

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



# THE NEW TIMES

SURVEY

THE AUSTRALIAN

LEAGUE OF RIGHTS

Vol. 25 No. 02

Registered Australia Post - Publication PP343214 / 00016

February 2024

## CONTENTS

A Rudimentary Outline for a Douglas Social Credit System for Any Country by M. Oliver Heydorn	1
Libertarianism, Douglas Social Credit, and the Path to True Freedom by Peter Brüning	2
Henny Penny in the Science Lab by Neville Archibald	5
Vale Bill Carey, 31.10.38 – 31.1.24 by Jeanine & Grant Bird	8

## A RUDIMENTARY OUTLINE FOR A DOUGLAS SOCIAL CREDIT SYSTEM FOR ANY COUNTRY by M. Oliver Heydorn

The financial system (by which we mean the banking, cost accountancy, and taxation systems) may be likened to a type of software on which or with which we run the physical or real economy.

As such, the financial system can either serve the common good of the individual citizens of a nation in a way that is effective, efficient, and fair, or it can serve the interests of an oligarchy at the expense of the common good.

In order to serve the common good successfully, the financial system must be designed in such a way that it accurately represents and reflects the physical facts of the real economy, as these are and as these change from period to period. In other words, the financial system must operate as a structurally honest system, as if it were nothing but a mirror that reflects, in the virtual realm of numbers, a picture of the real economy as it truly exists.

On the level of production, this means that whenever there is a) a legitimate need on the part of consumers and b) the raw material, labour, technology, etc., to produce the good or service that would meet that need, financial credit should be created and lent to productive agencies so that this production can be catalyzed. In this way, the financial credit of an economic association (its capacity to create and issue credit as, when, and where required) will reflect, will map on to, its real credit (*the useful productive capacity*). "Whatever is physically possible and desirable should be financially possible."

On the level of consumption, the rate at which incomes are being distributed to consumers must equal the rate at which costs/prices of consumer goods and services are being built up in the production system and are coming on to the market for liquidation. "What has been paid for in physical terms in the *process* of production, must be capable of being paid for in financial terms in full (without necessitating further indebtedness)."

To this end, the Reserve Bank of any nation should periodically draw up a set of National Accounts: a National Balance Sheet and a National Profit and Loss Account.

The National Balance Sheet (prototype accounts are already in existence for Australia and the USA – see, for example, *Lives of Our Own*) would show all of a nation's productive resources as its assets and the existing money supply (at a particular moment) as its liabilities. So long as a nation has a positive net worth (assets-liabilities > 0) indicating unused or underused productive resources, additional credit for production can be created and lent to productive organizations to satisfy any unmet needs in the community.

Insofar as it is desirable for a nation's industry to produce public goods and services as requested by the general population, the government could borrow the needed producer credit into existence from the Reserve Bank (provided there is a positive net worth in the National Balance Sheet to cover the creation) and then set about employing the various economic resources required to deliver the public good or service. Taxation to recover the cost of this public production could, depending on its nature, be collected through user fees or a general sales tax (income or other direct taxes would be inadvisable).

The National Profit & Loss account would present the value of what is produced in the nation (both capital and consumer goods and services) over a specified period of time as compared with the total wages, salaries, and dividends which have been distributed during the same period. Normally, we would expect the total value of consumer goods and services, for example, to exceed the total value of incomes distributed: profit = anticipated/required revenue (as measured in prices) to meet costs - expenditure (what was paid to people to produce the goods/services). This gap can be monetized by the Reserve Bank in the form of new debt-free consumer credits (with the otherwise unsellable or 'surplus' goods and services acting as the backing or justification for the creation of these additional credits) and distributed to citizen as a National Dividend (i.e., a periodic, say monthly

payment issued independently of employment status) and/or as a National Discount (a rebate paid to retailers in exchange for lowering their prices to consumers by a fixed percentage as determined by the C/P ratio).

