

**Original:**

<http://www.alor.org/NewTimes%20Survey/Why%20Can't%20We%20See%20the%20Wood%20for%20the%20Trees.htm>  
2008-08-14

**Link here:** [http://blog.lege.net/content/Why\\_Cant\\_We\\_See\\_the\\_Wood\\_for\\_the\\_Trees.html](http://blog.lege.net/content/Why_Cant_We_See_the_Wood_for_the_Trees.html)

**PDF "printout":** [http://blog.lege.net/content/Why\\_Cant\\_We\\_See\\_the\\_Wood\\_for\\_the\\_Trees.pdf](http://blog.lege.net/content/Why_Cant_We_See_the_Wood_for_the_Trees.pdf)



THE AUSTRALIAN

LEAGUE OF RIGHTS

**"All that is necessary for the triumph of evil is that good men do nothing"**  
*Edmund Burke*

On Target from Australia    Political Democracy    Newtimes Survey    Economic Democracy    Race, Culture and Nation

Library

On Target from Britain

BankWatch

Triumph of the Past from  
USA

Booklist

## New Times Survey

[Archives](#)

### Why *can't* we see the Wood for the Trees?

by Betty Luks

March 2007

The *Wood* represents the finer details of the knowledge of the Laws of Life governing the Tree. The Tree is symbolically the Body-Social man has built up over the centuries and which is once more 'near unto death' because of its diseased condition.

#### **Clifford Douglas wrote of the two education systems from which we learn about the Tree:**

Under the heading of 'Static and Dynamic Sociology' [1] he wrote: "The two systems in the Public Schools (Private Schools in Australia) are the Classical and the Modern sides, and have their equivalent Triposes and Honours Schools in the universities. One of these systems is Aristotelian, the second is Baconian."

Douglas could see that considered separately the two systems were incompatible. The classic system is the embodiment of an attractive and artistic concept of society and spells out the conditions under which this *ideal* society lives and moves and has its being, whereas, the modern system in essence has nothing to do with ideals at all.

This system's backbone is that of *inductive* natural science, "based upon the experimental ascertainment of fact. It refuses to admit as fact anything which cannot be demonstrated, and, as a theory, anything which does not fit the facts." Douglas saw that the effect of these two philosophies on the Body Social couldn't but fail to be disruptive.

#### **The Classical and Modern effects**

Douglas could see that "the classical ideal lays emphasis of any observed defects in the social organisation on defects in the characters of the persons composing the society. Wars occur because people are wicked, poverty because people are idle, crime because they are immoral."

Whereas, material progress, in essence applied Science, is repulsive to the Classical mind, because it stultifies the rigid Classical ideal. Conversely, the scientific attitude tends to the opposite extreme, towards what is called Determinism. "People's actions, thoughts, and morals are the outcome of more or less blind forces to which they are subjected, and consequently, both censure and praise are out of place." Douglas thought that "as in many controversies there is a good deal to be said for both points of view, but it is even more probable that approximate truth lies in the appreciation of the fact that neither conception is useful without the other."

Poor miserable creature that I am. If greater minds than mine cannot bridge this yawning chasm between the two systems of education, where can I turn? But wait, all is not lost. Adelaide folk were privileged to hear Archbishop John Hepworth of the Anglican Catholic Communion give an address on "The Contribution of Greek Thought to

Western Christian Civilisation", where he explained the importance of Greek thought in the development of the Christian Faith.

Therefore, this debate should be of interest to all, including Christians who are social crediters.

### **The Scientific Ethos**

In an address to the University of Regensburg last September, Pope Benedict reminisced about his teaching years at that university. If I have understood his paper correctly he says there is a need to bridge that yawning gap between the two systems, and observes:

"The scientific ethos... is... the will to be obedient to the truth, and as such, it embodies an attitude which belongs to the essential decisions of the Christian spirit. The intention here is not one of retrenchment or negative criticism, but of broadening our concept of reason and its application. While we rejoice in the new possibilities open to humanity, we also see dangers arising from these possibilities and we must ask ourselves how we can overcome them..."

