



- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

IN THIS ISSUE

- 2 Video: 'We Are Your Enemy'
- 2 When Will the *Australian People* Say: Thus Far, But No Further?
- 3 Let's Look Back On the 1951 Referendum Proposals
- 4 How The Us 1st Amendment Was hijacked By Corporations
OZ Plain Packaging Feud Disrupts EU-US Trade Treaty
- 5 All Does Not Bode Well for Post-Mandela's South Africa
- 5 How Fares Russia's Post Communism 'Democracy'?
- 6 Basic Fund
- 6 The Machine Stops Series
- 7 To Begin To Uphold and/or Regain Our Freedoms, Our Rights
- 7 Letter to Senator Cori Bernardi
- 8 Heritage Bookshop Services and VERITAS Books Online

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK

"In Part 1 of this two-part analysis, we considered the relationship of these forces to World Revolution, the integrated human machinery involved, well-expressed in the "Mattoid" syndrome, and the way in which the virus, the spores of Marxist-Leninist revolutionary philosophy, formerly enshrined in Soviet politico-Military Doctrine, are continuing to weave a path through Western society(2). It is worth taking a look at what Paul Kingsworth wrote in the context of the corporate world in the United States under the title "In My Own Words", in *Resurgence*, No. 227, November-December, 2004.

Corporations gained the rights of "persons" in a series of controversial court decisions in the Nineteenth Century, in which corporate lawyers successfully, if bizarrely, argued that the constitutional rights which guaranteed the freedom of American citizens applied to American companies too. From then on, there was no looking back. Today, American companies regularly claim constitutional rights to increase their power and evade their responsibilities. They use the Fourteenth Amendment, to the United States Constitution - written to protect the "life, liberty or property" of freed slaves - to evade laws aimed at protecting people from corporate abuses. They use the Fourth Amendment - the right to be secure from government interference - to avoid inspections of their property. And they use the First Amendment - the right to free speech - to protect corporate donations to political parties, and the funding of political advertisements..."

-- "Control and Nature of the Coming World Order" On Target Britain, October 2004.

<http://www.alor.org/Britain/Control%20and%20Nature%20of%20the%20Coming%20World%20Order%20Part%202.htm#1a>

TARGETS FOR THE WEEK

Target 1. High priority; Get your council to withdraw support from ECLEI. This is UN AGENDA 21 in action. It is an open attack on private property rights!

Target 2. From The Australian "The Education Minister, Christopher Pyne, is seeking a blueprint by mid-year to overhaul the curriculum, warning that the rise of "remedial" classes at universities proves the depths of the problem in Australian classrooms. Vowing to restore an "orthodox" curriculum, Mr Pyne will today name author and former teacher Kevin Donnelly and business professor Ken Wiltshire to lead the review." The type of education received by future voters is what will shape this Nation, remembering there is little time between High School and enrolling as a voter Make you views known to the Education Minister and send copies to your local member and State Senators.

Target 3. From The Australian again, "The Financial System Inquiry, which will be conducted during 2014, will

provide an interim report to the federal government in September 2014, and a final report in December 2014." Sixteen years ago we had the Wallis Enquiry and 32 years since Sir Keith Campbell undertook a major investigation into Australia's financial system. In 1937 there was a Royal Commission into Australia's financial system. You are urged to contact your local member and request information as to how you can add your voice to the inquiry. Make sure you also ask for copies of any Ministerial Statements and ANY other information that will help you make some input... you will not be invited so MUST INTRUDE and after the three previous enquiries' this could also be an illusion of concern by the government.

Do not be intimidated by the 'terms of reference' but make your input fit in so you cannot be ignored. The BIG question... will they ever get it right without more debt and taxes?

We live in a 'democracy' so RAISE YOUR VOICE to be heard. ND.

America now a Classic Fascist State

"We are not your enemy because we wish to be. We are your enemy because you have left us no choice..."

The United States – a Corporate Gulag controlled by an International Elite—<http://ppjg.me/2013/12/23/we-are-your-enemy/>

Comment by US Citizen: This may well be one of the most "to the Point" presentations of how our government views us, and how we view them. Those in government are not part of "We The People"..... they have by their actions and words, declared us, the public, to be enemies of the fascist's that have overthrown our Constitutional Republic.

Some points made in the video:

- America's judiciary is corrupt
- America's governments have caused revolutions to install puppet regimes worldwide
- American government's corporate masters feed on the carcasses of nations and install brutal dictators
- Thus making more profit for the

military/industrial complex, commodity corporations and of course the governments' gods are the bankers

- American governments have stolen trillions of dollars from the American people to bail out corrupt financiers and gamblers of Wall Street

- And trillions more of the people's wealth has gone to domestic and foreign banks

Closing industrial plants here and relocating overseas – our money paying for our people to be thrown out of work. Mussolini the father of Corporatism said that Fascism should more properly be called Corporatism – the joining of corporate greed and government power over the people.

