



- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Print Post Publication Number 10000815

Vol. 53 No. 21

2<sup>nd</sup> June 2017

#### IN THIS ISSUE

The Psychology of Prohibiting Outside Thought by James Reed	1
Peterson on 'One Of The Most Dangerous Canadian Institutions'	2
The Trojan Horse of 'Constitutional' Recognition by Nigel Jackson	2
Letter to The Editor	4
Unemployment Rubbery Figures by James Reed	4

#### THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: IN 1934 DOUGLAS WARNED OF AN EVEN GREATER TYRANNY

I will put the objective as I see it for your consideration in a very general form and that is, we want to establish a correct relationship between the individual and the group so that the group, and the attributes of the group shall serve the individual and not the Individual be the slave of the group.

#### The Proper Relationship Between the Individual and the Group

The whole of society exists from my point of view - it may not be yours - but from my point of view the whole of society exists for the benefit of the individual. ... The great danger at the present time is not that the present financial system will persist ... but that under the confusion that will exist as a result of the crises caused by the breakdown of the financial system, an even greater tyranny may be put over on you as in the cases of many countries at the present time, and which is in active progress in still more countries even as I speak. That is the danger, and you must keep in your minds, to avoid that danger, some clear objective, and that objective, the proper relationship of the individual to the group, is in my opinion, the relationship and objective to which we want to strive. ...

We are at the present time unquestionably under the domination of a financial system, which rules us. It rules us in our most basic necessities; the necessity for bed, board and clothes, and the other things that go to make up the standard of living. But we do not want to transfer that domination from, let us say, what we can call the banking, system under another name to something we call the State.

We have no desire whatever if we will analyse what our objective is, to change one master for a still more powerful master. That is one of the greatest dangers at the present time - that large bodies of people will be carried away by words of which they have not analysed the meaning. ... The opponents in this matter - we will put it on its lowest terms - can either allow the world to be plunged into another great delirium tremens, another great World War, or the opponents themselves can take steps to change the system.

\*\*\*

#### THE PSYCHOLOGY OF PROHIBITING OUTSIDE THOUGHT by James Reed

There is an insightful piece by Justin Murphy, <http://jmrphy.net/blog/2017/05/15/psychology-of-prohibiting-outside-thinkers/>, which deals, from the perspective of the Left, with the Left-wing dominance of the culture of discourse in the West. Why does the Left close down other thought—on moral grounds? Actually Murphy should have probed deeper and recognised that the Left openly resort to violence to shut down any opinion they see as a threat. On university campuses, even notices challenging aspects of globalisation get torn down. Therefore, this article is somewhat superficial and does not address the clear fact that the Left has state-legitimated terrorists who freely break the law, and are permitted to get away with it. These terrorists within a few years move into positions of power and continue the agenda of national suicide and societal deconstruction.

The article has some merits however, although written in the usual academic language: "...Because respectable-intellectuals are often pretty smart and capable, why are they so fearful of outside intellectual projects, even if they are as evil as some fear? ...The reason respectable-intellectuals so instinctively close ranks around the moral exclusion of non-respectable-intellectuals is that (those) currently-working respectable-intellectuals privately know that the intellectual compromises they have made to secure their respectability and careers has rendered most of their life's work sadly and vulnerably low-quality.

(continued on next page)

(continued from previous page)

To convince status-quo cultural-money-dispensers to give you a grant, for instance, any currently “successful” academic or artist has to so extensively pepper their proposal with patently stupid words and notions that knowingly make the final result a sad, contorted piece of work, 80% of which is bent to the flattery of our overlords.

But we falsely rationalize this contortion as “mature discipline” which we then rationalize to be the warrant for our privileged status as legitimate intellectuals.

This is just good old fashioned conservatism, the standard psychology of bourgeois hypocrisy that is the molecular basis for the stability of a capitalist society organized around unjust and unequal exploitation...”

