



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.42, No.16

April 28th, 2006

*May it Please Your Majesty,
On the occasion of your 80th birthday, and in the 54th year of your reign, we express
our deep affection and appreciation for your dedicated service to your people.
God Save The Queen!*

HONOURING THE QUEEN OF AUSTRALIA from David Flint's ACM column: "In this column on 5 April, 2006, I told of an eye witness report from a man who had been at the Opening Ceremony of the Commonwealth Games. He said that when Dame Kiri sang Happy Birthday, about 90% of the crowd, without any invitation to do so, stood, faced The Queen and joined in. When Dame Kiri went into God Save The Queen, almost everyone stood and boomed out the words. He said you could feel the love and affection for The Queen across the stadium of 80,000 people. I told him of a band of young constitutional monarchists who had distributed several thousand copies of both anthems outside the MCG.

Another eye witness Hans Paas of Newport, confirms that this report was correct.

He writes that "The vast crowd joined into the singing of Happy Birthday but then took a few moments to realise what Dame Kiri had gone on to sing and within another few seconds everyone in the stadium was on their feet singing with the same gusto we had sung Advance Australia Fair earlier. **Then at the end there was a roar from the crowd and a sustained standing ovation.**

My partner was watching Her Majesty through binoculars and observed everyone in the Royal Box slowly getting to their feet as they realised what was happening. The two Royal Princes must have realised that this was a Royal Salute after all and stood – awkwardly at first – as if they were not sure of the protocol.

Then Prince Phillip leaned down and urged Her Majesty to stand. Clearly our Queen was stunned by the affirmation and acclamation of the crowd. Unlike during the Golden Jubilee celebrations she had not prepared herself for this great gesture of affection. We could all tell that she must have been moved.

In a way it turned out better because the crowd decided on what the right protocol was and left it to the misguided politicians to join us.

I know I am biased but I think everyone felt they wanted to snatch this opportunity to show how they felt about this marvellous lady. It may sound lame in this macho era but love was really in the air. You

In this issue: • *Honouring The Queen Of Australia* • *Freedom Of Thought : Part 1 : Africans And Crime* • *The War Against Boys* • *Pig Iron John*

"ON TARGET"

April 28th, 2006

Page 1 (61

could just tell that whatever the people in that crowd think about our constitutional future, we were in the presence of the most famous woman in the world and we loved it and her.

A footnote about Advance Australia Fair. It was also sung with great gusto but I had a sense that it was sung to The Queen as she stood there on the dais apart from the other dignitaries. Her arrival had been greeted with much applause and cheering but then we really wanted to sing our National Anthem for our Queen...

There can be no doubt – the rank and file Australian honours and respects The Queen of Australia."

"FREEDOM OF THOUGHT : Part 1 : AFRICANS AND CRIME by Ian Wilson LL.B.: Professor Andrew Fraser, who raised controversy last year when he questioned the government policy of flooding Australia with large numbers of African refugees, has been found to have made unlawful statements under the Racial Discrimination Act. Professor Fraser said in a letter published in the *Parramatta Sun* newspaper that expanding a black population was a "sure-fire recipe" for increased crime and violence. American black crime statistics and other evidence allegedly support such claims.

Considerable media controversy occurred as did the suspension of Professor Fraser from teaching at Sydney's Macquarie University. The Sudanese Darfurian Union also complained to the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission. *The Australian* of 4/3/06, p.3, reports that the Jewish Board of Deputies' president David Knoll helped in preparation of the complaint by the Sudanese.

Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission Chairman John von Doussa found that Professor Fraser's remarks were unlawful because they amounted to a "sweeping generalisation" not backed by research, so that Fraser's section 18 D defence of comments "made for genuine academic purposes in the public interest" was not met. Section 18 D was to give people the right to comment on controversial topics and maintain freedom of speech. At the time when the legislation was drafted the politicians said that race hate laws would not prevent the criticism of immigration matters. I was present at a Melbourne meeting when I heard such assurances. Of course it was a lie.

The powerful ethnic groups that supported this legislation – and this included representatives of the professional ethnics of almost all non-Anglo Saxon groups – also maintained that freedom of speech on immigration and race matters would not be affected. Case after case has shown otherwise.

If controversial remarks are made about a non-Anglo Saxon group then it will be found that the remarks were not made "reasonably" because, with circular logic, no "reasonable person" today could hold that position! I have seen this type of circular reasoning in all of the written judgements which I have sighted where judges have decided race-hate cases and I have commented about this legal flaw previously in these publications.

I have not seen the reasoning given by the HREOC chairman John von Doussa so logically I cannot yet make this same criticism. *The Australian* article says that von Doussa concluded that Professor Fraser's comments were not made with "sufficient constraints and proportionality" – whatever that means. How could controversial social criticism in the past – by Marx, Voltaire, Rousseau and Socrates – have been made with "sufficient constraints and proportionality"? Doesn't the "constraint" requirement just beg the very question of the debate?

As a legal hypothetical consider this one: is it possible for a reasonable person X to express doubts about the Holocaust (either that it occurred or the six million figure) with "sufficient constraints and proportionality"? By this I don't mean that person X establishes that revisionism is true, but only makes a public expression of that position in principle within the bounds of section 18 D.

I am willing to bet that it is humanly impossible to do this even as a legal skills exercise. Thus there really is no section 18 D defence for controversial and extremist views. As a matter of judicial

definition section 18 D defences will not cover "extremist" views – and extremist views now include criticisms of African migration. Such views are never "genuine" or "reasonably" held – by definition.

