a new one, it has been mentioned and lamented in many a book before. Astute writers and politicians themselves have warned of it's destructive nature. First though, if we are to consider replacing it, we need to have a recap on the structure of government we have developed, the one that we are trying to recreate.

This from Baron Lord Acton's book *Essays on Freedom and Power*. In chapter 3, The History of Freedom in Christianity, available here:

<https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Acton%20-%20First%20Baron%20-%20Essays%20on%20Freedom%20and%20Power.pdf>

he writes:

*In the height of their power the Romans became aware of a race of men that had not abdicated freedom in the hands of a monarch; and the ablest writer of the empire pointed to them with a vague and bitter feeling that, to the institutions of these barbarians, not yet crushed by despotism, the future of*

*the world belonged. Their kings, when they had kings, did not preside at their councils; they were sometimes elective; they were sometimes deposed; and they were bound by oath to act in obedience with the general wish. They enjoyed real authority only in war. This primitive Republicanism, which admits monarchy as an occasional incident, but holds fast to the collective supremacy of all free men, of the constituent authority over all constituted authorities, is the remote germ of parliamentary government.'*

*'Feudalism made land the measure and the master of all things. Having no other source of wealth than the produce of the soil, men depended on the landlord for the means of escaping starvation; and thus his power became paramount over the liberty of the subject and the authority of the State.'*

Here we see a comparison today with companies. The land is no longer the biggest employer or influence on the public. Companies, both large and small are the new landlords. The 'land' originally being all important to produce, has been changed by technology to be production by whatever means, even unto vague and amorphous output. The small have far less impact than the large (multinationals) as they must work within the framework that the bigger can successfully buy into, or lobby for; BUT we are reliant on these new 'landlords' (production lords) for our daily bread, our very existence. Productivity of a Nation is now so entwined with these big businesses that all monetary policy is connected to it. Even the noblest of these are now so captive of the system (the collective of the production lords) that the control of money and it's scarcity is the leash by which we are released or reeled in. As Acton then said, it became a clash between the feudal hierarchy and the ecclesiastical one. In our case the rights of our developed Parliament under our Christian Constitution ('humbly relying on the blessing of Almighty God' and on the institution of the Monarchy to rule according to the customs and traditions of their people.) and the collective of International interests (WEE, IMF etc).

*Every baron, said the French maxim, is sovereign in his own domain. The nations of the West lay between the competing tyrannies of local magnates and of absolute monarchs, when a force was brought upon the scene which proved for a time superior alike to the vassal and his lord.*

*In the days of the Conquest, when the Normans destroyed the liberties of England, the rude institutions which had come with the Saxons, the Goths, and the Franks from the forests of Germany were suffering decay, and the new element of popular government afterwards supplied by the rise of towns and the formation of a middle class was not yet active. The only influence capable of resisting the feudal hierarchy was the ecclesiastical hierarchy; and they came into collision, when the process of feudalism threatened the independence of the Church by subjecting the prelates severally to that: form of personal dependence on the kings which was peculiar to the Teutonic state.'*

Under our system of government, we recognise the right of the people to sanction the decisions that effect them: democratic election of representative government. The key word here should be representative. This derives from the Greek concept, 'Vox Populi Vox Dei', 'The voice of the people is the voice of God.' Not to suggest that the madness of the mob may be considered so, but the early expression was largely to do with choice of Kingship. Who would be ruler. The people themselves: speaking as to who they wish to be and whom they consider would best represent this wish.

Acton says on pg62:

*'And this doctrine of the divine right of the people to raise up and pull down princes, after obtaining the sanctions of religion, was made to stand on broader grounds, and was strong enough to resist both Church and king. In the struggle between the House of Bruce and the House of Plantagenet for the possession of Scotland and Ireland, the English claim was backed by the censures of Rome. But the Irish and the Scots refused it, and the address in which the Scottish Parliament informed the Pope of their resolution shows how firmly the popular doctrine had taken root. Speaking of Robert Bruce, they say: "Divine Providence, the laws and customs of the country, which we will defend till death, and the choice of the people, have made him our king. If he should ever betray his principles, and consent that we should be subjects of the English king, then we shall treat him as an enemy, as the subverter of our rights and his own, and shall elect another in his place. We care not for glory or for wealth, but for that liberty which no true man will give up but with his life."*

And so we have seen this development brought forward into our Parliamentary form, where we were expected to choose the representatives best acquainted with our lives and desires, to be a part of the determination of National direction (or local or state). If our Parliament, behaves as to betray our principles, then we too, should elect another in it's place. If the options of that other are little different, as we are seeing, then it is up to us to push for a change.

Again from Acton:

*'Here are the sentiments of the most celebrated of all the Guelphic writers: "A king who is unfaithful to his duty forfeits his claim to obedience. It is not rebellion to depose him, for he is himself a rebel whom the nation has a right to put down. But it is better to abridge his power, that he may be unable to abuse it. For this purpose, the whole nation ought to have a share in governing itself; the Constitution ought to combine a limited and elective monarchy, with an aristocracy of merit, and such an admixture of democracy as shall admit all classes to office, by popular election. No government has a right to levy taxes beyond the limit determined by the people. All political authority is derived from popular suffrage, and all laws must be made by the people or their representatives. There is no security for us as long as we depend on the will of*

another man." This language, which contains the earliest exposition of the Whig theory of the revolution, is taken from the works of St. Thomas Aquinas, of whom Lord Bacon says that he had the largest heart of the school divines.'