Wallace Klinck comments on the video:

A very impassioned and all too justified presentation. Those who seek power rarely know bounds and they are usually inclined to push to limits which can no longer be tolerated by ordinary citizens, eventually ensuring their downfall. How long will it take the American public to deal with their internal cancer one cannot with accuracy predict—but obviously the process is developing. If America can again lead the way this may bring a reversal also of the power-centralizing policy at work in other nations. I would not include Austrian Economics as a factor deserving of any credit to revival but most of what the speaker has to say seems quite sound.

WHEN WILL THE AUSTRALIAN PEOPLE SAY: THUS FAR, BUT NO FURTHER? by Betty Luks

Chris Berg in "Australia's March To Free Speech Has Begun" *The Drum* 31st December, 2013 would have us believe the recent "The High Court's decision in Unions NSW vs New South Wales is one of the most significant decisions for democracy and human rights in Australian history", he sees the High Court decision as "on par with the 1951 decision which quashed the Communist Party Dissolution Bill".

"It reveals a High Court inching - slowly, reluctantly, unhappily - towards a full-

blown recognition of the human right to freedom of speech and freedom of association: the sort of uncompromising liberties expressly found in United States' First Amendment...

The decision was released just before the Christmas break. The High Court found that the New South Wales ban on organisations donating to political parties and third party political campaigning were invalid, as they violated the constitution's implied freedom of political communication..."

He continues: "The court's reasoning went like this. The Australian Constitution is a democratic constitution. A democracy is predicated on the free flow of communication about political issues. Therefore the document is predicated on the existence of some form of freedom to talk about politics - a freedom of political communication..." Berg has dressed it up as: "... it's about protecting political communication - and political communication alone - from legislative interference."

<http://www.ipa.org.au/news/3028/australia%27s-march-to-free-speech-has-begun>

According to the Museum of Australian Democracy Old Parliament House website:

"When Menzies swept into power at the federal election in December 1949, his policy included the banning of the Communist Party. The coalition's Communist Party Dissolution Act 1950 became law on 20 October 1950. The Act included three measures to deal with communism:

1. The Communist Party was declared to be an unlawful association and, as such, was to be dissolved, its property forfeited without compensation.
2. The Governor-General was authorised to declare bodies (such as trade unions) communist affiliates. The Governor-General could declare these bodies unlawful, satisfied that their existence was prejudicial to Australia's security and defence.

The Governor-General was authorised to declare a person as a communist and engaged, or likely to engage, in activities prejudicial to Australia's security and defence. Effectively, such a person could not be employed by the Commonwealth. Furthermore, such a person could not hold office in a labour union or industry vital to Australia's security and defence. The Communist Party and several unions launched an immediate challenge in the High Court, former attorney-general in the Curtin and Chifley Labor governments, Dr H.V. Evatt, appearing for the Waterside Workers Federation. On 9 March 1951 the High Court, by a majority of 6 to 1, ruled the Communist Party Dissolution Act 1950 unconstitutional. In summary, the High Court decided that because Australia was not in a state of war the government did not have the power to proscribe organisations.

Moreover, the Act prevented the Communist Party and its members from disproving allegations made against them. The High Court ruled the threat posed by the party did not warrant the imposition of such peremptory legal penalties. The Menzies government then put the issue to the people via a constitutional referendum on 22 September 1951, seeking to change the constitution to give Parliament the power to ban the Communist Party. For such a change to the Constitution to succeed the referendum had to pass with a double majority, in accordance with Section 128 of the Australian Constitution. This meant that a majority of all electors nationally would have to vote yes, and a majority of states would have to vote yes, for the change to become law..."

LET'S LOOK BACK ON THE 1951 REFERENDUM PROPOSALS

Source: *The New Times*, August 17, 1951-Page 3.

A Critical Examination of Referendum Proposals, by L. G. DeGaris

Under the heading, "A Layman Looks At the Referendum," Mr. L. G. DeGaris, of Geelong, a man who has made a deep study of constitutional matters, has issued a circular in which he poses some very important questions concerning the Federal Government's proposed Constitutional Amendment. Mr. DeGaris writes:

The Referendum Bill proposes that the Constitution be altered by inserting after section fifty-one the following section: — "51 A. —(I) The Parliament shall have power to make such laws for the peace, order and good government of the Commonwealth with respect to communists and communism as the Parliament considers to be necessary or expedient for the defence or security of the Commonwealth or for the execution or maintenance of this Constitution or of the laws of the Commonwealth.