"Modern scientific reason quite simply has to accept the rational structure of matter and the correspondence between our spirit and the prevailing rational structures of nature as a given, on which its methodology is based..(But) The West has long been endangered by this aversion to the questions which underlie its rationality, and can only suffer great harm thereby. The courage to engage the whole breadth of reason, and not the denial of its grandeur - this is the programme with which theology grounded in Biblical faith enters into the debates of our time..."

In the days when the university was made up of ordinary professors, the various chairs had neither assistants nor secretaries, but in recompense there was much direct contact with students and in particular among the professors themselves."

He mentioned that despite the specialisations which at times made it difficult to communicate with each other "we made up a whole, working in everything on the basis of a single rationality with its various aspects and sharing responsibility for the right use of reason - this reality became a lived experience."

So there was a time when the various faculties communicated with each other. But he is now concerned there is a "call for the de-hellenisation of Christianity, a call which has more and more dominated *theological* discussions since the beginning of the modern age."

He sees three stages in this programme of de-hellenisation and "two principles which are crucial" for the issue raised.

**First**, only the kind of certainty resulting from the interplay of mathematical and empirical elements can be considered scientific. Anything that would claim to be science must be measured against this criterion. Hence the human sciences, such as history, psychology, sociology and philosophy, attempt to conform themselves to this canon of scientificity.

"**A second point**, which is important for our reflections," he noted, "is that by its very nature this method excludes the question of God, making it appear an unscientific or pre-scientific question. Consequently, we are faced with a reduction of the radius of science and reason, one which needs to be questioned."

He continued: "...it must be observed that from this standpoint any attempt to maintain theology's claim to be "scientific" would end up reducing Christianity to a mere fragment of its former self."

### **What about the human questions?**

"But we must say more: if science as a whole is this and this alone, then it is man himself who ends up being reduced, for the specifically human questions about our origin and destiny, the questions raised by religion and ethics, then have no place within the purview of collective reason as defined by "science", so understood, and must thus be relegated to the realm of the subjective.

The subject then decides, on the basis of his experiences, what he considers tenable in matters of religion, and the subjective "conscience" becomes the sole arbiter of what is ethical. He warned: "In this way, though, ethics and religion lose their power to create a community and become a completely personal matter. This is a dangerous state of affairs for humanity, as we see from the disturbing pathologies of religion and reason which necessarily erupt when reason is so reduced that questions of religion and ethics no longer concern it. Attempts to construct an ethic from the rules of evolution or from psychology and sociology, end up being simply inadequate." [2] (sub-headings and emphasis added)

Others have posed such questions as we know. C.H. Douglas for one. Nearly one hundred years ago the world's problems presented similar seemingly insurmountable difficulties desperately needing answers.

On the vast subject, editor of *On Target*, New Zealand, Bill Daly, wrote in his Introduction to Michael Lane's review of Dr. Tom Robertson's book "*Human Ecology*":

"(Bacon's) Inductive Method made possible greater boldness in the advance of certain of the sciences... Bacon was not anti-authority. He upheld the legitimate institutions of government and the Church. But he rightly insisted that preconceived attitudes, based only on established practises, must be tested against reality and if found wanting then changed or superseded. This brings us to the heart of the social, economic, political and scientific problems of modern mankind."

### **Thomas Robertson a Scottish doctor did just that**

Dr. Robertson had read Douglas and had grasped the importance of the disruptive influences of the two systems of education. Like Bacon, Robertson sought the primary causes of the unhealthy Body Social looking past the symptoms to grasp the facts about the primary causes.

He set out to examine the Body Social's institutions, the social mechanisms, using the Hellenic-Deductive Method which emphasised, as observed by Douglas in "Social Credit": "any observed defects in the social organisation are defects in the characters of the persons composing the society. Wars occur because people are wicked, poverty because people are idle, crime because they are immoral."

Robertson, as a medical doctor and homeopath, likened the Body Social to a boy who displayed the symptoms of gluttony, laziness and a penchant for 'sweeties'. On examining the boy in more detail by the Inductive-Baconian Method, and ascertaining the facts, found the causes for his gluttony, laziness and craving for sweets were to be found in his diabetic condition.

