

"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. 18 No. 10

Registered Australia Post - Publication PP343214 / 00016

October 2017

CONTENTS

Clifford Hugh Douglas Had It Right All Along By Betty Luks	1
The Moral Grounds Of Economic Relations	2
Social Credit: An Evolutionary Resolution Not A Revolutionary Response	3
And Now to David Graeber	5
Modern-Day 'Whigism'	7
Vale John Hallows Brett 7th March 1931 — 16th August 2016	8

CLIFFORD HUGH DOUGLAS HAD IT RIGHT ALL ALONG By Betty Luks

"Credit is the substance of things hoped for, *the evidence* of things not seen," and no stable society can endure on *false* evidence. . ."

Social Credit is: "The power of human beings in association to produce the result intended, measured in terms of their satisfaction."

"The mediaeval preachers used to insist that religion which stopped short of actual conversion was like unto filthy rags. They had the root of the matter. Every attempt to treat a symptom of the financial disease diverts attention from the disease itself. The Labour revenge-complex-all-power-to-the-State-Party, with its "planning" and bureaucracy, is a great deal further from a Christian economics than even the Liberal laissez-faire, with all its abuses.

Both are Whiggism—an assumption of moral superiority used as a cloak behind which to exercise authority in support of the hidden potentate Mammon."

- - C.H. Douglas

I recently watched a couple of David Graeber's Youtube Videos. He is an Anthropologist by profession and an activist by conviction. The first is, "Why Capitalism Creates Pointless Jobs" and the other is "DEBT: The First 5,000 Years". I have to say I am quite impressed with what David Graeber had to say on a number of issues. It appears here is a person coming out of 'left-wing' politics who has an open and questioning mind. One wonders whether his mind is open enough to study C.H. Douglas's work. There are a number of issues that need further discussion and clarification but we are happy to present the following to open up debate.

In the Introduction to "Why Capitalism Creates Pointless Jobs" we read:

"David Graeber presents a stunning reversal of conventional wisdom: he shows that before there was money, there was debt. For more than 5,000 years, since the beginnings of the first agrarian empires, humans have used elaborate credit systems to buy and sell goods - that is, long before the invention of coins or cash. . . It is in this era, Graeber argues, that we also first encounter a society divided into debtors and creditors. Graeber shows that arguments about debt and debt forgiveness have been at the centre of political debates from Italy to China, as well as sparking innumerable insurrections.

He also demonstrates that the language of the ancient works of law and religion (words like 'guilt', 'sin', and 'redemption') derive in large part from ancient debates about debt, and shape even our most basic ideas of right and wrong. We are still fighting these battles today without knowing it."

The talk was hosted by Boris Debic on behalf of the Authors@Google program.

The report from the *Washington Examiner*, on America's Debt Ceiling (19 September 2017) is most timely:

"US National Debt Hits \$20 Trillion for First Time in History"

<http://www.washingtonexaminer.com/national-debt-hits-20-trillion-for-first-time-in-history/article/2634050>

"The national debt exceeded \$20 trillion for the first time ever on Friday [Sept. 8], the same day President Trump signed a bill into law that suspended the debt ceiling and allowed unlimited federal borrowing. The debt ceiling had been frozen at about \$19.84 trillion since mid-March, and the Treasury Department was forced to use "extraordinary measures" to prevent borrowing from exceeding that level. But with Trump's signature on Friday, the debt ceiling was suspended . . . Trump criticized the growing national debt under the Obama administration when he was campaigning for president, and talked as president about the need to rein in the debt and spending . . . But last week, Trump indicated he could be open to the idea of getting rid of the ceiling entirely."

(continued on next page)

(continued from previous page)

Accompanying David Graeber's "DEBT: The First 5,000 Years" is the text:

"While the "national debt" has been the concern *du jour* (of the day-ed) of many economists, commentators and politicians, little attention is ever paid to the historical significance of debt.

For thousands of years, the struggle between rich and poor has largely taken the form of conflicts between creditors and debtors—of arguments about the rights and wrongs of interest payments, debt peonage, amnesty, repossession, restitution, the sequestering of sheep, the seizing of vineyards, and the selling of debtors' children into slavery.