"(2) In addition to all other powers conferred on the Parliament by this Constitution and without limiting any such power, the Parliament shall have power—

(a) to make a law in the terms of the Communist Party Dissolution Act 1950— (i) without alteration; or (ii) with alterations, being alterations with respect to a matter dealt with by that Act or with respect to some other matter with respect to which Parliament has power to make laws;

(b) to make laws amending the law made under the last preceding paragraph, but so that any such amendment is with respect to a matter dealt with by that law or with respect to some other matter with respect to which the Parliament has power to make laws; and

(c) to repeal a law made under either of the last two preceding paragraphs.

"(3) In this section, 'the Communist Party Dissolution Act 1950' means the proposed law passed by the Senate and the House of Representatives, and assented to by the Governor-General on the twentieth day of October, One thousand nine hundred and fifty, being the proposed law en'titled 'An Act to provide for the Dissolution of the Australian Communist Party and of other Communist Organisations, to disqualify Communists from holding certain Offices, and for purposes connected there-with'.

He sees:

i. The 'powers' sought are 'red powers';
ii. A yes vote is a red vote for revolution party-line legislation.

iii. A no vote is a vote against 'powers' of party-line government by regulation.

A yes vote would put a proposed new section into the Constitution regardless of the form of the question on the ballot paper. (emphasis added...)

A no vote would call upon Parliament to seek and to find an alternative to the 1950 invalidated Act, within the present powers of Parliament, or within a referendum amendment that would keep the safe-guards that now limit party-line legislation, and allow the States to function on a truly federal basis in the spirit of self-government.

Why is the saving phrase: 'SUBJECT TO THIS CONSTITUTION' which limits ALL present powers, omitted from the proposed new section 51A. If the omission is without significance, why make the omission? If the omission has significance, what is the impact on constitutional process?

If the proposed new section 51A is drafted to override the safeguards against party-line legislation which invalidated the Communist Party Dissolution Act 1950, what becomes of those safeguards against party-line legislation under the proposed new section 51A, if adopted into the Constitution?

Paragraph (1) of the proposed new section 51A is neither for nor against Communists or Communism. It seeks power 'with respect to Communists or Communism.' If one asks: "Is not that so with all powers of legislation?" the layman says:

"No. Present powers are all subject to this Constitution, until altered by referendum, and the proposed new section omits that saving phrase."

Paragraph (2) of the proposed new section 51A seeks 3 'powers' (a) to re-enact the 1950 Act, with or without alterations; (b) to amend; (c) to repeal: invoking all present and new powers without limiting them.

If adopted, the proposed new section 51A would enable Parliament to ignore paragraph (2), and to rely on paragraph (1), or to use paragraph (2) to the extent of its 'powers' and then to rely on paragraph (1) which would remain an effective power fortified by the preamble in paragraph (2) and the implications of the (a), (b) and (c) clauses of that paragraph.

If the proposed new section 51A is drafted to override limits to the powers

of Parliament which invalidated the 1950 Act, its impact is intended to lift the limits as PARLIAMENT may consider necessary or expedient, not only for defence or security of the Commonwealth, but for execution or maintenance of THIS CONSTITUTION as if amended, or of the laws of the Commonwealth including the laws made, re-enacted, amended, or repealed, under the new limitless power if adopted WITH RESPECT TO communists or communism, either for or against undefined 'ists or 'isms; or WITH RESPECT TO some OTHER matter within the powers of Parliament sought to be brought into the Constitution or invoked by the proposed new section 51A.

The prevailing notion of regular elections rests on sections of the Constitution to which all present powers are subject: but, if adopted, the proposed new section 51A would override any section that Parliament considered to be a limit on its powers sought under the proposed new section 51A.

The invalidated 1950 Act is clear evidence of present safeguards against party-line legislation, but if the proposed new section 51A were to override these safeguards it is clearly a proposed new constitution within the framework of the old, but to which all the old Constitution would be subject, if the new proposed section 51A be adopted.

Such powers could, and if adopted into the Constitution, would be applied on party-line consideration of necessity or expediency.

Executive power and responsibility are now established for the execution and maintenance of the Constitution. Why a reference to those powers in the new proposed section 51A not subject to the safeguards so far prevailing?

The proposed new section 51A amounts to assailing limits to all the present powers of Parliament and adding those powers to new powers sought in the proposed new section 51A.

The layman sees, it is hoped not mistily, that the purport of the proposed new section 51A is to give sovereign powers to transitory federal parliaments on party-line legislation with respect to undefined 'ists' and 'isms'.

All State Constitutions, all State legislation, current and new, are subject to the Constitution.

The new proposed section 51A, if adopted, would be an overriding part of

(Continued on page 4)

the Constitution.

The layman looks to the referendum ballot to reaffirm the faith professed in the preamble to the Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act: "Whereas the people . . . humbly relying on the blessing of Almighty God, have agreed . . ." to safeguard religious profession and

practice; free trade, commerce and intercourse; trial by jury; rights of appeal; State Laws for liquor-traffic; peaceful international affairs; finance agreements; and especially to rely on the spiritual protection enshrined in the true function of the Commonwealth, under the Constitution, and under the Crown, of righteousness, against invasion." (emphasis added...ed)

Information about the Australian Electoral system and Referendums is available from the AEC.

