



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.34

September 1st, 2006

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "The qualities which Christ manifested in His life were a sense of freedom, balance, courage, initiative, simplicity. These qualities were displayed in a man unique in the history of human affairs.

Realistic Christianity is not possible unless the dangerous myth of "Judaео-Christianity" is rejected. Writing in "The Big Idea" (C.H.) Douglas said: 'It is necessary to face up to the fact of institutionalised Judaео-Christianity... which is simply Liberal Judaism. I repeat my belief, not only that Christianity has not failed because it has not been tried, but that it has not been tried mainly because Judaео-Christianity has taken care that it should not be tried.'

...The Christian concept of unity through diversity is reflected in the Doctrine of the Trinity...(neither confounding the Persons nor dividing the Substance).

Christ's revelation paved the way to free the individual from the domination of the group or the system... (and) Douglas stressed that a genuinely Christian society is one in which power is effectively in the hands of the individual members of that society, who are then in a position to make free choices, accepting of course, personal responsibility for the choices made."

– Eric D. Butler in "Releasing Reality: Social Credit & the Kingdom of God", 1979

THE MUSLIM MINDSET IN AUSTRALIA? When Eric Butler wrote the above book twenty five years ago, adherents to the Muslim religion in Western countries were not as many as today, and we had not experienced the consequences of the "race-hate" legislation. But thanks to the imposition of multiculturalism, the 'race-religion-hate' legislation and the dismantling of our national sovereignty through U.N. conventions, we are in great danger of losing our freedom to publicly discuss matters of concern to us. We must come to grips with what has happened to our freedoms and culture – and come out fighting!

Saltshakers www.saltshakers.org.au had this to say: The Muslim mindset, exposed in the Victorian Court of Appeal puts freedom of speech and the Australian culture under threat:

"It is impossible to vilify Islam without also vilifying Muslims, because the two are indistinguishable. "If one vilifies Islam, one is by necessary consequence vilifying people who hold that religious belief," Brind Woinarski, QC, told the court.

In this issue: • *Thought For The Week* • *The Muslim Mindset In Australia?* • *Religion In The Dock – At The Court Of Appeals* • *Another Matter Of Lawful And Cultural Concern* • *Homebuyers Beware*

"ON TARGET"

September 1st, 2006

Page 1 (133)

If that claim, made in the Victorian Court of Appeal yesterday by the Barrister for the Islamic Council of Victoria, was found to be true it would fundamentally change the freedom we have to speak about *any* religion in Victoria.

Justice Geoffrey Nettle asked Mr. Woinarski: "There must be, intellectually, a distinction between the ideas and those who hold them?"

Clearly the underlying assumption of Islamic Council: "We don't agree with that," Mr. Woinarski said. "But in this case it's an irrelevant distinction, because Muslims and Islam were mishmashed up together."

Despite so-called 'exceptions', under this assumption, any comedian, actor, journalist, and certainly any religious commentator, would be severely restricted to only saying nice things about *any* religion or face possible prosecution under Victoria's Religious Tolerance Act.

Any religious debate, no matter where it took place, could be found to contravene this Act simply because one person could claim they were vilified *by criticism of their religion* – despite the word *vilify* not even appearing in the Victorian Act.

This was clearly the underlying assumption of the Islamic Council when they instigated this case against Pastors Nalliah and Scot: From the first was the encouragement of three individuals to go to a seminar (conducted by these Christian pastors) to specifically lodge a claim that they were vilified by their (the Pastors') critique of Islam through to today.

Such an assumption is totally incomprehensible to a Western culture where free speech is a vital component of a democracy.

Clearly a wake up call to all Australians: The fact that the barrister for the Islamic Council could make such a claim should be a wake up call to *all* Australians as to how easily our freedom of speech could be removed by stealth..."

RELIGION IN THE DOCK – AT THE COURT OF APPEALS – Barney Zwartz of *The Age*, 23/8/06 reported: "Christians who were found to have vilified Muslims should not be banned from making statements that would be lawful by anybody else, two Court of Appeal judges suggested yesterday.

Discussing orders made against Christian pastors Danny Nalliah and Daniel Scot, Justice David Ashley said a judge could not restrain conduct that was lawful, and Justice Geoffrey Nettle questioned whether too much was expected of Pastor Scot.

The Victorian and Civil Administrative Tribunal ruled last year that the pastors and Catch the Fire Ministries vilified Muslims in a seminar, newsletter and article in 2002. They have appealed against the ruling and the remedy orders made by Judge Michael Higgins.

Debbie Mortimer, SC, for the Islamic Council of Victoria, said the Muslim side had sought a public apology and undertakings not to repeat the vilification, but the pastors had refused and said they did not recognise the findings or even the law on which they were based (the Racial and Religious Tolerance Act).

Truth is now 'not a defence': She said the tribunal gave the pastors another chance before ordering them to apologise in newspaper advertisements and granting the injunctions forbidding them from repeating the statements anywhere in Australia. She said the ban applied only to the two pastors.

Justice Geoffrey Nettle said: "Surely that can't justify restraining them from saying something that said by anyone else would be legal? In the case of the newsletter, for example, Pastor Nalliah says many churches have closed down. What's wrong with saying that?"