By the same token, for the past five thousand years, popular insurrections have begun the same way: with the ritual destruction of debt records—tablets, papyri, ledgers; whatever form they might have taken in any particular time and place.

Enter anthropologist David Graeber's "Debt: The First 5,000 Years", which uses these struggles to show that the history of debt is also a history of morality and culture.

In the throes of the recent economic crisis, with the very defining institutions of capitalism crumbling, surveys showed that an overwhelming majority of

Americans felt that the country's banks should not be rescued—whatever the economic consequences—but that ordinary citizens stuck with bad mortgages should be bailed out. The notion of morality as a matter of paying one's debts runs deeper in the United States than in almost any other country.

Beginning with a sharp critique of economics (which since Adam Smith has erroneously argued that all human economies evolved out of barter), Graeber carefully shows that everything from the ancient work of law and religion to human notions like 'guilt', 'sin', and 'redemption', are deeply influenced by ancients' debates about credit and debt.

It is no accident that debt continues to fuel political debate, from the crippling debt crises that have gripped Greece and Ireland, to our own debate over whether to raise the debt ceiling. Debt, an incredibly captivating narrative spanning 5,000 years, puts these crises into their full context and illuminates one of the thorniest subjects in all of history."

BL: I first found his discussion on Communism in his book "Debt: The First Five Thousand Years" startling. It just goes to show we really do have to make sure of our meaning of words before a discussion can even 'get off the ground'.

THE MORAL GROUNDS OF ECONOMIC RELATIONS

Graeber's definition of Communism:

"I will define communism here as any human relationship that operates on the principles of "from each according to their abilities, to each according to their needs". I admit that the usage here is a bit provocative. "Communism" is a word that can evoke strong emotional reactions—mainly, of course, because we tend to identify it with "communist" regimes. This is ironic, since the Communist parties that ruled over the USSR and its satellites, and that still rule China and Cuba, never described their own systems as "communist." They described them as "socialist." "Communism" was always a distant, somewhat fuzzy utopian ideal, usually to be accompanied by the withering away of the state—to be achieved at some point in the distant future...

In fact, "communism" is not some magical utopia, and neither does it have anything to do with ownership of the means of production. It is something that exists right now—that exists, to some degree, in any human society, although there has never been one in which everything has been organized in that way, and it would be difficult to imagine how there could be. All of us act like communists a good deal of the time. None of us acts like a communist consistently. "Communist society"—in the sense of a society organized exclusively on that single principle—could never exist. But all social systems, even economic systems like capitalism, have always been built on top of a bedrock of actually-existing communism.

Starting, as I say, from the principle of "from each according to their abilities, to each according to their needs" allows us to look past the question of individual or private ownership (which is often little more than formal legality anyway) and at much more immediate and practical questions of who has access to what sorts of things and under what conditions. Whenever it is the operative principle, even if it's just two people who are interacting, we can say we are in the presence of a sort of communism.

Almost everyone follows this principle if they are collaborating on some common project. If someone fixing a broken water pipe says, "Hand me the wrench," his co-worker will not, generally speaking, say, "And what do I get for it?"—even if they are working for Exxon Mobil, Burger King, or Goldman Sachs. The reason is simple efficiency (ironically enough, considering the conventional wisdom that "communism just doesn't work"): if you really care about getting something done, the most efficient way to go about it is obviously to allocate tasks by ability and give people whatever they need to do them. One might even say that it's one of the scandals of capitalism that most capitalist firms, internally, operate communistically. True, they don't tend to operate very democratically. Most often they are organized around military-style top-down chains of command.

(continued on next page)

(continued from previous page)

But there is often an interesting tension here, because top-down chains of command are not particularly efficient: they tend to promote stupidity among those on top, resentful foot-dragging among those on the bottom.

The greater the need to improvise, the more democratic the co-operation tends to become. Inventors have always understood this, start-up capitalists frequently figure it out, and computer engineers have recently rediscovered the principle: not only with things like freeware, which everyone talks about, but even in the organization of their businesses. Apple Computers is a famous example: it was founded by (mostly Republican) computer engineers who broke from IBM in Silicon Valley in the 1980s, forming little democratic circles of twenty to forty people with their laptops in each other's garages.

