

"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. 26 No. 1

January 2025

IN THIS ISSUE

Growth - It's Still the Plan By William Waite	59
Turbocharging Productivity - Another One on Growth - It's Still the Plan By William Waite	63
Conventional Economic and Political Spectra By Patrick O' Brien	66
Herding Cattle By Neville Archibald	71

Growth - It's Still the Plan By William Waite

The following excerpt (edited for readability) was taken from a recent discussion between Joe Rogan and Marc Andreessen. Andreessen is an American tech billionaire and Trump donor — a pairing which listeners of Rogan's podcast are becoming accustomed to. We pick up the discussion with Andreessen talking about the approach of the newly elected Republican party to the economy and the \$35 trillion dollars of U.S. debt.

***Andreessen:** So the, the two headline things you hear from them when, whenever they talk about this, the two headline things are number one growth. You just need faster growth. But by the way, it's the only way to resolve the long-term fiscal situation. It's the only way to resolve the debt. There's only two ways to do it. You can inflate your way out of it and end up in 1930s Germany with hyperinflation like that, that's one track you can get on, which is a very bad track. And you don't want to go there. Or you can grow faster because if you grow faster, then you, your economy can catch up to the debt and you can pay down the debt as you grow. And so they wanna go for a higher rate of growth.*

And then the other thing is they want America to win. And this you know, my partner Ben and I were able to spend time with Trump this summer. And that was like his adamant thing he kept coming back (to), which is like, look, America has to win and specifically what that means is America has to win in business and in technology and in industry generally globally. Like our company should be the ones that win these, you know, broad, we should win global markets. Like our, our company should be, should be the global state (?)¹

***Rogan:** How can anybody be against that?*

Andreesen: *I happen to think that makes a lot of sense. Yes (laughs)*

Rogan: *I know. I mean, obviously you're a wealthy man and I am as well, but it's like, how could you not want that?*

Andreesen: *Yes. By the way, if you are in favor of a high level of social support, if you want there to be lots of welfare programs and food assistance programs. Yes. All these things. I would argue you also want that because yes, it's the growth that will pay for all the social programs. Right? Like that's how you square the circle. That's how you actually have your cake and eat it too. Which is like first your economy just generates a fountain of money through, through growth and economic success. And then you can pay for whatever programs you want. I actually don't personally, like I'm totally fine. Like set up all the programs you want, all the social spending you want, all the safety nets you want. And if as long as it's easy to pay for 'cause you're growing so fast, then everybody wins. Yeah.²*

Firstly is this frankly *dumb-arse* narrative about money and debt? Modern money *is* debt. Whether the public pays for it in taxes, increased prices or in servicing consumer debt directly it doesn't really matter. The debt remains. I know it, Andreesen knows it, Trump knows it, my mum's aged care worker knows it. But, largely as a result of nonsense like this, it hasn't found its way into the working consciousness of the general public and while this remains the case there is little hope of untangling the mess we're in. This is gaslighting, to use one of Rogan's favourite words. That is, they want us to believe that something which everybody can see is happening is not happening. It's a blatant attempt to obscure important facts.

“You need faster growth... it's the only way to resolve the debt.” Seriously? And what about this: “Or you can grow faster because if you grow faster, then you, your economy can catch up to the debt and you can pay down the debt as you grow.” No you can't. You're actually not permitted to pay debt down with beads, or computer chips or potatoes or any other physical thing. Debt must be paid with money borrowed from the banks.

You can't catch up to it. Especially now. What Andreesen and the merry men at Mar-a-lago plan to do is increase GDP relative to debt so the government can satisfy the banks' conditions re. GDP-to-debt ratio. It just means they can keep borrowing. There is no long-term plan here to actually 'resolve' the debt problem. How does he expect to pay for the growth? How are people expected to pay for the consumables? The more productive you are the more money you need and it all comes from the banks as debt.