Ms. Mortimer replied: "The tribunal has found there is something wrong with saying it. Truth is not a defence, it's irrelevant to contravention of the act."

Justice Ashley said so many of the statements were entirely innocuous and asked how the pastors could legitimately be restrained from making them. Ms. Mortimer replied:

"Because the tribunal found that when they made them they made them in a way that contravened the act." She said the comments had to be seen in the overall context.

Justice Nettle said that if she was right that only some comments from the seminar were banned, "a layman whose first language is not English (Pastor Scot, from Pakistan) is supposed to go through 140 pages of judgement and discern from that things he may not say on pain of contempt". Running seminars on Islam is Pastor Scot's occupation.

Question of constitutional validity of the Act: Ms. Mortimer said he would have the same obligation under the vilification act, with no guidance. "There is a lot more guidance in this kind of order than the act provides."

Cameron Macaulay, barrister for the pastors, claimed that Judge Higgins made errors of law and that his orders were too wide, and questioned the constitutional validity of the act.

Solicitor-General Pamela Tate said the case did not come under the implied constitutional right to free speech because that right applied only to political and governmental matters.

Justices Nettle, Ashley and Marcia Neave reserved their decision."

ANOTHER MATTER OF LAWFUL AND CULTURAL CONCERN: Mr. Nick Maine of >nmaine@bigpond.net.au< has been following up the matter of welfare payments to some of these people coming to Australia as 'refugees':

"I have been following up the payments made to polygamists who have been allowed into this country. Maybe someone could enlighten me as to why these people have been brought here? During my enquiries with politicians and Centrelink I am told that although these people cannot marry again here, as that is then bigamy, they are however permitted to bring in all their existing wives and even accumulate more women and live in a de facto relationship and then claim further pensions.

RESPONSE: ATTORNEY-GENERAL RUDDOCK:

06/6850, MC06/8626: Mr. Nick Maine, 5/40 Duet Drive, Mermaid Waters, Qld., 4218
16 August, 2006

Dear Mr. Maine,

I refer to your e-mail dated 22 May 2006 in which you raised further concerns about bigamous marriages.

As you are aware, under Australian law, a person cannot be legally married to multiple partners. However, there may be people of many backgrounds in Australia who may be involved in more than one marriage-like relationship.

I am advised that if Centrelink assesses a customer as being involved in a marriage-like relationship, each person is paid the relevant income tested payment at the partnered rate. This ensures that people in more than one marriage-like relationship do not get a financial benefit above what is available to other customers.

Centrelink only makes payments to people who are entitled according to legislation and they use a variety of review activities directed towards the prevention, detection and deterrence of incorrect payments and fraud. The Government is also considering whether additional action is necessary.

I hope this information is of assistance to you. Thank you for bringing your views to the attention of the Government,

Philip Ruddock, Parliament House, Canberra ACT 2600

Telephone (02) 6277 7300 • Fax (02) 6273 4102 <<http://www.ag.gov.au>>

Actionists: Please write to your politician as well as the Attorney General, Philip Ruddock who can be contacted on:- <https://www.ag.gov.au/agd/www/ministerruddockfeedback.nsf/Feedback> And his Postal Address is: P.O. Box 1866, Hornsby Westfield, N.S.W., 1635.

HOMEBUYERS BEWARE: If Australians cannot rise to the multitude of threats facing them, then it is curtains for this country. It may retain the name of 'Australia' but it will not be the spiritual, moral and cultural federation that was born 200 years ago.

As you read the following email report from Germany, take careful note of what is really happening. Native Germans are losing their commercial properties and homes and rootless aliens are taking over. In this case it is the international money lenders, such as George Soros.

E-mail warning from overseas: August 23rd, 2006: "If you owe money on your home, beware! For the past three or four years it has been the policy of German banks to lend money for private homes but not to lend money to locals for commercial properties. This policy has not only forced many local commercial property owners into receivership, but also allowed foreign investors who could borrow money outside Germany, to come in and snap up German commercial properties at a tenth of their actual worth. The U.S. investor George Soros has spent at least 200 *billion* buying up German real estate.

Last night on NDR (Nord Deutsche Rundfunk TV) on a programme called *Frontal* they highlighted a new dangerous trend coming from the banks.

Foreign Investment companies are buying up private debts from local banks, then instead of taking the interest payments, or honoring the terms of the loans, they are foreclosing and demanding the full sum of moneys owed.

If the Person cannot pay the debt they owe immediately (they don't even allow time for the person to borrow from another bank) they are treated as defaulters and their homes or property are forcefully auctioned off.

Frontal showed a few examples, one man who had his family home auctioned off from under him and was forced to move out, another man had bought a large hall that he had rented out to an ALDI Market. Even though the rent ALDI was paying to him was much higher than his interest repayments to the bank, the Investment Firm took over his property and *they* now collect the rent from ALDI.

These U.S./U.K. Investment firms have names like TEXAS or in the above cases HUDSON.

How German banking laws *allow* the banks to sell off private debts was not explained in this programme, but it looks like the German banks (most foreign owned) use loopholes to transfer debts and although HUDSON has huge modern offices in Frankfurt they refused to be interviewed on camera.

If you live in Australia and think this cannot happen to you THINK AGAIN, most money borrowed for home loans in Australia was borrowed from U.S. Investors operating *through* Australian banks."

"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.