




ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance –

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.44, No.24

June 27th, 2008

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "But 1947 was also the year when the challenge against bank nationalisation forced on us a realisation of the restrictions and restraints imposed by the Constitution, and in particular Section 92. Consequently, this led to a rethinking of our approach. Because, unless the Platform was just to stagnate into irrelevance, the search had to be made for alternative means of achieving our objectives..."

"There was another important idea – a method more than a principle – which became closely associated with Fabianism. Sidney Webb called it "permeation". Today it would be called "consensus".... That I find to be an accurate description of the approach I and my colleagues have tried to bring to the affairs of this nation in our first term of office. From the National Summit on, we have attempted to transform the atmosphere of politics - the background, the assumptions, the shared information and perceptions of common goals, through which decisions can be made, not just by the Government and Parliament but by key groups and interests like business and unions..."

Source: Speech by the Prime Minister Robert (Bob) Hawke – to the Fabian Society Centenary Dinner, Melbourne, 18 May 1984.

"Nation Tired of Confrontation, says Hawke": But Hawke has some advice for Rudd: remember that Australia 'is the most over-governed country in the world with its many houses of parliament'; and as Rudd proceeds with reform through the Council of Australian Governments, beware the nonsense about states' rights.'
– Paul Kelly, *The Australian*, 5 March 2008

AFTER THE REVOLUTION YOU WILL DO AS YOU'RE TOLD! by Patrick O'Shea: Liberty: the catchcry; Equality: the objective; Fraternity: the happy ending when the workers rule the world! Workers of the world *unite*: we will attain our Utopia! Or so they thought.

But, the deceived were to learn: instead of the Proletariat ruling, it was The Party that now ruled and they were to do as they were told. As in George Orwell's "Animal Farm" they were to learn all men are equal... but some are more equal than others!

Nearing the end of the dark days of World War I, the world was to witness the next phase of the Revolution. This time, the bloody takeover of Christian Russia by the Bolsheviks. It is difficult for present Australians to comprehend the magnitude of the savagery and brutality inflicted upon the various peoples of Russia during this phase.

But the revolution must push on: with the Socialist International firmly in power under the Soviet

In this issue: • *Thought For The Week* • *After The Revolution You Will Do As You're Told!* • *Notes From The Red House* • *Maybe It Would Be Best If We Lost This Battle!*

regime, other tactics would be needed for the western phase. They had learned armed revolution would not work in the West.

Enter Cultural Marxism – the Ideological Phase: In the Australia of the 1920s, money poured in from the sympathetic European Socialist Internationale and the instructions for *methods* came direct from Moscow to the Australian communists. In fact, in the early stages of development for the Communist Party in Australia, funds were never a problem. It is sickening to research the naivety of grown men of those days accepting the communist brainwashing and believing in the fight for the 'glory of the Soviet'.

One of the main objectives was to change the Labor Party's nationalistic platform to one of Socialism. Some of the earliest prominent Trades Union members travelled to Moscow to receive their instructions and orders on how to betray their fellow countrymen and achieve this aim. For those who care to scrutinise it, they will see the Marxist platform of the Australian Labor Party (ALP) is still in place today.

How was this achieved? It was the Union Movement's structure through which these revolutionaries gained the power to control and direct and discipline the ALP members busily ushering in the Socialist agenda. Working away at ensuring the election of their own people to Federal Parliament was one of their main objectives.

1949 and China: The Chinese peoples were subjugated by Chairman Mao's Red Brigade with the backing of sympathetic western powers and the Christian Chinese and foreign missionaries were slaughtered like dogs.*

But Australia was not to be forgotten by the Socialist International. It was to become 'Red' via the Labor Party. A 'Labor' college was set up to instruct the comrades in establishing the Red International Labour Unions. The documented facts survive to this day.**

Work-clothed militant union officials, leading bloody-minded strikes one year changed into business suits the next. They then 'swanned' around in chauffeured-driven government limousines as Senators and Senate leaders.