### The social mechanisms

Robertson, examined the real objective of the social mechanisms, including the Church as a social mechanism, and insisted the Church also must re-examine its attitude to the boy, to the Body Social, because it was 'sick unto death' and the Church was also treating the symptoms and not the causes.:

### Robertson wrote [3]:

"No section of the organised Christian church has grasped the vital fact that men's relations are no longer direct and personal but are conditioned by the interposition of social mechanisms; and therefore all, even Christians automatically serve the ends towards which these (social) mechanisms operate, no matter whether these ends are known or otherwise, and no matter what the moral or spiritual status of those who use them...

The majority of clergy...state that human conduct cannot be changed without first changing human nature, or, as it is often put, changing men's hearts.

A corollary of this view, *which is very important*, holds that there is nothing wrong with our social mechanisms and that if men were only good enough, these mechanisms would work perfectly. The whole of this book is based on the thesis that it would not matter how good men were, the money, political, or any other existing social mechanisms, would in the long run achieve the same results as they achieve now."

Whilst writing this article I received two phone calls from folk within the farming community. They just wanted to talk with me because they know I understand their desperate plight. Not only are many areas still in the grip of this heartbreaking drought but none of Australia's social mechanisms are geared to help them in the basic causes of their plight.

Oh yes! The leaders will appear to be concerned about those farmers 'on a knife edge' not knowing which way to turn. They will even offer more band aids such as crisis management help - but change the objective, the policy of the mechanism? Treat the causes? NO! NEVER!

Those with the power and influence to set about changes to the mechanisms would rather see the Body Social disintegrate than give up their privileged positions based upon the present social set up.

No matter how hard the farmer works, no matter how many long hours he puts in, no matter how much he produces in the good times, the social mechanisms are so geared that he will not be able to 'put by' for such seasons. The financial mechanism is geared to force him further and further into debt until in such a desperate plight he will welcome some multinational who wants to take over his farm as some type of 'saviour'.

The *political* mechanism is geared to foster and shepherd the sell-off of the nation's (the people's) assets and resources to the alien and foreign business/financial mafia and is controlled and directed by the *financial* mechanism.

What can be done in the circumstances? We offer no magical cure but all hope is not lost. One hundred years ago Charles Ferguson foresaw the problems we now face, but he also encouraged his readers to look past the Trees and see the Wood.

The review of his books by Michael Lane in "Charles Ferguson: Herald of Social Credit" could be the start of a new way of thinking for you. Seeking the 'social credit'; the 'faithful dealings', the mutual love and co-operation from and between your families, neighbours and friends, you could be part of the survival and regeneration of this once great South Land of the Holy Spirit.

In the meantime, the social mechanism - the Church - set up to Shepherd the souls of the flock needs to realise the Body Social is dynamic not static and must re-examine its own position. The flock is being ravaged by the ruthless financial and political wolves and is virtually Shepherd-less.

### References

1. "Social Credit": 'Static and Dynamic Sociology' by C.H. Douglas, 1924.
2. Pope Benedict's address to the University of Regensburg is online at ZENIT.
3. "Human Ecology: The Science of Social Adjustment", Thomas Robertson 1948.

### Further essential reading

- § "Charles Ferguson: Herald of Social Credit," by Michael Lane: \$12.00 posted
- § "An Introduction to Social Credit," by Bryan W. Monahan: \$6.00 posted
- § "Social Credit," by C.H. Douglas: \$15.00 posted
- § "Human Ecology and Social Credit: The Legacy of Tom Robertson," by Michael Lane: \$10.00 posted
- § "Releasing Reality," by Eric D. Butler: \$7.00 posted - from all Heritage Book Services.

### DVD or Video essential viewing:

We highly recommend the DVD or Video "**The Contribution of Greek Thought to Western Christian Civilisation**" by **Archbishop John Hepworth**.

The Archbishop wove a brilliant word picture, a panorama, of the development of Mankind over the centuries and in particular dealt with "The Contribution of Greek Thought to Western Christian Civilisation".