If we assume (for the sake of simplicity) that all production in a nation is conducted on revolving lines of credit and other loans issued by the Reserve Bank (using the unused assets in the National Balance sheet as the security), then the costs and prices generated in production can be represented as debts owing to the banking system, over and against which, insufficient incomes have been distributed. When the Reserve Bank, on the basis of the National Profit and Loss Account, creates and issues compensatory debt-free consumer credits to bring the flow of incomes into alignment with the flow of costs/prices and distributes them to, or on behalf of, consumers via the dividend and discount, these consumer credits will then, in conjunction with the regular flow of wages, salaries, and private dividends/profits be used to dynamically cancel in full the productive loans of the retail stage of production that are ultimately owed to the Reserve Bank. There will be equilibrium and no residue of additional debt incurred by this process. At the same time, in order to avoid any possible demand-pull inflation, consumer loans from the Reserve Bank or any other bank in the nation for consumption purposes of any kind should be prohibited, as should common palliatives like exporting more than you import, or excessive government spending, etc.

Finally, while the Reserve Bank should be

## **LIBERTARIANISM, DOUGLAS SOCIAL CREDIT, AND THE PATH TO TRUE FREEDOM by Peter Brüning**

In the wake of the last few years with its unprecedented Covid tyranny, a number of people in the freedom movement seem to be coalescing around the view that government is THE problem, i.e., the source of all or at least the preponderance of our social evils, and that the solution, therefore, is to drastically reduce the size and power of government ... and then all will be well with the world. This point of view is generally associated with the political philosophy known as ‘libertarianism’. More specifically, it is characteristic of what is sometimes termed ‘right-libertarianism’, or the species of libertarianism that has very largely appropriated the term ‘libertarianism’ in the Anglo world.<sup>[1]</sup> That the libertarian ‘star’ should appear to be in the ascendancy in certain circles is quite understandable as a reaction to years of government overreach and similar abuses of power. While the reaction itself is quite justified, I want to suggest that the direction in which the reaction is being harnessed is not and that libertarianism – whatever its merits – is not the correct solution to our political, economic, and cultural problems. Rather, the

autonomous and hierarchical (but answering fully to the nation’s government), it would be fitting if the citizens of a nation were recognized as shareholders in the Reserve Bank and thus entitled to a dividend whenever economic conditions in the nation are profitable (in the sense indicated above, where the value of things produced exceeds the normal incomes distributed to buy them). The financial system in the nation could then be represented as a gigantic profit-sharing co-operative which truly serves the commonweal of the citizens and turns money and the money system into a servant for all. Since, in this scenario, the financial system would operate as a public utility, any and all legitimate costs associated with the operation of the Reserve Bank should be covered by service fees of one kind or another (but not so great as to make a profit, unless things like foreign trade and exchange make a profit necessary or useful). Either way, there should be no opportunity for private profiteering. Any undistributed or unused profits could revert back to the shareholders (the citizens) at the end of any given fiscal year or set period.

Finally, it would be best to introduce this sort of system gradually, or in stages, and to adapt it as is necessary. The important thing is the set of general principles, the mechanisms by means of which the policy is applied are adaptable to time, place, and conditions. What we want in the end is the system that will work best in practice to achieve the desired objective: an honest financial system that maximizes the prosperity, security, freedom, peace, and independence of the general population. \*\*\*

much ignored and relatively unknown body of thought known as Douglas Social Credit offers a superior approach to the rehabilitation of our society.

Perhaps the easiest way to explain why and how libertarianism fails, is to take, as our point of departure, the correct diagnosis for our social ills. What is wrong with our civilization? According to the Douglas Social Credit analysis, our big problem is ‘monopoly’, i.e., the monopolization of power. An elite few wish, through various mechanisms, to dominate and to exploit the wider society and to thereby usurp the unearned increment of association in the service of their own vested interests. Thus we see that there are three main enemies which confront us; these may be described as 1) “Big Government” (often associated with the political left), 2) “Big Business” (often associated with the political right) and, directing these two wings of the one “Monopoly Bird” as its head we find 3) “Big Finance” (which is the true power behind the curtain manipulating both conventional left and right-wing politics to its advantage).

Libertarianism fails as a complete and appropriate response to the situation in which we find ourselves for two basic reasons.

In the first place, libertarianism only deals explicitly with one of the threats, namely that of Big Government. Is government too large and too powerful? Absolutely. Are taxes too high? Yes. Indeed, we Social Crediters are in complete agreement with the general principle that we need smaller and less powerful governments, much lower taxation, less regulation and bureaucratic red tape, and that the power of government should be subject to strict constitutional limitations. However, the libertarian solution of drastically restricting government and curbing government power does not address the threats to freedom posed by “Big Business” and “Big Finance”. It leaves two of the three legs of the stool of tyranny intact. In fact, focusing exclusively on “Big Government” as “the problem” allows “Big Business” and “Big Finance” to operate unhindered and even undetected. Since private monopoly can be just as much of a tyranny, perhaps even a worse tyranny, than an overt government tyranny (because it’s more hidden), how well does libertarianism succeed in liberating us from the scourge of monopoly?