SOCIAL CREDIT: AN EVOLUTIONARY RESOLUTION NOT A REVOLUTIONARY RESPONSE

As an anthropologist, David Graeber approached the subject and history of Debt from an angle that needs to be seriously considered. He insists that accepted written history is wrong when it considers what came first. He insists that 'Credit' came first in human history, followed by Monetary Coins, Paper Notes and then again Credit... but the meaning of 'Credit' had an entirely different meaning the second time round. The term 'Credit' now actually means 'Debt'.

The original meaning came from a religious concept: credo ['I believe']

'kri:dəʊ, 'kreɪdəʊ/

a statement of the beliefs or aims which guide someone's actions.

"he announced his credo in his first editorial"

a creed of the Christian Church in Latin. (e.g., The Apostles Creed, the Nicene Creed, the Athanasian Creed...ed)

Origin: Middle English: Latin, 'I believe'.

Compare with creed.

DAVID GRAEBER:

(ancient texts) ... "demonstrate that the language of the ancient works of law and religion (words like 'guilt', 'sin', and 'redemption') derive in large part from ancient debates about debt, and shape even our most basic ideas of right and wrong. We are still fighting these battles today without knowing it."

As far back as 3500BC the Mesopotamians had devised very elaborate credit systems for use amongst themselves. Letters of Credit were in circulation between city-states. A city-state's commercial agent would travel to other city-states and conduct commerce and trade on behalf of his home-state. He would carry Letters of Credit acknowledging he was authorised to do so". Graeber notes, "trade and commerce were first conducted by way of 'credit' long before 'money'—in

This is presumably also why in the immediate wake of great disasters—a flood, a blackout, or an economic collapse—people tend to behave the same way, reverting to a rough-and-ready communism. However briefly, hierarchies and markets and the like become luxuries that no one can afford. Anyone who has lived through such a moment can speak to their peculiar qualities, the way that strangers become sisters and brothers and human society itself seems to be reborn. This is important, because it shows that we are not simply talking about cooperation. In fact, communism is the foundation of all human sociability. It is what makes society possible.

There is always an assumption that anyone who is not actually an enemy can be expected on the principle of "from each according to their abilities," at least to an extent: for example, if one needs to figure out how to get somewhere, and the other knows the way..."

the forms of coins and paper notes—were first used. But not only was trade and commerce operated on a 'credit system' so were every-day economic activities conducted between peoples of the same community."

The authorised definition of Social Credit is:

"The power of human beings in association to produce the result intended, measured in terms of their satisfaction."

C.H. Douglas wrote of the UK's ruling 'Whig Policy':

"I said that the policy of this country was and is a Whig policy. Now I should like you to place this statement side by side with the accusation which is universal on the Continent, in regard to both British and United States policy, that it is hypocritical. Because the keynote of **Whig policy, which is predominantly a policy based upon orthodox finance**, is hypocrisy—the justification, on some allegedly moral ground, of policies which are in fact not merely narrowly selfish, but pragmatically disastrous.

I should like to emphasise at once that Social Credit is not an artificially concocted plan either of my own or of anyone else's. That is exactly what its opponents wish to argue about. While I am satisfied that the technical proposals which have been associated with it are reasonably sound (and I must add that that conviction is only strengthened by the complete failure of its opponents, either here or elsewhere, to establish their criticisms), the fundamental idea is simply the antithesis of Whiggism, namely, that the first essential of a stable, peaceful and successful society is to get at the truth and to present—not misrepresent—the truth to everyone concerned."

"Credit is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen," and no stable society can endure on false evidence..."

(continued on next page)

(continued from previous page)

BL: It was C.H. Douglas who brought these matters to mind in a 1934 booklet *‘‘The Use of Money’’. He cautioned his readers that they must be quite sure what they mean when these issues are considered because meanings of words have changed and may mean the exact opposite to what they once did.