Why this growth? Money stupid. What else is there? That non-entity the bean counters conjure out of thin air. Then once we have 'generated a fountain of money' by all our growth we can pay for 'lots of welfare programs and food assistance programs.' Thanks Marc. To quote you from literally 45 seconds earlier in this

podcast:

if you're making somebody dependent on you because you're giving them money, then you're in a tremendous position of power. 'Cause you can make their life horrible by, by pulling the money away. You know, it's, it's, it's, it's on the, it's on the spectrum to a form of like domination.

Andreesen's promise of social programs should not be taken as an idle threat. He's deadly serious. The desire to control large swathes of debt-impoverished people with so-called safety nets is the unholy alliance between socialism and big money. A lot of people don't understand the common ground here but Douglas was all over it.

What will farmers do? Build farmdroids? How will they pay for that delicious looking food from that vibrant looking soil. It can sow and weed around the clock and hardly pay an income. That's growth.

Or maybe they'll figure out how to 'square the circle' once they have applied all the processing power of Nvidia to collect, store and process everything there is to know about everybody on the planet. Finally, they'll have the answer to the ultimate question and we'll have an entrenched voyeuristic dictatorship. Until then just grow, and fountains of money and social programs will surely follow... three cheers for the genius and generosity of wealthy men!

Douglas dealt a death blow to the growth delusion with the first thing he ever published in 1918 called the *Delusion of Super-Production*. England, following the First World War, faced a similar dilemma. A massive industrial capacity and a political class committed to producing their way out of the war-debt. We've been on this merry-go-round for more than a hundred years with no intellectual progress at all. Douglas explains why there is no economic solution found in revving up production. Read it carefully.

The factory cost — not the selling price — of any article under our present industrial and financial system is made up of three main divisions — direct labor cost, material cost and overhead charges, the ratio of which varies widely, with the "modernity" of the method of production. For instance, a sculptor producing a work of art with the aid of simple tools and a block of marble has next to no overhead charges, but a very low rate of production, while a modern screw-making plant using automatic machines may have very high overhead charges and very low direct labour cost, or high rates of production.

Since increased industrial output per individual depends mainly on tools and method, it may almost be stated as a law that intensified production means a progressively higher ratio of overhead charges to direct labour cost, and, apart from artificial reasons, this is simply an indication of the extent to which machinery replaces manual labour, as it should.

Now, for reasons which it is hoped will be clear from what follows, the factory cost, including management and indirect labour, of the total factory output

*of any article is always more than the total sum paid in wages, salaries, and for raw material, in respect of it. Consequently, the total output of the world's factory system is inevitably costed at a figure greatly in excess of the salaries and wages which go to the production of it. Selling charges and profit merely increase the price and decrease the purchasing power of money, as, of course, **caeteris paribus** (all else being equal) do general rises in wages. In order to realise clearly this most important relation between factory cost, and money released, it must be borne in mind that manufacturing, or, what is commonly called production, is conversion, and just as the conversion of mechanical energy into electricity or heat into mechanical energy involves a dispersion, which for practical purposes is a loss, so the conversion of manufactured articles can never take place without a similar economic dispersion. Obviously the balance, which is represented by this economic dispersion must go somewhere. A little reflection will make it clear that it represents depreciation, obsolescence, scrapped material, etc., all of which are charged to the consumer **instead of being a charge against the value of the product.***

*In consequence of this the book-value of the world's production is continuously growing more and more in excess of the capacity to absorb or liquidate it, and every transaction between buyer and seller increases this discrepancy so long as the exchange takes place at a figure in excess of the total wages, etc., which go to the various conversions of the product; with the result that a continuous rise in the cost of living absolutely **must** take place, apart and above that represented by currency inflation; palliated by intrinsically more efficient productive methods, but leading along a path of cumulative fierce competition and harder toil to an absolutely inevitable breakdown. The money required for public works can only be provided by loans or taxation, a decreasing amount of which is returned in wages and salaries; an increasing amount going to swell the mortgage held by the banker and the manufacturer on the effective effort of the world's population.³*

Will someone please tell me what he got wrong. The growth that Andreesen talks about has nothing to do with providing goods and services to the American people — that's more or less incidental. Debt and inflation are hard baked into the system. There can be no resolution until we change long-established financial conventions so that industry exists for the support of the free individual and not the power ambitions of a financial oligarchy.

