



- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Print Post Publication Number 10000815

Vol. 55 No. 31

9th August 2019

IN THIS ISSUE

Cash! Going! Going! Gone! By James Reed	1
Vaccine Technocracy By Mrs Vera West	2
We Should Love Coal-Fired Power Stations By James Reed	3
The Mitcham City Council ... Who? By James Reed	4

THOUGHTS OF THE WEEK: ‘So what’s to be done about these and similar distortions of economic activity? Well, by eliminating the artificial financial pressures under which the economy presently labours via the **dividend and the discount proposals**, (Douglas) Social Credit would eliminate the need for cancerous economic growth and, with it, the main incentives for all of the perverse forms of market-making that we have considered. We might legitimately expect to live in a saner and more satisfactory world as a direct consequence. And that’s what Social Credit is offering as a free gift to any country and people who are ready for a radical rethinking of our financial infrastructure.’

Extract from – Blessed are the Market-Makers? By M. Oliver Heydorn Ph.D – from *New Times Survey*, August 2019 issue.

CASH! GOING! GOING! GONE! By James Reed

The Morrison government is attempting to sneak legislation through Parliament to virtually criminalise cash as part of an International Monetary Fund (IMF) drive to bring in negative interest rates, allegedly to “fight recession”. Negative interest rates mean you pay the bank to hold your money, but cash in hand incurs no such charge. It means governments will exercise even tighter control over money than they and the central banking system already have. Draft legislation about to be pushed through Parliament by the Morrison Liberals will outlaw cash payments above \$10k under the guise of tax efficiency and combating “the black economy”.

Prime Minister Scott Morrison acting under orders from the IMF moves to eliminate cash. But the Australian lobby group Interests of the People (IOTP) says the real agenda is all about the imposition of the IMF’s extreme global monetary policy in the form of negative interest rates.

“This represents a significant curtailment of civil liberties, and more,” says IOTP. Australians have less than two weeks to respond and mainstream media appears to have ignored it. IOTP spokesman John Adams says the Australian Treasury has released draft legislation which was initially announced in the May 2018 Budget by then-Treasurer Scott Morrison. Nothing was done last year, but the legislation now proposes introduction on January 1, 2020. “I was skeptical that this ban on (cash) transactions would come in but now that the Coalition has been re-elected, the Coalition with ScoMo and (Treasurer Josh) Frydenberg have decided to push this initiative forward,” Mr Adams said on IOTP’s YouTube channel (“Red Alert: ScoMo declares war on the Australian people”). Adams says the government is claiming it’s to deal with tax revenue and the black economy but if this was the case, why didn’t they do it a decade ago when the GST was brought in as a way of eliminating the black economy.

“They could have easily introduced certain bans on transactions at that point, but they never did. So why now? “It’s not because of tax revenue, it’s about interest rates. It’s about the International Monetary Fund. They’ve written a series of technical papers ... about how to make negative interest rates work.” Adams says the IMF wants to make interest rates “deeply negative” e.g. negative 3 to 5 percent, something never done before in human history. And this would allow the central banks to implement controls on money and people never before implemented in history.

The Treasury announcement came out at 5:12pm on Friday, July 28, in an attempt to limit exposure of it. Mainstream media do not appear to have reported on the plans. The consultation period ends on August 12th, which points to an attempt by the government to limit exposure of the plans, while allowing them to say “consultation was sought”.

The full interview can be seen at: <https://youtu.be/770M2s6ZD8Y>

(Ed – No time for letters – Call or Email your Representative now!)

AUSTRALIA'S FRAGILITY EPIDEMIC By Michael Ferguson

Wow, a fragility epidemic! It is enough to make even the hardest of men, well ... fragile.

