



- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Print Post Publication Number 10000815

Vol. 54 No. 43

2<sup>nd</sup> November 2018

## IN THIS ISSUE

Australian Senate Says it is Not Ok to be White By James Reed	1
Are All German Critics of Immigration “Nazis”? By Richard Miller	2
Why Do intellectuals Fall for Socialism? By James Reed	3
Everywhere ... the Smell of Pot Burning By Chris Knight	4

**THOUGHT OF THE WEEK:** “It is possible that there exists, somewhere upon this planet, a country which is satisfied with its government, but if this is so, the location of it has escaped me. The problem posed by this elusiveness is not new, but dates from the birth of society. The record of governments is a record of precarious and frequently inglorious tenure, terminated, or at any rate punctuated, by violent upheaval and modification, if not in fact, at least in name. It might be with some justification be contended on a dispassionate examination of this dolorious history, that the idea of government is itself thereby discredited. But I think that the argument for pure anarchy, which is derived from the moderate popularity of modern governments, can be held as equally as an argument for the inherent necessity of government.”

C.H. Douglas, *The Alberta Experiment*, (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode., 1937), 39.

### AUSTRALIAN SENATE SAYS IT IS NOT OK TO BE WHITE By James Reed

Well, Pauline Hanson’s motion had a predictable response from our pathetic politically correct Senate:

<http://www.abc.net.au/news/2018-10-16/morrison-regrets-senators-backing-anti-white-racism-support/10381038>

‘Prime Minister Scott Morrison has described as "regrettable" his own senators' decision to back a motion declaring "It is OK to be white", while the Coalition's leader in the Senate has apologised and blamed an "administrative error".

Key points:

- The Coalition's decision to endorse the motion sparked immediate backlash
- Senator Mathias Cormann later said the Coalition had actually resolved to oppose the motion
- Labor voted against the motion

The motion, moved by One Nation leader Pauline Hanson on Monday, was narrowly defeated 28 votes to 31, despite the Coalition's backing. It called on the Senate to acknowledge the "deplorable rise of anti-white racism and attacks on Western civilisation" and that "it is OK to be white" — a phrase commonly used by white supremacists. Facing an almost immediate backlash, Attorney-General Christian Porter, whose office directed Coalition senators to vote in favour of the motion, defended the move on social media.

"The Government senators' actions in the Senate this afternoon [Tuesday] confirm that the Government deplores racism of any kind," he said.”

Ok, so let’s get this straight. The proposition, “it is ok to be white,” according to the Senate is “racist,” hence bad. Therefore it is NOT ok to be white, meaning that it is bad to be white. And, that is not racist? Surely what is being pushed here, by “our” (actually “their” Senate) is that whites have no rights and are replaceable. Wow, to think all of history has led up to this pathetic moment. Putin has more testosterone than all the “men” in the Senate put together. That definitely shows the depth of white racial genocide and ethno-masochism of the political elites, for the “Australian” parliament has actively supported the Asianisation of Australia as part of the Great Replacment. Read about it here in an all time classic paper by Denis McCormack that explains the agenda in full detail:

[https://reduceimmigration.files.wordpress.com/2013/12/mccormack-d\\_the-grand-plan-asianisation-of-australia-race-place-and-power\\_1996.pdf](https://reduceimmigration.files.wordpress.com/2013/12/mccormack-d_the-grand-plan-asianisation-of-australia-race-place-and-power_1996.pdf)

Spread the word about what has gone on in this country by emailing the link of this and getting the information out there! It is never too late!