*Douglas’s booklet ‘‘The Use of Money’’ can be found here <https://alor.org/Library/Douglas%20CH%20-%20The%20Use%20of%20Money.htm>).

CH Douglas:

‘‘FIRST the word ‘Law’ - there are two kinds of ‘laws’ with which we are familiar:

- First there is Natural Law of the nature of the conditions which compel a stone to fall when it is dropped from a height, and which, if it falls, let us say, in a vacuum, always falls at the same rate of acceleration under the compulsion of gravity. That is a Natural Law, and, so far as we know, those laws are compelling laws. We cannot change the laws of that description, and all we can do is adjust ourselves to those laws.
- There is also a second type of law, a law which is what we may call a Conventional Law. Our legal laws - the laws of our Government - are Conventional Laws. We have agreed to rule ourselves by those Conventions.

On a smaller scale, we have the same sort of thing in connection with playing a game. We agree that, in a game we call cricket, if the ball is struck by the batsman and is caught by a fielder before it touches the ground the batsman is ‘out’. We could change them if we found that we could improve cricket by some other convention. **Those two laws have to be very carefully separated in one’s mind in considering such matters as we are now discussing.**

It is frequently stated, ‘‘that there is no escape from inexorable economic laws’’. In fact, there are no **inexorable economic laws** with which I am familiar; they are practically all conventions.

‘Economic Law’: Agreeing to Pursue Certain Ends

What we call an Economic Law is what happens if you agree to pursue certain ends in industrial, economic, and social organisations governed by certain conventions. That is about all that so-called economic laws amount to.

Conventional ‘Laws’ are matters of POLICY

The first requisite in any understanding of this position is to recognise that what we refer to as conventional laws are matters of policy.

What End Are You Endeavouring to Serve?

You do not make a conventional law without having some sort of an idea in your mind as to what it is you are trying to do—what end you are endeavouring to serve.

If you make a law that all motor-cars shall drive on the left-hand side of the road, you have in your mind that in that way you will avoid collisions, and you have a policy in your mind in making such a law that you want to avoid collisions of motor-cars.

What we do have is a thing we may call ‘an ECONOMIC SYSTEM’

I am not sure we are all clear as to what it is we are trying to achieve by means of that ‘Economic System’ and by means of the Conventions with which we have surrounded it.

At the present time, we are assailed with the reports that one of the troubles with the present Economic System is what is known as the ‘Problem of Unemployment’.

Whether consciously or unconsciously what is suggested here is that one of the objectives of a policy of an economic system is to provide employment.

If you really wanted to run an economic system for the purpose of providing employment quite obviously the first thing to do would be put back the clock about three-four hundred years. You would destroy as far as possible all your labour-saving machines; you would cease to use the power you have developed from water and coal and revert to handicraft. You would do everything as laboriously as possible and for sure you would solve the ‘Unemployment Problem’.

But you wouldn’t be the first people to think of that!

The Russians struck upon that idea when they made the 1917 Revolution; they removed or imprisoned their scientists and organisers. They said they wanted the population to work and they got them to work quite easily... in Siberian slave-labour camps!

Employment/Unemployment

It is quite possible to demand from the Economic System a lot of different things. In regard to this question of employment and unemployment, there has been almost absurd confusion on the part of some people, e.g., Karl Marx, who complained that the present system provided a parasitic class who battered on the producers of the wealth of the world—AND at the same time complained that the Economic System was breaking down and quite correctly from his point of view, that the Capitalistic System was breaking down because it could not provide enough Employment!

Money, Wealth and Goods Are NOT the Same Thing

Now, either unemployment is a privilege—in which case quite obviously you want to try and get as many unemployed as possible—or else it is something requiring pity, in which case any parasitic class is an object of pity and not of contempt or of criticism. You cannot have it both ways.

You must make up your mind whether you want to provide leisure, by an economic system,

(continued on next page)

(continued from previous page)

accompanied by goods and services producing what we call a high standard of living with an increasing amount of leisure, or, conversely, you must admit that what you want to do is to provide employment, in which case your policy is exactly opposite.