Libertarianism secures a theoretical ‘negative’ freedom of individuals *vis-à-vis* the government (and that only to the extent that libertarian policies are ever really embraced by the political system) that may or may not be actualisable in practice depending on how well resourced one is by “Big Business” and/or “Big Finance”. But that resourcing depends on one’s individual conformity with policies that advance the aims of “Big Government” and/or “Big Finance”, i.e., the centralization of power. In other words, access to the material abundance which makes the freedom from being interfered with by government meaningful and exercisable often comes at the cost of servility and the loss of control over one’s own policy as far as the world of employment is concerned. How many times, even now, do people fail to exercise their political rights and freedoms to the full because they are concerned (quite rightly) with falling afoul of the policy of Big Business or Big Finance and risking their livelihoods in the process? For such individuals, ‘freedom’ must remain nothing more than a theoretical abstraction even in, or especially in, the libertarian utopia of the night-watchman state.

In the second place, even with respect to the threat of “Big Government”, libertarianism does not assume the correct attitude in approaching the problem. Typically, libertarians tend to take a two-dimensional quantitative view of government power, i.e., that granting the government more power is necessarily bad and that taking power from the government is necessarily good. What is lost here is precisely the qualitative dimension. If, because we have drastically curbed the government’s

powers, it is no longer capable of regulating some aspect of our social life in line with reality and the natural law, and thus in favour of the common good, how is that an improvement? For a successful social life in common, we need the government to fulfill its true purpose well and, to that end, it must have sufficient and appropriate power. Furthermore, the failure of a government to do what it ought to do, because it lacks the power to do it, leaves a vacuum that can only be filled by one of the two other threats already mentioned: “Big Business” and “Big Finance”. The end result may well be that one ends up ‘swallowed’ by Charybdis (in this case, “Big Business” and/or “Big Finance”) because one has myopically striven so hard to successfully evade Scylla (i.e., “Big Government”). Good government is much more important than small government as an end in itself.

This raises the questions of what the true purpose of political association is and what is the due role of government? Libertarians hold that the purpose of political association is to maximize, promote, and protect individual liberty. Individual liberty is rather narrowly understood, in turn, as the freedom not to be interfered with by the state or the government, amongst other things. As such, libertarianism’s vision for the due objective of the political system is identical with that of classical liberalism. Where the two schools of thought differ has to do with the means that is appropriate to the furtherance of that end. Classical liberalism has a broader idea of the scope of government’s rightful power to promote liberty than does libertarianism, which is minimalist in orientation. Libertarianism may thus be considered as both a continuation and radicalization of the classical liberal tradition.

Opposed to the liberal tradition in politics in the Anglo world, is that of Toryism or Classical Conservatism. According to the latter, the true purpose of political association is not the abstract maximization of individual liberty understood as “freedom from interference”, but rather the maximization of the appropriate conditions for the full functionality of all the other associations within a nation-state (or the political community). The well-being of the individual, each concrete individual, is directly and indirectly dependent on this functionality being achieved. Respect for individual liberty in the sense of “freedom from interference” is, no doubt, an important component, both of the individual’s well-being and of the functionality of human associations, but it is not the only consideration, and while it may be sacrosanct in many situations, it is not unlimited. In order to establish and promote order and functionality, the scope of an individual’s legitimate ‘negative freedoms’ (the individual’s right not to be interfered with) may be more narrow than what classical liberals, and even more so, libertarians, would countenance. Classical conservatism thus holds that government and/or the state must have the



authority to regulate community life in line with reality and the natural law in order to create, in a consistent and effective way, the conditions for well-being. This will have, as an inevitable consequence and as an inherent component of well-being, the maximization of a more positive conception of freedom, i.e., the concrete or resourced freedom to do or to achieve x, y, z, for the largest number of the citizenry possible. Disagreements may naturally arise in terms of what the objective reality is and in what the natural law consists or how it should be applied. These can be settled by experiment whenever necessary.