## PETERSON ON ‘ONE OF THE MOST DANGEROUS CANADIAN INSTITUTIONS’

The following is an explanation from Jordan B. Peterson as to his testimony to the Canadian Senate’s Hearing on Bill C16:

I served as a witness at the Canadian Senate yesterday, regarding Bill C16, which adds the ill-defined categories of gender expression and gender identity to the list of prohibited grounds of discrimination. The Federal government, in a website which has since been taken down, stated clearly that this legislation would be interpreted in keeping with the policies of the Ontario Human Rights Commission, which I regard as one of the most dangerous institutions in Canada, in relationship to all rights other than those of “equality,”

## THE TROJAN HORSE OF ‘CONSTITUTIONAL’ RECOGNITION by Nigel Jackson

The ongoing campaign for ‘constitutional’ recognition of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples is an enormous and dangerous scam, no matter how idealistic or not its various proponents are. An attempt to work a vast fraud on the Australian people is in progress; and it is difficult not to believe that there is a ‘third party’, financially and thus politically powerful, behind the whole adventure.

This critical situation became even more apparent in a huge article in *The Australian* (20-21 May), ‘Renewing the Faith of 67’ by Nicolas Rothwell, journalist, authority on Aboriginal affairs and long-time advocate for ‘constitutional’ recognition. Although this article is far from impartial and thus genuinely comprehensive, it gives a useful summary of the moves towards ‘Aboriginal sovereignty’ (and thus future national division) since the 1967 referendum. It shows (unintentionally) that a clear pattern emerges of a long-term plan to destabilise the Australian nation, just as former communist Geoff McDonald predicted in his 1982 book *Red Over Black*.

Rothwell’s article deserves the closest scrutiny for its detailed presentation of this plan and indication of how

Well, that is an interesting confession, but still superficial. It is not just the quality of the outside work which is feared, but it is precisely because it is a direct ideological and philosophical challenge to their thinking. Difficult issues the Left have created, cannot be resolved in normal discourse because free-speech is constrained. The Left’s (*Tribalism*) agenda coincides with that of the ruling Dark Lords, the global financial elite, so are permitted to engage in their shock troop tactics to keep any *real* intellectual opposition or discussion suppressed. **See Also:** Strengthen the Individual: A Counterpoint to Post Modern Political Correctness - Prof Jordan B. Peterson: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CwcVLETRBjg&list=PL22J3VaeABQD8oW-mqWpKumeqglQCe6VZ&index=3> ...

including freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of association.

The Bill Amends the Canadian Human Rights Act and the Criminal Code.

I was partnered with lawyer Jared Brown, whose courageous and detailed analysis of Bill C16 can be **found here:** <https://litigationguy.wordpress.com/2016/12/24/bill-c-16-whats-the-big-deal/> which amends the Canadian Human Rights Act and the Criminal Code.

**Update:** on May 18, C16 sailed through the Canadian Senate with no amendments.

**View here:** <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KnIAAkSNtqo>  
\*\*\*

its exponents look at matters and/or want Australians to look at them. Needless to say, it steers well clear of examining the case against ‘constitutional’ recognition. The rest of this analysis will merely comment on a few striking points. Extracts from Rothwell’s piece are given in italics.

*‘Today’s proponents of a new referendum hope their proposals for constitutional reform also may have the potential to bring about a revolutionary change in the social landscape.’*

Yes, revolution in the mode of France 1789, China 1911 and Russia 1917 is the threat this campaign contains.

*‘Levelling the playing field, of giving equal rights to Aboriginal Australians.....the [1967] referendum proposal incarnated the core Australian legend: it was a chance to say yes to equality, to fairness, mateship trumped prejudice...’* The core Australian legend is not egalitarianism or even ‘mateship’: it is the transplantation of British culture and civilisation, founded in Christianity, in a new land. This project has been successful; now sinister forces wish to end it, so evidently they perceive it as a danger to their own interests. (continued on next page)

(continued from previous page)

*'But the most far-reaching downstream result of the 1967 referendum... was the coming of native title, established by the ruling of the High Court in the Mabo case in June 1992..... Native title was accepted on the basis of a much deeper principle: the concept of pre-existing Aboriginal law and tenure. At a stroke it... made the nation, by legal judgement, into an occupying settler-state.'* There is good reason to believe that the Mabo decision was a case of thoroughly unjustified

judicial adventurism (see *The High Court of Australia in Mabo* by the Hon Peter Connolly QC and Mr S.E.K. Hulme QC, two papers delivered to the Samuel Griffith Society, The Association of Mining & Exploration Companies, WA, 1993). Australia is not, in 2017, an 'occupying settler-state' but a thoroughly sovereign nation enjoying de jure status. The attempt to browbeat us into resigning that hard-won status by pseudo-moral argumentation needs to be unequivocally resisted. Rothwell argues that after Paul Keating's one-sided Redfern Speech in 1992 there has been 'a shadow' over our nation 'that requires and demands expiation.'