The policy which is attached, and the matters which can be attached to a policy to relieve the unemployment problem permanently, must in the very nature of things be a policy which will decrease the unit production of wealth by the individual, and a policy which is intended to produce and deliver goods and services with the minimum amount of trouble to anyone must, quite mathematically, increase the unit production of wealth, and so create what you can, if you like, call an increasing unemployment problem.

Those are the only two alternatives in regard to that, and you must first of all, before being in a position to form any opinion at all upon proposals in regard to the present crisis, make up your mind as to what it is you want.”

You must make up your mind whether want to provide Leisure, by an Economic System, accompanied by goods and services producing what we call a high standard of living with an increasing amount of Leisure, OR Conversely, what you really want is to provide Employment. In which case, the second POLICY is exactly the opposite of the first.

Now, the second necessity of an understanding of this situation is a sound analysis of the difficulties which stand in the way of getting to where we decide we want to go. That is to say, if we decide—and I am assuming that having put the matter to you in the way I did, you

AND NOW TO DAVID GRAEBER

Graeber: Policy Designed to Create Deep Sense of Rage and Resentment

“In the year 1930, John Maynard Keynes predicted that technology would have advanced sufficiently by century’s end, that countries like Great Britain or the United States would achieve a 15-hour work week. There’s every reason to believe he was right. In technological terms, we are quite capable of this. And yet it didn’t happen. Instead, technology has been marshalled, if anything, to figure out ways to make us all work more. In order to achieve this, jobs have had to be created that are, effectively, pointless.

Huge swathes of people, in Europe and North America in particular, spend their entire working lives performing tasks they secretly believe do not really need to be performed. The moral and spiritual damage that comes from this situation is profound. It is a scar across our collective soul. Yet virtually no one talks about it.

“But rather than allowing a massive reduction of working hours to free the world’s population to pursue their own projects, pleasures, visions, and ideas,

will practically all have decided that we do not want to produce for the sake of producing, but that we do want to deliver goods and services—that what we want from the economic system is goods and services to provide a high standard of living.

– An Interjector shouts: I want a job!

To which Douglas responds... And then you will be able, if you like, to provide jobs for yourselves, you will I think—unless I grossly underrate the intelligence of the gentleman who made that remark—agree that if he was provided with what he would refer to as an income of £500 a year, (*1934 figure...ed*) he would be able to find some use for his leisure.

Now, if you do agree with me, for the sake of hypothesis we will say, that the only object of an economic system is to deliver goods and services to the population concerned, with the minimum amount of trouble and friction to anybody, then the next thing to do is to analyse whether that is possible, to what extent it is possible, and what, if anything, interferes with carrying out your plans.

Douglas Insists the Reader Must Make an Effort—not a mental effort but an effort of self-demesmerisation. The reader must demesmerise himself from the idea that money is the same thing as wealth and goods and services.

He may say that you cannot get goods and services without having money. That does not mean that those two things are the same—they are not. You must look with a clear and unbiased eye at the purely physical side of the production system today. We live in an age of Hyper-Mass-Production.”

we have seen the ballooning not even so much of the “service” sector as of the administrative sector, up to and including the creation of whole new industries like financial services or telemarketing, or the unprecedented expansion of sectors like corporate law, academic and health administration, human resources, and public relations. And these numbers do not even reflect on all those people whose job is to provide administrative, technical, or security support for these industries, or for that matter the whole host of ancillary industries (dog-washers, all-night pizza deliverymen) that only exist because everyone else is spending so much of their time working in all the other ones. These are what I propose to call “bullshit” jobs.

Maintaining the Power of Finance Capital

“It’s as if someone were out there making up pointless jobs just for the sake of keeping us all working. If someone had designed a work regime perfectly suited to maintaining the power of finance capital, it’s hard to see how they could have done a better job.”

(continued on next page)

(continued from previous page)

“Real, productive workers are relentlessly squeezed and exploited. The remainder are divided between a terrorised stratum of the—universally reviled—unemployed and a larger stratum who are basically paid to do nothing, in positions designed to make them identify with the perspectives and sensibilities of the ruling class (managers, administrators, etc)—and particularly its financial avatars—but, at the same time, foster a simmering resentment against anyone whose work has clear and undeniable social value.

