



A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

PER

ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance –

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.46, No.1

January 15th, 2010

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: The statements from government and opposition about Peter Spencer's issues are "to have it settled in courts". This is from the people you voted into government and opposition in our two party preferred political system, who either do not know or do not care, that Peter has been to court 200 times over their land theft during the governments of Liberal and Labor.

They further, and their taxpayer funded \$200,000 pa minders, do not mention that the high court has stated, Peter Spencer has a case, it is not a legal matter but that of government to correct the wrong they have engineered.

Listening to both Barnaby Joyce, shadow treasurer, Kevin Humphries MP N.S.W. Nationals and Barrister Peter King who represents (free of charge) Peter Spencer, (one) reflects that PM Rudd and Tony Abbott are flying on pure arrogance as leaders of the 'two party preferred' system and are quite prepared for Peter to die up the tower rather than address the issue – both their parties (were) involved in the THEFT.

Annually, there are some 50 deaths of farmers in Australia from suicide out of desperation of government land theft, carbon theft and unworkable vegetation laws... The Peter Spencer fight to receive compensation for farmers' stolen assets, along with our stolen democracy needs to be kept up to speed. *Source:* SOS-NEWS website.

Want to know more about a just 'social credit' financial system? View...


THE ISLAND AND THE TREE: <http://www.michaeljournal.org/myth.htm>;

THE MONEY MYTH <http://www.michaeljournal.org/myth2.htm>

FARMER PETER SPENCER – VICTIM OF WORLD GOVERNMENT AGENDA: How galling. The very political parties who approved the legislation permitting the stealing of Peter Spencer's land are saying he should take his case to the courts! The courts will try the case based on that same legislation which is now LAW! Australians need to wake up. The one-worlders are in positions of power. They must be disabused as to their role and purpose in Parliament. **"Peter Spencer's Hunger Strike against unconstitutional carbon-fuelled actions by the Commonwealth Government..."**

On the 1st December 2009, high up on a 300m wind-monitoring tower, farmer Peter Spencer of "Saarahnee", N.S.W., Australia, commenced an indefinite hunger strike until the Australian government meets his demands. Peter claims that the Government has unconstitutionally stolen 109 million Ha of agricultural land from Australian farmers, being that they have not been compensated for the 22% CO₂

In this issue: • *Thought For The Week* • *Farmer Peter Spencer – Victim Of World Government Agenda* • *Monckton Offers Personal Briefing For PM Kevin Rudd*



reduction – that they, the farmers – have contributed to, in order to meet the U.N. Kyoto emission targets. Peter has been arguing his case for over 10 years through the courts and is now taking his stand to the people, where the true power of a democracy lies.

It is time we all put pen to paper and tell our political representatives to get off their backsides and insist that Rudd and his political hacks repeal the legislation that allows governments to steal the farmers' lands. Our farmers are not to be sacrificial lambs slaughtered for the altar-scam of global warming. Write today.

You can read Peter's full story at: <http://www.clrg.info/2009/12/peter-spencers-hunger-strike-against-unconstitutional-carbon-fuelled-actions-by-the-government/>

Let us be quite sure all Australians know who had a hand in setting Australia up for the New World Order. The beauty of the online *On Target* archives is that readers can check for themselves what we are saying.

In *On Target*, Vol.40 No.8, 5/3/2004: The Nationals and the ALP forced the Vegetation Management Laws upon the people... "...Under the preceding heading, the following advert appeared in the North Queensland Register, 29th January, 2004. You are wrong if you blame Peter Beattie alone for draconian anti-development laws. BEATTIE HAS JUST SUNK THE BOOT IN FURTHER--- THE QUEENSLAND NATIONALS WERE THE REAL CULPRITS. Borbidge, Littleproud and Hobbs betrayed Queensland farmers and land-holders for money – they agreed to bring in restrictions on your freehold land.

The original Commonwealth-State Natural Heritage Objectives Agreement to enact State Vegetation Laws preventing landholders from developing and maintaining their properties was signed on November 5, 1997 by the Queensland National Party leader, the Hon Rob Borbidge along with Minister for Environment, the Hon Brian Littleproud and Minister for Natural Resources, Howard Hobbs on behalf of Queensland...

The Commonwealth Signatories to the Agreement were: Signing on behalf of the Commonwealth were Prime Minister The Hon John Howard, Environment Minister Senator Robert Hill and Primary Industries Minister The Hon John Anderson.

Section 5.1[c] states: "No activities that adversely effect the status of ecological communities." This and other sections will allow Peter Beattie to convert most of our regional forestry to National Park or exclusive reserve status, thus preventing sustainable grazing or any human activity...

Bureaucrats in those departments HAVE been given authority to do those things, and the 'somehow' is legislation – legislation passed pursuant to written Agreements between federal, state, and local governments drawn up at meetings of the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) and the Australian Local Government Association (ALGA).

Agenda 21 commits Australia to: The legislation implements the Australian government's commitments under Agenda 21, an international instrument signed by Ros 'Whiteboard' Kelly on behalf of the Nation at the June 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) in Rio de Janeiro.