Write to your local member and request a copy of the Australian Constitution. Read more here...
<http://www.alor.org/Library/AustralianElectoralCommission.htm#1a>

HOW THE US 1ST AMENDMENT WAS HIJACKED BY CORPORATIONS

Just 'google' US Corporations and the 1st Amendment and you will come up with many websites dealing with the issue. Here is just one. After reading the following ask yourself - is it not time that Australians insisted our governments governed according to the Commonwealth Constitution and our system of law, based as it was upon English Common Law?

(Political parties for the first time 'got their foot in the door' of the Constitution when the proposal for Casual Senate Vacancies was passed in the 1977 referendum.)

"The Right to Evade Regulation" by Tim Wu:

Every time you fill a prescription at a drug store like Walgreens, the pharmacy keeps a record of the transaction, noting information such as your name, the drug, the dosage, and the issuing doctor. It's a routine bit of bookkeeping, and for a long time it raised few eyebrows.

Then a firm called IMS Health starting buying up the data. Mining pharmacy records, the company assembled profiles of hundreds of thousands of American doctors and millions of individual patients, with names and other identifying details encrypted.

IMS Health turned around and sold access to those files to pharmaceutical companies, making it easier for the firms to target (and reward) the physicians most likely to prescribe expensive, brand-name drugs.

Eventually, doctors and state officials caught on to what IMS Health was doing.

Where the company saw a business opportunity, they saw a strategy that violated patient privacy and could increase health care costs. Three states—New Hampshire, Maine, and Vermont—decided in 2006 and 2007 to ban pharmacies from selling prescription records for commercial purposes. By late 2010, 26 other states were considering similar measures.

Had the issue remained subject to a normal democratic process, it would have continued to play out that way—through a gradual, state-by-state debate about whether so-called "prescription confidentiality" laws make for good policy. But IMS Health did not want that kind of fight. Instead, it filed separate suits against the three states that had first cracked down on its business, invoking the First Amendment. ***The selling of prescription records, the company asserted, is a form of free speech.***

For most of U.S. history, such a claim would have been a dead letter in court. But when it comes to the First Amendment, we live in interesting times. In June 2011, the Supreme Court struck down the new data-protection laws, arguing that they discriminated against IMS Health. "The State," wrote Justice Anthony Kennedy for the majority, "has burdened a form of protected expression. ... This the State cannot do."

Independent Political Spending by Corporations Shielded by Bill of Rights!

It was Kennedy, of course, who authored Citizens United, which established that independent political spending by corporations is shielded by the Bill of Rights as well. The IMS Health case, which drew much less attention, shows just how pervasive such free speech arguments have become. Once the patron saint of protesters and the disenfranchised, the First Amendment has become the darling of economic libertarians and corporate lawyers who have recognized its power to immunize private enterprise from legal restraint. It is tempting to call it the new nuclear option for undermining regulation, except that its deployment is shockingly routine.

- Last summer, the tobacco industry used the First Amendment to have new, scarier health warnings on cigarette packaging thrown out on the grounds that the labels constituted a form of

compelled speech.

- Ratings agencies like Standard and Poor's and Fitch, whose erroneous and possibly fraudulent AAA ratings of worthless securities helped cause the banking crisis, have leaned heavily on a defence that deems their ratings mere opinions and therefore protected by the First Amendment.

- The U.S. Chamber of Commerce is pushing to gut the disclosure requirements in new securities regulations, citing the free speech rights of hedge funds and publicly traded companies.

- Attorneys working for Google have argued that, since search results are speech, its rights are impinged by the enforcement of tort and antitrust laws. Southwest and Spirit airlines have employed the First Amendment to resist efforts to force them to list the full price of tickets. The incomplete, misleading cost, they have argued, is a form of free speech, too.

Fred Schauer of the University of Virginia calls such claims "First Amendment opportunism". Free speech is a cherished American ideal; companies are exploiting that esteem, as he puts it, "to try to accomplish goals that are not so clearly related to speech."

The co-opting of the First Amendment has happened slowly, but not at all by accident.

First, it was helped along by questionable court decisions. Today, it is being accelerated by a strange alliance between two groups: a new generation of conservative judges, who have repudiated the judicial restraint their forebears prized, and legendary liberal lawyers, like Floyd Abrams and Laurence Tribe, who, after building their reputations as defenders of free speech, are using their talents to deploy it as a tool of corporate deregulation.

OZ PLAIN PACKAGING FEUD DISRUPTS EU-US TRADE TREATY

ABC Radio National: Wednesday 8 January 2014. "Australia's plain packaging stoush with the tobacco industry has created policy ripples in some unexpected places, as members of the European Parliament use the Australian stand-off to argue against a free trade agreement with the United States.