The force opposite of the Guephic (the Church) at that time, were the Ghibelline (the Imperialists). Acton writes of them: *'The ablest writer of the Ghibelline party was Marsilius of Padua. 'Laws,' he said, 'derive their authority from the nation, and are invalid without its assent.*

*As the whole is greater than any part, it is wrong that any part should legislate for the whole; and as men are equal, it is wrong that one should be bound by laws made by another. But in obeying laws to which all men have agreed, all men, in reality, govern themselves.'*

So this development has continued apace to this point. Acton, writing this historical overview in the late 1870s, is a really good start to understanding our governmental development. This chapter from which I am quoting, sets up the reasons why it is important to know just how this came about. It also gives a clear insight on why we have seen a rise and fall over history.

*'Looking back over the space of a thousand years, which we call the Middle Ages, to get an estimate of the work they had done, if not towards perfection in their institutions, at least towards attaining the knowledge of political truth, this is what we find: Representative government, which was unknown to the ancients, was almost universal. The methods of election were crude; but the principle that no tax was lawful that was not granted by the class that paid it – that is, that taxation was inseparable from representation – was recognised, not as the privilege of certain countries, but as the right of all. Not a prince in the world, said Philip de Commines, can levy a penny without the consent of the people. Slavery was almost everywhere extinct; and absolute power was deemed more intolerable and more criminal than slavery. The right of insurrection was not only admitted but defined, as a duty sanctioned by religion. Even the principles of the Habeas Corpus Act, and the method of the income tax, were already known. The issue of ancient politics was an absolute state planted on slavery. The political produce of the Middle Ages was a system of states in which authority was restricted by the representation of powerful classes, by privileged associations, and by the acknowledgement of duties superior to those which are imposed by man.'*

Later speaking of the French philosopher Charron, Acton sums up:

*'In a passage almost literally taken from St. Thomas, he describes our subordination under a law of nature, to which all legislation must conform; and he ascertains it not by the light of revealed religion, but by the voice of universal reason, through which God enlightens the consciences of men. Upon this foundation Grotius drew the lines of real political science. In gathering the materials of international law, he had to go beyond national treaties and*

*denominational interests for a principle embracing all mankind. The principles of law must stand, he said, even if we suppose that there is no God. By these inaccurate terms he meant that they must be found independently of revelation. From that time it became possible to make politics a matter of principle and of conscience, so that men and nations differing in all other things could live in peace together, under the sanctions of a common law.'*

For the Nations of the world to live together peacefully, we must all agree on our right to self determination. The Nations of the west have a rich history to learn from and a responsibility to see that the advances thus far made, are not lost by lethargy or the pursuit of hedonism over true purpose. Freedom comes from exercising this right regularly. It stays, when we are continually aware and active in our involvement in the process. Abdicating this responsibility to a party or other such proxy will only lead to lessening of these freedoms, as those others clamour to use that process to further their own interests. We have been given a glimpse (some would say many) of what the future looks like if we do not start to address these problems now. As I said at the beginning, others have made comment on what we might do. The following authors give insight and potential for returning to true representative government that lessens the input of Party politics; but, all finish with the basic presumption that it is only when enough of the population are active in their future that it truly starts to be seen.

I will go through some of these suggestions next week. In the meantime you need to go over where we came from, to understand where we are going. Remember that if we do nothing; it is guaranteed nothing will change. \*\*\*

Further reading:

[https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Belloc\\_Chesterton-The\\_Party\\_System.pdf](https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Belloc_Chesterton-The_Party_System.pdf)

[https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Bernays%20E%20-%20Engineering\\_of\\_Consent\\_1947.pdf](https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Bernays%20E%20-%20Engineering_of_Consent_1947.pdf)

[https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Guthrie%20J%20-%20Our\\_Sham\\_Democracy.pdf](https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Guthrie%20J%20-%20Our_Sham_Democracy.pdf)

<https://alor.org/Storage/Library/Initiative%20Referendum%20and%20Recall.htm>

[https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Dobbs\\_G-Responsible\\_Government\\_in\\_a\\_Free\\_Society.pdf](https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Dobbs_G-Responsible_Government_in_a_Free_Society.pdf)

<https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Lee%20J%20-%20Conscience%20Voting.pdf>

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

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

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

BSB 105-044

A/c No. 188-040-840

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

Telephone: 08 8322 8923 eMail: [heritagebooks@alor.org](mailto:heritagebooks@alor.org)

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

Our main website of the Douglas Social Credit and the

Freedom Movement "Archives" :: <https://alor.org/>

On Target is printed and authorised by Arnis J. Luks

13 Carsten Court, Happy Valley, SA.



- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

---

Vol. 62 No. 04

6<sup>th</sup> February 2026

---

IN THIS ISSUE

An Alternative to Parties By Neville Archibald

47

---

**An Alternative to Parties By Neville Archibald**

As mentioned last week, this week I am going to look at what we could do to stop the huge influence that the party system of politics has over the common man.

We have seen in the last few weeks, continual party political maneuverings. Are the Coalition filing for divorce? Who has custody of the kids? Who is jumping ship to join the next big thing? Media has focused almost exclusively on these Machiavellian manipulations as the players of this game seek to increase their chances of re-election. To be seen as being in the right group, the right team.

Sadly this attitude flows on into public discourse as well, with each person looking at team scores and agreeing or disagreeing with the players being picked for the coming competition. Their “dream team”. Buying into this whole charade is what they want you to do! Pick a side and reap the rewards! Or as we have been seeing time after time, pick a side and end up with the best of the worst. Or in other terms, choose from the almost indistinguishable differences by one or two variations in otherwise almost identical policy sets.

