



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.44, No.43

November 7th, 2008

## **THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK:**

"The financiers are in fear of losing the 'confidence' of their subjects. The public cannot be exploited if there is no value left to 'cream'. The inevitability – that the public will in fact, be 'evicted from their cells in Poverty Street' – is becoming imminent. Without tenants, there are no rents to receive! As Mugabe is now witnessing.

In fear of revolt, or just abandonment, the financiers know that the burden of interest must be carefully reduced – to prolong the agony of service." –Terence Holmes, Victoria, October 2008

"Fascism, by which name it appears to be fashionable to designate anything which isn't labelled Bolshevism, is as a title contemporaneous with the rise of Mussolini. It is quite easy to show, however, not merely that its origin is identical with Bolshevism, but that it is merely Bolshevism wintering in the Mediterranean. Its aims are similar, and its technique, like that of 'German' National Socialism, or PEP, is localised centralisation in order to transfer power to International Centralisation – as you might say 'C'. It is the second episode, in point of time, in the advent of gangster Government."

– C.H. Douglas in "Programme for the Third World War"

"One Ring to rule them all, One Ring to find them, One Ring to bring them all, and in the darkness bind them..." – Gandalf in "The Lord of the Ring" by J.R.R. Tolkien 1954

**TOLKIEN'S 'SAURON' GROWS STRONG ONCE MORE** by Betty Luks: There is nothing new in the history of Mammon (Sauron) and what is happening in this age. Be it that ancient land of Sumer, the Greek states, or the Roman civilisation, those who have made the effort to understand just what Jesus Christ meant when He said 'You cannot serve God and Mammon' recognise, in this day and age, the rise and control by Mammon ('Sauron'... call it what you will) over the lives of the people and the nations.

While we are constantly bombarded with 'newspeak', and it takes a little while to recognise the truth from the PR smokescreen, the intent of the Labor Party's Fabian Socialist plans for the further centralisation of power over the Australian people takes shape. Notice that the *means* for 'our salvation' from the global financial crisis are based on the presently structured international privately-owned debt-money system, whose *end* translates into our oppression through a New World Order?

**In this issue:** • *Thought For The Week* • *Tolkien's 'Sauron' Grows Strong Once More* • *This Is Where The League Of Rights Came In* • *Bank Nationalisation And The Constitution* • *Obama's Coming Multicultural Fascist State* • *Obama And Black Liberation Theology* • *The Song Remains, Always The Same – For The Left* • *Is It True What They Say About Political Correctness?*

"ON TARGET"

November 7th, 2008

Page 1 (169)

**History, in this case, is so important:** On the night of 25th January 1934 C.H. Douglas, at the then Sydney Stadium, spoke to an audience of 12,000 people. The following portion of his speech is just as relevant to us today as it was to Australians in the 1930s.

"Now there is one danger which I see at the present time, apart from the intervention of a worldwide catastrophe, (the catastrophe was World War II) and that is, in regard to this question of change in the financial structure of the world. We know quite well that governments are supposed to be supreme over the people governed. On paper, at any rate, the Government of Australia is the supreme authority in Australia, I presume. But I refer to a country I know better, Great Britain.

On paper the supreme authority in Great Britain is the House of Commons; but it is extremely doubtful if this is so at all. It is much more likely that the supreme authority is the Bank of England. But the point I want to make is this, that there is a sort of paper condition of these governments of ours which does make them a power, though they may not be the supreme power, they are the second power in the state.

What I am so much afraid of is that, by undue haste in combining these two powers through the nationalisation of the financial system and its combination with the government system, you might make only one supreme power which you cannot handle and you cannot control. That is a very real danger, and I would like to impress it on you. I do not think that it might not eventually be necessary to make banking a state service, but what I'm convinced of is that, before you do that, **YOU MUST BE ABSOLUTELY CERTAIN THAT YOU HAVE THE POLICY OF THE BANKING SYSTEM CHANGED.**

**THIS IS WHERE THE LEAGUE OF RIGHTS CAME IN** by Betty Luks: The first League of Rights was formed in South Australia in 1946, having developed from the VOTE NO campaign against Labor's war-time Attorney General Dr. H.V. Evatt and his continuing bid to centralize more power in Canberra. Evatt's efforts up to then were foiled at the wartime 1944 Referendum.