The decision by tobacco giant Philip Morris to take legal action against the Australian government has caught the attention of the European Parliament, which is using the legal wrangle to pour cold water on a trade deal currently under negotiation between the EU and the United States. Many in Europe are concerned that once

the deal is reached, legitimate health and social policies could then attract legal action taken on the part of aggrieved corporations, and opponents are using Australia's clash with Philip Morris as an example of how badly things can go wrong."

<http://www.abc.net.au/radionational/programs/breakfast/oz-plain-packaging-feud-disrupts-eu-us-trade-treaty/5189866>

ALL DOES NOT BODE WELL FOR POST-MANDELA'S SOUTH AFRICA

"... These are all unfortunate symptoms of a deep institutional rot that can be traced back to the founding of South Africa's democracy. As in the cases of Chile and Turkey, its transition was guided by a constitutional framework that gave outgoing oligarchs -- in this case, apartheid

leaders -- an upper hand in new democratic life. A complicated institutional arrangement gave outgoing elites veto power over policies that threatened their political and economic interests. Though apartheid leaders have faded into the background, the legacy of

their transition bargain with the ANC still haunts South Africa's democracy. Mandela was fully aware of the tradeoffs implied by the bargain he and the ANC struck with the Apartheid regime. The inequality was by design..."

Read further... http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2014/01/03/south_africa_unequal_by_design#sthash.JsUPkg8M.dpbs

HOW FARES RUSSIA'S POST COMMUNISM 'DEMOCRACY'?

Alexander Solzhenitsyn summed up Russia's situation in 1997: " Democracy in the unarguable sense of the word means the rule of the people -- that is, a system in which the people are truly in charge of their daily lives and can influence the course of their own historical fate. There is nothing of the sort in Russia today..."

The authorities operate on a moral imperative: We don't betray our own and we don't uncover their wrongdoing. So the fate of the country is now decided by a stable oligarchy of 150 to 200 people, which includes the nimbler members of the old Communist system's top and middle ranks, plus the nouveaux riches.

This is no tree of state grown up from roots but a dry stake driven into the ground or, as things now stand, an iron rod. The members of this oligarchy combine a lust for power with mercenary calculations. They exhibit no higher goals of serving the country and the people.

It could be said that throughout the last 10 years of frenetic reorganization our Government has not taken a single step unmarked by ineptitude. Worse, our ruling circles have not shown themselves in the least morally superior to the Communists who preceded them. Russia has been exhausted by crime, by the transfer into private hands of billions of dollars' worth of the nation's wealth. Not

a single serious crime has been exposed, nor has there been a single public trial. The investigatory and judicial systems are severely limited in both their actions and their resources...

Was it so long ago that we thought there could exist no more absurd and unwieldy bureaucracy than that of the Communist regime? But during the last 10 years, the bureaucracy has doubled and tripled in size, all of it supported at the expense of a nation that is being reduced to beggary. **Local Self-Government:** When a people is deprived of local self-government and when rights are neither guaranteed nor defended, those with the most initiative and talent can find few outlets for their creative powers, stonewalled by bureaucracy at every turn...

The so-called economic reforms -- Mikhail Gorbachev's between 1987 and 1990, then Mr. Yeltsin's from 1992 to 1995 -- are another problem. Having noisily proclaimed the slogan of perestroika, Mr. Gorbachev was probably concerned with smoothly transferring party personnel into the new economic structure and safeguarding the party's own funds. He took no steps to create small- and middle-level private manufacturing, though he did wreck the system of vertical and horizontal links in the existing Communist economy, which, though it worked badly did work.

In that way, Mr. Gorbachev opened the door to economic chaos, a process

further improved by Yegor T. Gaidar's "reform" and Anatoly B. Chubais's "privatization". Genuine reform is a coordinated, systematic effort combining numerous measures aimed at a single goal. But from 1992 on, no such program was ever declared. Instead, there were two separate actions, which were not coordinated with each other, let alone with the economic benefit of the country. One was Mr. Gaidar's "liberalizing of prices" in 1992. The lack of any competitive environment meant that monopolistic producers could inflate costs of production while at the same reducing its volume and the outlays for it. This sort of "reform" quickly began to destroy production and, for much of the population, made consumer goods and many food items prohibitively expensive.

The other action was the frenzied privatization campaign.

The campaign's first step was the Government's issuing of vouchers to each citizen that supposedly represented his "share" of all the national wealth accumulated under the Communists. ***In reality, the total value of all the vouchers represented only a small fraction of 1 percent of that wealth.***

The second step was the sell-off, not to say give-away, of a multitude of state enterprises, including some gigantic ones. Those enterprises ended up in private hands, most of the new owners people

(Continued on page 6)

(Continued from page 5)

seeking easy profit, with no experience of production and no desire to acquire any.

