



A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

ON TARGET



- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance -

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.41, No.15

April 29th, 2005

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "Merely to state that these (common law) rights exist is no guarantee that they will be observed. The struggle will always go on to ensure that authority is subject to law, that there is a proper balance and division of power. It must not be supposed, because we have no more royal tyranny, that we have disposed of the tyrant forever. The will to power lurks in many breasts..."
— Canon Arthur Fellows in *"The Foundations of Liberty"*, 1973

THE GLOBAL WARMING OF A CLIMATE OF FEAR by James Reed:

The Kyoto Climate Treaty has become international law with the approval of the Russian Federation. The United States got things right on this one, maintaining that the idea of human caused global warming was unproven. No matter: the ruthless, rootless cosmopolitans who dominate the United Nations have wanted this treaty in force as a matter of religious "faith" – and a foul and sinister "faith" it is.

Global warming is a matter of religious faith, not scientific truth. As will be argued in this article there is no cogent scientific evidence to support the hypothesis of human-caused global warming. There is no consensus among scientists about the empirical support of this hypothesis except among a group of elites who feed off a massive quantity of research grants and jet around the world (producing greenhouse gases) producing hot air about why we should not produce greenhouse gases, i.e., live a civilized life.

The global warming cult is based upon a climate of fear which sustains a culture of panic. Michael Crichton's new novel *State of Fear* gives a good portrayal of this. The novel attacks the greenhouse nonsense and, unusual for a "fiction" work, has a bibliography referring to the work of dissenting scientists. We can be sure that this is one book which Hollywood will not be making a movie out of. Or if they do, the plot will be turned completely around to protect the Kyoto craze. The real plot behind Kyoto – to create a worldwide economic collapse of the Western nations to further the globalist dream of a one-world communist society will not be seen on the silver screen. Films such as *The Day After Tomorrow*, showing the destruction of civilization (overnight!) by global warming are made and promoted to reinforce this climate of fear.

Let us briefly examine the main scientific evidence for global warming:

The first assumption which is seldom examined by both sides in this rather one-sided debate, is that humanly caused quantities of carbon dioxide (CO2) act as an atmospheric blanket, increasing temperatures.

IN THIS ISSUE: • *Thought For The Week* • *The Global Warming Of A Climate Of Fear* • *So... David Irving Was Right After All!* • *On Nazis, Republics, Monarchy, Our Constitution And All Things British* • *The Aboriginal 'Battering Ram'*

However, even if average increases in global temperature had occurred, these are not necessarily due to CO2 increases. Correlation does not prove causality.

A number of scientific studies have examined the relationship between atmospheric CO2 and air temperature, based upon Antarctic ice core data extending over a quarter of a million year period as represented through the ice cores. It was found that the earth's air temperature rose first before any increase in atmospheric CO2. This time lag period is about 400-1,000 years.

Global warming may thus cause CO2 increases rather than it being the other way round. The warming may be due to increased activity of the sun. The correlation between solar activity and average global temperature increases is statistically significant, but not that between carbon dioxide and temperature increases. In any case, even if a global warming trend does exist, this could be no more than a long term statistical average increase in temperature arising from the planet coming out of the last ice age of 10,000 years ago.

But is there really any good scientific evidence that global warming is actually occurring at all? The global warming thesis is primarily based on computer models of the world's climate. These type of "world system" models are necessary simplifications of an enormously complex phenomena. Models of national economies are simple by comparison and the limits of these economic models are well known. So the more complex model must be subject to even greater uncertainties. Garbage in; garbage out.

Greenhouse fanatics made much of the claim that Greenland has allegedly lost 51 cubic kilometres over the last five years. But Greenland's ice sheet has a volume of 2,600,000 cubic kilometres, so at that rate the whole sheet will be gone in 260,000 years! Don't blow up your inflatable boat just yet. Again there are alternative explanations of the ice lost including natural variations in both snowfall and ocean currents. These alternative explanations are typically discounted by the greenhouse lobby.

