A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Vol. 61 No. 29 **25th July 2025**

IN THIS ISSUE

They Want Your Home By Jeremy Lee 09
Looking Forward, Looking Back By Arnis Luks 17
Under Which King? By CH Douglas 19
Who is Important? By Neville Archibald 21

They Want Your Home By Jeremy Lee (circa 1976)

The attack on one of the basic rights of the English-speaking peoples - the right to private ownership of a home and the land on which it stands, is being stepped up throughout the English-speaking world.

Nobody who has read the text of *Magna Carta* could fail to be impressed with the fact that the dominant theme is private ownership. Many of the abuses so evident in modern society were thoroughly dealt with (then-ed). Those fighting today against Probate and Death-Duties might be surprised to learn that *Magna Carta* banned the penalisation of those bereaved by the death of a breadwinner. Even those heavily in debt were guarded against the deprivation of private property, and, once debts were paid, property was restored. It was clearly stated in *"The Great Charter of Liberties"* that freedom was dependent on private property.

THE EMERGENCE OF SOCIALISM

It wasn't until the industrial Revolution that Socialism gained any cohesion from a practical political viewpoint. In a revolutionary form through Communism, or in an evolutionary form through Fabianism, the attack on private property was the same. Writing in the *Communist Manifesto*, Karl Marx advocated as a first step: **"Abolition of property in land, and application of all rents of land to public purposes."**

The Fabian Society, on whose original policies the programme of the Whitlam Government is based, has amongst its objectives the following:-

"The Fabian Society consists of Socialists."

"It therefore aims at the reorganisation of Society by the emancipation of Land

and Industrial Capital from individual and class ownership, and the vesting of them in the community for the general benefit. In this way only can the natural and acquired advantages of the country be equitably shared by the whole people.

"The Society accordingly works for the extinction of private property in Land and of consequent individual appropriation, in the form of Rent, of the price paid for permission to use the earth, as well as for the advantages of various Soils and Sites."

FABIANISM AND MODERN LABOR GOVERNMENT

In a lecture delivered to the Fabian Society on October 23rd, 1908, a prominent Fabian, Stewart D. Headlam, explained how the Society derived its basic policies on land from Henry George:-

"The first part of our basis is in fact saturated with the teaching of Henry George; and that need not be a matter of surprise to us when those who know remember how much the original Fabians owed to him. The Fabians of the present generation would do well, if they want to understand the first principles on which their Society is founded, to read *Progress and Poverty*. Most of the older Fabians, having got the fundamentals of their Socialism from Henry George, seldom mention his name, and lead you off into all sorts of interesting propaganda which enable them to make much of details which they can handle in a clever way: but though they please you immensely, they don't go to the root of the matter; the root of the matter is contained not for the most part in your Tracts, but in Your Basis. And you will find the main justification for your Basis better stated in *Progress and Poverty* than in anything we have published. For I unhesitatingly claim that, according to Your Basis, Land is not merely one of a large number of items, all of equal importance, to be dealt with, - but its emancipation from individual and class ownership is the essential preliminary for the reorganisation of Society at which we are aiming. (emphasis added) ... The taxation of Land values is a much bigger and more far-reaching thing than the mere taxation on unearned incomes, which our society is fond of advocating ... my contention is that the Fabian Society has for many years failed in its main work, and, to some degree, hindered the progress of Socialism by not realising the unique importance of the Land question, and by throwing itself heartily into the most fruitful movement of modern times - the movement for the Taxation of Land Values ... the socialising of Land Values must take precedence of every other socialising; and is probable that when it is accomplished we shall find that the other socialising's about which some of us are so eager will have been accomplished by means of it ... You must not buy the Landlords out, you need not kick them out, you had better tax them out."

https://archive.org/details/progress-and-poverty

CURRENT LABOR POLICIES ARE FABIAN-PLANNED

The current crisis in Britain is the result of long-term Fabian planning. Harold Wilson, current (UK) Prime Minister, has been a Fabian for many years, and was

chairman of the Society in the mid-fifties. The Majority of his Party are also Fabians. Consequently, the centralisation of power and the nationalisation of industry were preplanned. The resulting chaos has not deterred the Fabians. An article in the *Christian Science Monitor* of July 7th 1975, highlights the attack on Land ownership. The article reads:-

THE SOCIALIST PLAN FOR THE ENGLISHMAN'S CASTLE

Is the Englishman's home still his castle? and, come to that, has the Palace of Westminster become a dormitory?

