



ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance –

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.45, No.16

May 1st, 2009

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK:

Austin Texas, Wake Up Call: Texas Governor backs resolution affirming sovereignty. Rick Perry joined state Rep. Brandon Creighton and sponsors of House Concurrent Resolution (HCR) 50 in support of states' rights under the 10th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

"I believe that our federal government has become oppressive in its size, its intrusion into the lives of our citizens, and its interference with the affairs of our state," Gov. Perry said. "That is why I am here today to express my unwavering support for efforts all across our country to reaffirm the states' rights affirmed by the Tenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution. I believe that returning to the letter and spirit of the U.S. Constitution and its essential 10th Amendment will free our state from undue regulations, and ultimately strengthen our Union."

Perry continued: "Millions of Texans are tired of Washington, DC trying to come down here to tell us how to run Texas."

A number of recent federal proposals are not within the scope of the federal government's constitutionally designated powers and impede the states' right to govern themselves. HCR 50 affirms that Texas claims sovereignty under the 10th Amendment over all powers not otherwise granted to the federal government.

It also designates that all compulsory federal legislation that requires states to comply under threat of civil or criminal penalties, or that requires states to pass legislation or lose federal funding, be prohibited or repealed. Developing...
– Drudge Report, 14 April, 2009

BIKIES TODAY, SOCIAL CREDITERS TOMORROW? by James Reed: South Australia has tough 'anti-bikie' laws and in the wake of the Sydney Airport bikie killing, New South Wales and other states are falling over themselves to introduce such laws. It all sounds so easy, so much like Port Arthur with all the pieces magically falling into place.

Civil Liberty groups have warned that the proposed laws could be used against other groups. Not likely. As with the race unification laws, which were rolled in the 1990's, the aim is to take out the extremists first and then work one's way down the list. The public will get increasingly used to having freedoms restricted so that they will get to the point of not missing what they never had.

In this issue: • *Thought For The Week* • *Bikies Today, Social Crediters Tomorrow?* • *Our 'Noble' Medical Profession And The Drugmakers* • *Death Of Democracy: Brth Of Post-White Cargo Cult* • *The Tragedy Of Environmentalism* • *Dr. Fredrick Toben Found 'Guilty'*

Brisbane barrister Mark Legrand saw the anti-bikie laws as 'obnoxious'. "It is obnoxious in a democratic society governed by the rule of law to declare a person guilty because of his or her associations and without a trial on a specific charge of wrong doing." (*The Australian*, 1/4/09, p.8) I can't argue with that.

Le Grand says that if the government was serious about stopping crime they would introduce laws cutting the money trail and confiscating assets from the crimes. However, in my opinion, governments have never done this, especially with the Mafia, which has been in this country since the 1930s. The Taxation Department, if serious, could investigate income/asset matching in many Griffith estates, but does not do so.

Behind the anti-bikie laws lies yet another assault on our freedom. A few years down the track, these laws will be used against any group that the Establishment doesn't like. And it won't be the socialists and environmentalists.

OUR 'NOBLE' MEDICAL PROFESSION AND THE DRUGMAKERS by James Reed: From memory, every year or so we see an article like this: 'Drug Companies Censured Over Lavish Doctors' Seminars' (*The Weekend Australian*, 18-29/3/09, p.3). The statistics cited hurt my eyes a bit and numbed my brain but the gist of the story is that drug companies have hosted 'educational events' for doctors at lavish five star hotels, with the costs for this often being up to \$300,000. The cost per attending doctor was up to \$4154.

One may at first shake, think 'shame on the drug companies' for doing this. But the doctors fall over themselves to jet off to seaside locations to be wined and dined in posh hotels. They may not have dancing girls on tap today, but the doctors have a good time and they get fully beefed up about the latest drugs to try out on you and me. If that is not a good reason for taking charge of one's own health, nothing is.

A good book for young mothers-to-be to check out is: "The Final Pollution" by Robert Anderson \$30.00 plus postage. It is dealing with the question of "vaccination – or not?"