The limit they fear is the patience of the public and there are indications it's wearing thin. But where is the frustration to be channeled if no solution to these problems is known? The solution is simple: "*We must give the consumer purchasing power which does not appear in prices.*" That or Andreesen's global state.

Alternatives Exist.

References:

1. I've listened to this comment by Andreesen multiple times and its difficult to hear what that last word is. I'm pretty sure it's 'state.' Which is rather a startling admission. The transcript here agrees:
<https://app.podscribe.ai/episode/117705381> 01:03:58 or you can check it for yourself on YouTube from 01:05:00.
2. *Joe Rogan Experience* #2234 - Marc Andreesen. 1.12.24. Available on YouTube or Spotify.
3. Douglas, C.H. 1918. *The Delusion of Super Production*. Available from:
<https://www.socred.org/images/douglas-archives/The-Delusion-of-Super-Production.pdf>

Turbocharging Productivity - Another One on Growth It's Still the Plan By William Waite

*In all the animal kingdom
the obsession with money is unique to late stage economic man*

We are this morning (Monday 6.1) told in *The Australian* that our standard of living is declining and we shouldn't expect a recovery to pre-flu panic prosperity until at least 2030.¹

This is a Coalition conclusion based on Treasury figures that predict Australians' disposable income over the next decade or so. In the two dimensional world of economics our 'standard of living' can be easily calculated by dividing after-tax pay (disposable income) by population. Voila! standard of living measure.

According to Treasury figures for the last two years disposable income has been in negative territory before it is predicted to break through zero sometime in 2024-25. It creeps upwards for the next few years; 1.5, 1.6, 1.6%. At this point shadow treasurer Angus Taylor gets hold of the numbers and follows the trend to 2030 and Kapow! Labour's done a terrible job on the economy! Again! 'The lost decade' they're calling it.

The solution according to economist Chris Richardson is simple, "We need to become more productive; that's what will return our living standards. And you turbocharge productivity to some extent through bipartisanship, through both sides agreeing such and such is a mess and needs to be fixed."² In other words, the political class agrees that we all have to work more. Great. Another moralising rich person, whose fee range for a speaking engagement is between 5 and 10k, telling us to work harder.

These remarks remind me of something Geoffrey Dobbs wrote in his introduction to the fourth edition of Douglas' *Monopoly of Credit*:³

*I have long ago come to the conclusion that it is virtually impossible for any mind which has accepted the axioms implicit in first-year Economics to come to grips at all with the realistic thinking of an engineer such as Douglas.
The concept of the real credit: the capacity to make and deliver what is wanted, which is basic to the production of anything for sale to the public, is quite*

inconceivable and unreal to an economist unless it incorporates the accountancy arrangement we call money, which, despite its well-known and wholly symbolic nature, is still credited with the properties of a real entity — a commodity such as gold, for instance — of which there can be a quantity, a stock, a store. Upon this illusory basis the whole vast and subtle structure of economic thought has been built, so there is no escape from circular thinking.

On illusions. There are any number of reasons why disposable income isn't a very good indication of standard of living. For starters, disposable income takes no account of the cost of necessities like food, housing and energy without which numbers in a bank account are utterly meaningless. What is the use of a standard of living measure that doesn't consider prices on essentials during a cost-of-living crisis?

But Dobbs is talking about illusion at a deeper level than the mere obfuscation of economic speak :

An actual capacity to produce, or a need and want for the product, cannot be made effective without money; hence there is no “reality” for economists except in monetary terms. And since practically all economic concepts, however complex or abstract, incorporate this idea of money as if it were a neutral “unit of account”, “medium of exchange”, “measure and store of value” and so forth, the possibility is eliminated ab initio of comparing the economics which is determined by the nature and use of bank credit with that which could exist if the accountancy were secondary and not a determining factor.