Both questions have been raised by the Labor Government's latest reform bill, dealing with the subject of land ownership and development in Queen Elizabeth's over-crowded island. The draft law, known as the Community Land Bill (or Communist Land Bill to the Tories) is meant to meet two problems: the accumulation of huge capital gains by non-constructive landowners, and the difficulty experienced by local governments in getting their paper plans actually carried out in bricks and mortar.

The quick socialist answer would be nationalization. But for a start there is no money to pay compensation, and furthermore the Labour Party cannot quite bring itself to antagonize Britain's small farmers and homeowners. As it is, Gift and Death taxes are making it almost impossible for them to pass their properties on to their children; something has to be left to them in life.

So instead of nationalization, the idea of "community ownership" of the land was devised. Local or county councils will raise money by borrowing, purchase all the land needed for building up to ten years ahead, and then sell or lease plots to would-be developers, including individual homeowners, provided they conform to the approved development plan. The law is so devised that the authorities will be able to buy at an artificially low price and sell as high as they can, pocketing the difference to pay off borrowings and finance further acquisitions for the "land bank" ....

The socialist argument is that since it is the community and its planning laws which create high values for building sites, the profit should go to the community, not the landowner - who has done nothing to deserve it. But the ultimate effect of the new law will be that there is no privately owned land for sale: the only supplier of new building lots - whether for homes, offices, shops or factories - will be the community, or, as some prefer to call it, the state. And you will have to pay its price or get nothing.

For many years, British planning laws have firmly controlled the sitting and appearance of new buildings and alterations to existing ones. The main intention has been to preserve architectural harmony, prevent overcrowding and protect the vanishing countryside. The Labour Government vows it will continue this policy. Labour and Tories alike are agreed that spectacular land profits should be taken away. But critics reading the Bill suspect it of trying to go much further.

In spite of Labour election promises, the text contains almost no safeguards for the family homeowner. Strictly enforced, it would compel a man who wanted to convert his loft into an extra bedroom to sell the house to his local authority and then persuade it to sell his own home back to him – with permission to make the alterations. Further reading suggests that local government could compulsorily purchase anyone's house, garden, paddock or even farmland without giving any public reason at all; and without any right of Appeal.

In a desperate attempt to alter the Bill in committee, the Tories have been keeping up two 27-hour sessions twice a week - doing all the talking, while Labour supporters slumber on camp beds in the next room, in case a vote is called.

All of which says something about the more ludicrous rituals of the Mother of Parliaments.

The government insists that the Tory objections are a scare. Ministers say they have given solemn undertakings that the small man's home and garden are perfectly safe. Besides, they add, the voters of each community will keep an eye on things and guard against corruption.

But there are two quite serious counter-objections. The safeguards promised by the government are still not part of the Bill itself: they are to be incorporated in subsidiary regulations, issued and altered by ministers with little or no control by Parliament. That way, say the critics, lies creeping socialism - even communism.

As for "community control" - nobody is quite sure what the community is.

Seeing that the voter turnout in British local elections is 20-40 per cent, it will be hard to claim that the people are watching with hawk-like eyes to ensure fair play.

***

NOT CONFINED TO BRITAIN

The thrust on private ownership has not been confined to the United Kingdom. Shortly after gaining power, the Whitlam Government appointed a Commission, under Justice R. Else-Mitchell, to investigate the question of land tenure. It may have been pure coincidence that the Commission came up with findings so close to the basic philosophy of the A.L.P. and the Fabian Society. The Commission was not restricted by any inhibitions, and unequivocally recommended the complete abolition of freehold.

The Stockowners Association of South Australia reported in the paper *Stockowners Digest* (April 1975) as follows:-

The first report of November 1973, found that the present ownership of land was unsatisfactory, and that existing controls were inadequate. It recommended that Government appointed Development Corporations should have full control of all development of land, and have power to acquire any land at a basic price, that would be arrived at, presumably by market value, less the cost of and enhancement by all development (of) the existing, e.g. road, lighting, water, sewerage, housing etc., and any other way in which land values might have been enhanced.

The Development Corporations would control or supersede such authorities as

the South Australian Planning Authority, the Lands Department, South Australian Housing Trust and Local Government.

Any part of a selling price of any property which could be attributed to any of conditions described above, would revert to the Development Corporation, for future development purposes.

It is also recommended that all privately owned land should revert to leasehold, with the possible exception of dwelling houses. This would be achieved by acquisition, and compensation paid on existing value, taking into consideration such developments as described above.

Should those Development Corporations become a fact, they would necessarily become a huge semi government instrumentality, requiring an extremely large staff, and control a great deal of money.