**The DVD or Video will be available in the near future from Heritage Book Services, P.O. Box 27 Happy Valley SA 5159. Advance orders taken. Price: \$18.00 posted.**

**Audio Tapes: Audio Tape copies of Archbishop John Hepworth's address are now available from Mayo Tapes, P.O. Box 6, Hahndorf SA 5245 - one copy \$6.00 posted.**

---

## Global Warming: The Cold, Hard Facts?

by Timothy Ball,

5/2/07:

"Global Warming, as we think we know it, doesn't exist. And I am not the only one trying to make people open up their eyes and see the truth. But few listen, despite the fact that I was the first Canadian Ph.D. in Climatology and I have an extensive background in climatology, especially the reconstruction of past climates and the impact of climate change on human history and the human condition." Few listen, even though I have a Ph.D. (Doctor of Science) from the University of London, England and was a climatology professor at the University of Winnipeg." For some reason (actually for many), the World is not listening.

### Here is why.

What would happen if tomorrow we were told that, after all, the Earth is flat? It would probably be the most important piece of news in the media and would generate a lot of debate. So why is it that when scientists who have studied the Global Warming phenomenon for years say that humans are not the cause nobody listens? Why does no one acknowledge that the Emperor has no clothes on?

Believe it or not, Global Warming is not due to human contribution of Carbon Dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>). This in fact is the greatest deception in the history of science. We are wasting time, energy and trillions of dollars while creating unnecessary fear and consternation over an issue with no scientific justification. For example, Environment Canada brags about spending \$3.7 billion in the last five years dealing with climate change almost all on propaganda trying to defend an indefensible scientific position while at the same time closing weather stations and failing to meet legislated pollution targets.

No sensible person seeks conflict, especially with governments, but if we don't pursue the truth, we are lost as individuals and as a society. That is why I insist on saying that there is no evidence that we are, or could ever cause global climate change. And, recently, Yuri A. Izrael, Vice President of the United Nations sponsored Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) confirmed this statement. So how has the world come to believe that something is wrong?

Maybe for the same reason we believed, 30 years ago, that global cooling was the biggest threat: a matter of faith. "It is a cold fact: the Global Cooling presents humankind with the most important social, political, and adaptive challenge we have had to deal with for ten thousand years. Your stake in the decisions we make concerning it is of ultimate importance; the survival of ourselves, our children, our species," wrote Lowell Ponte in 1976.

I was as opposed to the threats of impending doom global cooling engendered as I am to the threats made about Global Warming. Let me stress I am not denying the phenomenon has occurred. The world has warmed since 1680, the nadir of a cool period called the Little Ice Age (LIA) that has generally continued to the present. These climate changes are well within natural variability and explained quite easily by changes in the sun. But there is nothing unusual going on.

### Global trends now indicate a cooling

Since I obtained my doctorate in climatology from the University of London, Queen Mary College, England my career has spanned two climate cycles. Temperatures declined from 1940 to 1980 and in the early 1970's global cooling became the consensus. This proves that consensus is not a scientific fact. By the 1990's temperatures appeared to have reversed and Global Warming became the consensus. It appears I'll witness another cycle before retiring, as the major mechanisms and the global temperature trends now indicate a cooling.

### Universities dogmatic and oppressive

No doubt passive acceptance yields less stress, fewer personal attacks and makes career progress easier. What I have experienced in my personal life during the last years makes me understand why most people choose not to speak out; job security and fear of reprisals. Even in University, where free speech and challenge to prevailing wisdoms are supposedly encouraged, academics remain silent.

I once received a three-page letter that my lawyer defined as libellous, from an academic colleague, saying I had no right to say what I was saying, especially in public lectures. Sadly, my experience is that universities are the most dogmatic and oppressive places in our society. This becomes progressively worse as they receive more and more funding from governments that demand a particular viewpoint. In another instance, I was accused by Canadian environmentalist David Suzuki of being paid by oil companies. That is a lie. Apparently he thinks if the fossil fuel companies pay you have an agenda. So if Greenpeace, Sierra Club or governments pay there is no agenda and only truth and enlightenment?

### A civilised - not political - debate is needed

Personal attacks are difficult and shouldn't occur in a debate in a civilized society. I can only consider them from what they imply. They usually indicate a person or group is losing the debate. In this case, they also indicate how political the entire Global Warming debate has become. Both underline the lack of or even contradictory nature of the evidence.

I am not alone in this journey against the prevalent myth. Several well-known names have also raised their voices. Michael Crichton, the scientist, writer and filmmaker is one of them. In his latest book, "State of Fear" he takes time to explain, often in surprising detail, the flawed science behind Global Warming and other imagined environmental crises.