Considered in this light the false calculus of economists like Richardson becomes clear. The call for turbo-charged productivity is not a case for the generation of goods and services backed by consumer demand. The actual provision of goods and services is a by-product of the more important objective of spreading money (and debt) around i.e. the distribution of incomes. Afterall ‘standard of living’ is only after-tax income much of which is siphoned off as interest before it is even available for buying anything in the physical economy.

This explains a lot which is otherwise logically inconsistent, like why would a “capitalist” economy maintain millions of bullshit jobs? That is work that serves no purpose outside the money it distributes. Recently we have seen a Labor government bloat the public service: “More than 575,000 people who joined the jobs market in the two years to June (2024) were employed in public sector or care economy roles, mostly funded by the government, including the healthcare, social welfare, education and disability sectors.”⁴ Does anyone think that means a proportional improvement in services?

I realise this is largely a reiteration of my last post but these articles and commentators that latch onto growth as the solution to our problems is an irritation which I feel compelled to scratch. We, the people, have to stop letting this through as

though it made sense because it forms the justification for what comes next.

Forced growth is a recipe for a society of mindless drones and environmental catastrophe. Where are the environmentalists on this issue? Are they all sidelined into hyperventilating about carbon. The biggest threat to the environment is unrestrained industry chasing full employment which is what is meant by ‘turbocharging’ productivity. The entire left (whatever that means) seems missing in action. One would think that all the hand wringing about social justice and economic equality would lead to a sensible examination of “the nature and use of bank credit” where the solution to this problem will finally be found. But alas, the financial system and the havoc it wreaks remains as inevitable as a tropical cyclone and apparently far less interesting. At least we know something about cyclones which is more than can be said for the cultivated ignorance that swirls around money.

Why such a fundamental question is so studiously avoided I can’t say for sure. Maybe we can’t explain things simply and clearly enough, or perhaps there is a vast conspiracy keeping people in the dark. Maybe its the madness of crowds. Maybe we are dumb animals that must merge with machines before cyborg reasoning shows us the way. Don’t laugh. The public mind is being steered in this direction. Maybe we need to try and educate people about the deceptions involved in bank accounting processes to better understand the alchemy of money creation as Pat Cusack suggests. I can’t honestly say. What I can say is that there is very little interest in understanding how our economics is “determined by the nature and use of bank credit.”

One thing that has been repeating itself in my mind is that maybe we have come to love our enslavement or “love our servitude,” that most chilling phrase of Huxley’s. There was evidence of that during the great flu panpanic. A mass Stockholm Syndrome; “a psychological response to captivity or abuse that can cause victims to develop positive feelings toward their captors or abusers.” After all the debt-slavers feed us, entertain us, they make us comfortable, and they give us things to do. Like children or cattle. But they are not good parents. They steal from you, kill you, poison you, lie to you, surveil your every move and there is every indication they will mistreat your children the same. So even if we don’t care about our own preservation we might make an effort for theirs. ***

References:

1. Benson, S. 6.1.25. Living standards to take a decade to return to pre-Covid levels as top economist calls for ‘courage.’ *The Australian*. Available from: <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/nation/politics/living-standards-to-take-a-decade-to-return-to-precovid-levels-as-top-economist-calls-for-courage/news-story/0bbe4c587fcb7b27d4344d5a96c99d1>
2. Richardson in *ibid*.
3. Douglas, C.H. 1979. *The Monopoly of Credit*, Fourth Edition. Bloomfield books, England.
4. Quail, J. 8.9.24. Labor fuels jobs boom with public sector employment surge. *The Australian*.
<https://www.theaustralian.com.au/nation/politics/labor-fuels-jobs-boom-with-public-sector-employment-surge/news-story/44df7bf52908f85c597dc04b31c00596>

