



- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Print Post Publication Number 10000815

Vol. 54 No. 47

30<sup>th</sup> November 2018

## IN THIS ISSUE

UN One World Government by 2030? By James Reed	1
Mexicans Against Migrants By Chris Knight	2
Crucifying Julian Assange By Michael Ferguson	3
Letter to The Editor	4

**THOUGHT OF THE WEEK:** “We fully realize today that victory in war requires a mighty united effort. Certainly, victory in peace calls for, and must receive, an equal effort. Man has learned long ago, that it is impossible to live unto himself. This same basic principle applies today to nations. We were not isolated during the war. We dare not now become isolated in peace.”

– President Harry Truman’s address to the delegates, delivered from the White House on April 25, 1945.  
The conference culminated in the signing of the United Nations Charter on June 26, 1945.

### UN ONE WORLD GOVERNMENT BY 2030? By James Reed

Things are moving along nicely for the New World Order, as they, Thanos-like, crushing all resistance in their path to create a communist world dictatorship, under the guise of “saving the environment,” “muh human rights” and other pc/bs nonsense:

[https://www.americanthinker.com/articles/2018/10/the\\_un\\_wants\\_to\\_be\\_our\\_world\\_government\\_by\\_2030.html](https://www.americanthinker.com/articles/2018/10/the_un_wants_to_be_our_world_government_by_2030.html)

“In 2015, seventy years after their original rights-based document, the UN took a giant step towards the global government that was only hinted at in their first organizing document. They issued a document entitled *Transforming Our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*. This document has 91 numbered sections of the UN’s program for world government. The UDHR is only referenced once in the entire document in Article 19. Unlike the original “mother document” that was under 1900 words, this document is 14,883 words. The 91 items are addressing issues under the five headings of People, Planet, Prosperity, Peace, and Partnership. Additionally, the document provides 17 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) to improve life on the planet.

What is meant by the term “sustainable?” The most often quoted definition comes from the UN World Commission on Environment and Development: “sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.” The earlier ideas and ideals of rights, freedom, equality, and justice are subsumed under meeting of needs and an explicit environmentalism which emphasizes preventing the depletion of scarce planetary resources. Of course, the takeoff is the Marxist axiom that society should be organized around the idea of “from each according to his ability to each according to his needs.” Thus, Marxism is implicit in sustainability, but is nuanced by its alliance with seemingly scientific adjustments and goals related to environmentalism. A technical jargon is welded to Marxist intentionality to produce a sense of fittingness and modern progress. The entire “Transforming Our World” document is cast in a stream of consciousness of pious platitudes for a utopian future. It is an outsize utopian dream. Five of the 17 items pertain to the environment. There are goals for the cities, for women, for the poor, and even for life under the water. Absolutely no sphere of human activity is exempt from control by the UN. The key word of course is no longer “rights” except the oblique reference in Article 19. In fact, this writer did not see the word rights even once in this document even though that word appeared in practically every sentence of the original UN document.

The one-worlders of the 1950s and early 1960s are now in the UN driver’s seat, and they have made their move. The overlay of Marxist talk about “meeting needs” has moved to center stage. The UN has assigned itself a time frame for moving forward in its plan for planetary hegemony.”

(continued next page)

(continued from previous page) That time frame has 2030, as the year national sovereignty will be eroded to the point it will disappear. This is to be done by the death of a thousand cuts, primarily using the environment and the meaningless idea of “sustainable development” to promote global governance.

Then there is the Global Compact on Migration, which will create open borders for the West. That agenda is already well advanced. David Samuel rightly describes the Compact as a “sinister globalist ploy,” his words, not mine:

“To properly understand the trend of world political events in recent years, it is essential to appreciate that a titanic struggle for supremacy between two implacably opposed ideologies is raging right across the Western world. It is an undeclared war waged largely behind the scenes. The attackers are powerful globalist and multi-national interests such as the EU and the UN, supported by many leftist groups funded, paradoxically, by mega-rich financiers. Their ultimate aim is the abolition of borders, migration between countries at will, the dismantling of national identity, the transfer of power to supra-national bodies, and eventually the imposition of a post-democratic unitary world government. The defenders are those who believe that Western-style democracy based on the nation-state remains the least-worst way yet devised of safe-guarding the life, liberty and prosperity of its citizens.

The Global Compact for Safe, Orderly and Regular Migration, to give it its full name, originated with the bureaucrats of the UN General Assembly in 2016. It morphed into the New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants and then through various stages to become in July 2018 the Final Draft, which is due to be adopted at the IGC (Inter-governmental conference) on international migration in Morocco in December.

At all stages it has had the backing and support of the UN Secretary General, António Guterres, who as the former UN High Commissioner for Refugees was never slow to attack Australia’s immigration

## **MEXICANS AGAINST MIGRANTS By Chris Knight**

We see the same Camp of the Saints pattern right across the West; migrants charge the borders, and Leftoid social justice warriors defend them on the grounds of “muh racism,” “otherwise White supremacy.” Ok, we know all of that. But, what do these morons say when it is not White people, but Brown people protesting against invading illegals? How do their one-dimensional brains cope? Answer; they immediately switch off much like extremist cult members, “when prophecy fails”:

“Mexican protesters took to the streets on Sunday to protest the growing influx of Central American

policies. The Compact is basically a means by which the UN can install itself within the legislative process of democratic nation states by persuading them to recognise the supremacy of international law, i.e. that proposed by the UN and its agencies, over domestic law. It has been described variously as ‘a vision for world order that promises disorder’ and ‘a plan for borderless chaos’.