Now Douglas described himself as a 'Tory', i.e., as a classical conservative, and Douglas Social Credit must therefore be understood within a Tory philosophical framework.<sup>[2]</sup> From a Tory and Social Credit point of view, "The remedy is exactly what you would expect it to be, once it is admitted that the disease is monopolistic. It is de-centralisation."<sup>[3]</sup> To decentralize the power of finance and the power of business, i.e., to neutralize "Big Finance" and "Big Business", the regulatory power of the state and/or government must be invoked and applied in such a way that in both its structure and operations finance and business come to respect both the reality of the physical economy and the natural law. The Douglas Social Credit proposals to reform the financial system achieve these objectives via its introduction of a 'debt-free' dividend and a discount which break the monopoly of credit and decentralize the power of money in favour of the common individual. Furthermore, the due enfranchisement of consumers with sufficient buying power to purchase in full whatever the economy produces would remove the 'double advantage' that cheaper goods and services tend to have in an economy that is anaemic where consumer buying power is concerned. This would favour smaller and mid-size companies which are often better-placed to respond to the individualized needs and desires of consumers, thus moving the economy towards greater competition and away from monopoly and oligopoly. Any additional regulations that may be deemed necessary to establish and maintain a high level of competition in every industry, such as anti-trust legislation, could be introduced alongside the Douglas monetary reform proposals.

At this juncture, the libertarian is bound to object that the kind of government and state interference which Douglas Social Credit proposes to deal with the threats of "Big Finance" and "Big Business" are, even if effective, nevertheless dangerous because they seemingly run the risk of reinforcing the power of "Big Government". The correct response to this line of thinking is, first of all, to point out that the Douglas Social Credit monetary reforms would actually reduce the need for many other government interventions that

are currently taken for granted and their accompanying bureaucracies. If, for example, everyone receives a dividend and can enjoy compensated price discounts on consumer goods and services, the need for various social programmes like public pensions, employment insurance, welfare, etc., could be greatly reduced if not eliminated, alongside all of the government departments that monitor and administer these programmes. At the same time, taxes could be correspondingly reduced and whole departments, like the income tax department, could be eliminated in a favour of a smaller and more efficient government service. Secondly, Douglas had also developed an extensive programme for political reform, i.e., reform of the state and government sectors. The object of these reforms was to render the government highly responsive to the common will of the public. Proposals such as 'the Voter's veto' were designed to put the ultimate political sanctions in the hands of the individual citizens so that government could be kept to its narrow path and the fulfillment of its true purpose. In other words, there can be no threat of 'Big Government' if the people hold sufficient power within the political system that they can effectively say 'No' whenever a government gets too big for its britches.

Thus we see that the Douglas Social Credit approach to securing and promoting true human liberty is more well-rounded and integral in comparison to its libertarian counterpart and competitor and far more likely to succeed because it deals not only with the threat of "Big Government", but also with the equally (if not more) menacing threats of "Big Business" and "Big Finance". \*\*\*

#### References:

- [1] There are also left-leaning forms of libertarianism which hold that the commitment to personal liberty necessitates some form of socialist economics.
- [2] Cf. *The Douglas System of Social Credit: Evidence Taken by the Agricultural Committee of the Alberta Legislature Session 1934* (Edmonton, Alberta: W.D. McLean, King's Printer, 1934), 122: "I am a Tory."
- [3] C.H. Douglas, *"Whose Service is Perfect Freedom"* (Bullsbrook, Western Australia: 1983), 77.

#### PODCAST & WEBSITE DVDs

Our latest addition to the ongoing work of the League is the inclusion of a Weekly Podcast available for listening or download from [freedompotentials.org](http://freedompotentials.org).

Our main website, [alor.org](http://alor.org), as the repository of the Library and Archives, is regularly being added to from publications and historical documents of the Social Credit and Freedom Movements. The online Library is now divided into 5 areas for ease of navigation. The ever expanding website files, available on DVD, placed onto your personal computer with added 'Desktop Search' software, can result in an excellent research facility for equipping the developing actionist.

## HENNY PENNY IN THE SCIENCE LAB by Neville Archibald

One of the dangers of associating the twin problems of greed and power with the system of government we now have, is the answer being proposed to fix it. The Henny Penny course of action is not an appropriate way of making wise decisions. While everybody is running around in panic with various incantations of magic answers, the truth becomes the first casualty, and considered debate is neither calm nor collected.