Over time, Communists and Labor Party members became indistinguishable. Frequently Party conferences were one and the same thing. You could be a Communist one day and a Labor man the next. They dreamed of the day when Federal Parliament became their 'machine' for implementing the instructions from the Comintern for revolutionary war.

And then.... The Fabian Society: In the West, the Marxist cultural phase is mainly through the Fabian Society and Labor governments. The Fabian Society is the training ground for many who seek the pathway to Labor Party power. Fabian objectives are the same as the Communists but their way is not through armed revolution. Theirs is 'softly, softly catches monkey' or as Bob Hawke would put it: through 'consensus'.

The final phase of the Revolution is the complete subjugation of the peoples of the world - an unchallengeable power imposed through sheer brutality. And unless Australians arise from their sleep-walking and act to regain their freedoms, they will experience as much bitter fruit as did the Russian and Chinese peoples and as the Tibetans now do.

* "The Red Lacquered Gate". Try the internet for a copy. ** "The Garden Path" by M.H. Ellis, 1949; "Comrade No More" by Tony McGillick, 1980.

NOTES FROM THE RED HOUSE by Betty Luks: After reading Andrew Coyne's article (below) on the antics of the Canadian Human Rights Tribunal, and the psycho-political pressure that it wields upon its hapless victims, echoes from the past reverberated into the present day 'politically correct' climate for me. I searched out my tattered 1972 copy of "Notes From the Red House", a report

smuggled out of the Soviet Union exposing the psycho-political pressure, along with the mind-bending drugs, meted out to dissidents, not criminals mind you, but dissidents, within that slave state.

These were men and women who came to the attention of the KGB authorities as still having a mind of their own, whose spirit had not been broken, who had not wholly conformed to the 'thought processes', the 'politically correct' policies of the brutal Communist authorities.

The booklet lists some of these men: Vassily Ivanovitch Chernyshev, professor of mathematics, who was confined in the Leningrad "Special Psychiatric Hospital" wrote: "Although I am afraid of death, I would rather be shot. How horrible, how loathsome is the mere thought that my soul will be soiled, crushed!

Man's individuality vanishes, his brain is numbed, his sensibility destroyed, his memory lost. But what is worse, as a result of the "treatment", the delicate texture of human personality is coarsened, and this – brings death to creation. People forced to take "aminazin" cannot so much as read after taking the drug. Their mental process becomes an increasingly coarse and primitive one".

N.I. Chernyshev testifies that for more than 25 years, N.I. Broslavsky – a sane man – has been languishing in the same "hospital". He is offered freedom if he denies his faith in God.

Guenady Mikhaiovich Shimanov, (writer of the report): After further "treatment", the author expects to be released from the "hospital" and sent back to his beloved wife, a "feeble-minded, slobbering-mouthed, giggling individual".

"There has been some progress!" – the psychiatrist will say, "he has already lost his faith in God. Yet it is true that he reasons with some difficulty and can hardly move his tongue around, but his previous logic was merely a superficial one; as a matter of fact, he was raving."

"Special Psychiatric Hospitals" are known to exist in Kazan, Sychevka (Smolensk region), Leningrad, Cherniahovsk, Minsk, Dniepropetrovsk, Orel. It is very likely that they are also to be found in other regions. In many psychiatric hospitals special wards have been set aside for "treatment" against dissidents of all complexions.

The Moscow Patriarchate, recognized by the atheistic Government of the USSR, and kept under its control, maintains a stony silence."

MAYBE IT WOULD BE BEST IF WE LOST THIS BATTLE! Andrew Coyne, in *Maclean's* magazine writes: "I think my favourite *60 Minutes* segment ever was the time shortly after the fall of the Soviet Union that they sent a liberal Russian journalist to interview the surviving members of the Moscow base Institute of the Brain. The Institute as its name does not quite imply was set up after Lenin's death in 1924 for the purpose of analysing just what it was about the great man's brain that made him superior to other men. Lenin's body, or corpse, was embalmed, and kept on public view in Red Square. But the brain they'd cut up into thousands of micro-thin slices, the better to perform various tests on it. Which they'd be doing ever since.