<https://www.smh.com.au/education/really-disastrous-the-fragility-epidemic-that-could-change-australia-20190726-p52b3j.html>

“Jonathan Haidt has a prediction. In the not-too-distant future, Aussie backpackers will no longer be found exploring far-flung corners of the world. The decades-old tradition of setting off with a backpack and a one-way plane ticket will likely be too daunting for a generation who have been sheltered from any kind of risk by their parents, and too alien from the world they have built themselves online. “I have no data on this, but I am going to predict that it's going to become less common,” said the New York University social psychologist and co-author of the bestseller, *The Coddling of the American Mind*. Professor Haidt was in Australia this week, adding his voice to growing

concern about the threat posed not only to children, but to the rest of society by parental over-protection in the middle classes of the English-speaking world.” Here is a link for Haidt’s book, *The Coddling of the American Mind*, which I can’t afford:

<https://www.amazon.com/Coddling-American-Mind-Intentions-Generation/dp/0735224897>

That book may be an interesting exploration of the coddling that precious snowflakes at universities get, and the dire social consequences that follow, but the bigger problem is the softness of an entire civilisation produced by consumerism and technological conveniences, with the crash of manhood. It is assumed that all of the cornucopia will continue forever, but the slightest disruption to vulnerable supply chains, by EMP, nuclear war, pandemics and many other horsewomen of the apocalypse could bring it all tumbling down. ***

VACCINE TECHNOCRACY By Mrs Vera West

Criticisms of the vaccination industry were once populous on the web, but censorship and law suits, and mandatory vaccinations, often at gun point, have mowed down the ranks of the champions of freedom. But, has Big Pharma actually won?

<https://www.technocracy.news/vaccine-survey-45-of-americans-doubt-safety/>

“The latest measles outbreak that’s gripped communities across the country in recent months pushed the topic of vaccinations (and those who choose to forgo them) right back onto centerstage for many Americans. Now a new survey delving into feelings over immunizations finds the country may be more split on the issue than believed, with 45% of adults admitting to harboring some doubt about the safety of vaccines. That said, the vast majority — more than eight in 10 surveyed — still view vaccines as effective and continue to support them, despite their concerns. The survey, funded by the American Osteopathic Association, questioned 2,000 adults and asked doubters the source of their suspicions of the science-supported, long-established safety and importance of vaccinations. Of the nearly half who listed at least one source of doubt over vaccine safety, researchers found the most common sources came from online articles (16%), distrust of the pharmaceutical industry (16%), and information from medical experts (12%). According to lead researcher Rachel Shmuts, a perinatal psychiatrist, widespread negative attitudes towards vaccines has become a phenomenon caused by human psychology and amplified by social media. “From an evolutionary perspective, humans are primed to pay attention to threats or negative information,” Dr. Shmuts explains

in a media release. “So it makes sense that people hold onto fears that vaccines are harmful, especially when they believe their children are in danger.” Another factor in this phenomenon is that, since vaccines have effectively banished many once-common and deadly diseases, people fear possible side effects from the vaccines more than the diseases themselves.

“For some, it really might be that vaccines are viewed as the more salient threat,” says Shmuts. Despite these concerns, 82% of respondents were still generally in favor of vaccines, while 8% showed serious doubts, and 9% said they were unsure. Many people are uninformed about vaccines. The state of Michigan, for example, ended public education for vaccines in the mid-2000s. This, combined with legislation that allows for vaccine exemptions for religious and philosophical beliefs, led to Michigan being ranked 44th in the country in the number of vaccinated children between the ages of 19 and 35 months in 2015. In 2017, the state launched a new education program about vaccines, and immunization rates increased across all demographics. Doctors warn that people with doubt only breed more people with doubt, and that can be dangerous when certain diseases require up to 95% of the population to be vaccinated in order to eliminate the threat of those diseases.”

Requiring 95 percent of the population to make something work clearly shows that it does not work, at least as it should. If vaccines give me immunity, what possible difference does it make if even the rest of the world was not vaccinated? Herd immunity? Yes, no doubt there is a level of protection in the population which makes...
(continued page 4)

WE SHOULD LOVE COAL-FIRED POWER STATIONS By James Reed

We received this via the magic of email, but there was no source reference. however, the material is terrific and should be read and thought about.