\*\*\*

## ARE ALL GERMAN CRITICS OF IMMIGRATION “NAZIS”? By Richard Miller

Part of the strategy of the globalists is to smear anyone, who in any shape or form criticises open borders immigration, as “Nazi.” Here is an example from Germany:

<https://voiceofeuropa.com/2018/10/students-in-germany-are-now-called-nazis-for-criticising-migration/#.W7txsBsQQMk.twitter>

“Leftist suppression of freedom of speech becomes increasingly worse in Germany. Many students no longer dare to openly voice their opinion on migration policy, the *Epoch Times* reports. The Alternative for Germany (AfD) party received several reports from students who have been called Nazi for criticising Angela Merkel’s migration policy. From this school

year, the AfD started a “Neutral School Initiative” in Germany’s second largest city Hamburg. Goal of the initiative is to battle political indoctrination and to strengthen a democratic and free discourse in Hamburg schools.”

That U2 singer with the weird glasses and millions of dollars thinks that critics of immigration are Satanic. Does he protect his house, and his money, or is that run on socialist principles too? If so, I will be there soon for a slice of his pie. Here in Australia, critics of immigration, at least those in parliament, can simply be eliminated by strategic use of preferences. Bob Katter is probably going to be another example of how the mainstream parties eliminate democratic dissent. \*\*\*

## EUROPE; PLEASE DO NOT STEAL THE REFUGEES! By Richard Miller

Syria's Foreign Minister Walid Moualem at the recent UN General Assembly said that Syria wanted its refugees who have gone to Europe back, as the Syrian civil War is basically over:

“The government continues to rehabilitate the areas destroyed by terrorists, to restore normalcy,” he told the meeting. “All conditions are now present for the voluntary return of Syrian refugees to the country, the country they had to leave because of terrorism and the unilateral economic measures that targeted their daily lives and their livelihoods. True enough, thousands of Syrian refugees abroad have started their journey back home. From this podium I would like to stress the

following - the return of each and every Syrian refugee is a priority for the Syrian state. All doors are wide open for All Syrians abroad to return voluntarily and safely...

Thanks to the help of Russia, the Syrian government will spare no effort to facilitate the return of refugees and meet their basic needs. Therefore a special committee was recently established to coordinate the return of refugees to their places of origin in Syria, and to help them regain their lives once again.”

<https://www.sbs.com.au/news/syria-ready-for-refugees-to-return-foreign-minister-tells-un>

Will even one of these “refugees” return? \*\*\*

## SEND IN THE MILITARY! By Chris Knight

Here comes the next wave of illegals from south of the border, down Mexico way, to attempt to break any form of US border control. Trump at long last has meekly suggested using the military to defend the US from an invasion of foreigners, just as China would do:

<https://www.breitbart.com/border/2018/10/18/exclusive-former-sheriff-joe-arpaiio-send-u-s-military-deep-inside-mexico-stop-migrant-caravans/>

The question is: who is funding the invading caravans, as these people are well prepared for their journey? And, it is done right in time to make it an election circus.

President Trump has said that a lot of money has been spent on this invasion, and of course, the false news folk deny this, saying that there is no evidence old Georgey is up to his usual tricks. Trump needs to act like a man, or what men used to be, and try to be a little bit of a Putin, and shut this down. Put the US military on the border and turn these invaders back. No need to invade Mexico, let Mexico deal with this. Then investigate Soros, and if there is evidence, do something instead of always being so pathetically reactive. \*\*\*

## LETTER TO THE EDITOR

To *The Age* There is some truth in your editorial claim that “the historical ties to England are no longer the focus of our national identity” (“No reason to delay republic debate”, 19/10), but they remain the most important aspect of the foundation of our political order. Australia will be wise to continue to honour them, and that means no republic. The warm welcome given to the Duke and Duchess of Sussex strongly suggests

that most Australians do not see Her Majesty the Queen and the Royal Family as “foreigners”. They are much more intimately a part of us than that term states. Most important of all is the fact that monarchy is inherently a superior form of government to republicanism. It makes more sense, therefore, to work long-term for a totally independent Australian throne.