DEATH OF DEMOCRACY: BIRTH OF POST-WHITE CARGO CULT by James Reed: How happy the bleeding heart liberals were to see their man B. Hussein Obama take office. But things did not go smoothly during the Oath of Office. Chief Justice Roberts – and Obama himself – botched the Oath. The media blamed Roberts for the stuff-up, but they are only partially right. Look at the tape on You Tube. Obama is like a nervous groom at a wedding. Obama started to respond even before the Chief Justice had completed the first phrase. Obama said: 'I, Barack Hussein Obama', twice. The Chief Justice, quite unprofessionally or deliberately, then went off the rails.

Obama followed him in incompetency. If he knew the speech, all thirty-five words of it, he should have turned from Roberts and said it. Instead he spoke over Roberts. Both men looked like idiots. It was a symbolic act, heralding in the decline and fall of the American Political and Legal systems. In any case, the Establishment was worried about a Constitutional challenge because of this botch-up and had the Oath repeated in the White House as an 'abundance of caution'.

Obama also said 'Forty-four American presidents have now taken the presidential Oath', however Americans number presidents by terms of office served consecutively, so in fact only forty-three presidents have taken the Oath. Writers in the Australian media were falling over themselves seeing Obama as a gifted writer not seen since Lincoln. It certainly shows how low the bundle of talent is. Obama's inaugural speech was full of pop music 'wisdom', 'The time has come to set aside childish things'. What does that mean? When has the U.S.-military industrial complex been 'childish'? Obama's speeches have often been derived from pop-song sentiments and catch phrases, about all that a dumbed down American who sees Oprah as an intellectual, can appreciate.

Let us take one issue - race. That should be a strong ground for Barack as he devotes one whole book to the wonder of his white mom coupling (then divorcing) his African father. Obama says that 'people of colour' in the U.S. are '90% of the way to equality'. Let's cite a left-wing source to rebut this: Juan Santos, 'Obama, King and Kennedy: Empire and the End of Racism' (at <http://carolynbaker.net/site/content/view/939/1/>) Santos cites piles of statistics to rebut Obama from a left-minority position: 1/4 of all U.S. blacks live in poverty, black unemployment at 11.1%; on a given day, 1 in 9 young black males are in prison etc., etc., etc. What will Obama do for these people? Nothing – Obama is really a Wall Street Man.

Back to the closing prayer of Obama's inauguration. This was by Joseph Lowery. The prayer contained such gems as asking that 'black will not be asked to get in back' and 'when white will embrace what is right'. An anti-white racist prayer at a presidential inauguration. Guess the future. You don't have to. The League has for sale an excellent book by Webster Griffin Tarpley, "Obama: The Postmodern Coup" (\$59.95 plus postage), which says: 'Barack Obama is a deeply troubled personality, the megalomaniac front man for a postmodern coup by the intelligence agencies using fake polls, mobs of swarming adolescents, super-rich contributors and orchestrated media hysteria to short-circuit normal politics and seize power.' Tarpley's book in my opinion is better and more hard hitting than two other more 'popular' critiques of Obama: Jerome Corse, "The Obama Nation" (Threshold, 2008) and David Freddoso, "The Case Against Barack Obama" (Regnery, 2008).

THE TRAGEDY OF ENVIRONMENTALISM by Brian Simpson: Since the end of World War II, environmentalism has been dominated by Left-wing ideology. Green parties essentially have a 'red' agenda with trendy social justice and human rights issues dominating concerns over preserving nature. Although some 'deep ecologists' claim that all species are equal ('biocentric egalitarianism'), when push comes to shove, the environmentalist inevitably sides with political correctness and supports (or at least remains silent) about the threat posed by Third World population growth and mass migration. The late Professor Garrett Hardin was one of the few ecological philosophers or environmentalists from 'the right'. He opposed foreign aid to the Third World and opposed migration to the United States and the West. He was to a degree a critic of multiculturalism. The key to his thought lies in the idea of the tragedy of the commons and Hardin set out his general argument in a paper entitled 'The Tragedy of the Commons' (*Science*, vol.162, 1968, pp.1243-1248). This paper has given the Left much heartache.