While we are comparing the theatre of political opposition, we miss the point of the existence of politics in the first place. It is essentially there to represent the people! The election of each individual member is solely the responsibility of the electorate they are supposed to represent. Each federal electorate averages 120,000 registered voters, I state it again, they are the sole reason for that member being there! Forget the party nominations, or the machinery of selecting a candidate, the purpose is given in the first sentence of section 24 of our federal constitution.

*“24. The House of Representatives shall be composed of members directly chosen by the people of the Commonwealth,”* it then goes on to talk of numbers and relationships between those numbers and the population statistics and Senate elect numbers. Nowhere does it mention party pre-selection or the party system at all. The sole responsibility of the member, is to his constituents!

If we look at Senate members we see a similar intent. In Section *“7. The Senate shall be composed of senators for each state, directly chosen by the people of the state, voting, until the Parliament otherwise provides, as on electorate.”*

Again no talk of party interference in this process!

The first mention of party political interference has then been inserted in the following section 15. under the casual vacancies ruling added in 1977.

This effectively says that if there is a vacancy of a given senator (through resignation or death etc.) then the ‘party’ to whom they were a part, would then have the right to replace them with one of their own. In this way the ‘party’ retains it’s seat. There is quite a section added at this point. Of the 18 clauses in the whole section describing the Senate, this addition (made in 1977) occupies almost as much space as the other 17 combined. That in itself dismays me, what could be said simply in the past has ballooned under this style of politics to be wordy and confusing. It was a simple concept previously, as the whole of our original constitution is, in this case the voting population chooses the Senator, full stop. People calling for a ‘new Constitution’, do so thinking something is wrong with it. They don’t seem to equate the verbose additions (Which I believe, is one of the most insidious ways of changing intent) as the actual problem. To me, corruption creeps in with every word added to legislation. Original intent becomes codified and multiplied and full of variations to the point of making that original intent, capable of any interpretation, by who ever can afford to pursue it. That seems to be the sad reality that many overlook when following the call to reform.

This is why the previous reading suggested is important. Knowing the reasons and outcomes of the development of these intents is a crucial part of understanding why we need to be not only careful, but understanding of the philosophies behind them. They are the very binding glue that holds a society together and allows us to find that common ground. To operate successfully as a Nation.

So when we look at what has been said about the problem of ‘party’ involvement, we can see what needs to change.

Under the heading of “Political causes of the American Revolution”, which is chapter 7 in his book of essays, Lord Acton presents the writings of many statesmen, on the actions of using a ‘party’ system in representative government.

None had anything nice to say.

Joseph Story (American lawyer, jurist and politician), writing of the development of American political systems in 1818, says this:

*"A new race of men is springing up to govern the nation; they are the hunters after popularity; men ambitious, not of the honour so much as of the profits of office, the demagogues whose principles hang laxly upon them, and who follow, not so much what is right as what leads to a temporary vulgar applause.*

*There is great, very great danger that these men will usurp so much of popular favour that they will rule the nation; and if so, we may yet live to see many of our best institutions crumble in the dust."*

On the 18th February, 1834, he (Story) writes of Jackson's administration:

*"I feel humiliated at the truth, which cannot be disguised, that though we live under the form of a republic, we are in fact under the absolute rule of a single man." And a few years later, 3d November, 1837, he tells Miss Martineau that she has judged too favorably of his country: "You have overlooked the terrible influence of a corrupting patronage, and the system of exclusiveness in official appointments, which have already wrought such extensive mischiefs among us, and threaten to destroy all the safeguards of our civil liberties. . . .*

*You would have learned, I think, that there may be a despotism exercised in a republic, as irresistible and as ruinous as in any form of monarchy."*

(Lord Acton page 234 )

These are comments about the powerful grouping arising from the formation of these 'teams of representatives', rather than the arising of a single person to represent the people who elected them. Calhoun (a New England judge) also commented on the despotic nature of any government when it concentrates its power in the system itself, rather than the people. English pamphleteer, journalist and politician, William Cobbett said much the same thing, having lived under a republican government in Pennsylvania for eight years.

*"Channing (Unitarian minister and abolitionist) touches on a very important point, the influence of European liberalism on the republicanism of America: "Ever since our revolution we have had a number of men who have wanted faith in our free institutions, and have seen in our almost unlimited extension of the elective franchise the germ of convulsion and ruin. When the demagogues succeed in inflaming the ignorant multitude, and get office and power, this anti-popular party increases; in better times it declines. It has been built up in a measure by the errors and crimes of the liberals of Europe. . . . I have endeavoured on all occasions to disprove the notion that the labouring classes are unfit depositaries of political power. I owe it, however, to truth to say that I believe that the elective franchise is extended too far in this country." In 1841 he described very accurately the perils which have since proved fatal:*

*"The great danger to our institutions, which alarms our conservatives most, has not perhaps entered Mr. Smith's mind. It is the danger of a party organisation, so subtle and strong as to make the government the monopoly of a few leaders, and to insure the transmission of the executive power from hand to hand almost as regularly as in a monarchy ..... That this danger is real cannot be doubted. So that we have to watch against despotism as well as, or more than, anarchy." (Lord Acton, page 235)*

Is this not exactly what we are witnessing? A Few leaders who pass on the very same policies and more importantly, the philosophies, that have previously failed to make change for the better. We elect one of two, in a series of actions more like throwing one out than actually going for something better. The system is passed from one to the other but never really altered at that crucial point, the one that ensures it will reflect our wishes and not that of a party elite.