*Nigel Jackson*, Belgrave, Vic \*\*\*

## WHY DO INTELLECTUALS FALL FOR SOCIALISM? By James Reed

I wrote on this topic in a recent *On Target*, but shortly after its publication, came across the following interesting article, worth quoting by Friedrich Hayek:

<https://mises.org/wire/why-intellectuals-fall-socialism>

“A proper understanding of the reasons which tend to incline so many of the intellectuals toward socialism is thus most important. The first point here which those who do not share this bias ought to face frankly is that it is neither selfish interests nor evil intentions but mostly honest convictions and good intentions which determine the intellectual's views. In fact, it is necessary to recognize that on the whole the typical intellectual is today more likely to be a socialist the more he is guided by good will and intelligence, and that on the plane of purely intellectual argument he will generally be able to make out a better case than the majority of his opponents within his class. If we still think him wrong, we must recognize that it may be genuine error which leads the well-meaning and intelligent people who occupy those key positions in our society to spread views which to us appear a threat to our civilization.

Nothing could be more important than to try to understand the sources of this error in order that we should be able to counter it. Yet those who are generally regarded as the representatives of the existing order and who believe that they comprehend the dangers of socialism are usually very far from such understanding. They tend to regard the socialist intellectuals as nothing more than a pernicious bunch of highbrow radicals without appreciating their influence and, by their whole attitude to them, tend to drive them even further into opposition to the existing order.

If we are to understand this peculiar bias of a large section of intellectuals, we must be clear about two points. The first is that they generally judge all particular issues exclusively in the light of certain general ideas; the second, that the characteristic errors of any age are frequently derived from some genuine new truths it has discovered, and they are erroneous applications of new generalizations which have proved their value in other fields. The conclusion to which we shall be led by a full consideration of these facts will be that the effective refutation of such errors will frequently require further intellectual advance, and often advance on points which are very abstract and may seem very remote from the practical issues.

It is perhaps the most characteristic feature of the intellectual that he judges new ideas not by their specific merits but by the readiness with which they fit into his general conceptions, into the picture of

the world which he regards as modern or advanced. It is through their influence on him and on his choice of opinions on particular issues that the power of ideas for good and evil grows in proportion to their generality, abstractness, and even vagueness. As he knows little about the particular issues, his criterion must be consistency with his other views and suitability for combining into a coherent picture of the world. Yet this selection from the multitude of new ideas presenting themselves at every moment creates the characteristic climate of opinion, the dominant *Weltanschauung* of a period, which will be favorable to the reception of some opinions and unfavorable to others and which will make the intellectual readily accept one conclusion and reject another without a real understanding of the issues.

In some respects the intellectual is indeed closer to the philosopher than to any specialist, and the philosopher is in more than one sense a sort of prince among the intellectuals. Although his influence is farther removed from practical affairs and correspondingly slower and more difficult to trace than that of the ordinary intellectual, it is of the same kind and in the long run even more powerful than that of the latter. It is the same endeavor toward a synthesis, pursued more methodically, the same judgement of particular views in so far as they fit into a general system of thought rather than by their specific merits, the same striving after a consistent world view, which for both forms the main basis for accepting or rejecting ideas.

For this reason the philosopher has probably a greater influence over the intellectuals than any other scholar or scientist and, more than anyone else, determines the manner in which the intellectuals exercise their censorship function. The popular influence of the scientific specialist begins to rival that of the philosopher only when he ceases to be a specialist and commences to philosophize about the progress of his subject and usually only after he has been taken up by the intellectuals for reasons which have little to do with his scientific eminence.”