Hardin argued that in a hypothetical 'commons', selfish individuals aim to maximise utility/their use. The individual benefits from increased use of the commons, but also degrades the commons by some degree. The individual gets the advantages but everyone shares the disadvantages. Thus the individuals all increase use of the 'commons' until it is degraded and disaster faces all. 'Commons' include the atmosphere, oceans, river, fish stocks and so on.

The argument seems to be one directed against either non-ownership of the commons or the freedom of individuals that potentially conflicts with the philosophy of us – social credit. But in an insightful book, "Ethics for a Finite World" (Fulcrum Publishing, 2005) U.S. philosopher Herschel Elliott, generalises and systematises Hardin's argument. It is not explicitly an argument against free enterprise as such. Nor is the argument necessarily about actual commons open to trivial historical refutation by examples of managed commons. The argument is a thought experiment, which shows, in Elliott's opinion, the incoherence of cosmopolitan ethics. In Elliott's view it is not self-interest which produces ecological collapse but merely the exploitation of a finite ecosystem by increasing demands, mainly through population growth. An increased growth in the use of resources in a finite ecosystem leads to depletion and ultimately collapse.

These considerations show, Elliot argues, that moral systems can be criticised and refuted by empirical

considerations. In particular the idea of the tragedy of the commons offers a powerful argument against immigration:

'If nations and peoples are allowed to work out their own moral, economic and cultural experiments, human rights and moral obligations need to be limited. That is, people of overcrowded nations have no moral right to immigrate to other countries; nations that live by environmental principle have no moral obligation to give their natural wealth to those that have squandered their resources and trashed their environments. No nation has the obligation to share its material resources or the products of its land equally and justly with the citizens of other nations' (p.117)

'Any nation that does not limit immigration loses its ability to make its own cultural/moral experiment. Its failure to curtail immigration would prevent it from choosing to use its lands and natural resources to support a minimal population at a high standard of living and a maximum quality of life. In effect, uncontrolled immigration allows nations whose experiments have failed to overload the world lifeboat to cause it to founder.' (pp.117-118)

Elliott has done a service in advancing what is in effect an environmentalist critique of environmentalism, hoisting greenies by their own petard.

DR. FREDRICK TOBEN FOUND 'GUILTY': *The Age* reports (16/4/09): "Holocaust revisionist Fredrick Toben has been found guilty of criminal contempt after defying orders to stop publishing racist material on his Adelaide Institute website. In a judgment in the Federal Court on Thursday, Justice Bruce Lander said Dr. Toben's conduct had been wilful and he had steadfastly refused to comply with the law.

"The courts have held, but his conduct shows he does not accept that the freedom of speech citizens of this country enjoy does not include the freedom to publish material calculated to offend, insult or humiliate or intimidate people because of their race, colour or national or ethnic origin," Justice Lander said. "It is conduct that amounts to criminal contempt."

Dr. Toben had pleaded not guilty to 28 counts of contempt arising from allegations from former president of the Executive Council of Australian Jewry, Jeremy Jones.

Mr. Jones first lodged a complaint with the Human Rights and Equal Opportunities Commission in 1996 and later applied to the Federal Court to uphold its ruling, which it did in 2002.

But in hearings last year, counsel for Mr. Jones, Robin Margo SC, told the court Dr. Toben had defied its orders for six years. Mr. Margo said the Adelaide Institute website was still publishing (in July 2008), "virulent anti-semitic material", including that there were no death gas chambers at the Auschwitz concentration camp and that the holocaust was "the world's filthiest blood libel". He urged the court to fine Dr. Toben, or impose a period of imprisonment if he could not pay.

After handing down his judgment, Justice Lander adjourned the case to take submissions on penalty. The federal court ruling came after Dr. Toben fled Britain in November last year when a German authorities' bid to have him extradited to face charges of Holocaust denial failed. The 64-year-old had been arrested a month earlier at Heathrow Airport on a European warrant but a British court later ruled it invalid because it did not provide enough detail. German authorities vowed to continue their attempts to have Dr. Toben arrested in other countries. 'Holocaust denial' is a crime in Germany and offenders can face up to five years in jail."

"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 \$45.00 p.a.