Such is untrue but is part of a confidence trick being attempted upon us.

*'Positive views on Aboriginal questions now became tokens of a general world view... at once progressive and revisionist, enlightened and free from the vulgar trappings of self-interest.'* On the contrary, the self-interest of various Aboriginal activists and groups is blindingly obvious; that of the power behind them is not so easy to identify, but how else is one to explain the compliance of the major media and most politicians?.

Rothwell does not identify the obvious manipulation of definitions of 'Aboriginality' since the time of the first Whitlam government (as chronicled in Peter B. English's 1985 book *Land Rights – Birth Rights*); nor does he consider that this might have been planned deliberately to create the present situation where Aboriginals are 3

ON TARGET

per cent of our population and activists (not necessarily representative of most Aboriginals) are preparing a nationwide 'resistance programme' (which could lead to bloodshed and even civil war).

Nor does Rothwell analyse properly the complex question of 'Aboriginal identity'; but it is clear that many 'Aboriginals' are really only part-Aboriginals and thus do not have the 'moral high ground' claimed for them or the 'entitlements' they claim.

A further omission by Rothwell concerns the 'expert panel' set up by the Gillard government

in 2010 to 'build consensus' and the current 16-member Referendum Council established to advise on steps to a 'successful' referendum. Rothwell does not admit that these committees were stacked with advocates of change and cannot possibly be regarded as impartial. The same objection can be made to his discussion of 'Recognise', the government-funded body working towards a 'yes' result.

Rothwell also notes that the 12 recent 'Aboriginal led and managed'

'First Nations meetings' organised by the Referendum Council were organised on the basis of limitation of participants to '100 by invitation only', which clearly suggests (he does not notice this) further stacking of discussions to arrive at a pre-planned result. The unrepresentative nature of such gatherings is obvious.

Good news is that Rothwell admits that Australians generally are losing interest in Aboriginal claims and are much more likely to vote 'no' than they did in 1967. He fails, however, to admit that this might be because their eyes have been opened somewhat to the nefarious nature of this brazen attempt to steal away their sovereignty and security. Despite this, every thoughtful and patriotic Australian should speak out strongly against 'constitutional' recognition. We cannot afford to be complacent.

\*\*\*

### **Not by Drought, nor by 'Global Warming' but by Crafty Usurers!**

AUSTRALIA...

When the shearing sheds are silent and the stock camps fallen quiet  
When the gidgee coals no longer glow across the outback night  
And the bush is forced to hang a sign, 'gone broke and won't be back'  
And spirits fear to find a way beyond the beaten track  
When harvesters stand derelict upon the wind swept plains  
And brave hearts pin their hopes no more on chance of loving rains  
When a hundred outback settlements are ghost towns overnight  
When we've lost the drive and heart we had to once more see us right  
When 'Pioneer' means a stereo and 'Digger' some backhoe  
And the 'Outback' is behind the house, there's nowhere else to go  
And 'Anzac' is a biscuit brand and probably foreign owned  
And education really means brainwashed and neatly cloned  
When you have to bake a loaf of bread to make a decent crust  
And our heritage once enshrined in gold is crumbling to dust  
And old folk pay their camping fees on land for which they fought  
And fishing is a great escape; this is until you're caught  
When you see our kids with yankee caps and resentment in their eyes  
And the soaring crime and hopeless hearts is no longer a surprise  
When the name of RM Williams is a yuppie clothing brand  
Not a product of our heritage that grew off the land  
When offering a hand makes people think you'll amputate  
And two dogs meeting in the street is what you call a 'Mate'  
When 'Political Correctness' has replaced all common sense  
When you're forced to see it their way, there's no sitting on the fence  
Yes one day you might find yourself an outcast in this land  
Perhaps your heart will tell you then, 'I should have made a stand'  
Just go and ask the farmers that should remove all doubt  
Then join the swelling ranks who say, 'don't sell Australia out'

- - Author unknown

## LETTER TO THE EDITOR

If you are trying to understand Scott Morrison's Budget, which someone has described as a 'Labor Budget', then the following quote from Mr Robert Menzies (Leader of the Liberal Party) in *The Age*, March 3, 1941, p. 7, may bring some enlightenment.