The article rattles on like that for a lot more, but enough has been said to dispute it. Sure, intellectuals are seduced by general ideas. But, to suppose that they are not driven by self-interest, seeing socialism as a way of achieving new class power is simply naïve, and had probably been well refuted since Hayek wrote this paper. Intellectuals have a class position and seek power and influence. They are ideological to the core, and socialism is the leading way of them moving on the road to class power:

<https://www.amazon.com/Intellectuals-Class-Power-English-Hungarian/dp/0151778604>

\*\*\*



## EVERYWHERE ... THE SMELL OF POT BURNING By Chris Knight

Boomers love their dope, cannabis or “pot.” For starters, Canada will have to soon change its pathetic politically correct maple leaf design, to marijuana leaves, now that they have moved into the new era of legalised dope:

<https://www.yahoo.com/news/canada-ushers-historic-new-era-legalization-cannabis-035458897.html>

“The Great White North could find itself in a great white puff of pot smoke as Canada makes history by legalizing marijuana. What started as an election promise by Justin Trudeau in 2015, has led to Canada becoming the second country in the world to legalize the production, sales and distribution of recreational cannabis. Uruguay broke the mould in December 2013, but Canada is the first country in the G20 to move forward with pot legalization. Cannabis is being legalized in Canada through the Cannabis Act, the first alteration to the Canadian Criminal Code as it relates to pot prohibition in 95 years. It allows adults in Canada to do the following:

- Purchase fresh cannabis, dried cannabis, cannabis

oil, cannabis seeds, or cannabis plants from retailers authorized by the provinces and territories.

- Consume cannabis in locations authorized by local jurisdictions.
- Possess up to 30 grams of dried legal cannabis or equivalent in non-dried form in public.
- Share up to 30 grams of dried legal cannabis with other adults.
- Grow up to four cannabis plants per household (not per person) for personal use, from licensed seeds or seedlings from a licensed supplier.
- Make legal cannabis-containing products at home, such as food and drinks, provided that dangerous organic solvents are not used in making them.”

Sure, kiddies will tumble straight from mother’s milk to marijuana, but that is just the way it is now. the global dope market expected to reach \$ 57 billion. That is too much money for the greedy elites to worry about things like health and social survival. \*\*\*

## QUEERING THE BIBLE By Mrs Vera West

Universities, at least in the US, and probably here in Ozzy, are running courses about queering the Bible, showing that the Bible is, I suppose, a gay document:

<https://www.breitbart.com/politics/2018/10/18/college-offers-credit-course-queering-bible/>

“We will examine biblical passages that are central to prohibitions on homosexuality and the larger discourses of heteronormativity (constructed around gender, sexuality, class, national identity, state formations, kinship, children, etc.) in which homophobic readings of the Bible emerge. We will also look at the ways in which these discourses and the identities they shore up can be “queered,” as well as at biblical texts that can be read as queer friendly. This process of queering will allow and require us to approach the biblical text in new ways. Pomona student Daniel Silverman told Campus Reform the course meets the high demand at the school for classes that contain topics representative of left-wing ideology.

“The overall socio-political environment among both students and faculty at Pomona lies deep into the left of the political spectrum,” Silverman said. “As I see it, ‘Queer Theory and the Bible,’ and other similar classes related to gender theory, exist because there is a high demand among students to enroll in those courses.” Silverman added a thought that if the course were to be “co-taught with a conservative professor,” he thinks “fewer Pomona students would enrol in it than otherwise, as students on campus, in general,

don’t seem interested in learning from conservative professors.”

What I am not sure about, is why bother with the Bible at all, and just go straight to what they call queer theory? Why not have a queer theory of creation instead, a queer ecology of creation, and cut out the middle man/person: \*\*\*

<https://hcommons.org/deposits/item/hc:20103/>



**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:**

A/c Title Australian League of Rights (SA Branch)

BSB 105-044

A/c No. 188-040-840

or by cheques directed to:

‘Australian League of Rights (SA Branch)’

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

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

“On Target” is printed and authorised by K. W. Grundy.

13 Carsten Court, Happy Valley, SA.

**Postal Address:** PO Box 27, Happy Valley, SA 5159.

**Telephone:** 08 8387 6574

**email:** heritagebooks@alor.org

**Head Office Hours** - Mon., Tues., Wed. 09.00am - 3.00pm