So, given the recognition of the corrupting influence of the party system on true representative government, what can we do about it?

Recognition that we must deal with it, is paramount. Unless the voting public can see the need to change their ways, they may feel it is too hard. For far too long they have abdicated their true responsibility. The first step in this change would have to be to lead by example. To start small with achievable goals in your own locality, like taking back control of local government. Many politicians have started in local government before moving on to state or federal. It is the same with anything you wish to achieve in life. You crawl before you walk to gain both confidence and experience.

To read about this and the experience of a true representative parliamentarian, I recommend the works of Ted Mack.

[https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Mack\\_T-Beyond\\_Representative\\_Government.pdf](https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Mack_T-Beyond_Representative_Government.pdf)

and [https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Mack\\_T-Henry\\_Parkes\\_Oration.pdf](https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Mack_T-Henry_Parkes_Oration.pdf)

Also the works of Mr Graeme Campbell MHR. Who says of the uni-party,

*"Governments, Liberal or Labor, are like Mr Rowe - aground on the barren rock of rational economics. So beguiled are they that they have not realised rational economics is not an economic theory but the political ideology of big business to control world trade."*

Commonsense writing on the issues confronting us are his forte. He tells us that the forces we are battling are between nationalist and internationalist, but describes the 'nationalist' completely different to that of the skewed version sold by those competing to push the internationalist end. His words that cannot be denied by anyone who is looking clearly at the problems we face: *"In this battle, the internationalists have the support of big business, big governments, the media and our sick academia, most of our supine politicians and the banks."*

Both of these men made good their days in parliament by doing the

very thing the constitution expects of them: re-presenting the will of their electorate! Campbell, who started out as a Labor member, lost endorsement when he continued to oppose the expected party position where it conflicted with his electorate. Because of this, he resigned before he was removed from the party and became an independent, winning the election despite being dis-endorsed.

Ted Mack, started in North Sydney council, where he was a proponent of Citizens Initiative Referendum and Recall. Basing his ideas on both the Swiss concept and that of several US State versions. His push for this was, in part, due to the real need for accountability to ratepayers. He was to follow this through into both state and federal politics, using office to promote this idea that we, the people, should have a better say over what we do and don't want. As an addition to the Constitution it would enable the voters themselves to put a halt to bad legislation, and even initiate some. Recall could be used to oust a member who no longer had the support of his constituents.

When I consider the role of the Parliament, I expect the 'will of the people' should prevail; however, the member should also be able to vote as his conscience dictates. A person of strong conviction (for this will be what is needed to make this change) should not be expected to compromise their faith. When a conflict like that arose, the population would either have to put up with it, or ask for resignation. One hopes that this would be a lesser issue than some paint it. If the election of an honest person is considered best, then such an occurrence need not be the worry it is made out to be. For surely the direction of votes as it presently stands in parliament, is increasingly at odds with the peoples desires, as we have seen. Jeremy Lee sets this out succinctly in his book, *Conscience Voting*.

<https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Lee%20I%20-%20Conscience%20Voting.pdf>

Another, more in tune with Ted Mack's accountability drive, is Jeremy's book, *Impact Voting* <https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Lee J-Impact Voting.pdf>

Both of these books offer advice on how to proceed, with references on past actions and possible new methods to try. As with all of the information linked here, it will only be of benefit if you actually read and disseminate it. Only if you take action yourself to make it available in your local circles of influence. Copies of all these items are available at reasonable cost to take that action.

Another series of observations and suggestions are made in a book from 1911. Hilaire Belloc and Cecil Chesterton, *The Party System*.

<https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Belloc Chesterton-The Party System.pdf>

on page 17, they write:

*"Either the representative must vote as his constituents would vote if consulted, or he must vote in the opposite sense. In the latter case, he is not a representative at all, but merely an oligarch ; for it is surely ridiculous to say that a man represents Bethnal Green if he is in the habit of saying " Aye " when the people*

*of Bethnal Green would say "No." If, on the other hand, he does vote as his constituents would vote, then he is merely the mouthpiece of his constituents and derives his authority from them. And this is the only democratic theory of representation. In order that the practice may correspond to it, even approximately, three things are necessary. First, there must be absolute freedom in the selection of representatives ; secondly, the representatives must be strictly responsible to their constituents and to no one else; thirdly, the representatives must deliberate in perfect freedom, and especially must be absolutely independent of the Executive."*

Here we see the alterations that need to be addressed in our current system. Even though this was written in 1911, and of the English Parliament, it still applies here. Freedom of selection, means just that, no pre-selected candidates arrived at by a few party political interests. Few enough put their name forward now, we do not need to winnow, or whittle down the numbers, especially when it is done by outside influence, just allow them to step forward. There will be no vague promises of loyalty conferred in this manner. Other collusion or vested interests behind a candidate would be punishable by existing law, if they should be made known or come into the light of day. The 'expected coercion' by party ties would not be adding some form of legitimacy to this practice.

Secondly the 'strictly responsible to their constituents and no one else', part need only be modified to allow the genuine person to not compromise on their personal principles, which I imagine would have already been made known in the debate or discussion prior to the vote (in the 'get to know your candidate' stage.) discussed more thoroughly in Jeremy Lee's book, "Conscience Voting".

