



- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Print Post Publication Number 10000815

Vol. 56 No. 04

7th February 2020

IN THIS ISSUE

Camus on Replacism By Richard Miller	2
Letters to the Editors	3
Sex is for Married Heterosexual Couples Only: Church of England By Mrs Vera West	4

THOUGHT OF THE WEEK: “Work and Income – extract from *Understanding The Financial System* – **Frances Hutchinson**

...Why, in fact, did the peasants throughout the nineteenth century have to move into towns for money wages? Was it the pressure of higher money wages than they could earn as farm labourers, or the promise of a better lifestyle? The question reveals a great deal about the standpoint of a reader, who has been conditioned by a mainstream education into thinking in terms of ‘progress’ from rural poverty to urban plenty. From this perspective, *Rational Economic Man*, the hero of economics textbooks, migrates for ‘economic’ reasons, that is, for the higher money wages made available through industrialisation. This is, however, a ‘teleological’ (*the explanation of phenomena by the ‘purpose they serve’ rather than by postulated causes*) argument.

The emergence of landless labour was a direct result of **enclosures**, which were undertaken on grounds of financial profitability, rather than the free choice of the ‘labourer’. Throughout long ages the right to use a piece of land, together with rights to the resources of commons and waste lands to provide for one’s family has been a fundamental human right. The power of moneyed interests to take the land from the people for commercial ‘development’... dates back to the dawn of modern times. From the outset, enclosure of land has been a legal process, endorsed by the force of laws passed by the political sphere of society:

*They hang the man and flog the woman, That steal the goose from off the common,
But let the greater villain loose, That steals the common from the goose.*

James 1st to the Parliament of 1603 : *I will ever prefer the weal of the public, and of the whole commonwealth, in making of good laws and constitutions, to any particular and private ends of mine; thinking ever the wealth and weal of the commonwealth to be my greatest weal and worldly felicity; a point wherein a lawful king doth directly differ from a tyrant: for I do acknowledge, that the special and greatest point of difference that is between a rightful king and an usurping tyrant is this, that whereas the proud and ambitious tyrant doth think his kingdom and people are only ordained for satisfaction of his desires and unreasonable appetites, the righteous and just king doth, by the contrary, acknowledge himself to be ordained for the procuring of the wealth and property of his people.*

Arnīs Luks - Individual freedom and personal property ownership are inseparable. The modern era’s polical ‘outcomes’ are comparable with the historical ‘**enclosures**’. Live-stock removed from historical grazing land — National Parks — with the subsequent buildup of fuel loads, lack of ready access to ‘affordable’ energy and water, (especially for agriculture,) and ever increasing taxes and fees on property, are all outcomes of a long term plan. Our aspiring propertied-classes are being financially squeezed away from the soil where they could be more independent and self-reliant, and then herded into the (landless) city highrises. Governments of all persuasions are doing the bidding of the duopoly — bigger-government (UN) and big-money — with the help of the ‘willing handmaid to power’ the MSM, (all forms of education and information broadcasting), quick to turn the heat to white-hot for any who may be thinking otherwise. The UN’s policy implementation, (Agenda 2030), continues unabated towards World-Government. The Monopolising Cartels controlling Industry and Resources continues towards World-Ownership, International Central Banking at the apex controlling both. All forms of education and information broadcasting have left the public ill-informed and un-prepared, putty in the hands of this power group. The dual-political-party system — dominated by the MSM — has overcome ‘democracy’ as a mechanism against tyranny. Tyranny must again be fought, by sufficient individual ‘will’ and ‘outworking’ (faith) being materialised (incarnated), or the day will come when we wake up to realise our freedoms are gone.