There would be no incentive for economy in either its planning or works, and no doubt would provide innumerable job opportunities for anyone with any of the various ideas on development, both serious and otherwise, which are appearing in our present-day society, as well as many jobs for the "boys" of all types. All this would be achieved at the expense of the present owners of land.

The Development Corporations would become so big and unwieldy that decisions would take so long to be processed, and the costs involved so great, that the cost of housing and development, would exceed by far those that exist at present.

This state of affairs could or would be a national disaster, and any proposals to bring these Development Corporations into being, and the principles involved, should be opposed at every opportunity.

The rural community would probably be the first involved and likely to be the hardest hit.

The dangers of all this should be recognised with the object of preventing these things getting off the ground.

These Development Corporations would be Government directed and controlled. Whenever such a body is incorporated on some matter they will refer to guide-lines laid down by Government, etc. If Government is requested to take action they will say that the Corporation is an autonomous body and they can do nothing.

In other words, these Corporations would have neither a soul to be damned or a behind to be kicked!

***

INFLATION AND HOME OWNERSHIP

At the time of the Else-Mitchell Commission, however, the attack had been directed on land used for productive purposes. Private homes had partly escaped - but only partly. The intensification of the inflation rate had an immediate effect on home ownership, resulting in a housing crisis. One effect was the increase in local government rates and land tax, to scales which constituted as heavy a penalty as the most vicious rent.

At the end of September 1975, the Victorian Minister for Housing, Mr. Dickie,

told a conference of the Victorian Building Societies Association that only the mass prefabrication of houses could give many Australians the chance to own their own homes. He said, "As Minister for Housing, I would never have expected three years ago that I would one day become an advocate of mass factory production."
He explained that the high cost of building and buying land had made it impossible for most people to have their own homes, and the supply of houses already built was fast running out. The same day that Mr. Dickie spoke, it was announced that, due to astronomical increases in building costs, rates, administration and maintenance costs, Housing Commission rates in Victoria would rise more than 33 per cent.

In early October 1975, the then Opposition spokesman on housing, Mr. J.E. McLeay, said that only wealthy people could afford to own their own homes. If present conditions continued, people would be forced to live in tents and shanty towns within 10 years. In illustration, Mr. McLeay said that, since 1972 the national figure of 93,000 people waiting for Housing Commission homes had risen to 120,000 but this was only the tip of the iceberg for those looking for accommodation to rent.
In the same period the percentage of people owning their own homes fell from 73% to 68%. Three years ago 90% of income earners expected to own their home with 80% of high-income earners owning one, and 55% of low-income earners. But with the cost of a modest house rising by $5,000 annually, the decline in home ownership will accelerate even more dramatically.

TWO CHOICES

There are two ways of tackling such a crisis. There is, firstly: the free enterprise policy of reducing housing costs by eliminating the cost factors - composed mainly of debt-charges and taxation – which have produced the current crisis. By eliminating inflationary costs, and increasing the purchasing power of the individual, the present results could be changed fairly quickly.

The alternative - the Fabian proposal - is to maintain the present crisis, offering government control as the only way out. It has always been grasped by Fabian planners, since the days of Political and Economic Planning PEP, that a financial squeeze was a good - and sometimes the only way to panic people into abandoning their freedom. It was well expressed by Dr. Jim Cairns in his book *The Quiet Revolution* when he said: "Revolution in an advanced capitalistic country can become a possibility only if there is a serious economic crisis."

HOME TAX PROPOSED

The Whitlam's Government's Priorities Review Staff P.R.S. then came up with the suggestion of an owner's Home Tax. The rental value of an owner-occupied home, the P.R.S. claimed, should be treated as part of the owner's income, and should be taxed accordingly. It was stated that the Government was missing out on $500 million in taxation by neglecting to tax home ownership. With solicitous concern, the P.R.S. worked out appropriate rates for the taxation of homeowners.

Mr. J. McLeay, spokesman on Housing for the Liberal/Country Party said there were two aspects to the P.R.S. Report which particularly worried him. One was that a home should be assessed for rental value, and that value, even though it was not earned should be added to a home-owner's income and taxed accordingly. This meant that a house worth $25,000 could have $36 a week added to the income, and the owner would be taxed on that. The other main aspect was that if anybody built a house of more than 12 ½ squares (116 square meters) they might be subject to an additional building tax. This also applied if a person added extensions to a home which made it bigger than 12 ½ squares.

Mr. McLeay, who was speaking on an Appropriation Bill in Parliament, said he strongly suspected the recommendations could become law. "This PRS staff has already prepared half a dozen reports for this Government, and many recommendations and suggestions are now enshrined in legislation", he said.