The third part, is even more important, in that there can be no pressure exerted unduly from the executive arm of government. Considered debate, consultation and investigation must be allowed to take place. Gagging of debate, pressure to conform, or incentives in the form of promises made, should be considered an undue influence. This does not mean that deals can not be struck or that true debate would not be able to change a position, it means that time to go back to the electorate and confer with any new information that may come into play, can be a part of the process.

It is here that time for consideration must also be addressed. The late night or rushed sittings to force something through need to be curtailed. Emergencies may crop up, but much of the posturing and parading to garner votes that causes this knee jerk reaction in the first place, would be out. Nothing decided in haste is ever good. The old proverb, "decide in haste, repent at leisure" is true far more often than not.

In chapter 7, (The Party System) "Can it be mended?" other ideas have been put forth as to how to limit the influences of the party system. A Mr Jowett, M.P.,  
52 *On Target* January 2026

makes a suggestion to abolish Ministries per se, and substitute departmental committees of the house. This would see a “minister” as just the chairman of a committee, where a number of parliamentarians make up the body itself. Instead of having only party representatives push a ‘party line’, the committee would be open to input from all who wished to partake. This would be especially important, given that some electorates are far more impacted by decisions that they also know something about. It would be ‘horses for courses’, in that those with the first hand experience of that particular item being considered would have a better understanding of both the workings of, and the desire of the people in those industries. If you were looking at parliament as a business, surely you would expect no less! Parliamentary committees now in place are often the point of exposure for departmental flaws or failures. Just one sincere member can raise important questions that may well otherwise risk of being swept under a festive rug. Senator Gerard Rennick, Senator Alex Antic and Senator Malcolm Roberts, among others, have been successful in this manner, when active on these committees. More of the same, but on a ministerial basis, can only help, surely? What do you think. We need to consider and expound on these possibilities. Anything that will bring us more accountability can be considered.

The most interesting point I can make here is that when you look at the loss of actual true representation that has occurred since full on party involvement, it makes you realise just how few of us are a part of any decision. Democratic elections have become mere words to give the illusion of participation. Selected individuals (all toeing the one line) are put to us to choose from. After we choose, they then either participate to a small degree (if it agrees with party ideology) or sit out the decision making process on the side lines with little or no input, until it is time to vote. They then vote, but knowing full well the party in control already has the numbers to pass, all worked out beforehand via deals and backscratching. Less than half the participants have any say, and even less than that make policy. That is reflected back at us, in that only a small portion of electorates have a member who actually has a say. Even then it not necessarily the true say of the electorate, it is the party interpretation; and there are only a few policies that make the difference in elections. The majority of these policies are just brought along for the ride and rarely feature in the decision to elect in the first place.

Anyway you look at it, it is representative government in name only! This is what we must change.

The other significant addition to our system would be the Referenda process (C.I.R) laid out here: <https://alor.org/Storage/Library/Initiative%20Referendum%20and%20Recall.htm> and commented on here:

<https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Walker%20G%20de%20Q%20-%20The%20Peoples%20Law.pdf>

It is also in the works of Ted Mack MHR, as previously mentioned. A man who took this seriously and endeavoured to use it in his own North Shore Sydney council. Practical applications and experiences already proven. This eight page read gives clarity and insight into just how it operated quite successfully in the 1980s. [https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Mack\\_T-Beyond\\_Representative\\_Government.pdf](https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Mack_T-Beyond_Representative_Government.pdf)

Once again, participation of the public must be encouraged first. The apathy and disinterest shown in previous times has become less of a problem now, as the successive governments we have had, ride roughshod over our various freedoms. The awakening multitude must be given encouraging and relevant material to show that it is possible to sort this out. Dissatisfaction with party political division should be acted on; in whatever form would best help. If we are talking corruption, point it out, even if the media does not. If we see a politician walk from public life directly into a job he helped to create while in office, point that out too. For too long voting on particular issues has not been mentioned. It is published in the parliament record, Hansard. Much should also be made of this, especially when the prevailing electorate desires the very opposite. Voting by your elected candidate should be common knowledge in your area. How else are people to know whether they are actually trying to represent their interests or not.

Ignorance leads to lack of action and apathy. Both knowledge and awareness of the less than desirable practices by party hacks, can only push us towards a more independent and therefore more representative form of government. People will eventually stop supporting those who do them wrong! Mistakes are one thing; but continued failure, whether intentional or not, should not be allowed to go unnoticed and without comment. We all need to be more active in our public life, when it concerns politics. It must be pointed out to all voters, that if we don't take an interest, the same people will continue to change this country until it is unrecognisable. As was pointed out in the last article, the times that have reflected public satisfaction and prosperity, have been the times that people have actively participated. We need to encourage this and from there we can push for the changes needed.

In the current media scrabble to point out differences and difficulties within party unity, for all parties, the one real issue being missed, is the one that created the rift in the first place. The quiet around the potential impact of the hate speech legislation is conveniently forgotten. This is the impact of Party politics showing. It is all about the puppetry, the show, the distraction around personalities, and not about the damage they are inflicting on us. More of the same will follow until we set about reducing or removing it's influence. Check the mentioned works, work out a plan and begin to make that change. In whatever way suits you best. \*\*\*

"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. 27 No. 1

January 2026

## **IN THIS ISSUE**

Some Reflections on the Feast of the Epiphany By M. Oliver Heydorn	55
Trump's Tariff Dividend Idea Shows Some Promise	59
Vale Donald James Auchterlonie	61
Vale William W. Ridgway	62

## **Some Reflections on the Feast of the Epiphany By M. Oliver Heydorn**

As today is the feast of the Epiphany, it seems opportune to throw some light on the mysterious personage of Zoroaster (Zarathustra), his teachings, and their connections with Christianity and Douglas Social Credit.

