



A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

ON TARGET

STATE LIBRARY

- 7 DEC 2006

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance –

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.42, No.48

December 8th, 2006

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: There is something delightfully quaint about the way we debate the common European foreign policy in Britain. We make sonorous noises about the importance of NATO. We trot out cliches about Britain's links to the rest of the English-speaking world. But we are a decade too late. To all intents and purposes, we are already in a common foreign policy.

On Wednesday, Brussels announced plans to merge the 25 national consular services in non-EU countries: a tidying-up measure since, in most of the world, Brussels has taken over diplomatic representation from the member states.

Go to any banana republic and you will find that the national legations have been displaced by giant EU embassies (still coyly known as 'missions of the European Commission'). I have just come back from Nicaragua where Britain recently closed its embassy because the tasks it used to perform – trade, aid and visas – have been absorbed by the EU.

And what is the primary function of these imposing and well-staffed EU embassies? To encourage other countries to form their own regional associations, in mimicry of the EU. The Central American nations are being told, in no uncertain terms, that the EU will sign commercial and development deals only with supra-national blocs, not individual states. Members of ASEAN, Mercosur, the African Union and the rest are told the same thing.

Some of them don't much like it: Costa Rica, which diverges historically, politically and ethnically from its neighbours, resents being pushed into a regional parliament whose chief purpose seems to be to afford immunity to ex-dictators. When I passed on this argument to a British euro-diplomat, he replied, with the air of a man delivering a brilliant put-down: "That's like arguing that Britain shouldn't join the euro!"

Such are the people representing us abroad; yet still we tell ourselves that we are independent.

– Daniel Hannan's *EU Briefing*, November 2006

THE WHEAT DEBACLE CAN BE SOLVED by Patrick O'Shea: "Woe to the politicians who do not understand wheat." – Socrates.

Take it, that despite all that has been reported and regurgitated from the Cole Enquiry, the great majority of grain growers still want the single desk exporting concept to stay.

Okay – but how? There is only one way. The National Party has its greatest chance in decades to come out from the political shadows and cat's paw role they are locked into within the Coalition.

In this issue: • *Thought For The Week* • *The Wheat Debacle Can Be Solved* • *Misleading And Mischievous Claims* • *The 'Common Purpose' EU Agenda* • *A Picture Tells A Thousand Words*

"ON TARGET"

December 8th, 2006

Page 1 (189)

Simply say to the Joint Party: "The single desk stays." "Bring in better governance as the reform!" Take on all objections, from Prime Minister Howard to all maverick backbenchers, calling for the end of the AWB. Remember the Traders are circling.

Big growers are whinging and W.A. growers are claiming great disadvantages without proof. Maybe Mr. Howard is considering 'reform options' with the Free Trade long-term agenda in mind?

The National Party *can* stand up and show they are still a force and keep faith with their long-suffering electorate. Remember, Mr. Howard needs the Nationals – not the other way round.

MISLEADING AND MISCHIEVOUS CLAIMS: Hands up those readers who have received the email titled: "Forget your mortgage lender, it's the Queen who has first claim on your home". It would appear that is the misleading and mischievous claim made by 'investigative journalist' and financial writer Kevin Cahill in a forthcoming book "Who Owns the World: The Hidden Facts Behind Landownership".

Excerpts from the book are being circulated via email and the claim is: 'The Queen owns the ground beneath everyone's feet.'

We asked Dr. David Mitchell to explain what is the legal situation: "Like much of the nonsense currently being circulated regarding alleged inapplicability of law, this claim sounds as if it might be right. Indeed, there is a sense in which there are elements of truth behind the claim but these elements are so misrepresented that they are completely misleading and mischievous.

In our constitutional system the term Crown or Queen can be confusing because it usually has no reference to the person of the monarch. Both these words are generic terms meaning "the government". It is nonsense to say that the Queen has any claim, let alone first claim, on your home. By legislation, the government does have some rights, but the Queen in person has none.

The law protected Freeholder's rights: Historically, the idea was that the monarch "owned" the land and could deal with it however he chose. When the monarch was strong enough to defend his "ownership" by physical force the historical theory worked in practice. However, when a stronger claimed the land, the monarch no longer "owned" it. As English law and its enforcement developed, the technical "ownership" by the king was recognised but the concept of "freehold" was also recognised as ownership. "Freehold" existed when the king granted land, for whatever reason, to another person without retaining any right to recover the land. Such land was referred to as being "alienated" because it was no longer "owned" by the king. The law protected the freeholder's right to his land against everyone, including against the king. The freeholder could himself assign his ownership, or rights in the land, to another person. Of course, assignments from the king or from a freeholder could be conditional. If land is assigned for a limited period the assignment is called a lease.

Lender and borrower – 'his' land: When land is offered as security for money lent, historically the title actually passed to the lender. The loan document was called a "dead hand (or dead glove)" (mortgage) because the borrower was no longer in control of "his" land. The "owner" retained only "an equity of redemption" (a right to demand the return of the land on repayment of principal and interest). Since the passing of the Land Titles Acts in every State of Australia the term "mortgage" is still used but the freeholder retains title. If the borrower fails to fulfil his contract to repay principal and interest the lender has power to sell the land for the purpose of recovering what is owing to him under the loan contract.

The way in which land is held or owned is called "tenure". The owner is called a "tenant" (e.g. tenant in fee simple, joint tenant, tenant in common), not because he pays rent but because "tenant" means "holder".