But let's go a little further back in the story. The Social Credit movement, having earlier played a vital role in bringing John Curtin into office, now spearheaded a national campaign against Dr. Evatt's dangerous war-time proposals.

This resulted in an incensed Evatt contacting Tasmanian Labor Senator Richard Darcy, a social creditor and friend of Eric Butler and other social creditors of the time, where he adopted a threatening attitude to their campaign against his proposals. When the threats were not successful Evatt changed his tactics and suggested a meeting with Social Credit leaders.

The result was an historic address by Evatt, of which in later years he did not like to be reminded. While expressing support for the main principle of Social Credit, 'what was physically possible should be made financially possible', his real purpose for the meeting was to convince the Social Crediters such things are not always *constitutionally* possible. He did not convince them.

For those who doubt this little bit of Australian history: The Evatt address took place at a luncheon at Farmers, Sydney, on 3rd December, 1942. But now let Eric Butler take up the story in his own words from "*Steps Towards a Monopoly State*":

**BANK NATIONALISATION AND THE CONSTITUTION** by Eric D. Butler, written Prior to the Victorian State Elections, 1947. *Melbourne Argus*, October 10, 1947: "The League of Rights is a non-Party organisation with no Parliamentary ambitions and no brief for the trading banks. It is primarily concerned with obtaining an informed public opinion in support of those fundamental British Constitution principles which, over a period of hundreds of years, were painfully evolved for the purpose of ensuring that there was a proper and clearly defined limit to the powers which any individual, or group of individuals, should exercise over the lives of other individuals.

Bank nationalisation, the Victorian elections, and the subject of the Federal Constitution are inseparably connected. Bank nationalisation is a direct assault upon the Federal Constitution; it is merely a means to an end and not an end in itself.

As Mr. Chifley has been persistently publicised as a financial expert, it is obvious that his argument that bank nationalisation is necessary to prevent any policy of credit restriction by the trading banks is merely camouflaging the real objective. Is it not a fact that a person who cannot obtain financial credit from one bank can go to other banks? Surely it is elementary that, in the event of all the trading banks restricting their credit advances, the result would be increased business for the Commonwealth Bank.

Even the most rabid financial reformer cannot deny that the Federal Government already has more than sufficient power over general financial policy to implement any modifications deemed necessary.

**The Real Objective:** The real objective of bank nationalisation is to further the imposition of a "planned economy" in Australia. Bank nationalisation is merely a part, admittedly an important part, of the general totalitarian strategy being pursued.

A "planned economy" necessitates the centralisation of all political, economic, and financial power into one set of hands. Stripped of all camouflage, a "planned economy" means a Monopoly State in which all resources and all individuals are controlled by the central planners. As proved in practice in Russia and Germany, and now in Great Britain under the Socialist regime, a "planned economy" cannot be allowed to be jeopardised by any individual having the power to contract out of the centrally imposed plans if he doesn't like them.

The Federal Constitution, which limits the powers of the Federal Government, is a barrier to the imposition of a "planned economy" in Australia."

**OBAMA'S COMING MULTICULTURAL FASCIST STATE** by John Steele: *Global Research* (www.globalresearch.ca) author Tom Burghardt reports that 9 months before the 9/11 alleged terrorist attacks Donald Rumsfeld signed off on the Pentagon's ultra-secret Continuity Of Operations Program (COOP). In a nutshell, the document describes how the army will be used not only in natural disaster situations and terrorism, but also for civil unrest control, "a non-lethal crowd control package."

Since that time a COOP data base has been constructed which "includes dissidents and activists of various stripes, political and tax protesters, lawyers and professors, publishers and journalists, gun owners, illegal aliens, foreign nationals, and a great many other harmless, average people". The data base will be used in the coming times of civil unrest when the Constitution is suspended.