CLIMAX OF LONG-TERM PLANNING

It can thus be seen that the present crisis in Australia is the result of planning commenced long ago. The sabotage of home ownership is part of that plan. It is not enough to believe that the problem can be solved by a mere change of political parties. History has shown, in Australia and other countries that one party resumes where another leaves off. They only change course under threat of losing, or promise of gaining office.

TWO ARMS TO THE ATTACK ON HOME OWNERSHIP

Since the change of Government on December 13th, 1976, the introduction of a Homeowner's tax may have been shelved, although the Priorities Review Staff has not been changed. But the attack on home ownership is taking a more intense form with the growing crisis in Local Government. Rates in many areas of Australia have moved well past the ability to pay of ratepayers. 1976 and 1977 will bring this crisis to a head. Instances can be given of people leaving their homes - driven out by the rate notice.

The worst example of many is the Brisbane City Council, Australia's largest Local Government Authority in terms of numbers and revenue. The Motto of the Council - *"Meliora Sequimur"* - "We aim at higher things" has been taken too literally, and the Council has a debt completely out of control. The total rate revenue of the City is $5 million short of the requirements to pay debt and interest. To break even, the Brisbane rates will have to increase by 162%. Long before that point is reached, thousands of Brisbane families will have forfeited home ownership.

RATE INCREASES LEAD TO SOCIALISM

As pointed out earlier, the Fabians grasped early on that taxes could be used to force people into socialism.

A Shire Councillor returning from the Institute of Municipal Administration's

annual seminar in July 1976, reported as follows: (*South Burnett Times*, 7 /7 /76)

> " .. a hard hitting address at the seminar, the Commonwealth Grants Commission Chairman, Justice R. Else-Mitchell, had claimed that Local Government had lost its initiative. He had claimed that rates in many areas had not reached saturation point by a long way and there was ample opportunity for councils to pursue many areas of private enterprise and revenue raising ... "

It seems ironical that the man who presided over a Commission which advocated complete socialisation of land should have been made Chairman of the Commonwealth Grants Commission by a Liberal/National Party Government. Socialism is not confined by Party demarcation!

Strong and outraged opposition should be aimed at any advocacy of further rate increases at a time of Local Government and Rate crisis throughout Australia.

WHO DECIDES WHEN RATE INCREASES STOP?

If democracy means anything at all, it means that government is the servant of the people. It is the people who should decide how much is to be paid to Government. Talk of "saturation" in the level of rates is blatantly dictatorial. It is a deliberate policy aimed at the destruction of private ownership.

But it will continue as long as the people refuse to stand up for their rights. Local Councils will continue to take the path of least resistance, further penalising their ratepayers, until the ratepayers will no longer tolerate the situation. At that point - and not before - the tide will turn against socialism and a return to freedom will begin - if it is not too late.

Unless home-owners take the initiative, the time will come when they are offered financial relief – in exchange for their title deeds. It is an offer currently being made to farmers in the United Kingdom by a Fabian-controlled British Government. The same powers in Australia want YOUR home. How soon will it be before you decide to defend your rights? Decide now, while you still have time.

***

THE INSTITUTE OF ECONOMIC DEMOCRACY

(A Division of the Australian League of Rights)

The Institute is a non-party, non-profit making research organisation pledged to preserve free enterprise and individual freedom.

The policy of the Institute is to show quite clearly that Australia's present economic position in which all sectors suffer from a continually rising cost structure, bears no relationship to reality. We believe that Australia in terms of natural wealth, productive capacity, technical proficiency and creative initiative is one of the richest countries in the world. Far from reflecting this, the economic system, which should have showed that falling costs are the result of increased efficiency has whittled away the security of great industries and has fomented industrial unrest in the form of strikes and stopages amongst wage earners.

Our purpose is simple. We seek to provide research information on economic,

monetary and trade policies to all individuals, organisations and industries concerned with the threat of rising costs. We do so without fear or favour. Free-enterprise built Australia. It is worth preserving.
THE INSTITUTE ACCEPTS THE FOLLOWING AS FUNDAMENTAL TRUTHS:

- The true purpose of man transcends the economic environment in which he lives, and can only be sought through self development. Self development is impossible without genuine freedom of choice and the acceptance of personal responsibility.
- Personal and individual freedom is impossible without economic freedom.
- The true purpose of production is to satisfy those requirements of the individual consumer as freely designated by him.
- A system of private ownership and free competitive enterprise produces more efficiently the material requirements of the individual.
- ECONOMIC DEMOCRACY, which is consumer control of the production system, can only be exercised through a system in which the consumer can democratically select his own requirements without coercion, through the personal use of the "money vote."
- All monopolistic policies tend to undermine economic democracy.
- Decentralisation of economic and financial power is therefore essential for economic democracy.