Another cry in the wilderness is Richard Lindzen's. He is an atmospheric physicist and a professor of meteorology at MIT, renowned for his research in dynamic meteorology - especially atmospheric waves. He is also a member of the National Academy of Sciences and has held positions at the University of Chicago, Harvard University and MIT. Lindzen frequently speaks out against the notion that significant Global Warming is caused by humans. Yet nobody seems to listen.

### **The consensus was reached before the research began!**

I think it may be because most people don't understand the scientific method which Thomas Kuhn so skilfully and briefly set out in his book "The Structure of Scientific Revolutions." A scientist makes certain assumptions and then produces a theory which is only as valid as the assumptions. The theory of Global Warming assumes that CO2 is an atmospheric greenhouse gas and as it increases temperatures rise. It was then theorized that since humans were producing more CO2 than before, the temperature would inevitably rise. The theory was accepted before testing had started, and effectively became a law.

As Lindzen said many years ago: "the consensus was reached before the research had even begun." Now, any scientist who dares to question the prevailing wisdom is marginalized and called a skeptic, when in fact they are simply being good scientists. This has reached frightening levels with these scientists now being called climate change denier with all the holocaust connotations of that word. The normal scientific method is effectively being thwarted.

Meanwhile, politicians are being listened to, even though most of them have no knowledge or understanding of science, especially the science of climate and climate change. Hence, they are in no position to question a policy on climate change when it threatens the entire planet. Moreover, using fear and creating hysteria makes it very difficult to make calm rational decisions about issues needing attention.

### **Yes, but is it true?**

Until you have challenged the prevailing wisdom you have no idea how nasty people can be. Until you have re-examined any issue in an attempt to find out all the information, you cannot know how much misinformation exists in the supposed age of information.

I was greatly influenced several years ago by Aaron Wildavsky's book "Yes, but is it true?"

The author taught political science at a New York University and realized how science was being influenced by and apparently misused by politics. He gave his graduate students an assignment to pursue the science behind a policy generated by a highly publicized environmental concern. To his and their surprise they found there was little scientific evidence, consensus and justification for the policy.

You only realize the extent to which Wildavsky's findings occur when you ask the question he posed. Wildavsky's students did it in the safety of academia and with the excuse that it was an assignment.

I have learned it is a difficult question to ask in the real world, however I firmly believe it is the most important question to ask if we are to advance in the right direction.

*Dr. Tim Ball, Chairman of the Natural Resources Stewardship Project ([www.nrsp.com](http://www.nrsp.com)), is a Victoria (Canada)-based environmental consultant and former climatology professor at the University of Winnipeg. He can be reached at [letters@canadafreepress.com](mailto:letters@canadafreepress.com)*

Subscribe to *The New Times Survey* today! For just AUSD\$25.00 you will receive 12 copies each month by mail.

---

## **BOOKS**

### **"Dumbing Down," by Kevin Donnelly:**

This is one for all parents (as well as for the grandparents, aunts and uncles, to introduce to the busy parents). It is by an experienced teacher and academic Dr. Kevin Donnelly and is about the 'dumbing down' of the public education system so that Johnny never develops his skills to read and write well and think critically. "Dumbing Down" It is a revealing study of just what effects outcomes-based and politically correct education has had on our younger generations and Western Culture. Softcover, 230 pp. Price: \$29.95 posted.

### **"Brainwashed for War: Programmed to Kill" - Matthias Chang's latest book.**

If you have read Chang's earlier book, "Future Fastforward" you will realise his latest one is a must read also. He deals with such urgent issues as: The Zionist Global War Agenda; The Military-Industrial-Media complex propaganda behind the Cold War, the Vietnam War and the War on Terrorism. More than anything there is a crying need for informed and effective citizens to help bring rogue governments back into order. Softcover, 521 pp. Price: \$57.95 posted.

### **\*"Future Fastforward" available from all Heritage Book Services for \$48.00 posted.**

"New Times Survey" is published by the Australian League of Rights, Box 1052. G.P.O. Melbourne 3001.

*(In accordance with Title 17 U.S.C. Section 107, this material is distributed without profit to those who have*

*expressed a prior interest in receiving the included information for research and educational purposes.)*