Albeit wrapped up in the boring prose designed to put you to sleep before you reach the end of the sentence, as so beloved by the EU, it also plans to suppress any criticism of increased immigration by attacking freedom of speech. In a sinister passage it commits to ‘promote independent, objective and quality reporting of media outlets, including by sensitising and educating media professionals on migration-related issues and terminology, investing in ethical reporting standards and advertising, and stopping allocation of public funding or material support to media outlets that systematically promote intolerance, xenophobia, racism and other forms of discrimination towards migrants’. The devil is in the detail as to whether such terms are to be defined objectively or subjectively.

On 25 July, Alan Jones asked then Immigration Minister, Peter Dutton, whether he or his government would be signing The Compact and the best he could get out of Dutton was ‘Not in its current form’. Since then, of course, we now have a more conservative Prime Minister. So can we now expect Australia to join the US in refusing to sign The Compact? Let’s hope so. But what of a possible Labor government? With their track record of encouraging people-smugglers (50,000 illegal immigrants and 1,200 deaths at sea), we can only fear the worst. Our best hope is that we can open the eyes of public opinion to what is going on.”

<https://www.spectator.co.uk/2018/09/the-war-of-the-world/>

So there you have it, straight from the mainstream media. The UN is set to make any meek cries about our genocide, illegal. What little remains of free speech will be gone. Have you contacted politicians like Fraser Anning, Bob Katter and Pauline Hanson yet? \*\*\*

migrants who have made their way to the border city of Tijuana. In the most recent protest, groups of Tijuana residents want to evict the migrants from a shelter where approximately 2,000 Central Americans are staying. The Tijuana government set up the shelter as the city witnessed a reported buildup of federal and state police forces while the numbers of migrants continue to climb. In two videos shared online by U.S. journalist Emily Green, dozens of protesters, some wearing wrestling masks and bandanas, can be seen marching towards the makeshift shelter.” \*\*\*

## NO, YOU CAN'T ASSOCIATE WITH BAAHARNIE THE SHEEP! By James Reed

Civil liberty folk are rightly concerned that the Andrew government anti-association laws have passed the Lower House, and are unfortunately not heading to the outhouse, where they belong, but directly into law:

“The laws will give police excessive powers to issue ‘anti-association notices’, telling people – including children as young as 14 – who they can and can’t be friends with or spend time with. Human rights advocates, lawyers and community workers all say that these laws are an attack on our democratic rights and neither politicians nor police officers should have a role in deciding who people can and can’t be friends with. Ruth Barson, a director of legal advocacy at the Human Rights Law Centre, said that the laws are senseless, dangerous and a sign that Premier Andrews is pandering to Matthew Guy’s toxic law and order agenda.

“We should all be free to decide who we spend our time with and who we want to be friends with. Every single Victorian should be worried about these laws because they're excessive and ripe for abuse. Such laws belong in a police state – not the connected, harmonious community that we all want Victoria to

be,” said Ms Barson. The new anti-association laws are fundamentally different to existing laws in the following key ways:

- Children are now caught up in the scheme: Anti-association notices can now be given to children as young as 14 years. The notices can prevent children going to the movies, playing sport, talking online or spending time with extended family members.
- It is far easier for police to issue a notice: Police are no longer required to consider whether the issuing of a notice will actually prevent serious crime. Police will only have to show that the person receiving the notice has spent time with someone who has been convicted of a particular offence.
- There are far less safeguards: There is no requirement for police to consider whether the association is for non-criminal purposes such as rehabilitation, friendship, support, education, sport any other legitimate activity; and
- The laws operate retrospectively.”

Will this mean, if the system wants it, that say the editor of this noble publication, would not associate with the journalists? We will have to see what happens. \*\*\*

## CRUCIFYING JULIAN ASSANGE By Michael Ferguson

The Pope, if he could stop crawling to Islam for a few seconds, should make Julian Assange a saint, or at least let him wine and dine at the Vatican, and use their internet. But, instead, this champion of truth has been “crucified”:

<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/50597.htm>

“Julian Assange’s sanctuary in the Ecuadorian Embassy in London has been transformed into a little shop of horrors. He has been largely cut off from communicating with the outside world for the last seven months. His Ecuadorian citizenship, granted to him as an asylum seeker, is in the process of being revoked. His health is failing. He is being denied medical care. His efforts for legal redress have been crippled by the gag rules, including Ecuadorian orders that he cannot make public his conditions inside the embassy in fighting revocation of his Ecuadorian citizenship. Australian Prime Minister Scott Morrison has refused to intercede on behalf of Assange, an Australian citizen, even though the new government in Ecuador, led by Lenín Moreno—who calls Assange an “inherited problem” and an impediment to better relations with Washington—is making the *WikiLeaks* founder’s life in the embassy unbearable. Almost daily, the embassy is imposing harsher conditions for Assange, including making him pay his medical bills, imposing arcane rules about how he must care for his cat and demanding that he perform a variety

of demeaning housekeeping chores. The Ecuadorians, reluctant to expel Assange after granting him political asylum and granting him citizenship, intend to make his existence so unpleasant he will agree to leave the embassy to be arrested by the British and extradited to the United States. The former president of Ecuador, Rafael Correa, whose government granted the publisher political asylum, describes Assange’s current living conditions as “torture.”