Our system of government was brought about in far less hectic times. A slow and considered analysis of many systems was made over a decade or more. No pressing catastrophes were influencing the outcome. Today's proposed solutions will result in even more control over the individual.

What we are seeing is a bulldozer driver levelling a china shop. The one to pursue for damages and to stop any further destruction, is the driver, not the machine. The bulldozer is still an effective land levelling tool if used correctly. The problem we face now is the communist/Marxist sympathisers coming out of the woodwork and *carte blanche* blaming the current system, lumping it in with the concept of capitalism. I think we can all see the abuses of power that have gone on and those we see are just the tip of the iceberg – the more you look the more you find.

If it is not abuse of the letter of the law (and remember who it is, that writes the law) it most definitely is an abuse of the intent or spirit of the law. To quote that famous Australian movie, *The Castle*

***'it's the vibe of the thing.'***

To throw away our considered system of limited government, gives the entrenched Marxist/ elitists the power vacuum they need to take control. Our division over the questions, let alone the answers, is also caused by those very people stirring the pot. Promoting different versions of all sciences to fuel arguments. Here we need to go back to basics. We must first consider the nature of the question being asked, is it the right question? If you were to ask Douglas, no not C.H. Douglas at this point, but the author of *The Hitchhikers Guide to the Galaxy*, Douglas Adams. The answer to 'Life, the Universe and Everything', is '42'. This is the ultimate answer to the ultimate question. Adams puts many of the problems we face in a humorous context, with a sub plot. During our last podcast on TCR (link below):

**<https://thecross-roads.org/>**

we mentioned the ability of humour to help keep reality in sight. He does this very well and humanity's seeking of the ultimate answer to everything, is a million year quest by a super computer. After waiting so long, they find that they did not truly understand the question they were asking.

We too, must understand what questions to ask, for many of the answers we are being given, truly do not

relate to the actual problems we face. This is why it is important to do the prior reading to understand the nature of the problem. We were equipped at an early age to use our senses to see things as they are. Many of the fairy stories read to us growing up, were lessons in this.

*Henny Penny, The Emperors New Clothes and Hansel and Gretel*, to name but a few. Thus equipped we should be able to see through much of what is happening; because, as time marches on, the WEF and its minions hide their intentions less and less. The League's website and bookstore holds much of this background research. It is what they have been doing for many years. This is not a selfish plug to sell more books, for many are available to download for free, it is a cry for awakening of the spirit that we used to have as Australians.

**<https://alor.org>**

When doing any research certain rules apply. In science, you look at available evidence and then examine the evidence for bias and accuracy. It is also important to realise that data is not evidence until it has happened. Evidence exists only in the past. If you wish to determine the truth of a theory you must establish a link between the theory and the data. You can postulate what may happen in the future, but until experimentation or the future confirms it, there is no proof to show how correct you are. It then needs to be repeatable by others to the same rigorous standards. The purpose of Peer Review, or in our case, getting together with other like-minded individuals to, 'chew the fat'.

At this point I don't need people jumping down my throat, telling me we can't wait for evidence of the apocalypse to prove the point, or we will all be dead! I am asking for no such thing. Hysteria has been firing up mobs for centuries, a few well placed actors/dupes who portray that, 'the sky is falling, the sky is falling.' can put a lot of others into the same state. Please re-read the story of Henny Penny and think about the fox. Who is he? This has never been more important than it is today.

Science is either the study of concrete data, derived from the results of experimentation or the results of the observation of natural phenomena. I would urge you to also remember that all of man's results are still based on the natural order of things, we are merely working inside an existing system. This system has limits and that is what we are trying to put in our own terms. Gravity existed before Newtons apple and despite our best attempts to prove otherwise will continue on.

With Henny Penny running around in the fields of science, and not limited to her henhouse, fools-literal and fools-temporal are falling in with her panic and extending their theories into the future, with little concern for the accuracy of the data, or worse yet running future predictions on computer simulated models and using this data to approach a conclusion.

It seems that here are two sides to a scientific theory these days. A Theory based on confirmed actual data and repeatable experimentation, and theory projected forward still awaiting confirmation by observation. This to me is where many of the theories we see today fall down. Postulating an outcome in the future requires confirmed theory. Real world data is needed before any theory can be confirmed. Running endless cycles of modelling into the future and taking an average does not get you any closer to confirmation, yet this is what, in the case of climate we are asked to accept.