“First, coal fired power stations do NOT send 60 to 70% of the energy up the chimney. The boilers of modern power station are 96% efficient and the exhaust heat is captured by the economisers and reheaters that heat the air and water before entering the boilers. The very slight amount exiting the stack is moist as in condensation and CO₂. There is virtually no fly ash because this is removed by the precipitators or bagging plant that are 99.98% efficient. The 4% lost is heat through boiler wall convection. Coal-fired Power Stations are highly efficient with very little heat loss and can generate a massive amount of energy for our needs. They can generate power at efficiency of less than 10,000 b.t.u. per kilowatt and cost-wise that is very low. The percentage cost of mining and freight is very low. The total cost of fuel is 8% of total generation cost and does NOT constitute a major production cost. As for being laughed out of the country, China is building multitudes of coal-fired power stations because they are the most efficient for bulk power generation. We have, like, the USA, coal-fired power stations because we HAVE the raw materials and are VERY fortunate to have them. Believe me no one is laughing at Australia – exactly the reverse, they are very envious of our raw materials and independence. The major percentage of power in Europe and U.K. is nuclear because they don't have the coal supply for the future. Yes it would be very nice to have clean, quiet, cheap energy in bulk supply. Everyone agrees that it would be ideal. You don't have to be a genius to work that out. But there is only one problem...It doesn't exist. Yes - there are wind and solar generators being built all over the world but they only add a small amount to the overall power demand. The maximum size wind generator is 3 Megawatts, which can rarely be attained on a continuous basis because it requires substantial forces of wind. And for the same reason only generate when there is sufficient wind to drive them. This of course depends where they are located but usually they only run for 45% - 65% of the time, mostly well below maximum capacity. They cannot be relied on for a 'base load' because they are too variable. And they certainly could not be used for load control. The peak load demand for electricity in Australia is approximately 50,000 Megawatts and only small part of this comes from the Snowy Hydro Electric System (the ultimate power Generation) because it is only available when water is there from snow melt or rain. And yes, they can pump it back but it costs to do that. (Long Story).

Tasmania is very fortunate in that they have mostly hydro-electric generation because of their high amounts of snow and rainfall. They also have wind generators (located in the roaring forties) but that is only a small amount of total power generated. Based on an average generating output of 1.5 megawatts (of unreliable power) you would require over 33,300 wind generators. As for solar power generation much research has been done over the decades and there are two types. Solar thermal generation and Solar Electric generation but in each case they cannot generate large amounts of electricity. Any clean, cheap energy is obviously welcomed but they would NEVER have the capability of replacing Thermal Power Generation. So get your heads out of the clouds, do some basic mathematics and look at the facts, - not going off with the fairies (or some would say the extreme greenies.) We are all greenies in one form or another and care very much about our planet. The difference is most of us are realistic. Not in some idyllic utopia where everything can be made perfect by standing around holding a banner and being a general pain in the backside. Here are some facts that will show how ridiculous this financial madness is that the government is following. Do the simple maths and see for yourselves. According to the 'believers' the CO₂ in air has risen from .034% to .038% in air over the last 50 years. To put the percentage of Carbon Dioxide in air in a clearer perspective; If you had a room 3.7 x 3.7 x 2.1 metres the area carbon dioxide would occupy in that room would be .25 x .25 x .17m or the size of a large packet of cereal. Australia emits 1% of the world's total carbon dioxide and the government wants to reduce this by 20% or reduce emissions by 0.2 % of the world's total CO₂ emissions. What effect will this have on existing CO₂ levels? By their own figures they state the CO₂ in air has risen from .034% to .038% in 50 years. Assuming this is correct, the world CO₂ has increased in 50 years by...004% per year. That is 004 divided by 50 = ...00008%. (Getting confusing -but stay with me). Of that because we only contribute 1% our emissions would cause CO₂ to rise 00008 divided by 100 =...0000008%. Of that 1%, we supposedly emit, the governments wants to reduce it by 20% which is 1/5th of 0000008 =...00000016% effect per year they would have on the world CO₂ emissions based on their own figures. That would equate to an area in the same room, as the size of a small pin. For that they have gone crazy with the ridiculous trading schemes, Solar and Roofing Installations, Clean Coal Technology Renewable Energy, etc, etc. How ridiculous it that? The cost to the general public and industry will be enormous. Cripple and even closing some smaller businesses.” ***

(continued from page 2) ...it difficult for a disease to spread, but that does not alter the argument, because if the individual is immune, he/she is immune, so those that choose to be unvaccinated, by their logic are only putting themselves at risk. And, adults at least, should have the right to do this without having guns waved in their faces.