Zoroaster was a member of an Iranian (Aryan) tribe and probably lived anywhere from 1750 BC to 1200 BC and somewhere along the river Oxus, or one of its tributaries, in what is now known as Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, or Bactria. At the age of 30 he claims to have experienced a theophany, a personal revelation from God, Ahura Mazda, "The Wise Lord".

The three wise men, the Magi, were Zoroastrian priests. Zoroaster had received a prophecy of a world Saviour (*Saoshyant*) to be born of a virgin. This is why the Magi went looking for him. Many of the core Christian doctrines involving strict monotheism, the all-goodness of God, free will, angels and demons (Satan), the pre-eminent importance of morality, the personal judgement, the general judgement and bodily resurrection, heaven and hell, the apocalyptic renewal of the world (*Freshokereti*) have a Zoroastrian and not Jewish origin. The Jews were exposed to these ideas during the Babylonian Captivity and appropriated them in whole or in part (I use the term "Jew" here, but Israelite or Hebrew might be a more accurate one).

Perhaps the single most "impactful" doctrine from Zoroaster, however, is the notion of *Asha*, i.e., the natural law, the Logos. Reality is so constructed that whenever we arrange various components in accordance with the laws of functional order (*Asha*) we get positive outcomes, where things are empowered to fulfill their purposes well. Whenever we violate the laws of functional order we end up with negative outcomes, the frustration of fulfillment, the sabotaging of being's inherent potential for goodness.

These natural laws are operative on every plane of existence without exception. If you want, for example, to construct a flying vehicle that can transport people and cargo effectively, efficiently, and safely through the air from one location to another, say from one continent to another, you must discern the natural law that governs flight (the principles of aerodynamics) and apply them through appropriately designed mechanisms and using the right materials. You cannot say (not with success at any rate): “I don’t care what the natural law has to say about air travel ... I will design my plane according to what I think the principles of aerodynamics ought to be, or according to no set principles at all.” Any such approach is guaranteed to end in failure. The natural law (*Asha*) is universal and objective, though it admits of different applications and permutations depending on the inputs in question. To adhere to a false conception of the order of the universe is to fall into *Druj*, the Lie, which is the opposite of *Asha*.

C.H. Douglas referred to *Asha*, the natural law, as “the Canon”. Our societies, our civilization, fail to the extent that we disregard the natural law or do not apply it appropriately. Just as a plane cannot fly unless it embodies, incarnates the natural law, so too our societies cannot “fly”, cannot fulfill the purposes of association well, unless they embody the natural law. Instead, when society violates the natural law we end up with dysfunction, instability, corruption, and decay ... friction and frustration ... waste and sabotage. The fundamental fight we face is thus the battle between *Asha* and *Druj*, Truth and the Lie.

In this respect, Douglas Social Credit is simply a quest to correctly discern and apply *Asha*, the natural law, the Canon, to financial, economic, and political systems so that they might function as well as possible and that reality’s inherent potential for goodness can be released (instead of being imprisoned and thwarted).

But back to Zoroaster ... Zoroastrianism has not only had a significant impact on Christianity (properly understood), but also on Greek philosophy. The Greeks were exposed to Zoroastrianism *via* their colonies in Asia Minor which had been absorbed into the Persian Empire. The first Philosophers, Thales, Anaximenes, Anaximander, were all preoccupied with the problem of the One and the Many. Such a problem doesn’t even seem to pose itself as a problem, unless you believe or have been told that, as opposed to the teachings of pagan polytheism, there is but one Creator-God, Ahura Mazda, who exists in contrast with everything that is “not God” or is otherwise finite. Anyone who reads Plato cannot but notice the obvious Zoroastrian influence in the notion of the two metaphysical realms: the spiritual (*Menog*) world and the physical (*Getig*) world, the theory of the forms (perfect ideals echoing the notion of *Asha*), the human capacity for rational intuition (*nous* - *Vohu Manah* in Zoroastrianism), and Socrates’ insistence that

it is better to suffer injustice than to commit it (i.e., the pre-eminent importance of morality, of righteousness - doing the good because it is good and not out of narrow self-interest). Indeed, the Zoroastrians called their religion Mazdayasna or the worship/veneration of Wisdom. The Greek *philosophia*, love of wisdom, is just a secularized version of the same existential orientation.

It should also be noted that without philosophy, Christian theology is likewise impossible. Without Zoroaster, there would be no Augustinianism, no Thomism, nothing. Since without Zoroaster there would have been no Platonism, Whitehead's comment that "all of Western philosophy is but a series of footnotes on Plato" is better rendered as "All Western philosophy is but a series of footnotes on Zoroaster" — Plato was but one of the footnotes.

I submit that Zoroaster is the ultimate father of our Western Civilization, and yet hardly anyone knows anything about him or his teachings. Odd, isn't? Perhaps, like Douglas Social Credit, "the light is too bright and too blinding" (in the words of Ezra Pound) to be understood or appreciated by mere mortals and so Zoroaster has been left in obscurity.

I think that this sorry state of affairs needs to change, however, especially as our civilization is being subjected to greater and greater stresses precisely because we have abandoned *Asha*, the natural law.

Would it be too much to ask that an encyclical be written on Zoroaster, his teachings, and their importance for the survival of Christendom? The three Magi are already canonized Saints. For my part, I believe that Zoroaster was a *bona fide* prophet.