Conventional Economic and Political Spectra as Ideological Control Mechanisms By Patrick O' Brien

In this short essay, I wish to explain how and why the conventional economic and political “left-right” spectra are, in fact, ideological control mechanisms of an overarching power. That power, the reigning oligarchy, is a hidden power, but we can identify it under the rubric of “International Finance” or “Big Finance”. The basic claim is that we are living under an occult dictatorship to some significant extent, a dictatorship that will only expand its degree of control if it is not neutralized in time *via* monetary reform in the genuine interest of the public. One of the key tools which Big Finance deploys in order to maintain its hegemony and to expand its power base is the conventional spectra. They are the glasses which are placed on our noses and through which we are forced to both perceive and conceive of the world. But these glasses are distorting glasses that don't provide us with an accurate picture at all. Instead, they skew our perception and hence the way in which we interact with the economic and political worlds in favour of Big Finance.

The spectra in question are most typically arranged on an axis with two extremes, a left-wing extreme on the one hand and a right-wing extreme on the other. Between these two sides, every possible combination differing in degree can be found, depending on its closeness or distance from the one extreme or the other.

The economic spectrum typically ranges from Marxist socialism to *laissez-faire* capitalism, passing through various permutations of the mixed economy. The leftist extreme, Marxist Socialism, is characterized by public or national ownership of the means of production, a command economy, heavy regulations, and redistribution from those who can produce to those who are in need of production. The right-wing extreme, *laissez-faire* capitalism, opts instead for private ownership and the free market, but does so in such a way that the owners in productive property tend to be a small minority. Those who are not capitalists must sell the only thing they have, i.e., their labour, to the capitalist class in exchange for the means of subsistence. Both systems thereby tend to monopoly, the one public and the other private. The mixed economic models that fall in-between simply combine, in various ways and to various extents, private monopoly with public monopoly.

L – Marxist Socialism ----- Mixed Economy ----- “Laissez-Faire” Capitalism – R

The political spectrum, by contrast, typically ranges from totalitarianism to anarchism, passing again through various intermediate stages. We can also place these two extremes on a left-right axis. The leftist extreme of totalitarianism subordinates the individual to the state to such an extreme extent that he literally has no inalienable rights or meaningful independence from the state. There is an excess of collective authority over personal liberty, with the former being maximized and the latter minimized. On the other extreme, anarchism does away with coercive state or government institutions entirely. This results, at least in theory, with the

maximization of personal liberty to the utmost degree possible, since collective authority of the coercive institutional kind is non-existent. All points in-between involve various combinations between collective authority and personal liberty in terms of varying degrees, but these two components are seen as, or are often presented as, antagonistic, such that to the degree that one expands, the other must retreat. It's a quantitative rather than qualitative assessment of the range of possibilities in the political realm.

L – Totalitarianism ----- Mixed Polity ----- Anarchism – R

Now, the first thing I wish to point out is that both of these spectra fail to truly represent the full scope of economic and political options or possibilities.

In the case of the economic spectrum, the only options on the menu are: public monopoly (socialism), private monopoly (capitalism), or some monster mixed system involving various disjointed combinations of both public and private monopoly.

But what about an economic regime that involves a widely and equitable distributed private ownership? Distributism, understood here in the broadest of terms, is not allowed to emerge as a possibility where the conventional economic spectrum is concerned.