The Australian of 4/3/06, p.3, quotes NSW Jewish Board of Deputies president David Knoll, who helped prepare the complaint, as greeting the HREOC decision as (what the article calls) "an important milestone". Knoll is quoted to have said: "I have no difficulty with legitimate academic discourse but there is no such thing as freedom of hatred". Really? What this means is that there is no freedom of speech of extremist thought. But what is "extremist" thought? Typically this expression refers to thought that a powerful interest group does not like. And what about "extremist" thought made in past historical documents? The Old Testament would not find a publisher today if it was written as an original work in the present climate of politically correct Australia. Nor would many classic political and artistic works which constitute the classical canons of Western civilisation. Shakespeare and Marx would be race-haters.

Today as we all know, undemocratic immigration and multicultural policies have changed and are changing the historical and ethnic profile of Australia. Publications of this movement by writers better versed in history that I have documented these policies of perfidy. Although I didn't once believe it, I have come to accept in recent months that this is a "conspiracy" to ethnically dilute and eliminate Anglo Saxon Australians. This is an act of genocide according to the UN definition. The multicultural industry which works to produce a sense of historical guilt is also participating in a hate crime. Race hate laws effectively act to silence criticisms of this grand act of "race hate", so that our kind can pass away, quietly, with no effective protest at all.

It is about time that one of these race-hate cases is taken to the High Court. Of course I don't dream that there is a chance of victory, but what it will definitely show is the true extent of freedom of speech in Australia. Professor Fraser's case would be a good one to make a stand upon.

THE WAR AGAINST BOYS by James Reed: "What's Wrong With Boys" by Susan Maushart (*The Weekend Australian Magazine*, 8-9/4/06) deals with a problem existing right across the West. Boys are failing to compete academically with girls. Nor are boys doing as well as they once did. Although some feminists like to think that this is due to greater female intellect, the hard IQ data doesn't support them. Professor Richard Lynn has concluded that males have, generally, a higher IQ than women. Most IQ researchers accept that there are more male geniuses – and idiots – than females. Female IQ is nested more around the mean on the bell curve; there is greater variance in male IQ.

It is not a matter of raw intellect. Boys don't even volunteer to be school prefects anymore, and nor are boys turning to sports.

Maushart notes that of the 50,000 children taking medication for Attention Deficit disorder, boys outnumber girls five to one. Christina Hoff Sommers, a US academic who is an outspoken female critic of feminism, has recently published a book on this topic, entitled, naturally enough "The War Against Boys". Male culture is under attack by a feminist elite and boys are the victims.

It is not too difficult to see why things are as they are.

Today schools are horrible politically correct places where children are indoctrinated about new class values, guilt about Aborigines and the "invasion", the joys of multiculturalism and the evils of competition. Exams are out and so are true or false answers. Children now have to "reflect" and write journals. All of this nonsense benefits girls. Women conform better to oppression than men. Many women, for example, in every war known to mankind, have been prepared to ultimately mate with the enemy rather than fight to the death. I say this not to fault women but to state a long forgotten truth of socio-biology. It makes evolutionary sense for women to conform in this way, and many sociological studies of female conformity and compliance with authority back this up.

Note again that this is only a statistical generalisation: there are many dynamic women out there full of courage who refuse to conform to the new class ideology and I think that our League ladies are of this moral fibre. If only there were more of you!

The crushing anti-male environment of the modern classroom is highly destructive of young male creativity. Instead of learning about heroes of their race they are sprayed with politically correct poison. How could anyone do well in such an oppressive environment? The old school system was never unfair in this way against girls.

A 2001 survey done by Professor Faith Trent of Flinders University in Adelaide of 6000 teenage boys, found that boys in general felt "betrayed, disrespected and discriminated against at school".

Peter West, author of "What is the Matter with Boys?" argues that education has been "profoundly feminised" and that boys have been undermined by "overt messages about political feminism".

All of this has been part of the grand plan to destroy our people. Feminism, along with immigration and multiculturalism is one of the deadly weapons used by our enemy to break us down and ultimately destroy us.

Feminism is the "divide and conquer" strategy applied to the sexes and aims to demoralise and destroy the male. Without the warrior, the race quickly topples. In fact one can work and breed with the females as they all go down, in a genocidal exercise in economic efficiency maximisation.

Before we have any chance at all of achieving traditional goals such as social credit policies, we have to first, at a minimum, save our civilisation. Today we face problems of a depth unanticipated by an older generation of actionists.

PIG IRON JOHN by James Reed: One of the times I felt a sickening sense of shame at being an Australian was watching the TV coverage of the signing of the Australian-China uranium deal. Howard and Downer in their body language were like subservient peasants compared to the aggressive and strong Chinese. But beyond that John Howard *et al* have betrayed Western civilisation. They are feeding the military ambitions of a monster, a truly evil nation.

Chin Jin is chairman of the Federation for a Democratic China (Australian division) and published an article (one of the few critical press articles on this issue) "Put National Security Ahead of Economic Interests", *The Australian*, 30/3/06, p.12. Jin points out that although China is a signatory of the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, this is just ink on paper for China. It has signed human rights treaties which it also has ignored. China doesn't abide to World Trade Organisation requirements to open up its banking system and "China has shown nothing but contempt for intellectual property rights". China does what it wants.

Why should China be trusted? Chin Jin reminds us: "Let us not forget China where the private meetings of Christians in their homes are raided by police; where there are reports Falun Gong practitioners are placed in barbed wire camps and tortured; where an individual is sent to jail for seven to ten years for doing nothing but posting internet messages about democracy." This is the regime which Australia's elites suck up to for their thirty pieces of silver.

"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.