Looking Forward, Looking Back By Arnis Luks

Reading Jeremy's article reinforces that the socialising of Australia is accelerating. Legislation introduced in June of this year by the Greens and supported by Labor, the *'Use of Vacant Land'* Bill, allowing government-entities to seize property deemed 'under-developed'. That could be 'your' backyard, or grandma's block in the burbs she has been saving for that rainy day, or the grandchildren's inheritance.

Like the Treasurer's Superannuation tax on unrealised capital-gains coming into effect from July 2025, coupled with massive rate increases from Regional Councils (which were supposed to reduce the costs of local government), these combined amplify the pressure being placed onto the householder and wage earner alike.

The Whitlam-era argument of 'potential' rental income, and the current Federal Labor Treasurer's argument of having 'unrealised capital-gains' wreak of the putrid 'boiling the frog' technique both Fabian Socialists and Liberal-Nationals utilise.

The family home does not generally derive any sort of income and therefore should be tax free and sacrosanct. They, (whoever government we vote in), impose a policy of swamping the nation with new arrivals which developed into the 'housing crisis' from which is the justification to threaten the tenure and security of the family home. They, (whoever government we vote in), then use the crisis to bring about further socialisation. They are both using the same technique.

The rot didn't start only with Whitlam, but it has certainly accelerated since the seventies under every government flavour.

Last week I mentioned *Lex Mercatoria*, as a body of rules and principles that transnational corporations and national governments can be bound to. *Lex Mercatori*a is not something the local businessman or corner shop-owner can refer to in order to achieve a favourable tax ruling. It is a set of rules and principles that favour the elite trans-nationalist Corporations. The elite are not subject to taxation departments and over fattened bureaucracies that interfere with every part of your life. No, that is only for the little people.

The United Nations was established predominately by communists active within the West. Our governments of the time willingly assisted with this establishment. The case was put that once the UN was established that would be the end of war. We haven't seen this in the real world. Since the Second World War America has been involved in so many incursions you could easily lose count, 469 since 1798, 251 from 1991-2022. ***https://geopoliticaleconomy.com/2022/09/13/us-251-military-interventions-1991/***

The world is not a safer place since the establishment of the UN. What we have is interference into most parts of our private and national lives by bureaucrats, even to the point where your own physical body is no longer sacrosanct. The latest UN finding being the need to make court judgments in regard to the effects of climate change on small nations by the failure to adhere to climate protocols by larger nations. The 'advisory opinion' was issued just yesterday:
https://www.icj-cij.org/sites/default/files/case-related/187/187-20250723-adv-01-00-en.pdf

Rules of evidence or scientific proof of 'cause and effect', no longer apply. Only lively judicial-imagination and reparation for those affected by 'any' weather event.

The policy of neoliberalism/libertarianism is one of smaller government - hence *Lex Mercatoria* for the elites. The dialectical policy of corporatised government for the little people - hence fascism/communism. This is the dialectic within dialectical-materialism at work, which is Marxism, which is communism. This isn't a figment of my lively imagination. It is being demonstrated with what is going on on the ground. You will own nothing and be happy, equates equally to Marx's *Communist Manifesto*: "Abolition of property in land, and application of all rents of land to public purposes." Both utterances coming from the mouth of capitalists - Marx was sponsored by the wealthy Engels. Likewise, Whitlam and others of this ilk are fabian socialists -fascists.

The current financial system which controls us all is rigged to suit the central-banksters. The system is not self liquidating - the debts progressively get higher and higher. Again, this isn't a figment of my lively imagination it is a demonstrable fact.

https://worlddebtclocks.com/

The debt clock illustrates in numerical form the progressive indebtedness of every nation. Inflation, as a deliberate policy, accelerates that indebtedness.

'If you spend $1,000,000 a day it would take you 2,438 years and 7 month to spend all Australia debt.'

Under Which King? By CH Douglas

There is no single aspect of political economy which deserves more attention, and receives less, than the nature of an order. Like so many other matters of importance and subtlety, most people understand so little of the subject that they are practically unaware that it presents any problem, still less a problem on which the whole structure of society depends. The immense success of mediaeval civilization (and its ultimate failure) can be seen to be linked with one conception of an order and the sanctions which sustained it; the different, but notable achievements of the nineteenth century, and the chaos which has succeeded that short-lived adventure, are plainly the outcome of another. The problem is often stated by the use of the word "sovereignty", and we have an indication of that identity in the title of the gold coin which ruled the nineteenth century, the English sovereign, as well as in the declared intention to remove national sovereignty to an international centre.