Mr. Menzies is reported to have said: "I always tell my Opposition friends that the only difference between us is that I am theoretically non-Socialist, yet an amazingly practical Socialist, while they are theoretical Socialists. People will take things from us they wouldn't take from the Labor party. That is outstandingly true in Australia. It is a question of speed.

The whole process has been a magnificent justification of the Parliamentary system despite its superior critics. You get two views which, in theory, are violently opposed. In practice the extreme course of today is a commonplace of tomorrow. I claim to think, and that seems to be a most unpopular pastime with a great number of people."

Therefore, that's it — they are all socialist!

'Practical socialist' versus 'theoretical socialist', it could also explain the difference between 'good' debt and 'bad' debt — it is all bloody debt!

How do we rid ourselves of these deluded political parasites?

Louis Cook, Numurkah, Vic

\*\*\*

## UNEMPLOYMENT RUBBERY FIGURES by James Reed

The government tells us that the "official" unemployment rate in Australia is 5.7 percent, which is "vote for me, good." But, as pointed out in an article by the razor-sharp Adam Creighton (*The Australian*, May 22, 2017, p. 12), the official figure is nonsense, with the unemployment rate being at almost three times that, at 15 percent.

Rather than 732,000 Australians not being able to find work, more than 2.26 million are unemployed. The way the government fakes the figures is to use a definition of employment" that has any one working more than an hour a week as employed! To be unemployed, the test is much harder: one needs to have applied for a job in the past four weeks and be ready to start work.

In this way, the figures are cooked to make things look good on paper for the government. But, the harsh reality still exists for people who don't have work and struggle on the dole. As I see it, the dishonesty shown by the government on this issue, gives the game away.

We need a social credit alternative, because the age of work is grinding to a halt.

\*\*\*

## TARGET FOR THE WEEK:

While the MP's have much to offer as condolences over the Manchester horror terrorist attack, not one of them has suggested that Australia should do anything about reducing the intake of migrants or refugees. It is acknowledged that Minister Peter Dutton has made a great effort to deport those who have given false information regarding their safety in their homeland, but this does not tackle the numbers entering Australia.

Ask your MP and Senators whether there is a lesson to be learned from Europe where the masses of refugees simply oozed across borders. It was impossible to screen them to detect those harbouring terrorism. At least Australia had some advantage being an island, in those circumstances. The question remains as to how many escaped the net and entered our land?

Tell your MP that you believe a halt should be called to all migrant and refugee intake for two reasons. Firstly, we must avoid all chances of permitting any person harbouring terrorism to enter Australia. Secondly our unemployment level is too high and we must get those people into the workforce before any migrants or refugees are admitted. A high proportion of new arrivals remain on welfare for at least four years.

Be polite but firm with your letters and do not forget the papers because these influence public opinion. Let Head Office know about any interesting outcomes. - *Nat Dir*



**THE LEAGUE'S WEBSITE: — alor.org**  
blog.alor.org      thecross-roads.org

**Subscription to On Target \$45.00 p.a.**  
**NewTimes Survey \$30.00 p.a.**

and **Donations** can be performed by **bank transfer:**  
Account details are:

A/c Title      Victorian League of Rights  
BSB              083-004  
A/c No.         51-511-5296

or by cheques directed to:

'Victorian League of Rights'

or on the **Veritasbooks.com.au** website:

<https://veritasbooks.com.au/cat/subscriptions>

"On Target" is published by Australian League of Rights  
**Postal Address:** GPO Box 1052, Melbourne, 3001.

**Telephone:** (03) 9600 0677      **email:** hub@alor.org

**Head Office Hours** - Monday and Tuesday 09.30am - 3.00pm

All electoral comment authorised by Ken Grundy, Level 9, Suite 8,  
118-120 Queen Street, Melbourne, 3000 Victoria

**South Australia:** Heritage Book-mailing Service,  
P.O. Box 27, Happy Valley, SA 5159.

Ph:08 7123 7131      **email:** heritagebooks@adam.com.au