What about the study of the rings of temperature-sensitive trees? The greenhouse argument here is based on the idea that the various chemical changes can't be explained on a natural basis. It is conjectured – not proven – that human activity must be responsible. Again cosmological explanations are discounted. But there is good scientific evidence that in the last two hundred years, solar activity has been far greater than the greenhouse orthodoxy accepts. Good science involves thoroughly examining competing hypotheses before concluding that humanity is at fault.

This is of course not done because immediately the greenhouse of cards would collapse. It would challenge the new world order religion of 'environmentalism' which sees humans as pests on the surface of the earth. This reductionism is profoundly anti-Christian. It is a dark religion, a worship of nihilism and human death. Just as the fanatics of the cult of Kali threw themselves under a giant wheel to be crushed to death, so do these 'environmentalists' wish to crush Western civilisation under the wheel of death. The greenhouse "hoax" is but one of many spokes in this wheel.

The first step in overcoming such global tyranny is to keep informed of what "the enemy" is up to. Critically evaluate everything you read and hear. Don't blindly trust experts – they are often someone else's 'tool'. This is the first step in over-coming fear and walking down the road to freedom.

SO... DAVID IRVING WAS RIGHT AFTER ALL! by James Reed:

A recent article in *The Weekend Australian*, 2-3/4/05, confirms what historian David Irving said for many years: Adolf Hitler wanted a friendship with Britain. The qualification is now that this was before the Munich Agreement, but after that Agreement, 'love' turned to 'hate' and the standard story rolls on. No word about Hesse's peace flight to Britain and the fact that Hesse's files have been sealed by judicial order for 50 years. Nevertheless this latest admission is an important retreat by Establishment historians.

ON NAZIS, REPUBLICS, MONARCHY, OUR CONSTITUTION AND ALL THINGS BRITISH:

Back in school during boring lessons such as mathematics, I and most other boys would be naughty and draw the naughtiest things we knew – Nazi swastikas – on papers or sometimes on our desk with a compass. It did not lead to me or my other friends becoming Nazis. The reception by the media in general, and the Jewish lobby in particular, given to Prince Harry's 'swastika arm-band' incident at a fancy dress party was predictable.

At the time, Peter Kohn's *Australian Jewish News* "Outlook", 21/1/05, cited a number of authorities who claimed that the prank by a 20-year-old indicated a lack of "teaching" of the Holocaust to the young.

Leading the charge was Professor Andrew Markus, director for the "Centre for the Study of Jewish Civilisation" at Monash University, who was quoted as saying: "There has generally been a dulling of the senses about critical events like the Holocaust and World Wars." According to the article, 63 per cent of people in one US sample are unfamiliar with Auschwitz and 75 per cent in the United Kingdom. The Jewish writers are concerned that these figures are too high. It doesn't occur to them, or they do not address, the obvious reply that the Prince is simply part of the unfamiliar young. They may argue that a Prince should be familiar. Well they should have lifted his game and made him familiar by sending him Holocaust literature, videos, DVDs, etc., on a regular basis. Of course the lad would have been interested to research the topic! Surely, if the educational system is at fault, it is a cop out to blame individuals.

But there is another response that could be made to this incident suggested to me by my friend's teenage son (same age as Harry).

He said: "Look why has everybody got a 'wedgy' [presumably this means 'uncomfortable underpants' in young talk] because the guy was at a fancy dress ball. People go as the Prince of Darkness and all sorts of evil dudes. All those old f.... should 'chill out' ". I take it this means in translation that a mountain is being made out of a molehill.

Of course the event plays into the republicans hands – or so it was said. The Jewish Community Council of Victoria is quoted as saying that Harry is "an unfeeling, insensitive twit... If you want an advertisement for a republic, it would have to be Prince Harry."

Jeremy Jones, *The Review*, February 2005, said that Harry's behaviour "was disgusting and embarrassed the royal family". "Who has been guiding this person", www.news.com.au (13/1). *The Australian*, 15/1/05, put it all in a nutshell: "Enemies of Israel deny or demean the extent of the Holocaust because they realize it shapes Israeli actions still."