In the same way, the political spectrum is grounded on the incorrect idea that there is a necessary or inherent opposition between authority and freedom, such that one is asked to choose between them (in the case of the extremes) or to choose one's preferred degree of amalgamation between them. I would also argue that this boils down to a competition between an anti-social public monopoly over coercive power (totalitarianism) with no real personal freedom for the majority, or an anti-social private monopoly over coercive power (anarchism) with no real personal freedom for the majority in that case either (since, in practice, anarchism basically means that in the absence of state or governmental power, the law of the jungle will re-emerge as the richest and most powerful enforce their self-serving policies on everyone else). But what about a political regime that views authority and freedom as being on the same side, i.e., which promotes authority but only when and to the extent that that authority serves to maximize the freedom of each individual? As C.H. Douglas once put it: "... we are confronted by the fundamental alternatives of freedom and authority. But it should be possible ... to see that these are not necessarily alternatives at all – they are policies each fundamentally 'right' on its own plane of action." [1] What we might term "Political Functionalism" is also not permitted to emerge as a possibility where the conventional political spectrum is concerned.

The second thing that I wish to point out is that this failure to capture the full range of options is quite deliberate, because it enables the reigning oligarchy, i.e., Big Finance, to achieve the following objectives as part of their "running interference" tactics:

1. **Limit Options** – Since most people rely on this pre-given spectral framework for conceptualizing the range of economic and political options, the range of acceptable or conceivable discourse is artificially restricted to a set of linear alternatives by the conventional spectra. Models not found on the spectrum, models that may offer more effective solutions to economic and political problems, are marginalized or ignored from the outset. People are led to think only within certain imposed parameters.

2. **Obscure Truth** – I would also argue that since the conventional range of alternatives (the narrow band of acceptable ideologies) represent more or less false answers to the basic economic and political questions, while the correct answers to those questions lie beyond the spectra, the conventional framework also hides the objective truth from view. It locks people in an ideological prison, something akin to Plato's cave. They are distracted from the real issues and the real solutions.

3. **Divide and Conquer** – Finally, precisely because the range of false answers provided are opposites or antagonistic, the population can be divided into warring camps where people can fight over whose false answer is correct, thus consuming much time, energy, and good will in utter futility. Not only are the people placed

“in the cave” by the conventional spectra, but they are set against each other in the cave, i.e., fighting each other “over the false images that appear on the cave wall”, as per the Platonic allegory. These resources could have been used in a collaborative effort to find the correct answers instead and to challenge, on that basis, the status quo for the betterment of mankind.

Now, when it comes to this specific aim of dividing and conquering, the various political parties, which are designed to ostensibly represent the range of false options (and only that range), play a very special role: they serve to directly strengthen the two main proxies of International Finance, namely Big Business and Big Government. While their supporters fight unceasingly against each other, the parties bring ideology to bear on policy in the interests of those who were behind the false ideological narratives in the first place.

Conventional right-wing parties are there to introduce policies that favour Big Business (and/or to introduce leftist policies that would only be accepted by a right-wing constituency if they were brought in by a right-wing party). These policies might include deregulation, tax cuts for corporations, and policies that benefit the über-wealthy under the guise of promoting economic growth and “freedom”.

Conventional left-wing parties are there to introduce policies that favour Big Government (and/or to introduce right-wing policies that would only be accepted by a left-wing constituency if they were brought in by a left-wing party). Their policies might focus on increasing government size and power, often through welfare programmes, increased regulation, and increased taxation, purportedly for the benefit

of the less fortunate.

The unending dialectical struggle that these parties engage in as they vie for power mirrors the ideological struggle that naturally arises between the extremes on the conventional political and economic spectra and everything in-between. This struggle is essentially a fake one because no party ever holds power with any kind of finality, or successfully resolves political and economic oppositions in its favour. Beyond that, they certainly don't intend to truly change the system or to do anything in the genuine interests of the common people, which is why massive dissatisfaction with political parties and contemporary politics in general is endemic.

Instead, the parties survive and thrive in a sick symbiosis, siphoning off some of the cream that Big Finance milks off of the economy in exchange for their complicity. That is, the parties are not truly opposed to each other at all, but are interdependent, playing roles in a scripted political theatre reminiscent of professional wrestling. As they alternate in the holding of power, each party gets its turn to govern in the interests of Big Finance. They do this by: a) maintaining the illusion of democracy and choice in the minds of the voting public (thus acting as a stress-relief valve), by b) leaving the real or underlying power structures unchallenged, by: c) implementing whichever policies strengthen Big Finance's favoured proxy *du jour*: Big Government or Big Business (often times both), and by d) delivering the worst of both worlds from the extremes of the conventional spectra so that Big Finance can privatize profit and socialize wealth. The resulting regime might be most properly described as 'anarcho-tyranny': a breakdown in right order and justice (anarchy) coupled with oppressive government control and interference (tyranny).