Climate science is far from settled. The actual data suitability and zero points or baselines must be comparable, especially within a timeline if cause and effect is to be determined. The question of CO<sup>2</sup> following or causing warming is a fundamental one. Especially if we are to restrict all carbon outputs to the point of severe disruption to society and even potential famine. Otherwise it is just a knee jerk reaction, a 'Henny Penny' moment in history.

If we get this time-line wrong, it is akin to someone blaming the farmer for his crop failure because, it says here he ploughed his paddock.

*Farmer ploughs  
farmer plants  
farmer waters  
farmer harvests*

Get one of these out of order on paper and the farmer could be said to have ploughed in his own crop. Not a mistake he would make, but to all the chooks out there, maybe a possibility? So too with many of the other arguments our 'leaders' offer up as proof that we must change the system (read, 'give them more power').

With COVID, predicted outcomes far exceeded those actually observed. Statistical manipulation of the data aside, the reality did not come close to the panic induced fear that allowed them to change our laws and ride roughshod over us, forcing us to submit to their will. Also setting in motion long lasting precedents for controlling us in the future. The 'Henny Penny's' of science, used predictions to overturn realities and even when these turned out to be woefully wrong, still persisted, despite mounting evidence of damage being done.

Now a possible next global war is looming, led by man made disruption in so called 'critical' countries. Countries we have little knowledge about or only an increasingly corrupt media's false picture of. Propaganda works on both sides equally and not always just on the opposing side, it is felt that sometimes we too need 'encouragement'.

The Middle East, has long been a hotbed of ferment, pitting peoples against peoples, driving a wedge between us, not just in the 'infected' countries but in all other concerned nations as well. Something that is their

problem, is made out to be ours as well. Of course we find that the usual suspects, big business might suffer and therefore our economies would obviously be effected too!

Is this not a form of blackmail? Another form of 'Henny Penny-ism'.

Arguments over land go on all the time, individuals must sort it out, or their governments work it out. We truly have no part to play in their squabbles, no matter how benevolent we wish to seem. Do we really have concern for Blackrock or Vanguard or the myriad others who already make obscene profit from us? Why enable them more.

Don't get me wrong, I loved the Henny Penny story. I even had some admiration for the fox and his crafty cunning, after all he was only trying to eat. In later years my admiration dimmed as I saw first hand, Chicken Armageddon in the henhouse one year, mass slaughter and little taken. Giving the vixen benefit of the doubt, I'm sure she was going to come back to get them for her den of kittens. Today's fox, in metaphorical terms, has no such intent. The mass slaughter truly serves no ones purpose but the foxes own.

So what happened to Henny Penny after all the running around, all the recruiting of others. Are they still in the foxes den? I postulate that she and her most ardent followers are set free to run amok again, not so much on the sky falling, but in some other scam.

The remainder are stuck in the den, to be eaten at the fox's leisure. \*\*\*

### TRAINING

To become an effective Actionist, training is essential. Eric constantly reinforced this point. Utilize the online '**Actionist Corner**' with many links to *pro forma* letter templates, pamphlets and other important training and unique research resources.

Our ongoing training initiatives now include —

'**Science of the Social Credit Measured in Terms of Human Satisfaction**' — in three work-packs, steadily developing the individual actionist in their area of particular interest to release freedom of choice.

'**Introducing Social Credit by Betty Luks**' is built around five modules, as well as Video and Podcast lessons, other reading material and on completion, examination to achieve a basic **Science of the Social Credit** understanding.

'**Intermediate Social Credit by ED Butler**' includes eight written assignments, Video and Podcast lessons and other important developmental reading material.

'**Advanced Social Credit**' is conducted with the assistance of experts in this science, included is the historical '*Elements of Social Credit by Tudor Jones*', (originally published by The Social Credit Secretariat), two courses including texts, Video and Podcast lessons and other reading material and on examination to ensure an advanced ability of effective action in the Science of Social Credit measured in terms of human satisfaction. **Start your Training Today.**



## KEEPING A CIVILISED SOCIETY by Neville Archibald

To anyone interested in keeping a civilised society, health is an important concern. It does not stop at personal health, there are many facets of health, though not always to do with vitamins and human physiology. Health is a function of truth, whether it is the health of an organisation, a body or society at large. Only out of truth and the search for it, does true health appear.