Russia's economic chaos is made worse by organized crime, which, never nipped in the bud, is constantly stealing the country blind and accumulating enormous new capital. The gap between the rich and the impoverished majority has now assumed proportions unlike anything seen in the West or in pre-revolutionary Russia. Each year, no less than \$25 billion flows abroad into private accounts.

The destructive course of events over the last decade has come about because the Government, while ineptly imitating foreign models, has completely disregarded the country's creativity and particular character as well as Russia's centuries-old spiritual and social traditions. Only if those paths are freed up can Russia be delivered from its near-fatal condition." This was translated from the Russian by Richard Lourie.

<http://www.alor.org/Library/WhatkindofDemocracy.htm#1a>

THE MACHINE STOPS Series by Arnis Luks

I worry for the next generation. They do not see the debt avalanche and chaos that awaits them. Complicit media, church leaders and politicians combined have deliberately set us onto this path to financial slavery - all self-justifying statements by me. By only making these statements and nothing else will it resolve the problems of the world for generations to come? It is now up to me to do something. What I can do; I now must do. You cannot rebuild a society without understanding what previously worked well. Alfred (called the Great) boasted whereby woman or child could safely travel from one end of his kingdom to the other without fear. If this was so, what did they have that we do not. Faithful dealings amongst people is a good start. In this house we call faithful dealings the social credit of our community.

Recently our family celebrated our Mother's 80th birthday. Beneath all the greetings and talk we all held the deepest respect for what she had done with her 80 years. Our family is fortunate to have inherited a legacy of understanding of the Christian Faith, what it is and what it should stand for. This did not come from any pulpit but from many years of dedicated study and scholarship to clarify what the church fathers and thinkers of the past had revealed. Mother's University is life and life more abundant.

OnTarget was first published in 1965 and Father, a regular subscriber to it from these early days held a public meeting at the local hall to hear ED Butler speak on the Soviet military threat in the South Pacific. ED Butler also spoke of the military aid to the Soviet Union set up by the western industrial powers as an orchestrated event. It did not happen by chance but as a result of policy. We look today at the whole world in turmoil with the build up of China and India and the rampant pillaging of the Middle East, Africa, Asia and South America and acknowledge that this also is a result of policy.

What humbug and madness has besotted us?

What they could do (my parents); they have both been doing or done their whole life.

BASIC FUND:

We have commenced the new year well. Our very loyal and generous supporters have brought the Fund up to \$9, 910.66. Thank you. Please keep the momentum going.

My Father's Tools

We honour those that have gone before, And smoothed the pathway that we tread.
Their tools were crude, their road was rough, But faith and courage led them on.

Our factories now are silent, Our children out of work.
They'll never learn the joy, Of tools or hard days toil.

Our leaders all, have sold us out, Our Churchmen lost their way.
The lies of mammon rule Oz now, Truth they dare not speak.

Thirty Pieces of silver was paid, For the one who spoke of truth.
What price today for the lies we are told, What price a nations betrayal?

Where the Spirit of this Great South Land, Who led our fathers on?
Who bid them search and strive and toil, A better land to leave.

Shall we to our sons bequeath Slaves to mammon be?
Or will we break the chains of men For freedom once again?

So in my father's tools I see, A lesson for us all.
Faith for tomorrow for our kin, Relies on Truth employed today.

-- David Bruce Smith 2013

Other works by David Bruce Smith
<http://www.alor.org/blog/categories/listings/works-by-david-bruce-smith>

"ON TARGET" is printed and published by The Australian League of Rights, 145 Russell St., Melbourne.

Postal Address: GPO Box 1052, Melbourne, 3001. Telephone: (03) 9650 9749, Fax: (03) 9650 9368.

Subscription \$45.00 p.a.

TO BEGIN TO UPHOLD AND/OR REGAIN OUR FREEDOMS, OUR RIGHTS

Looks like its 'Back to Basics' – how do we know where we want to go till we determine where we came from? In the League of Rights basic course "Social Dynamics" is the foundational statement:

"Policies Rooted in Philosophies: Before we can study any type of policy, irrespective of whether it be political, economic or financial, it is first essential to understand that all policies stem from philosophies.

It is interesting to note that the words policy, politics and police have a common root, each stemming from the word "power". "Policy" might therefore be described as the purpose to which power is directed. The question of the purposes to which power might be directed, and whether the individual should have real independence to make choices concerning the use of power, goes right to the very core of the problem of the

individual living in society.

How power should be used involves the question of philosophy. An individual's philosophy is what he believes, his conception of reality, what he believes about the nature of man, his purpose, his relationship to his fellow man and the Universe. "By their fruits ye shall know them.... It is still impossible to get figs from thistles"...