I recommend to everyone a careful reading of Zoroaster's hymns, the Gathas. Below you can find Hymn No. Three, also known as Yasna 30:

## **Ahunuvaiti Gatha**

### **Yasna 30**

1. O ye, coming to seek wisdom, now shall I proclaim  
to you the message of the Wise Creator,  
The hymns unto Ahura, and the offerings of the Good Mind,  
The enduring sacred Truth,  
And the glorious vision of the Heavenly Lights  
attainable through Truth sublime.

2. Harken with your ears to these best counsels,  
Reflect upon them with illumined judgment.  
Let each one choose his creed with that  
freedom of choice each must have at great events.  
O ye, be awake to these, my announcements.

3. In the beginning there were two primal spirits,  
Twins spontaneously active,  
These are the Good and the Evil, in thought,  
and in word, and in deed.  
Between these two, let the wise choose aright.  
Be good, not base!

4. And when these Twin Spirits came together at first,  
They established Life and the Denial of Life;  
And so shall it be till the world will last.  
The worst existence shall be the lot of the followers of evil,  
And the state of Best-Consciousness be the reward of the righteous.

5. Of these Twin Spirits, the Evil one chooses doing  
the worst,  
While the most bountiful Holy Spirit of Goodness,  
clothing itself in the imperishable heavens,  
chooses Truth and Righteousness.  
And so will those who would please Ahura Mazda  
with righteous deeds, performed with faith in Truth.

6. Between these two Spirits the Demon-worshippers  
could not discern aright.  
To them Deception came at the time of decision,  
And they chose the Worst Mind.  
With violence then they rushed together,  
Life, in the world, to destroy.

7. And to support this life comes Armaity, the spirit of  
Benevolence and Right-mindedness.  
Together with the Spirit of Holy Power, the Good Mind, and Truth,  
That the soul, passing through the test of truth,  
shall be with Thee, O Lord.

8. And when there cometh the ultimate retribution  
for the evil ones,  
Then, at Thy Ordinance, shall the Good Mind  
establish the Kingdom of Heaven, O Ahura!  
For those who will deliver Untruth into the hands of Truth.

9. So may we be like those making the world progress  
toward perfection;  
May Mazda and the Divine Spirits help us and  
guide our efforts through Truth;  
For a thinking man is where Wisdom is at home.

10. Then truly cometh the blow of destruction upon Untruth;  
While those of good renown shall be received in  
the promised abode,  
The blessed abode of the Good Mind, of Truth, and  
of the Wise Lord.

11. O ye mortals, mark these commandments,  
The commandments the Wise Lord has given for  
happiness and for pain:  
Long suffering for the doer of Evil, and bliss  
for the follower of Truth,  
The illumination of salvation for the Righteous ever after.<sup>[1]</sup>

\*\*\*

[1] <http://zoroastrian.org.uk/heritage/gathas/gathas-irani.html>

## **Trump's Tariff Dividend Idea Shows Some Promise** The Clifford Hugh Douglas Institute <http://www.socred.org/>

The Clifford Hugh Douglas Institute is announcing its increased efforts to reach out to media, government, academia and other entities to share the Institute's unique and timely analysis regarding current economic, political, social issues in the context of Social Credit Economics.

Social Credit Economics stems from the financial and monetary discoveries and insights of the late Clifford Hugh Douglas, the Institute's namesake. Douglas (1879-1952), a widely successful British-born engineer, wrote a number of books, newsletters, spoke at major conferences, addressed the public on BBC radio, and also addressed government panels about economic philosophy. He recommended key measures to repair grave defects in the economic system and apply innovative solutions to enable the economy to flourish for the benefit of all.

In the context of Douglas' economic views, this press release addresses U.S. President Donald J. Trump announcing that he wants to tap into tariff revenue and issue a dividend check to low-income and middle-income American citizens.

## TARIFFS: SOURCE OF PAYABLE PUBLIC DIVIDEND

According to Institute founder Dr. Oliver Heydorn, US President Trump's announcement that he is strongly considering issuing approximately \$2,000 dividends from import-tariff revenue to middle- and lower-income Americans has some merit.

Importantly, Douglas' insights revealed that in the production cycle, the wages and salaries paid out to workers always fall short of, and fail to keep pace with, production costs. This leads to a chronic shortage of purchasing power in the economy. Modern, largely automated production easily produces plenty of goods and services, but there is insufficient direct purchasing power for consumers to buy that production, due to the gap created when such highly efficient production faces insufficient consumption capacity.

So, typically, most consumers must go into debt through credit cards, personal loans, home-equity loans and other means to try and bridge that gap. The "Douglas solution" is to instead fill the gap with newly created debt-free credit that is directly issued through an agency of government, not borrowed from the banking system.

"If Trump goes ahead with this 2,000-dollar dividend proposal (funded through tariff revenue), it is basically a tariff refund or rebate, to whatever extent that Americans pay tariffs due to increased prices on imported goods," stated Dr. Heydorn, who has authored several books on Douglas' social credit concepts.