Unalienated 'Crown' land and Native Title claims: The "unalienated" land of Australia (or Great Britain or Canada or New Zealand) is referred to as Crown land, not because it is owned by the Queen but because it is controlled by the government. In Australia all unalienated Crown land is now subject to possible claims for Native Title.

The Queen in person does own land in freehold, as do other members of the Royal Family, (particularly in U.K., perhaps in other countries also) but unalienated Crown land is not hers. "Crown" land is government land of the country concerned.

The Queen has no power to resume land from a freeholder for her own benefit. Resumption can only take place if there is government legislation authorising it. In the Commonwealth and in every State there is legislation authorising the government to resume land for public purposes, but the payment of "just compensation" to the landowner is required. Compulsory acquisition is common, particularly for road making or widening. Acquired land does not become the property of the Queen, even in war time. If the acquisition is stated to be in the name of the Queen or the Crown, this still means the acquisition is by and for the government."

THE 'COMMON PURPOSE' EU AGENDA by Betty Luks: The British Housewives' League has published a paper in *The Lantern*, October 2006, alerting their fellow Britisher to another facet of the push for a 'new world order'. The report outlines the agenda and tactics of a semi-secret group known as 'Common Purpose', whose stated aim is to set up a 'post-democratic' society in the United Kingdom under the rule and reign of the European Union parliament and its bureaucrats. One doesn't have to read too far to detect the same old finger-prints all over the document.

It is well over twenty years since I had read Whittaker Chambers' story in "Witness" – but I recognised the same old philosophy, the same old tactics and techniques that he had written about from his own personal experiences.

The younger generation might never have heard the story of the former communist secret agent Whittaker Chambers and his dealings with a Communist Fifth Column which infiltrated the upper echelons of the United States Government.

But, on 3rd August 1948, Whittaker Chambers then a senior editor of the prestigious Time magazine, shocked his fellow countryman by alleging before the Un-American Activities Committee that Alger Hiss, president of the venerated Carnegie Endowment for International Peace and previously a high State Department official, had served with him in the Communist underground.

Chambers wrote his book "Witness" in an effort to explain to his children – and to his fellow American – why men and women turned to Communism and what made a dedicated Communist 'tick'.

In summary, potential converts were presented with a Vision and a Faith. The *Vision* was of a brave new world which *inspired* the convert, giving him the Faith to be willing to live or die for those convictions.

The Communist Vision pointed from a World in *Crisis*, to a Vision of a 'more glorious' World Order. The world Crisis *impelled action* towards the 'more glorious future'.

Baffled by the power over the mind: He insisted the secret of the Communist power over the minds and lives of men, baffled most people because in large measure the rest of the world had lost the power to hold convictions at all – let alone act upon them. Communists, wrote Chambers, are that part of mankind which had recovered the power to live or die – to bear witness – for their faith.

This type of faith is not new. It is in fact man's second oldest faith. Its promise was whispered in the Garden of Eden under the Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil: "Ye shall be as gods." Other ages have had great visions, they have just been different versions of the same type. Either:

The vision of God and Man's relationship to God – and to one another.
The Communist vision of Man *without* God.

Ex-Communists' shared experience: Chambers explained there is one experience which most ex-Communists share, and he retold a conversation he had with the daughter of a former German diplomat in Moscow who had defected to the West.

As an 'enlightened modern man' the diplomat had been extremely pro-Communist, but upon conversion became implacably anti-Communist. The daughter was perplexed by this dramatic change and her father's explanation as to why:

"One night in Moscow my father heard screams. That's all. Simply one night he heard screams."

Five annihilating words: The daughter, as a child of Reason and the 20th century, knew that there is a logic of the mind. What she didn't know was that the soul has a logic that may be more compelling than the mind's. She didn't see that she had swept away the logic of the mind, the logic of history, the logic of politics and the myth of the 20th century with those five annihilating words: one night he heard screams.

Chambers continued: What Communist has not heard those screams? Execution, says the Communist code, is the highest measure of social protection. What man can call himself a Communist who has not accepted the fact that Terror is an instrument of policy, right if the vision is right, justified by history, enjoined by the balance of forces in the social wars of the century?

Those screams have reached every Communist's mind. Usually they stop there.

But one day the Communist really hears those screams. Suddenly, there closes around him a separating silence, and in that silence he hears screams. He hears them for the first time and they reach beyond his mind, they pierce his soul, and he says to himself:

"Those are not the screams of a man in agony, those are the screams of a soul in agony."

He hears them for the first time because a soul in extremity has communicated with that which alone can hear it – another human soul.

A genuine Vision is desperately needed: But, it is not enough that we understand what drives a dedicated Communist, or a dedicated Monopolist, or a dedicated Common Purpose member or any other 'one-worlder', if we are to survive the coming chaos and set about rebuilding, we also must seek a genuine Vision – and act upon it!

To 'take root' and grow the Vision must be based on mutual love and co-operation between human beings (do unto others as you would have them do unto you) – and that is just what Social Credit seeks to do, and is one aspect of the practical application of the Christian Faith, in the lives of men and women - with souls!

A PICTURE TELLS A THOUSAND WORDS by James Reed: The future revealed in a photograph! The illustrative photograph to an article by Shelley Gare on our troubled schools (*The Weekend Australian*, 11-12/11/06, p.29) has a portrayal of "new university students". The class is almost entirely Asian. With some minutes of study and a magnifying glass, I spotted two Aussies i.e., Anglo-Australians.

Soon it will not be possible to play spot-the-Anglo at all. Isn't this discriminatory, or is this just business-as-usual in creating the next class of elites to rule over us?

"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.