The development of representative government in the English-speaking world was originally based upon the conception of the individual possessing basic inviolable rights which no government could take away from him. The philosophy underlying this concept is Christian. It is significant that one of the leading figures at the Island of Runnymede, England, when King John was forced to sign the famous Magna Carta*, was Bishop Stephen Langton,

who insisted that even the King must obey a rule of law rooted in the Christian philosophy.

The famous English constitutional authority, Sir William Blackstone, pronounced upon Magna Carta as follows: "It protected every individual of the nation in the enjoyment of his life, his liberty, and his property, unless declared forfeited by the judgment of his peers or by the law of the land."

It was also Blackstone who wrote in 1760 that "Herein consists the true excellence of the English Government; that all parts of it form a natural check upon each other."

* 2015 marks the 800th year since the signing of Magna Carta by King John at Runnymede. We need to go back to our roots – and fight once more for our basic freedoms!

Make the effort to study "Social Dynamics" here... <http://www.alor.org/Library/Social%20Dynamics.htm#1a>

LETTER TO SENATOR CORI BERNARDI

Before publishing the following letter I note I had hoped to receive a response from Senator Bernardi. The letter was written on 27th November 2013; I thought five weeks was long enough for a response, but no such response has appeared.

Senator Cori Bernardi: Dear Sir, I recently received an advance notice from Connor Court Publishing about your new book, "The Conservative Revolution". The advert for your book states:

"This volume reminds us that conservative principles — not the populist whims of the left - generate enduring stability, success and strength. That is why we need a conservative revolution..."

"Bernardi's work courageously promotes the conservative cause and sets out a path to a better Australia through a commitment to faith, family, flag, freedom and free enterprise..."

"He takes the fight to the political left and calls for an overturning of the existing moral relativism that threatens Australia's way of life..."

I am genuinely intrigued as to what you mean by such words as 'conservative' and 'free enterprise'. It has been my experience over the years that people have various, confusing definitions of

such words, or terms, and it has proved nigh on impossible to take part in a meaningful political / philosophical discussion with other interested parties because there is no common definition of terms.

One glaring example of what I am referring to is your term 'left' as though only the 'right' had concerns for faith, family, flag, freedom and free enterprise! And what of 'moral relativism'? Are you limiting the question of 'morals' to the bedroom, or have you included lying, cheating, stealing, in your idea of 'morals'?

What do you mean by 'free enterprise'? Do you not think there would be many folk on the 'left' who have a commitment to faith, family, flag, freedom and free enterprise? Sir, are you not indulging in political dialectics when you imply folk on the 'left' do not have as much faith and patriotism as you — I presume of the 'right'?

I know what the words once meant but I am intrigued as to what they now mean

to you. Would you please indulge me by setting out your definitions so that I can grasp where you are coming from?

Finally, your wish to "protect and defend the traditional institutions" reminds me of G.K. Chesterton's advice that we should measure *temporal* institutions against *eternal* institutions to see if the temporal institutions don't 'come up wanting'.

He used the dirty nit-infested hair of a little girl in very poor circumstances as the measure. The little girl's hair was of the eternal institutions and the traditional institutions were not serving her needs.

Yours sincerely, Betty Luks (Mrs)

27th November 2013.

Hmmm... afterthought, maybe Senator Bernardi thinks I should buy his book if I want to find out his definitions of key words... Or, maybe I will simply look at the Liberal Party's 1949 Statement of Beliefs to get a better idea of the philosophy that first motivated them...BL

Dear Reader, You too are encouraged to write to Senator Bernardi; he is supporting our institutions instead of tearing them down.

Please keep in mind that you will not get any more joy out of his colleagues and certainly a lot less from Labor and Greens. ND

Please note: Prices quoted are inclusive of postage/handling charges ONLY within Australia.

Cheques/Money Orders by ordinary mail are to be made out to 'Heritage Bookshop'. Veritas Books now carries over 70 titles of CD's and DVD's... and you may now subscribe to "On Target" and "New Times Survey" online.

NATIONAL SEMINAR "DOWN TO EARTH" DVDs NOW AVAILABLE

1. **Mr Adam Vosey, "Roseneath Organics"**: Sat and watched the Adam Vosey DVD recently. Well worth having in your library. Adam relates his own experiences to what he now understands of the world of plants and herbs in relation to the human body. You won't look at your own garden in the same light again after listening to Adam Vosey.

2. Hon Ann Bressington MLC "Agenda 21"

3. Mr. Matthew Quinn "SA Composters"

Price: \$12.00 each posted or Set of 3 DVDs for \$30.00 posted.

Also... "New Home Economics" by Frances Hutchinson
Set of 2 - \$18 posted.