***Our ALOR online archives, continually being added to,
are an excellent resource to research for articles that ‘pave the way back to freedom’. ******

CAMUS ON REPLACISM By Richard Miller

Disclaimer: we do not necessarily agree with everything said here in Camus's article, but merely report the items said, since it is a matter of public interest; that is what journalism is about, covering the news in the public interest: <https://www.zerohedge.com/political/french-intellectual-sentenced-2-months-jail-after-calling-mass-immigration-invasion>

Here is French intellectual Renaud Camus writing on the Great Replacement, and the theme that immigration to France is an invasion – which got him a two-month suspended jail sentence:

<https://www.cnre.eu/en/appeal-of-colombey>

“Immigration has become invasion, invasion a migratory submersion. France and Europe are a hundred times more colonised, and more seriously so, than they ever colonised themselves. The only irreversible colonisation is a demographic one, the one which takes place via population transfer. Some people now say there is no colonisation, that the word is not proper, because there is no military conquest. Those people are wrong. The army of conquest are the delinquents large and small, all of those people who make life impossible for Europeans by harming them in every possible way, from the so-called incivilities to terrorism, which is in fact nothing but an extension of the rest. All the perpetrators of terrorist attacks launched their career in the violation of common law. Moreover, there are no terrorists. There is an Occupier who, from time to time, executes a few hostages, as occupiers have always done. I call occupiers all those who declare themselves to be such, or behave as such. The change in people, ethnic substitution, the Great Replacement, is by far the most important event in the history of our country since it has existed, because, with another people, the history, if it continues, will no longer be the history of France. France has always marvellously assimilated individuals who wanted to be assimilated. It cannot — it simply cannot — assimilate peoples, much less peoples who are hostile, demanding, even hateful and conquering. It requires a peerless form of vanity and complete ignorance of what a people is to think that with a changed population, another people, France would still be France. In the present situation, all words are liars but the most mendacious of all is “French” ...

One doesn't put an end to colonisation without the departure of the colonist: Algeria, in its time, showed us French that the hard way — a good opportunity for us now to underline the difference in civilisations. One doesn't put an end to an occupation without the departure of the occupying power, the occupying forces. There is no way out other than remigration. The same people who say this is impracticable want to bring forty million migrants to Europe, when it is not two hundred million.

They say mankind has entered an era of general migration. Let them migrate and remigrate then. What is possible in one direction should also be possible in the other, with greater gentleness, human respect, and more resources. The time for politics, elections, political parties, that time is over. The next presidential election in France is too far away. The change of people will by then have gone too far, the replacers will then be the kingmakers, unless they decide to be themselves the kings — the masters. In any case, there is no way to win a game in which your adversary holds all the cards and has set up all the rules. The powers-that-be, their banks, their judges and their media all want ethnic substitution. They are not in the least protecting us from it. Quite the contrary, they are organising it and promoting it. They have drugged people into accepting it, by the teaching of oblivion, by general deculturation, by censorship, by repression and permanent injections of self-hatred. They are not importing workers, because there is no work and there will be less and less in the future. They're importing future consumers whom they are no longer even making the effort to pretend are refugees since the vast majority of these migrants come from countries where there is not even a hint of war: there are often sick people, adventurous or conquest-minded youths, teenagers who've rowed with their parents or had run-ins with the police, tradesmen whose trade has failed. I know you object as these future consumers have no money. You are mistaken, if you permit me to say so. Tomorrow they will have yours. In truth, the supposed social transfers are little else than ethnic transfers. Europe is the first continent ever to pay for its own colonisation. A spectre haunts Europe and the world. It is Replacism, the tendency to replace everything with and by its double — standardised, normalised, interchangeable, low-cost: the original by the copy, the authentic by its imitation, the true by the false, mothers by surrogate mothers, culture by leisure and entertainment, knowledge by diplomas, the country and town by the universal suburb, the indigene by the allogene, Europe by Africa, men by women, men and women by robots, peoples by other peoples, humanity by a dazed posthumanity, undifferentiated, standardised, as interchangeable as you like. Of all forms of genetic manipulation, the Great Replacement, a kind of surrogate pregnancy applied to the entire planet, is by far the worst. Genocide by substitution, in the words of Aimé Césaire, the black communist Caribbean poet, is the Crime Against Humanity of the 21st century. It is a very strange thing, for that matter, that environmentalists seem to exclude man of their very commendable concern for biodiversity.