To summarize the foregoing:

- 1) Anarcho-tyranny is achieved through a regulation mis-match. Things that should be prohibited or regulated in view of the genuine common interest are not (this is the false liberalism, the anarchy), while things that should NOT be prohibited or regulated as they are in view of the genuine common interest, because they are unnecessary and/or harmful, (this is the false conservatism, the tyranny).
- 2) Big Finance is in a position to impose anarcho-tyranny because it has the means, due to the nature of the wealth and power-centralizing, dishonest and dysfunctional, financial system which they operate, to buy politicians, political parties, the media, celebrities, and everything else needed to push the policies that most favour Big Finance itself, while manipulating public opinion in its own favour. For Big Finance is also in a position to ensure, by its ownership or influence of the mass media, that only the views it approves of are to be given widespread airtime and people tend to believe what they hear most often. The result: the manipulation of public opinion in its own favour is a foregone

conclusion. At the same time, they can punish the recalcitrant by withholding monetary favours or via active persecution.

3) Finally, Big Finance imposes anarcho-tyranny because it is the set-up which is most beneficial to their own interests (even though it is the most destructive to the common interests of citizens). The arch-policy of Big Finance is TOTAL MONOPOLY. They want to transform their power to create money out of nothing into a total domination of everything that money can buy. This is the New World Order. Anarcho-tyranny strengthens public and private monopolies, i.e., Big Government and Big Business. Since both of these are controlled and subservient to Big Finance, Big Finance is the chief beneficiary whenever they grow in power, control, and influence.

As an alternative, we could have the opposite policy to Big Finance's policy of Total Monopoly, i.e., the decentralization of social power up to the limits of each individual. But this would require the implementation of the Douglas Social Credit proposals for monetary, economic, and political reform in the genuine common interest. DSC is the set of solutions which transcends the conventional spectra entirely and thus may be described as "the radical centre". It would enable economic and political systems to fulfill their true purposes well, restoring full functionality to economic and political association, and thus resolving the useless conflict between the conventional right-wing and left-wing of conventional politics ... all the while doing away with Big Government, Big Business, and Big Finance above all.

In place of the false dichotomy of socialism and capitalism, the Douglas Social Credit monetary reform would enfranchise all citizens as shareholders in their economies. This would, through the payment of a periodic dividend, ensure that the beneficial ownership of productive property is widely and effectively distributed. This is not left or right on the economic spectrum, nor some make-shift combination of the two extremes. It represents something entirely novel that lies beyond the conventional spectrum.

In place of the false dichotomy of totalitarianism and anarchism, the Douglas Social Credit political reform proposals would champion legitimate authority for the purpose of maximizing the freedom (both in the positive and negative sense) of each citizen. Legitimate authority, founded upon truth, especially in the sense of the natural law, is respected and obeyed because it is freeing: "Whose Service is Perfect Freedom". This way of conceiving of the nature and purpose of authority in relation to freedom is, once again, beyond the conventional political spectrum and therefore cannot be described as left, right, or as representing the conventional centre.

Conclusion

It is necessary to recognize the sophisticated manipulation that is inherent in our ideological systems. When we come to understand that the left-right spectrum is an artificially constructed dichotomy designed to serve, in various ways, the interests

of a financial elite, we can see the necessity of rethinking the nature of our political engagement. We need to look beyond partisan politics and towards a new system where genuine choice is respected and indeed empowered by the system itself. We need a new political and economic model that truly represents the needs of the populace, rather than the interests of an oligarchic few at the upper echelons of the financial hierarchy. Only thus can real change be achieved instead of a situation in which our political activity is inadvertently reinforcing the status quo. ***

• **Political Influence:** Through lobbying, funding campaigns, and revolving doors between finance sectors and government, Big Finance ensures that both left and right-wing policies serve its interests, whether through deregulation or through government contracts and bailouts.