“Now, I realise any such argument is going to run into immediate objections: “who are you to say what jobs are really ‘necessary’? What’s necessary anyway? You’re an anthropology professor, what’s the ‘need’ for that?” (And indeed a lot of tabloid readers would take the existence of my job as the very definition of wasteful social expenditure.) And on one level, this is obviously true. There can be no objective measure of social value...

“Graeber: Why Capitalism Creates Pointless Jobs”

“Why did Keynes’ promised utopia—still being eagerly awaited in the ‘60s—never materialise? The standard line today is that he didn’t figure in the massive increase in consumerism. Given the choice between less hours and more toys and pleasures, we’ve collectively chosen the latter. This presents a nice morality tale, but even a moment’s reflection shows it can’t really be true.

Yes, we have witnessed the creation of an endless variety of new jobs and industries since the ‘20s, but very few have anything to do with the production and distribution of sushi, iPhones, or fancy sneakers.

The ‘Managerial’ Revolution

“So what are these new jobs, precisely? A recent report comparing employment in the US between 1910 and 2000 gives us a clear picture (and I note, one pretty much exactly echoed in the UK). Over the course of the last century, the number of workers employed as domestic servants, in industry, and in the farm sector has collapsed dramatically. At the same time, “professional, managerial, clerical, sales, and service workers” tripled, growing “from one-quarter to three-quarters of total employment.” In other words, productive jobs have, just as predicted, been largely automated away (even if you count industrial workers globally, including the toiling masses in India and China, such workers are still not nearly so large a percentage of the world population as they used to be).

“It’s as if someone were out there making up pointless jobs just for the sake of keeping us all working. And here, precisely, lies the mystery. In capitalism, this is exactly what is not supposed to happen. Sure, in the old inefficient socialist states like the Soviet Union, where employment was considered both a right and a sacred duty, the system made up as many jobs as they had to (this is why in Soviet department stores it took

three clerks to sell a piece of meat). But, of course, this is the very sort of problem market competition is supposed to fix. According to economic theory, at least, the last thing a profit-seeking firm is going to do is shell out money to workers they don’t really need to employ. Still, somehow, it happens.

“While corporations may engage in ruthless downsizing, the layoffs and speed-ups invariably fall on that class of people who are actually making, moving, fixing and maintaining things; through some strange alchemy no one can quite explain, the number of salaried paper-pushers ultimately seems to expand, and more and more employees find themselves, not unlike Soviet workers actually, working 40 or even 50 hour weeks on paper, but effectively working 15 hours just as Keynes predicted, since the rest of their time is spent organising or attending motivational seminars, updating their facebook profiles or downloading TV box-sets.

“The answer clearly isn’t economic: it’s moral and political. The ruling class has figured out that a happy and productive population with free time on their hands is a mortal danger (think of what started to happen when this even began to be approximated in the ‘60s). And, on the other hand, the feeling that work is a moral value in itself, and that anyone not willing to submit themselves to some kind of intense work discipline for most of their waking hours deserves nothing, is extraordinarily convenient for them...

“I would not presume to tell someone who is convinced they are making a meaningful contribution to the world that, really, they are not. But what about those people who are themselves convinced their jobs are meaningless? Not long ago I got back in touch with a school friend who I hadn’t seen since I was 12. I was amazed to discover that in the interim, he had become first a poet, then the front man in an indie rock band. I’d heard some of his songs on the radio having no idea the singer was someone I actually knew. He was obviously brilliant, innovative, and his work had unquestionably brightened and improved the lives of people all over the world. Yet, after a couple of unsuccessful albums, he’d lost his contract, and plagued with debts and a newborn daughter, ended up, as he put it, “taking the default choice of so many directionless folk: law school.” Now he’s a corporate lawyer working in a prominent New York firm. He was the first to admit that his job was utterly meaningless, contributed nothing to the world, and, in his own estimation, should not really exist...

“In fact, I’m not sure I’ve ever met a corporate lawyer who didn’t think their job was bullshit. ... There is a whole class of salaried professionals that, should you meet them at parties and admit that you do something that might be considered interesting (an anthropologist, for example), will want to avoid even discussing their line of work entirely.