(continued next page)

(continued from previous page) Replacism now considers itself strong enough to take management of the human stock in hand directly, without intermediaries. In France, Emmanuel Macron, who, along with Justin Trudeau, is its most accomplished representative in the world, has already neutralised the political microcosm and sent the main actors in French political life over the last thirty years back to their homes, peopling the National Assembly with foot soldiers in his pay, building an *ad hoc* government, shattering all the major parties. He doesn't govern. He manages — as he would a bank or a PLC (*programmable logic controller-ed*). He exits politics via the economy, finance or corporate management. We want to exit it via history. The independence or subjection of a great nation, the survival or the disappearance of a great civilisation, that is not a question of politics, but of history. Charles de Gaulle in London, that was not politics. Jean Moulin in Lyon was not politics. Nor was Joan of Arc in Chinon, nor Churchill in the War Rooms, nor Gandhi in Calcutta, nor anyone who rose up for the independence of their country and the dignity of their people. What we need today is not a new party, not even a union of the Right: the rejection of totalitarian Replacism is no less a matter of the Left than the Right...

...What we need is a Council of National Resistance, of European resistance, because all European nations are invited to fight at our side for the well-being of our shared civilisation, Celt, Slav, Norman, Saxon, Germanic, Greco-Latin, Judeo-Christian and free-thinking. My friend Karim Ouchikh, president of the SIEL (*Society of International Economic Law*), and myself, Renaud Camus, have decided to found exactly that, a National and European Council of Resistance. We will publicly offer to unite with all public figures who seem to be motivated by the same desire to save our country and all European countries and we will expand our committee this way, through co-option. But all French people and all Europeans who think like us are invited to link up with us and offer their support. The aim is to put together a force such that, ideally, it would be unnecessary to make use of it.”

Strong words indeed, and we will see what comes of the National and European Council of Resistance. Like all articles on the same theme, the blame is put on the Other, where the root cause of the Other doing what they do comes because ordinary people do nothing to oppose the tide of evil. Thus, Camus will eventually say something more radical and get slammed in jail where he will be Epsteined, I suppose. The Sheeple graze on. ***

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

To *The Australian* We have a rare slip from Geoffrey Blainey (“An epic endeavour, a vexed debate”, 25-26/1): Aboriginal peoples were not “the first discoverers of Australia” but only of this continent - and there may have been others even before them. There is also a furphy from Angela Shanahan (“No welcome mat laid out for early European arrivals”, 25-26/1): immigrants from non-British nations have certainly contributed to our national character, but not (despite her claim) as much as “the English-speaking majority.” Australia remains primarily a British cultural creation, just over a hundred years old (if we date its origin as Federation) or twice that (if we go back to 1788). We enjoy a free way of life here (though not, alas, as totally free as it should be) thanks, essentially, to British endeavour. Any attempts to downplay the British contribution should be strongly opposed, since they also involve downplaying the importance of political freedom and open debate in public forums.

Nigel Jackson, Belgrave, Vic

To *The Age* Australians in general respect Aboriginal culture and see it as an important part of our national heritage, providing a distinctive element unique to our history. However, this does not mean that we should transform the nature of our wonderful Constitution to specially privilege one small minority of present-day Australians - those claiming Aboriginal ancestry (“Indigenous history vital to Australia Day”, 25/1). The Constitution originated as an agreement between the then colonies to form a single nation. It is not appropriate to turn it into a political manifesto. Divisive proposals that only make sense if there is a long-term goal of political separatism should be shunned.

Nigel Jackson, Belgrave, Vic

To *The Australian* Judith Sloan's critique of the Prince of Wales is too one-sided (“Charles could be the UK minister for silly talks”, 28/1). Yes, he may be irrational in his fears about climate change, but he did produce a very well thought out analysis of contemporary problems in his book “Harmony”. Moreover, someone who could count among his friends such eminent thinkers as Laurens van der Post and Martin Lings is certainly no fool. Prince Charles has an intellectual record, overall, that few royals in the preceding eleven hundred years ago can match; and he is highly regarded in many circles in Britain and Australia.