“If you only risked your own health by not getting vaccinated, that would be your business,” mass vaccination advocates state. “But when your failure to get vaccinated endangers me or my child, that becomes my business.” It’s a powerful argument, except for one thing — herd immunity in vaccinated populations has been repeatedly disproven. In November 1966, in announcing a mass vaccination program for measles that would exceed the 55% level reached in Baltimore, the U.S. Public Health Service confidently announced that “Effective use of these vaccines during the coming winter and spring should insure the eradication of measles from the United States in 1967.” When measles failed to be eradicated, public health experts decided that a 70% or 75% vaccination rate would secure herd immunity. When that proved wrong, the magic number rose to 80%, 83%, 85%, and then it became 90%, according to a 2001 Health Services Research report. Later health experts commonly cited 95%. But that too was insufficient — measles outbreaks occur even when the vaccinated population exceeds 95%, leading some to say a 98% or 99% vaccination rate is needed to protect the remaining 1% or 2% of the herd. But even that may fall short, since outbreaks occur in fully vaccinated populations. “The target would be to have 100% of the population vaccinated,” Dr. Gregory Taylor of the Public Health Agency of Canada recently told CBC, voicing an increasingly common perspective among public health professionals. At that point, the balance of the herd that would be protected through mass vaccination would be precisely 0. In fact, herd immunity — so elusive today — fully existed prior to the vaccine’s introduction. Virtually 100% of the population then contracted measles, typically as children, giving everyone lifelong immunity — and future mothers the means to protect their offspring. In mass vaccinating US, scientists of the 1960s didn’t realize that infecting us with the measles vaccine — a weak version of the natural measles virus — would give us a weak version of the defenses our bodies develop to the real thing. Herd immunity sounds fine in theory. But as Stanford’s Dr. Obukhanych concluded, “As with any garbage in-garbage out type of theory, the expectations of the herd-immunity theory are bound to fail in the real world.”

They said it, not me, I’m just the message girl. ***

THE MITCHAM CITY COUNCIL ... WHO? By James Reed

I heard about this one from my brother who has a nice house in the leafy Adelaide suburb of Mitcham (near Unley High School, where Julia Gillard apparently went). Mitcham is south of the city centre, basically divided by Unley Road. It is mainly white Anglo middle class, like my brother. But, political correctness has crept in even there:

‘It will be a silent night by Brownhill Creek this Christmas, after Mitcham Council dumped its highly popular carols night. The council decision ends 25 years of the *Carols By The Creek* event, which regularly attracted more than 5000 people. The seven councillors who voted to abolish the carols cited its cost (about \$45,000) and said the event was not inclusive for non-Christians. Hundreds of readers on Advertiser.com.au and our Facebook page have slammed the decision. At 6pm on Thursday the poll further down this story had 90 per cent of respondents calling on the council to reinstate the event. During a narrow 7:5 vote to discontinue the event, Cr Darren Kruse said he was happy to be known as the “Christmas Grinch”. “Council should not be funding what fundamentally is a religious event with no co-contribution from the churches,” Cr Kruse said during an hour-long debate on the issue. “It’s not inclusive because it talks to one major religion ... the Christian religion ... although it is dominant, that is not our demographic. “If the churches want to run it, they should run it.”

My brother who goes to one of the local churches near where the carols event used to occur, is livid about this, and expected that some of the massive council rates, relative to other areas of Adelaide, would go to something he liked. Now he will have to go down by the Mitcham Library, with his arthritic old black Labrador, 'Snoo', and weakly bay at the moon. Or move back home to Melbourne, a more civilised place. Come home. Bro!

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)’

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

Telephone: 08 8387 6574

**On Target is printed and authorised by K. W. Grundy
13 Carsten Court, Happy Valley, SA.**