The wearing of a Nazi arm-band at a fancy dress ball is not necessarily an endorsement of Nazism or Holocaust denial. If it was, it would raise a problem for Hollywood which produces a crop of anti-Nazi movies each season with arm-bands aplenty.

Predictably again, the republicans were crying that a "constitutional crisis" had been created by Harry's father, Prince Charles' marriage to Camilla Parker Bowles. "Made in Heaven for the Arm", *The Weekend Australian*, 12-13/2/05.

This was all said even though the Commonwealth Constitution makes no reference to the royal spouse. It is true that the marriage of King Edward VIII in 1937 to a divorced woman was controversial because in those days divorce was controversial. Today it is more common than ignorance of the Holocaust. Again, in the words of our young male – "chill out dudes".

The Monarchy and all things British are constantly under attack, sometimes even by those claiming to be friends. For example, David Smith in an article in *Quadrant*, November 2004, "Why the Queen is Not our Head of State" attempts to diminish the Queen's role to vanishing point. For Smith, the

governor-general is our Head of State. Such must be the fear of embracing the clear words of the Commonwealth Constitution that these tactics must be resorted to, to defend our Constitutional Monarchical system.

THE ABORIGINAL 'BATTERING RAM' by Betty Luks:

When are concerned Australians, both black and white, going to wake up to what is happening to the foundations of their country through the various 'rights' movements, including aboriginal 'rights'? If the political objective was to genuinely improve the living conditions of our aboriginal people, i.e. education, health and social infrastructures, etc., we should expect to see exceptionally positive results after twenty years and the billions of dollars of taxpayers' monies already spent.

But no, that hasn't happened. Why? Because the objective is not really improvement for the aboriginal communities of the sovereign nation of Australia. There is a far more sinister agenda than that and the Australian aboriginal people are one of the "battering rams" being used to push through that 'other' agenda.

People with genuine problems should not be just 'expendables' in ideological campaign: The living conditions of Aborigines would improve dramatically if they were treated as people with genuine problems, rather than as expendable 'cannon fodder' in an ideological campaign.

But no, for many years the Aboriginal 'industry' insisted that, as an article of ideological faith, their "rights" to land, recognition, and "justice" were essential to Aboriginal well being. Any suggestion that Aborigines could successfully assimilate into the mainstream of Australian life was greeted with horror.

The rejection of "assimilation" was based on the proposition that it posed a threat to native title, because it destroyed the argument that the mystical relationship between Aborigines and their land is essential for their well-being.

The charge from the Aboriginal industry was that Aborigines needed even more "rights" than other Australians, therefore, they can lay claim to economic, financial and political privilege on the basis of their race and past "oppression".

Such was not the genuine answer to "reconciliation" between the two groups. But then those heading the Aboriginal 'industry' know this. The League has persistently stated the only genuine answer is to insist that all disadvantaged Australians should be assisted to improve their circumstances. If some choose to pursue an Aboriginal culture, let them do so. Few Aborigines continue to live in a traditional lifestyle, and would lose little by "assimilation".

But it is their cultural masters, the leaders of the Aboriginal industry who would have much to lose. **They risk losing "the battering ram" they need to wrest "sovereignty" from the Crown. And this is the goal of a longer-term agenda; an agenda beyond what most Aboriginal Australians have yet come to realize.**

Aboriginal Australians need to think very carefully about this matter. How many honestly believe they would be better off governed by Zimbabwe's Robert Mugabe and his Marxist system and henchmen? What about the Indonesian over-lords; would the over-lords treat them well? I wonder what the East Timorese would say to that?

If they think they will keep this rich, but fragmented nation, without the protection and security of a strong united people, with strong defence capabilities, then they are being incredibly naïve. Australians including Aboriginal Australians need to resolve the genuine problems that beset us so that all might live in peace and security and freedom.

"ON TARGET" is printed and published by The Australian League of Rights, 145 Russell St., Melbourne.

Postal Address: GPO Box 1052, Melbourne, 3001. Telephone: (03) 9650 9749, Fax: (03) 9650 9368.

Subscription \$40.00 p.a.