Superior Law

The essence of medievalism (often, it may be noted, referred to as the Medieval Order) was the existence of the Church as a sanction, as an organization for making effective certain checks and balances upon the use of physical force to carry an order from its utterance to its execution. The Church claimed to be, and was to quite a considerable extent, a living body of Superior Law, not different in intention, but far higher in conception than the Constitution of the United States and it is important to notice that the breakdown of nineteenth century English prosperity can be seen in retrospect to be contemporaneous with the decadence in social prestige of the village parson.

Now the nature of the problem presented to political economy, as distinct from ideology, by an order, is simply this. Either Brown gives orders on his own behalf, or Mr. Pink-Geranium gives them for him. That someone has to give orders on Brown's behalf is not in dispute. And the decision between these two courses is ultimately dependent on which source of authority succeeds in making 'results' most accurately and rapidly eventuate from orders, in reasonable identity between specification and product. The problem is complicated for Mr. Pink-Geranium by the fact that he has no one but Mr. Brown to whom to give orders, and Mr. Brown is convinced that it is more blessed to give than to receive.

There was a period, say between 1850 and 1914, in which the economic aspect of this problem was in a fair way to solution. The gold sovereign was a complete order system. Mr. Brown had only to tender his yellow warrant of sovereignty and he got what he wanted. He set in motion the most marvellous train of self-acting psychological sanctions. Factories sprang to life, trains ran, and ships sailed, all concerned not merely to do his will, but to do it better than anyone else. It is quite irrelevant to this particular argument that a large and increasing number of Mr. Browns had no sovereigns; it is a fact of history that the man who had one always

wanted two, and in consequence, if every Mr. Brown had possessed a sovereign it would still have been effective. It is perhaps unnecessary to observe that the virtue of the gold sovereign lay not in its material but in its sanctions.

Political Sanction

Now the political equivalent of the gold sovereign is the vote, and the merest glance at our life and times is sufficient to establish the conclusion that it fails to work. There is nothing in the possession of a vote which remotely approximates to the power of choice and the certainty of delivery enjoyed by Mr. Brown with his golden sovereign in the latter days of the nineteenth century. No one outside the walls of a mental hospital would contend that the individual voter gets what he votes for, or voted for what he is getting. So obvious is this that the greatest difficulty is experienced in getting people to vote at all. The vote costs nothing: and it is worth precisely what it costs. If it cost ten shillings to vote, now many voters would be registered?

But the matter does not end there. While the political vote is valueless to the individual, it enables the Satanic Powers to claim a mandate which in fact does not confer, and which it is powerless to enforce. This situation is so satisfactory that the ballot-box is a cardinal provision of the World State, and it is clear for any ordinary intelligent person to see that it is the intention - and in Britain the rapidly developing fact - that the economic vote will be destroyed in its nineteenth century effectiveness, and substituted by the political vote as exercised in Russia.

Fraud and Usurpation

It is urgently necessary to realize these matters because they dominate our future. British Governments now hold office by a trick; no British Government has any genuine mandate.

Our whole political system is not merely irrational, it is a fraud and a usurpation. We have allowed the vicious nonsense which derided the values established by a thousand years of unique political experience to destroy in our name every safeguard against tyranny provided by historic continuity in the Three Estates, (the clergy, the nobility, and the commoners-ed), and we welcome the people who spawn this nonsense when they desert the Europe they have wrecked. Nothing can save us but a drastic de-hypnotisation. It is coming, but it may kill us.

***

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

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

A/c Title Australian League of Rights (SA Branch)
BSB 105-044
A/c No. 188-040-840
Postal Address: PO Box 27, Happy Valley, SA 5159.
Telephone: 08 8322 8923 eMail: heritagebooks@alor.org
Online Bookstore : https://veritasbooks.com.au/
Our main website of the Douglas Social Credit and the Freedom Movement "Archives" :: https://alor.org/
On Target is printed and authorised by Arnis J. Luks 13 Carsten Court, Happy Valley, SA.

Who is Important? By Neville Archibald

Ask your children who is the most important person in the world. I am sure most would answer, "Mum"! (Poor old dad would probably come in second!).
A child doesn't need to think very hard to make that decision, they depend on the parents at this early age, later on after much exposure, they may refine it or question why; but, the change is more likely to be about learned perception than a true consideration. As an individual we depend mostly on our immediate community, and then the community we call country or nation. All of our life needs are subject to the health of this family, and their unity of purpose.