While stressing that seeing a favorable aspect to Trump's tariffs is not an endorsement of any particular political party or officeholder, Dr. Heydorn added:

"Such a dividend issuance establishes the principle that citizens can, under certain circumstances, receive compensatory monies from the government without directly having to work, or without being further publicly indebted for it. Citizens should be regarded as shareholders in the overall economy. Once the precedent is set, this arrangement can be modified and expanded in the direction of Douglas Social Credit." \*\*\*

*The Clifford Hugh Douglas Institute, based in Canada, has members and advocates in the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia and elsewhere.*

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](mailto:hub@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](https://www.alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Pinwill_C-What_Has_To_Be_Done.pdf)

## Vale Donald James Auchterlonie

14<sup>th</sup> October 1931 - 11<sup>th</sup> December 2025

Moe New Life Christian Centre VIC

Friday 19<sup>th</sup> December 2025

It is a special honour and a privilege to be part of remembering Don here today.

I am a former National Director of the Australian League of Rights, as Don was, and I extend our deepest sympathies to his family and loved ones as we gather to celebrate his life.

My first meeting with Don was at the League's annual seminar in 1970. He was introduced as "the dour Scotsman from Narracan." At first I took "dour" to mean brooding and stern — but the Don I came to know was nothing of the sort. He was a man of stubborn persistence and quiet resolve, someone who refused to give up.

He had a delightful, often surprising sense of humour, and I found we shared much in common. In our younger days we had both been members of the Buffalo Lodge, and those early connections formed the foundation of a friendship that lasted decades.

Around 1970 conditions in rural industry were beginning to deteriorate. I was a dairy farmer in the Murray Valley; Don farmed potatoes in the Gippsland Hills. Under the influence of Eric Butler, we came to see that many of the problems we faced had a common source — political in nature — and that they demanded active, principled engagement in our communities.

Don embraced that challenge wholeheartedly.

The League's approach, rooted in Social Credit and guided by values drawn from the Gospels, appealed to Don's convictions. For him, faith and public life were not separate.

Association with the League meant work — real work to improve life for everyone — and Don threw himself into that mission with zeal. He inspired others simply by example: steady, patient, and thoroughly committed.

When Don later took on the role of National Director, I came to know the fuller measure of the man. He was modest and patient in explaining the principles he held dear. Time and again he took the trouble to make complex ideas accessible, and in doing so often cast new light on the substance of Christian teaching for those who listened.

I fondly remember accompanying Don on a short speaking tour of Tasmania in 2008 with the theme "Social Credit and the Law of Love." It was a thoroughly enjoyable trip. Don loved to explain the workings of the financial system; he would bring out his collection of coins from around the world and use them to illustrate money's role as a means of exchange. Those little objects seemed to

brighten his eyes as much as his audience.

Don was not afraid to tackle controversial issues. At a Melbourne meeting in 2008 he addressed the climate debate and encouraged us to scrutinise prevailing forecasts, citing works such as John Daly's *The Greenhouse Trap*. He believed in informed, rigorous discussion rather than easy certainties.

Above all, Don will be remembered for his steadfastness, his patience, his humour, and his generous spirit. He made a difference in many lives, and we are here because of that difference. We will miss him, but we honour his memory best by continuing the work to which he devoted so much — with the same integrity and quiet courage he showed us all.

To Don's family, thank you for sharing him with us. May we carry his example forward, and may he rest in peace.

*Louis Cook, Numurkah VIC*

### **Vale William W. Ridgway**

Bill Ridgways roots were in agriculture and the Christian faith.

His farm at Lock on Eyre Peninsula presented many challenges, deep sandy rises was one.

His answer was to pull rubber tyre rollers behind his cultivator to compress the soil which got the moisture to rise to the top so he could sow the seed into moist soil.

He was a member of the Methodist Church for many years and tried to thwart the communist movement into that Church.

His hobby was collecting old tractors and getting them into going order. Marshalls seemed to be his favourite. Even when he retired from farming, he had to be tinkering with something mechanical.

He had read widely and had a good understanding of Social Credit principles which he was willing to share with others.

He was a great letter writer.

Unfortunately, he succumbed to ill health, - cancer, diabetes and heart problems.

He surrendered to the Lord in his sleep.

*Tom Dolling, Port Lincoln SA*

That earthy, dry League soldier from Eyre Peninsula, Bill Ridgway has 'gone to God'. Bill did not enjoy good health over the last years but hung on despite the problem. The notice in the *Advertiser* shows his funeral was held at West Coast Memorial Park on Friday Feb 6<sup>th</sup> and committal service at North Shields Garden Cemetery. Rest well.

*Ken Grundy, Naracoorte SA*

\*\*\*

## On Target Subscription - details

Title: \_\_\_\_\_ Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Postal Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Suburb / City \_\_\_\_\_

Postcode: \_\_\_\_\_ State: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone : \_\_\_\_\_

Post Subscription details to ALOR c/o PO Box 27, Happy Valley, SA 5159

## On Target Subscription - details

Title: \_\_\_\_\_ Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Postal Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Suburb / City \_\_\_\_\_

Postcode: \_\_\_\_\_ State: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone : \_\_\_\_\_

Post Subscription 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 - details

Title: \_\_\_\_\_ Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Postal Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Suburb / City \_\_\_\_\_

Postcode: \_\_\_\_\_ State: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone : \_\_\_\_\_

Post Subscription details to ALOR c/o PO Box 27, Happy Valley, SA 5159

## On Target Subscription - details

Title: \_\_\_\_\_ Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Postal Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Suburb / City \_\_\_\_\_

Postcode: \_\_\_\_\_ State: \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone : \_\_\_\_\_

Post Subscription 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](mailto:heritagebooks@alor.org)

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

Our main website of the Douglas Social Credit and the

Freedom Movement "Archives" :: <https://alor.org/>

On Target is printed and authorised by Arnis J. Luks

13 Carsten Court, Happy Valley, SA.