I have always had an active interest in personal health, as well as a background in nutrition. My early years of study were chemical and food related, including processing. My take on this industry, coming from a food producing family, (mixed farming with an extensive home grown everything) often found me at odds with my employers. A natural, least refined direction should have been the aim in my mind, yet more and more it was to become about money alone. Rigorous product testing and questioning in supermarkets with the public, showed the direction that we as a population would prefer; however, this often had to take a back seat to the, “this is the way we do it in the States” attitude. (referring to the U.S, as increasingly, companies were taken over and brought into the multinational’s fold)

I left the industry feeling somewhat alone in my desire for doing good in this field. It was not my direction to take. Further ventures into it, in later years, only proved to me how corrupt these multinationals were. I do not mean corrupt in a legal sense, although I am sure, like all industries, it occurs. No!, I mean the underlying reasoning.

Food preservation to me, is the ability to create or keep the processed goods with the least deterioration of quality and nutrition. Meaning bluntly it should still be food when the process is finished. (Healthy food at that!) Anyone can make preserved food acceptable to eat, but as several arctic explorers found out, it may not keep you alive if you rely on it alone. This I am afraid is the problem we all face today, on many fronts too, not just food related. Having given you a brief outline of where I am coming from, it is important that we all realise that we are not alone in our thinking, no matter what the subject is.

I often listen to Dr John Campbell on YouTube:  
<https://www.youtube.com/@Campbellteaching>

His podcasts and videos are a true search for truth, as a nurse-educator, his teaching videos are excellent. I came to find his content largely out of the pandemic pandemonium. His latest interview with Consultant physician and Professor of Endocrinology, Dr David Anderson, started out discussing the role of vitamin D<sup>3</sup> and its importance, especially for COVID and related issues. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ICiABhI9qjU>

Mankind’s development over time has seen observation of skin colour and vitamin D production from the sun, become more important. With shifting

populations we can easily find ourselves depleted of this important part of our immune function support system. Denial of this and of other basic preventatives by the “science only” pushers of the COVID response teams worldwide, shows us truly who has our interests at heart.

At 82, Prof Anderson has an exceptional background in research and medicine, authoring several books and a large number of papers. Not only has he looked at the health of bodies, his desire for truth has led to him making observations regarding other fields of research as well. A wide ranging intellect, he applies the same scientific bent to other interests, like Chinese antiquities and archaeology.

It would seem to me, that like many people I have had the privilege to meet over the years, (sadly neither Dr Campbell or Prof. Anderson are included in this) this wide ranging search for truth leads to some very interesting discussions. Prof. Anderson put it well when he said that as a true scientist he laments a “denial of the obvious, a denial of the past in China”, when talking of the Younger Dryas disaster (meteorite impact) and the demise of an obviously advanced culture that existed at that time. Much of this being denied by professionals, despite the evidence available to them. “The people who should be talking about it seem to have shut their brains off.” he says.

He talks further of other areas of interest where this shutting down and denial is rampant.

I too see this failure of true science to look at obvious flaws in theories. When confronted by something that no longer fits the funding model or their inherent beliefs many still persist. If we cannot challenge these beliefs when faults are found, or contrary evidence is presented, then we are no longer looking for truth.

When listening to his talk and he touches on various unrelated topics (not strictly vitamin D) I can see that he shares this part of my concern with science and indeed its impact on society.

He talks of what he expects when having input into a theory, “people are supposed to start with a hypothesis and then refine it and not declare, like certain people, ‘I am the science’.”

This is happening across a wide range of scientific endeavours. It is increasingly having big impacts on our lives and we are not actively asking for accountability, especially when people take on dubious pursuits, like gain-of-function research and the creation of new viruses. I agree with Professor Anderson when he says, “we should be concentrating on humanity and making life better for people, we should be concentrating on the positive things and not making bio-wars.”

He wants us to get back to empathetic people running the world, not people who are just making excess money by reinvesting: people who are acting in their own best

interests with ours just being a by product, if that. "We've got a psychopathic financial system that is run for people who are already very wealthy" he says. Of this obvious problem he continues, "money has to be returned to its function, which is as a means of barter", to which John replies, "as opposed to a tool of control."