What is the aim of life? This would be the next question to ask. The fundamentals of our existence must serve some purpose, otherwise we are just adrift, sailing by the winds of the blow hards, who will push us into slavery: to toil for them!
Read your history! It is littered with examples of this.

In the form of a current question, is your aim the pursuit of monetary wealth? Needed to ensure a later version of you (at retirement) can enjoy old age? Or is it wealth in terms of a life well lived, shared and passed on. In trying to achieve this, are you coerced into playing the "fight for money game".

The Classic tale of Scrooge, in 'A Wonderful life', puts this question in it's proper place. Who doesn't want to spend the significant part of their lives around loved ones, sharing the richness that such a life can bring; rather than just the cold hard feel of coin and a vague promise of a future you may not even live to see. The cold hard things that money can buy, remain just cold hard things unless you are able to joyfully share them with those you love.

If I am sounding to you, a bit like a person in a middle age crisis questioning the meaning of life, perhaps it is you who should be wondering why you are thinking this way. These questions do get asked and should be asked more often in my opinion.

It is very easy for Hollywood to fictionalise and trivialise these deeper meanings, it makes a good setting for stories. The inescapable fact however, is that these meanings of life are some of the most important ones we can study, they are the basis of our satisfaction, our contentment. Every time you are confronted by a complication in life (another person or persons making a claim on you), your decision is going to be based on this meaning. A mixture of morals and life's intent (not simply just a selfish, 'what do I get out of it'). Without this grounding and a reasonably clear direction backing your desired aim, you cannot hope to resist those winds of change, the foul breath of the blow hards.

After all this moralising about the pursuit of monetary wealth over and above that of family wealth, perhaps expand your thoughts a little wider: community wealth.
If you are to consider the purpose of economics, our representation of wealth, it also must be subject to these basic moral principles, or as a mass population we will be manipulated.

The rules of the "game of life", those by which we are forced to play, will be dictated by Scroogisms? Is that a word? To me it is definitely a concept! The pursuit of life and its end goal is not the amassing of a fortune, or how much wealth you can capture, surely it is in the living of life itself, and the living of it more abundantly. As we were promised in the Bible: John 10:10. What other concept of life fits the bill for our ultimate aims.

If your bent is fishing, you work hard to buy a good boat, rods, bait, a ute to tow it all, licences to fish where you want. The advertisers lure you in, to compete in being the most well equipped. At some point though, you just need to cast a line and fish. Spending your life earning enough to buy everything you consider necessary to be 'the best' is not actually fishing. You may have been better off with just a bamboo pole and worms, sitting on a log by the river. Bragging of the big ones that got away while eating those that didn't, with your mates. Isn't that what fishing is about?

I see economics as no different. In our lives we wish to pursue our desires – diverse as they are. The means of achieving that, are just that, a means! Money is part of the equation, for it enables us to interact with others to obtain our wants and needs. It truly serves no other purpose than that, it should remain equal to the real wealth that earned it (be it labour or material). Any manipulation of the value of this money, by hedge funds, stock-market or other forms of gambling, just short changes the rest of us. The terms, inflation and interest, at first glance seem a normal part of financial life; but, once studied you will realise they are really reactions to an (intentionally) faulty economic system.

We ignore the bigger questions of life at our own peril. The continued increase in taxes, the continued increase in legislation to give rise to the excuse for more taxes, the increasing punitive controls for disobeying the legislation, are all a function of the dire need for money by our government. The total of their taking, never ever decreases one term to the next, the amount of control over us never decreases either, always there is a push for more. These things will continue apace, forever into the future unless we stop to ask those hard questions of ourselves. We will then be in a position to know what it is we are asking for. Until that time the ever more restrictive government of the day will continue to provide us with answers they wish us to believe will help. In the last fifty years they haven't, in the next fifty they won't either unless we push them. To do that we must clearly see what we want.

What is Economics?

Oxford dictionary calls it : the branch of knowledge concerned with the production, consumption, and transfer of wealth.

Historically it was denoted as the science of household management (and expanded out to include larger groups, regions or countries).

Many of the further definitions that pop up in google or the like, now mention scarcity or, the system for deciding how scarce resources are used. Incorporation of this idea suits the current climate of fear about the future, leading us to believe in higher prices, higher taxes and an increased expectation that things will not be so

rosy in the future. The exact opposite of how it should be if we are ever increasing our ability to produce more with less labour. You should note the emotive language use when researching topics, it is usually a giveaway that you should look carefully at it, for it may not be as factually based as it should be.