What made the piece work was, in part, how deadpan it was. The correspondent never cracked a smile as he interviewed these people who had spent their lives in such sublimely pointless pursuit. But what really made it soar was the detail. I can tell you about the Institute for the Study of Lenin's Brain. But unless you saw it up close – unless you watched these poor, lunatic pseudo-scientists describe their work, at length and with evident pride – you would not capture the full absurdity of it.

I feel much the same way now, after two days spent in a downtown Vancouver court room watching the B.C. Human Rights Tribunal's hearings into the case of Mohamed Elmasry *et al.* versus Mark Steyn and *Maclean's*. I have tried to convey some of the sense of what I have seen in my posts to the magazine's website. But I fear that unless you were actually in that tiny, suffocating room, you could not fully grasp just how utterly deranged the proceedings were.

You will perhaps be familiar with the case. It concerns an excerpt from Mark Steyn's book, *America Alone*, published in *Maclean's* a year and a half ago. You will recall that a group of students under Elmasry's influence approached the magazine some months after publication demanding it publish an article of equal length, (5,000 words!) unedited, together with cover art of their choosing. I do not know of any magazine anywhere that has ever consented to such demands.

So instead we are in court – or rather, not court, but some mad parody of a court, whose contours seem to bend and stretch like some psychedelic vision circa *Yellow Submarine*. Things are not quite as bad in B.C. as in Ontario, where the province's human rights commission felt able to issue a judgment without the cost and inconvenience of a hearing. But it's a near thing.

Free speech denied – even truth is not a defence: Section 7.1 of the B.C. Human Rights: "...prohibits 'any statement, publication, notice, etc., that is likely to expose a person or a group or a class of persons to hatred or contempt.'" Not that it actually exposes them to anything note: just that it's likely to.

Nor does section 7.1 make any allowance for the usual defences that apply where the law intrudes upon free speech rights. There is no defence of fair comment, for example, or of the public interest, or of good faith. Most notoriously even truth is not a defence.

The "remedies" at the tribunals command are equally breathtaking. Should, I don't know, a magazine be found to have contravened the code, the tribunal must, at a minimum, order that unnamed magazine to "cease the contravention" – i.e. to stop publishing whatever sort of material;; it was that the tribunal deemed unpublishable.

But the tribunal can also force it to publish something, or make it pay compensation to whoever launched the complaint against it.

But it is the actual process of hearing cases that the going gets really weird. As was evident this week, it isn't just that the tribunals have lower standards than regular courts when it comes to rule of evidence, protections for the accused and so on – it's that they have no standards. Practices that would earn prosecutors a stern rebuke, if not summary dismissal, in any proper court – failure to disclose, hearsay, you know, all that Perry Mason stuff – were here the subject of furrowed brows and frequent huddles among the three panellists. They truly appeared to be making it up as they went along.

In consequence, our high-priced legal help, fine lawyers that they are, found themselves boxing with shadows: all but forbidden to mount a defence, raising objections to evidence without the first clue of what rules, if any, the tribunal would apply, plowing methodically through whatever odd bits of flotsam and jetsam the complainants could think to throw at them – not just their own subjective reactions to Steyn's piece, but polls, blog posts, reports on Islamophobia in other countries, the works. Is it any wonder that I concluded, even before the hearing began, that our best strategy was to lose? Win the case, and all we do is legitimise the process. See, its defenders would argue – the system works, correctly distinguishing between an occasionally over-the-top polemicist like Steyn and a real, honest-to-God hate-monger. And so we would simply be teeing up the next complainant, and the next. For what they seek, is not, as they pretend, the right of reply. Their purpose is rather to prevent the offending material from being published in the first place.

No, the only answer is to lose, and challenge the law on appeal, on constitutional grounds – and if that doesn't work, to embarrass the politicians into repealing it. I'm guessing the tribunal can see the threat to their livelihoods if they convict *Maclean's*, and will do all they can to acquit us. But I have every confidence our lawyers can outwit them."

"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.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF AUSTRALIA

8 JUL 2003