(continued on next page)

(continued from previous page)

Give them a few drinks, and they will launch into tirades about how pointless and stupid their job really is.”

“This is a profound psychological violence here. How can one even begin to speak of dignity in labour when one secretly feels one’s job should not exist?

“For instance: in our society, there seems a general rule that, the more obviously one’s work benefits other people, the less one is likely to be paid for it. Again, an objective measure is hard to find, but one easy way to get a sense is to ask: what would happen were this entire class of people to simply disappear? Say what you like about nurses, garbage collectors, or mechanics, it’s obvious that were they to vanish in a puff of smoke, the results would be immediate and catastrophic. A world without teachers or dock-workers would soon be in trouble, and even one without ‘science fiction writers’ or ‘ska musicians’ would clearly be a lesser place.

“It’s not entirely clear how humanity would suffer were all private equity CEOs, lobbyists, PR researchers, actuaries, telemarketers, bailiffs or legal consultants

MODERN-DAY ‘WHIGISM’

History became legend and legend became myth... and those things which should not have been forgotten... were lost... wrote J.R.R. Tolkien

The policies of modern political parties are based on “Whiggism” – i.e., “an assumption of moral superiority used as a cloak behind which to exercise authority in support of the hidden potentate Mammon...”

-- C.H. Douglas “Money: An Historical Survey” 1936
The Policy of this Country is a ‘Whig’ Policy
C.H. Douglas wrote:

“...the policy of this country was and is a Whig policy.

Now I should like you to place this statement side by side with the accusation which is universal on the Continent, in regard to both British and United States policy, that it is hypocritical. Because the keynote of Whig policy, which is predominantly a policy based upon orthodox finance, is hypocrisy - the justification, on some allegedly moral ground, of policies which are in fact not merely narrowly selfish, but pragmatically disastrous.

I should like to emphasise at once that Social Credit is not an artificially concocted plan either of my own or of anyone else’s. That is exactly what its opponents wish to argue about. While I am satisfied that the technical proposals which have been associated with it are reasonably sound (and I must add that that conviction is only strengthened by the complete failure of its opponents, either here or elsewhere, to establish their criticisms), the fundamental idea is simply the antithesis of Whiggism, namely, that the first essential of a stable, peaceful and successful society is to get at the truth and to present—not misrepresent—the truth to everyone concerned. ***

to similarly vanish. (Many suspect it might markedly improve.) Yet apart from a handful of well-touted exceptions (doctors), the rule holds surprisingly well.

“Even more perverse, there seems to be a broad sense that this is the way things should be. This is one of the secret strengths of right-wing populism.

“You can see it when tabloids whip up resentment against tube workers for paralysing London during contract disputes: the very fact that tube workers can paralyse London shows that their work is actually necessary, but this seems to be precisely what annoys people.

“It’s even clearer in the US, where Republicans have had remarkable success mobilizing resentment against school teachers, or auto workers (and not, significantly, against the school administrators or auto industry managers who actually cause the problems) for their supposedly bloated wages and benefits. It’s as if they are being told “but you get to teach children! Or make cars! You get to have real jobs!

“And on top of that you have the nerve to also expect middle-class pensions and health care?...” ***

We recommend that you look up David Graeber’s Videos on Youtube and his book by the same name.

OUR POLICY

To promote service to the Christian revelation of God, loyalty to the Australian Constitutional Monarchy, and maximum co-operation between subjects of the Crown Commonwealth of Nations.

To defend the free Society and its institutions -- private property, consumer control of production through genuine competitive enterprise, and limited decentralised government.

To promote financial policies which will reduce taxation, eliminate debt, and make possible material security for all with greater leisure time for cultural activities.

To oppose all forms of monopoly, either described as public or private. To encourage all electors always to record a responsible vote in all elections.

To support all policies genuinely concerned with conserving and protecting natural resources, including the soil, and an environment reflecting natural (God’s) laws, against policies of rape and waste.

To oppose all policies eroding national sovereignty, and to promote a closer relationship between the peoples of the Crown Commonwealth and those of the United States of America, who share a common heritage.