References:

1. C.H. Douglas, *Credit Power and Democracy* (Melbourne: The Social Credit Press, 1933), 144.

Herding Cattle By Neville Archibald

When you work with cattle you begin to realise a few things. First it is important to have a good dog, to do your barking and nipping at the heels. If it is a big herd, maybe several dogs, who are trained well and work in unison. Second, it is important to keep them on a better pasture than is available through the fence, otherwise, that 'grass is always greener' saying, will see them pushing down or through the fences in which you wish to keep them contained (safe). Third, if you want to milk them, you need to let them do what they do best, feed and breed. Your lane-ways to the milking shed need to funnel the cows past other paddocks with their shut gates and right up to the dairy yards, where they wait patiently to be milked. If you feed them in the bale as an incentive then they are all the more willing to enter. Loud noises and violent actions will not endear you to them, nor the shed itself. The milking itself is a form of release for them, so they can be induced to willingly come up to be milked. Pretty soon they do not need the dogs to nip at their heels, and they arrive at the shed without the dogs encouragement. Even later they come up to the shed by themselves with-out dogs, only the new ones need that reminder at the start of their season.

Once your cattle are well versed in the operation it becomes routine and the newer ones are pacified by the older, more experienced ones.

To be put out to pasture, is a saying that you are going to retire and graze peacefully till the end of your days. This saying was more applicable to the horses or dogs used to round them up than it was to the cattle themselves. Maybe old Bertha, the house cow, got to live out her days, a promise to others to look at what happens when you are good. (this, of course, does not really apply to cattle - but it sounds good to say it!) there is some hope of a nice retirement.

All their working life they are looked after and maintained (while they are useful).

If they are poor milkers or develop an expensive problem they are eventually culled to make way for more profitable stock. Vet bills aside, production is also important. When it comes to better management and less work in the rounding up and taking to the dairy or market, there are other ways to improve the valued outcome. This has been seen in the development of large shedding and feeding with supplemented silage or hay. In this way, paddocks can be used for high output foodstuffs like maize or other green edibles, the intention being all sorts of other things can be added into their feed to make them cheaper to manage. Also, being in a small area, they move around less and are less subject to the elements, so they use less energy and produce more, for less input. These are the many ways that it can be said improvements are made in the industry.

It is against this that many of the so called “greenies” protest.

Cattle, being cattle, do not tend to ponder on these things, although at times you do see a wistful type of glance being made to the open grasslands if they can see them (or so it seems to me). Like the ‘grass is always greener’ example, if these sheds are shielded by desolation or greener pastures are blocked from view, then this wistful remembering will die out. Cattle will become used to the new environment and be productive at least, if not actually thrive. They will roam nothing and be happy.

The figures are good enough to keep the farmer happy, the cows are just a means to an end.

This story, this observation, is one that draws many parallels for me. I wonder if it does for you? I have seen greener pastures and pictures of desolation to run away from. I have heard the barking dogs and seen some of those put out to pasture.

When you are happy in your new shedding, will you remember what it was like to roam free? To choose your life? Will your feed be supplemented and your usefulness calculated to allow you to remain as a guest?

Fifteen minute cities, agenda 21/30 and the global administrators of the WEF, will be glad to see you!

Is it at this point that the ‘greenies’ will protest outside our shedding? ***

“

You will be perhaps puzzled to find that the conflict in the economic world is not so much between cartels, monopolies and nationalized industry and property, as between all three and small businesses and privately-owned property.”

C.H. Douglas

The Brief for the Prosecution (1945)

C.H. Douglas