Nigel Jackson, Belgrave, Vic

SEX IS FOR MARRIED HETEROSEXUAL COUPLES ONLY: CHURCH OF ENGLAND By Mrs Vera West

Is there still a little bit of life left in the Church of England? Well, maybe:

<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/jan/23/>

sex-married-heterosexual-couples-church-of-england-christians

“The Church of England has stated that sex belongs only within heterosexual marriage, and that sex in gay or straight civil partnerships “falls short of God’s purpose for human beings”. Bishops have issued pastoral guidance in response to the recent introduction to mixed-sex civil partnerships, which says: “For Christians, marriage – that is, the lifelong union between a man and a woman, contracted with the making of vows – remains the proper context for sexual activity.” The church “seeks to uphold that standard” in its approach to civil partnerships, and “to affirm the value of committed, sexually abstinent friendships” within such partnerships. It adds: “Sexual relationships outside heterosexual marriage are regarded as falling short of God’s purpose for human beings.” The affirmation of traditional teaching at a time when the church is undergoing a major review of sexuality and marriage will delight conservatives. The Civil Partnership Act came into force in December 2005, allowing same-sex couples to acquire a legal status and rights in relation to property, inheritance and tax entitlement. In 2013, same-sex marriage was legalised. The C of E does not permit same-sex marriage. It allows clergy to be in same-sex civil partnerships as long as they are sexually abstinent. After the supreme court ruled in 2018 that mixed-sex couples should also have the right to a civil partnership, the law was amended. The first mixed-sex civil partnerships were registered last month. The Rev Dr Malcolm Brown, the C of E’s director of mission and public affairs, said:

“Civil partnership is not the same as marriage, which is founded on the taking of solemn public vows and is recognised in the church’s teaching as the only proper context for sexual relationships. “So, as with same-sex civil partnerships, there is no formal service or blessing but clergy will, as always, be encouraged to respond pastorally to couples wishing to formalise their relationship in this way.” This week the C of E House of Bishops issued a new pastoral statement on civil partnerships, restating traditional teaching on sex and marriage. The bishops say that, unlike traditional marriage vows, the legislation on civil partnerships “leaves entirely open the nature of the commitment that members of a couple choose to make to each other when forming a civil partnership. In particular, it is not predicated on the intention to engage in a

sexual relationship. “Because of the ambiguity about the place of sexual activity within civil partnerships of both sorts, and the church’s teaching that marriage between a man and a woman is the proper context for sexual intercourse, we do not believe it is possible for the church unconditionally to accept civil partnerships as unequivocally reflecting the teaching of the church.” C of E clergy “should not provide services of blessing for those who register a civil partnership”. The church has been racked by divisions for decades on what it says about and how it deals with LGBT issues. It has embarked on a large study of human sexuality, *Living in Love and Faith*, which is due to be completed this year. Many LGBT people within the church say they have been made to feel unwelcome, and activists have campaigned for the church to allow same-sex marriage and bless same-sex civil partnerships.

While upholding its position that marriage is a lifelong union between a man and woman, the bishops say the church seeks to “minister sensitively and pastorally to those Christians who conscientiously decide to order their lives differently”. Jayne Ozanne, a campaigner for LGBT rights and a member of the C of E’s ruling body, the General Synod, said: “I’m sadly unsurprised by the content of this statement but I’m deeply saddened by its tone. Linda Woodhead, a professor in the department of politics, philosophy and religion at Lancaster University, said: “The C of E is unable to get over its fixation on homosexuality, which is driving the the national church into a position more like a fundamentalist sect and does not speak to the vast majority of younger people today.”

As we can see the Left are very unhappy with this development, and will work hard to reverse it. I would predict that the Left will be successful in the end, because they are relentless and have the frantic energy of the mad. ***

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 **cheques to:** ‘**Australian League of Rights (SA Branch)**’

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

Telephone: 08 8387 6574 **eMail:** heritagebooks@alor.org

Online Bookstore : <https://veritasbooks.com.au/>

<https://alor.org/> our main website and repository of the **Douglas Social Credit** and Freedom Movement 'Archives'.

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