While economics is not all about money, the very money we use to relate to it, is our point of interaction, it is where the rubber meets the road so to speak. Economists will tell us it helps us to understand our direction in coming years, if only we can understand trends and market conditions. One of its biggest disadvantages is its non-replicability. A bit like all that climate modelling, as much as they put in data and attempt to interpret the results, it is near impossible to precisely predict an outcome.

Public trust in economics as it stands today is low, the two competing schools of thought, Keynesian and Free-market, both suffer from forecasting problems. In fact one recent study, "looked at the longest running survey of professional forecasters and found that while forecasters were, on average, 53% confident in their predictions, they were right only 23% of the time."

'Economic Forecasts Are Crucial, Yet Often Wrong – The Horizon Tracker'.
https://adigaskell.org

I find it interesting, to say the least, that this 'so-called' science wallows it way forward in every country (and globally) with continued boom and bust cycles and ever increasing debt, yet never seems to turn its auditing powers on itself. We see continued re-enactment of past policies, even though they failed last time.
I see it like a spray painter, painting a car, he mixes colours over and over to get the perfect tint, but is still surprised when it washes off in the rain. The colours are making no difference, but he keeps trying, hoping to succeed in the end. Sadly he doesn't look at the type of paint to find out that maybe using water-soluble paint is his problem.

https://alor.org/Storage/Library/Dobbs_G-Who_Was_CH_Douglas.htm
and
https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Lee%20J%20-%20CH_Douglas.pdf

C.H.Douglas attempted to show leading economists of his time where they were going wrong. He had studied the production and consumption figures for over one hundred companies and found that there was an inequality between how much money was given out in wages, dividends and salaries, and how much was produced to be consumed. This disparity was not an isolated event and in fact continued into all of the current economic thinking of the day. Believing he could help fix this problem (with it's wide reaching and potentially devastating consequences) he went to them and explained his theory. It was at this point that he discovered that none of this was accidental, it was all by design, they did not want to fix the problem, it suited them just fine.

What have we seen since then? Only a continued use of the same faulty system, which is intended to take us further down the path of control.

This capturing of our true wealth and using it against us, to make us "own nothing" and be subject to a greater power, that of some form of global government; should, by now be easy enough to see. They have not been hiding their intentions, as I said before, a quick look at all those increases in control over us over the past fifty to one hundred years (even more in fact) should stand out to even the most reluctant of you.

Douglas wrote extensively on the issues facing us and the means of correcting this decline in our freedoms. Many others have also spent much of their lives in the pursuit of getting this knowledge out far and wide. A great resource of material is available for anyone who wishes to take the time to ask those 'middle age crisis' questions. But please be aware that gazing at your navel and uttering calming sounds will not change a thing, you may end up more at peace; but your lives and that of your progeny will be in pieces.

Douglas CH - The Control and Distribution of Production

This booklet contains a fairly in depth commentary on the elements of economics and it's real life applications. Included are some speeches and articles made in the early years of social credit. The chapters on world politics may be dated, but with a little thought (and possibly an updating of your history knowledge) you can trace some of our present woes, back to some of those observations. World politics has not changed much, it still uses the same tired old techniques to dominate. The league of nations, the Balfour agreement, etc are mentioned. Things which have had long lasting impacts on us; many, part of the genesis of the problems we face still today.

Douglas_Speaks

Another booklet, written in 1933, seeks to address the faulty monetary system and find a way to return us to a more accurate economic security which enriches all mankind. Just the first chapter alone (World in gold chains, 5 pages) gives a solid outline of why the monopoly of the banking fraternity is giving rise to "we will own nothing …" and why it is occurring.

https://alor.org/Storage/Library/Douglas%20CH%20-%20The%20Use%20of%20Money.htm

A short article that seeks to "de mesmerise" people from the idea that money is the same thing as wealth and goods and services. That it is simply a reflection of effective demand (or should be). He uses the explanation of railway tickets and the absurdity of running the system with half the seats empty, simply because the printer of these tickets somehow decides there are too many. This disconnect between real world and current economic process is discussed.

https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Douglas%20CH%20-%20A-B-and-the-Bankers-CH-Douglas-New-Age-1925.pdf

Once you have a grip on the fact that there is a problem, The A+B theorem goes into further depth on the arithmetic of economic accounting. In mathematics, all things must balance out: the equal sign is not just a pair of lines with no meaning. How is this related? Once again we must look at current economic process, when all the world is in debt: all the world is on one side of that equation? Are we all supposed to believe that 2+2 = 7?

All these and more are essential reading to anyone who wants to see a better world.