The Democratic Party—seeking to blame its election defeat on Russian “interference” rather than the grotesque income inequality, the betrayal of the working class, the loss of civil liberties, the deindustrialization and the corporate coup d’état that the party helped orchestrate—attacks Assange as a traitor, although he is not a U.S. citizen. Nor is he a spy. He is not bound by any law I am aware of to keep U.S. government secrets. He has not committed a crime. Now, stories in newspapers that once published material from *WikiLeaks* focus on his allegedly slovenly behavior—not evident during my visits with him—and how he is, in the words of *The Guardian*, “an unwelcome guest” in the embassy. The vital issue of the rights of a publisher and a free press is ignored in favor of snarky character assassination.”

Let that be a lesson to anyone who has secret information that can damage the Deep State; be prepared to die for your deeds. \*\*\*

## DEATH BY ROBOT By Brian Simpson

Here is a potential nightmare; one is booked for robotic surgery, which they say is better than that performed by a human surgeon. Then, after you are tied to the table, the robot goes mad and slices and dices you like a hamburger:

<https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2018/mar/25/>

death-by-robot-mechanised-danger-in-our-changing-world

“A surgeon has described the tense atmosphere in an operating theatre as a pioneering robotic heart operation went catastrophically wrong. At one point one of the assisting medics had his arms knocked by the robot which was being used to repair retired music teacher and conductor Stephen Pettitt's heart valve, an inquest was told. Communication between lead surgeon Sukumaran Nair and his assisting surgeon Thasee Pillay was difficult because of the 'tinny' sound quality coming from the robot console being operated by Nair.”

Then after the botched operation, the patient died. Gasp, will this be the future? I sure hope that I will not need surgery, on say a failing prostate. Oh, wait, such medical attention will not be for deplorable plebs like me anyway, so I will be safe! \*\*\*

## EVERY MAN NEEDS A KEG OF “TOXIC MASCULINITY” By John Steele

A common theme nowadays is that there is still too much “toxic masculinity,” and it must be completely eliminated to produce the New World Gendered society:

<https://www.breitbart.com/tech/2018/11/17/>

university-of-houston-clear-lake-toxic-masculinity-is-ruining-society/

“The University of Houston-Clear Lake is blaming “toxic masculinity” for a variety of social issues. According to a report from *Campus Reform*, the University of Houston-Clear Lake is playing a documentary called *The Mask You Live In* about the effect of “toxic masculinity” on society. For the uninitiated, “toxic masculinity” refers to the belief that Western men have been conditioned into a set of beliefs about acceptable expressions of masculinity. Proponents argue that failure to “be a man” causes men to crumble and lash out at others, particularly women. The film argues that “toxic masculinity” is the reason why boys are more likely than girls to commit suicide, crime, and fail out of school.

No, I don't agree. Traditional manhood, which built the comfortable society that these types are now dismantling, has been under attack at least since the femo-commo revolution of cultural Marxism kicked into full force. It is this undermining which has produced the problems that young men face, such a record youth and old men suicide. This tragedy did not occur in past eras. \*\*\*

## LETTER TO THE EDITOR

To *The Age* Your editorial on Brexit ("Britain cannot turn its back on the EU", 16/11) wrongly makes light of the clear verdict of the 2016 referendum which undoubtedly meant that a majority wanted a complete and fundamental severance of British sovereignty from EU jurisdiction. One of the most vital elements was precisely the need to throw off any subjugation to EU courts, for this would enable a vital restoration of free speech in Britain.

Your language betrays you: British loyalists and their Australian supporters are smeared as 'little Englishers', who are "misty-eyed" and "jingoist". Meanwhile the globalist functionary Macron shows the kind of future that would lie in the EU: eventual complete absorption and subordination to a "European army".

*Nigel Jackson*, Belgrave, VIC

\*\*\*

## MP'S APPRECIATE SUPPORT –ND

Recently Queensland Senator Fraser Anning has made speeches which are much in line with the *League of Rights*. We know many of you will have written to him but one reader in particular has received a reply from the Senator indicating his appreciation. In part, he wrote

“...the Australian people should have a choice on whether we are a part of the United Nations. For too long, politicians have been making decisions that are not in the best interest of the people they serve.”

He continued by assuring his continued effort to fight hard on issues as he tries to save our Australian values. MP's like Senator Anning need every support because we know they will also be criticised from other sources. \*\*\*



**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](mailto:heritagebooks@alor.org)

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