John Brett belonged to that special breed of Australian one might almost call an endangered species today. Conservative, self-reliant, dependable, kind and gentle, the fuel in his tank common sense and good humour.

Raised in Orange, New South Wales, educated at Scots College Sydney, later apprenticed as a fitter and turner, he left Sydney the day after earning his indentures, to head back to the land and the bush he loved.

He worked as a jackaroo and eventually manager for Scottish Australia Co. until 1958, a job which took him to stations in the Coonamble, Riverina, Old Junee, West Wyalong and Lake Cargelligo districts.

The 1960s saw him married, with a family and managing pastoral properties near Armidale. It was here that he first met Jeremy Lee, writing many years later: **“He changed all of our lives for the better. In my case it was what could be called a “sea change”, a change I will be forever grateful and thankful for, as is the case with so many other people”.**

The change John talked about is, as readers of this publication will recognise, that eye-opening revelation of Reality espoused by the Australian League of Rights, emanating from the life and pen of Clifford Hugh Douglas, and which Eric Butler, Jeremy Lee and others had a special gift for passing on.

From then on John became an enthusiastic League supporter, arranging and chairing meetings, participating in Voters’ Policy Associations, letter-box drops (he claimed he could toss a rolled newspaper into a household mailbox from a moving car), and became a prolific letters-to-the editor writer, armed with information from League of Rights publications.

On the tragic death of his wife Gay in 1977, John faced the challenge of bringing up his three teenage children, at the same time as keeping bread on the table. He moved the family to a five-acre block outside Toowoomba, where his skills as housekeeper, dad and provider were displayed to the admiration of all who knew him, not least his children and grandchildren, whose eulogies at his funeral years later were testimonies of the love, gratitude and respect they felt.

That task successfully completed, John was blessed to meet and soon marry Beth Shannon, who ably supported him through the following years as President of the Toowoomba branch of Australians for Constitutional Monarchy and the Flag Society.

Both these associations flourished under his leadership, and he, together with stalwart League supporters Winsome Rusterholz and Gerald Patch, revived the local Voter’s Policy Association, which remained active until a stroke struck down, and ultimately took John’s life in August last year. ***

BEQUESTS

We have received some interest from those wishing to remember the League in their Will. Information providing details of the most appropriate way to do this is available from Head Office in Adelaide.

- ND

The young are looking for answers. How better than a “gift invitation” to the National Weekend. CONSIDER A \$ 50.00 GIFT INVITATION AS SEEDING FOR OUR FUTURE!

**AUSTRALIAN LEAGUE OF RIGHTS
NATIONAL WEEKEND
14 & 15 OCTOBER 2017**

Public Schools Club
207 East Terrace,
Adelaide, SA 5000
Ph: (08) 8223 3213

ACCOMMODATION : The following accommodation addresses are within reasonable motoring distance.

- Public Schools Club**, 207 East Tce, Ph: 8223 3213
- Chifley**, 226 South Tce. Ph. 8223 4355
- Country Comfort**, 215 South Tce. Ph. 8223 2800
- Rydges**, 1 South Tce. Ph. 08 8216 0300

BOOKINGS FOR THE SEMINAR DIRECT TO
Head Office: Ph 08 8387 6574 - M 0415 527 121
heritagebooks@alor.org



THE LEAGUE'S WEBSITE: — alor.org
blog.alor.org thecross-roads.org
Subscription to On Target \$45.00 p.a.
NewTimes Survey \$30.00 p.a.

and **Donations** can be performed by **bank transfer:**

A/c Title Australian League of Rights (SA Branch)
BSB 105-044
A/c No. 188-040-840

or by cheques directed to:

‘Australian League of Rights (SA Branch)’

or on the **Veritasbooks.com.au** website:

https://veritasbooks.com.au/cat/subscriptions

“NewTimes Survey” is printed and authorised by K. W. Grundy.
13 Carsten Court, Happy Valley, SA.

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

Telephone: 08 8387 6574 **email:** heritagebooks@alor.org

Head Office Hours - Mon., Tues., Wed. 09.00am - 3.00pm