In effect, Bush hands to Obama what is essentially a Fascist police state. Let us see if "the man" dismantles it, or merely "high fives" Bush, as Bush takes his pot of gold and heads for greener pastures. All indications are, given Obama's support of homeland security measures, that once he gets power, fuelled by ego and the narcissism of the opinion polls, he will push further than even Bush.

**OBAMA AND BLACK LIBERATION THEOLOGY** by John Steele: President-hopeful-to-be, Hussein Obama claims to be a Christian. Forgetting the claims that he is a closet Muslim, what sort of Christian is he? William A. Borst, writing in the *Mindszenty Report* (July 2008) "Pandora's Box: Barak Obama and Black Liberation Theology" puts a good case that Obama's preacher, Jeremiah Wright and his Trinity church, has pushed the religious envelope to the extreme Left with its amalgamation of the black power and liberation theology."

Obama until recently openly supported Wright with donations from his books' royalties. He never condemned Wright's radicalism until it could possibly be used against him. McCain is too weak, stupid and/or inept to use this ammunition.

The *Mindszenty Report* concludes: "Even a cursory look at his [Obama's] intellectual pedigree should alarm even his most ardent supporters. As the most liberal and pro-abortion member of the Senate, his extremism was derived from the usual socialist mentors, urban agitators Saul Alinsky and Marxist Frank Marshall Davis. Now at the pinnacle of history, Senator Obama's long relationship with Reverend Wright is alarming, shocking and scandalous."

In an Obama world, what do you rate the chances of constructing a 'social credit' economy?

**THE SONG REMAINS, ALWAYS THE SAME – FOR THE LEFT** by James Reed: Mark Davis' "The Land of Plenty: Australia in the 2000s" (Melbourne University Press) is a standard attack on the Howard era. Some of this attack I agree with, but most, I don't. Rightly Davis is concerned about the attack of the economic rationalists upon public assets such as hospitals and schools. But he claims that 'Howard and co' used 'racism' about migrants to gain support for their programs.

Not really. As many articles in *On Target* show, Howard *et al* were the great Asianisers of Australian history. The project of market individualism is part and parcel of economic globalisation and the Labor Party believes in this as much, if not more, than the Liberals.

To a large degree Davis recognises that global capitalism is the real threat to our way of life. Unfortunately Leftism wins out and he cannot, in my opinion, produce a convincing critique of the *status quo*.

I await to see a book by these type of writers taking Rudd apart. The role of Labor leaders like Hawke and Keating to open the Australian economy to global market forces is not examined. The rule is: never damage that holy of holies, the Australian Labor Party.

**IS IT TRUE WHAT THEY SAY ABOUT POLITICAL CORRECTNESS** by James Reed: At this movement, the writers here talk a lot about political correctness and why it is a bad thing. But what is "political correctness"? Professor James Allan, Law, University of Queensland ("Political Correctness Stifles Debate", *The Australian*, 3/10/08 p.30) has written some instructive remarks defining his concept.

According to Professor Allan, the term "political correctness", "refers to an unwillingness to talk about certain issues". Further, it "refers to a refusal to speak the truth about, or even mention, issues related to particular groups or causes for which there seems to be a hyper-sympathy, especially if that description would be badly received by such groups."

"So, in this sense, political correctness is the sin of stifling honest debate by taking certain topics off the table as far as discussions in polite society are concerned. It's a pre-emptive strike against someone saying the emperor has no clothes."

Thus criticise the refugee or migration program and you must be a racist. Criticise Feminists and you are sexist and/or anti-women and, on this one, even the "anti-feminists" who are really closet feminists will roast you. The filed of multiculturalism and Aborigines, homosexuals and even Legal Affairs, offer numerous examples.

What all of this means is that some vitally important topics can no longer be talked about. Allan does not say this, but clearly the end result of the politically correct society is a type of multicultural or rainbow Fascism, the antithesis of democracy and freedom.