This is one of the first times I have heard this said out loud on this channel, although by inference it has been a part of observations made before. You never know where support will come from or what form it will take. There are many and growing numbers of people beginning to

## VALE BILL CAREY, 31.10.38 – 31.1.24 by Jeanine & Grant Bird

### The Man Who Started "A Revolution from the Bush"

Bill's life and faith reflected a strong understanding of Jesus' teaching on salt and saltiness: "Let your speech always be with grace, as though seasoned with salt, so that you will know how you should respond to each person" (Col 4:6). In Matthew Jesus tells us we are to be "the salt of the earth", the "light of the world".

People spoke to Bill as a trusted friend, and confided in him the financial trouble they were in after six years of drought on the Eyre Peninsula. They would normally have taken this in their stride, save for interest rates blowing out from 12% to 22% and some 28% seemingly overnight. This year (1988), there were no prospects of planting a crop in a drought. Banks had been greedy since the Hawke/Keating government's deregulation in 1983. They pushed out credit in an effort to "mark their territory", escalate profits for themselves, and incentivise managers to lend come hell or high water, and to hell with what they were doing to people. Consequently, as land prices crashed, people found themselves with little or no equity, and debts worth more than the farm. It was more than anyone could take, Jim Cronin remembers the night:

*...Bill Carey spoke of the banks' inflexibility; stating that dozens of families could be forced from their properties – some properties farmed by the same family for three generations or more. He started to count on his fingers those in real trouble who had spoken to him about their circumstances and said "the Minister for Agriculture, Kym Mayes, says there is no hope for these people. The Premier, John Bannon was here twelve months ago, wringing his hands, and blaming the banks, but nothing has been done since. The Federal Government won't give us disaster relief because the State Government won't declare the drought a natural disaster! They are not prepared to spend any money in assistance to instigate Federal Relief funding!" Bill continued in a fiery tone, "The banks are going to pick these fellows off, one by one! No-one seems to care how many of them go! So, we'll have to help ourselves." This sketchy outline was enough to make Jim Cronin ask himself, "What is Bill trying to do? He wants us to take on the world!" But there was no question - something had to be done to try to save these farmers!*

Bill explained this in a report for the 'That's Country' (Union of Farmers paper), Dec 1993.

*This year has been an interesting year, and a natural progression of what we started with our little group at Chandada in 1988. Farmers are still in trouble, and*  
*New Times Survey*

speaking out, to be heard. The more restricted we become, the more likely we are to burst our seams and let it spill out. The pursuit of truth and being unafraid of where it leads (John's basic motto) is an important part of growing up as a responsible adult. This has to be our individual endeavour in life, it is our guarantee of an advancing society.

I leave you with Professor Anderson's plea.

***"it is never too late to turn back, but it is really important now that there is an upwelling of protest against what is going on."*** \*\*\*

*coming to us for help. The established organisations are still saying they can help, but they aren't doing anything much, particularly when it comes to helping members. What they are doing is still throwing darts at us, which is understandable because we're getting results. In the Eyre Peninsula alone, we have saved a lot of farmers from eviction through taking action or negotiating for them. We will never know how many we have saved across Australia – directly or indirectly. Many groups have formed as a result of hearing about our success, and we have been available to help and offer an advise.*

This movement of Rural Action Groups (RAM), groups and the Union of Farmers had much to contend with – the fallout from not just the drought, but the "free trade" economic policies spawned from deregulation in 1983, and the fraud and corruption within the "self-regulated" banking system. Despite the banking inquiries and Royal Commission concerning banks, they have never been brought to proper account for the straight fraud (criminal), or the inhuman things they did to cover it or get what they wanted.

The movement developed many ways of dealing with banks and ways of holding the banks up for several years until farmers had a few good years (without paying interest) behind them. Then perhaps the son was able to buy the bank out after a series of events (perhaps tenders and/or auctions) which, surprisingly, weren't good news for the bank. Eventually, the bank would be "forced" (by circumstances whereby they made the decision) to write off the majority of the debt (for which – [thanks to Keating needing relief for his piggery trough] they got a 150% tax write-off).

It is interesting to note that back in 1993, Jim wrote an article in our paper about the French farmers, who were revolting at the time, saying **they weren't confused in their battle to preserve their rural base and culture, and that was our job here.** He said "They perceive the threat to their family farm looming through so-called free-trade arrangements (where they are supposed to make way for the masses of imported produce) overwhelming them while the social question is being ignored." \*\*\*

Read more about Operation Bankwatch here:

<https://alor.org/Storage/Bankwatch/Library/OperationBankWatch.htm>

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

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