THREE NEW TITLES:

"Grace and Mortgage: The Language of Faith and the Debt of the World" by Peter Selby, the President of the National Council for Independent Monitoring Boards. He was previously Bishop of Worcester, Bishop to HM Prisons and a Church Commissioner.

"This book has largely been about the violation of the conditions of the economy of exchange, such that it no longer shows that it takes place within the gift economy of God. The violation of the poor at home, of debtor nations abroad, and of the planet we share, are signs of an economy of exchange that does not know itself as inhabiting an economy of gift, that is oblivious to its conditionality, and that it therefore is unable to give and receive genuine gifts, the gifts of God and one another.

An economy of exchange that no longer dwells within the realm of gift turns into one in which exchange is itself dishonoured, and in which there is space neither for the gift nor the graciousness that are essential to the experience of God. In such a debased economy all becomes contract, and broken contract at that. It is to such a world that Christ came as Gift from the Giver, a Jubilee from Nazareth, to renew the gift and to call for a response: the remission of the debts that had accrued, the remission of the debts of those who had been violated by an exchange economy that had in its turn forgotten the condition and purpose for which it had been given." – Peter Selby. Price \$38 inc. p/h.

"Decoding Mammon, Money as a Dangerous and Subversive Instrument" by Peter Dominy: He has served as missionary in Nigeria for fifteen years before pastoring two parishes in the UK. He is an Emeritus Canon of Chichester Cathedral.

The book is a condensed version of the author's PhD thesis for the University of Exeter, approved in 2011, entitled "De-Coding Mammon: Money in Need of Redemption," which is available on the university Web site (to which readers are referred for a more detailed treatment of the subject) at <http://hdl.handle.net/10036/3065>

"Decoding Mammon" is an exposition of the negative assessment of money implied in Jesus' statement: "You cannot serve God and Mammon". On the basis of the theology enshrined in the Old and New Testament and in the long-term tradition of the church, it is claimed that problems associated with money do not arise simply from the way it is used but from the nature of money itself.

Despite the fact that money has enabled great economic development, and in contrast with the general consensus of governments, economists, and many theologians that money is either a positive or neutral instrument, the book seeks to show that money is a deeply flawed instrument, created by fallen human beings, and fashioned over the years to suit the interests of those in power rather than the needs of people in general. It is argued that money should be allowed to operate within severe restrictions, and that any reformulation of the global economy as a result of the recent financial crisis needs to be based on this understanding. Price \$37 inc. p/h.

"Taxing Air: Facts & Fallacies About Climate Change" Price \$30.00 inc. p/h.:

The book is not written by "alarmists", nor is it by "deniers" - it is by SCIENTISTS - it tells what science observed so far. "Taxing Air" will answer many questions about the CLIMATE, there is an urgent need to be informed and open the debate. Firstly, find out: do we need a TAX dictated to us by UN to fix a problem... what problem? You may ask why tax air? Are we polluting? **No! Carbon Dioxide is Not a Pollutant!** Over the last 500 million years, the levels of CO2 in the atmosphere, has varied between about 0.5% (5,000 ppm) and 0.03% (280 ppm). Ice core studies have shown that changes in ancient atmospheric carbon dioxide level persistently lag parallel changes in temperature by up to 1,000 years. That temperature leads carbon dioxide, in this case by up to 200 years, is well documented in recent ice core study (2013). The points considered are of physical effect, but **the molecule is also the key for one of the most crucial biological function of furnishing plants with the essential material they need for photosynthesis. Carbon dioxide is a plant food**, it underpins all plant growth.

To the degree that presently increasing concentrations of carbon dioxide might cause mild warming - and noting that our planet is currently traversing a short warm interval in an extended series of glaciations - more carbon dioxide is likely to be beneficial. Where plant growth is concerned, 'however likely' has nothing to do with it, for it is certain that moderate increases in carbon dioxide beyond present levels (say to a doubling or tripling) will enhance plant productivity; combined with which, plants use water more efficiently at higher carbon dioxide levels. Recent studies have estimated that between 1989 and 2009 about 300,000 km² of new vegetation became established across the African Sahel region in parallel with the increasing levels of atmospheric carbon dioxide. In other words, the recent increases in carbon dioxide have helped to green the planet and feed the world.

"The Precariat" by Guy Standing, Professor of Economic Security at the University of Bath, UK. Price \$45.00 inc. p/h. – Limited copies in stock – reprint due April 2014

The Precariat is an emerging class, comprising the rapidly growing number of people facing lives of insecurity, moving in and out of jobs that give little meaning to their lives. Guy Standing argues that this class is producing instabilities in society. Although it would be wrong to characterise members of the Precariat as victims, many are frustrated and angry. This important and original book brings out the political dangers, so clear in contemporary America, of failing to address the insecurities of the Precariat. It also suggests the way forward: a reconstruction of the concept of work.

-- Eileen Applebaum, Center for Economic and Policy Research, Washington DC, USA