Programme for planning and economic management of the entire world: Agenda 21 is 800 pages long, consists of 40 chapters, and is a comprehensive programme for the planning and management of the economic and social development of the entire world during the twenty-first century. Both the major political parties are committed to it. While a Labor government signed it, the Coalition government registered its commitment to its continued implementation at the Millennium Summit at United Nations Headquarters in New York on 8 September 2000. There, Prime Minister John Howard signed the Millennium Declaration, Article 22 of which states: "We reaffirm our support

for the principles of sustainable development, including those set out in Agenda 21, agreed upon at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development [Rio 1992]."

Agenda 21: Information about Agenda 21 and the progress of its implementation by all levels of government in Australia is readily available on the Internet – the websites of COAG, ALGA, and the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet. ...regardless of anything said or done in 1979, since the commitment of the Australian government to Agenda 21 in 1992, and the reaffirmation of that commitment in 2000, Agenda 21 and principles of 'sustainability' are now the basis of planning and land use law in Australia at Federal, State and Local government level.?

Australia's farmers' property rights are definitely under threat, but farmers are not going to be assisted in defending those rights by misleading explanations as to who and what is behind it, and home-spun theories as to what the law is...." – *Signed Graham Strachan, Queensland.*

Further study: "Globalisation: Demise of the Australian Nation" by Graham Strachan, available from League Book Services. CD: 'Water Report' on CD.

MONCKTON OFFERS PERSONAL BRIEFING FOR PM KEVIN RUDD: The following letter is lengthy, and the science data not for the faint hearted, but we thought it important to reproduce. The good news is that Lord Monckton may be heading for Australia later in the month. Please note what he has to say about governments stealing men's lands. [Sub-headings added for ease of reading]

A letter from Viscount Monckton of Brenchley to the PM: 1st January, 2010. "Your speech on 6 November 2009 to the *Lowy Institute*, in which you publicly expressed some concern at my approach to the climate question, has prompted several leading Australian citizens to invite me come on tour to explain myself in a series of lectures in Australia later this month. I am writing to offer personal briefings on why "global warming" is a non-problem to you and other party leaders during my visit. For convenience, I am copying this letter to them, and to the Press.

Proposed World Government: Your speech mentioned my remarks about the proposal for world "government" in the early drafts of what had been intended as a binding Copenhagen Treaty. These proposals were not, as you suggested, a "conspiracy theory" from the "far right" with "zero basis in evidence". Your staff will find them in paragraphs 36-38 of the main text of Annex 1 to the 15 September draft of the Treaty. The word "government" appears twice at paragraph 38. After much adverse publicity in democratic countries, including Australia, the proposals were reluctantly dropped before Copenhagen.

You say I am one of "those who argue that any multilateral action is by definition evil". On the contrary: my first question is whether any action at all is required, to which – as I shall demonstrate – the objective economic and scientific answer is No. Even if multilateral action were required, which it is not, national governments in the West are by tradition democratically elected. Therefore, *a fortiori*, transnational or global governments should also be made and unmade by voters at the ballot-box. The climate ought not to be used as a shoddy pretext for international bureaucratic-centralist dictatorship.

Powerful Kommissars of the hated EU: We committed Europeans have had more than enough of that already with the unelected but all-powerful Kommissars of the hated EU, who make nine-tenths of our laws by decree (revealingly, they call them "Directives" or "Commission Regulations"). The Kommissars (that is the official German word for them) inflict their dictates upon us regardless of what the elected European or any other democratic Parliament says or wishes. Do we want a worldwide EU? No.

Carbon Trading – Gigantic Financial Fraud: You say I am one of "those who argue that climate change does not represent a global market failure". Yet it is only recently that opinion sufficient to constitute a market signal became apparent in the documents of the IPCC, which is, however, a

political rather than a scientific entity. There has scarcely been time for a "market failure". Besides, corporations are falling over themselves to cash in on the giant financial fraud against the little guy that carbon taxation and trading have already become in the goody-two-shoes EU – and will become in Australia if you get your way....

The questions I address are:

- a) whether there is a climate problem at all; and
- b) even if there is one, and even if per impossible it is of the hilariously-overblown magnitude imagined by the IPCC, whether waiting and adapting as and if necessary is more cost-effective than attempting to mitigate the supposed problem by trying to reduce the carbon dioxide our industries and enterprises emit.

Let us pretend, *solum ad argumentum*, that a given proportionate increase in CO₂ concentration causes the maximum warming imagined by the IPCC. The IPCC's bureaucrats are careful not to derive a function that will convert changes in CO₂ concentration directly to equilibrium changes in temperature. I shall do it for them.

We derive the necessary implicit function from the IPCC's statement to the effect that equilibrium surface warming T at CO₂ doubling will be $(3.26 \pm \ln 2)^\circ\text{C}$. Since the IPCC, in compliance with Beer's Law, defines the radiative forcing effect of CO₂ as logarithmic rather than linear, our implicit function can be derived at once. The coefficient is the predicted warming at CO₂ doubling divided by the logarithm of 2, and the term (C/C0) is the proportionate increase in CO2 concentration. Thus:-
 $T = (4.7 \pm 1) \ln(C/C0)$ | Celsius degrees

We are looking at the IPCC's maximum imagined warming rate, so we simply write -
 $T = 5.7 \ln(C/C0)$ | Celsius degrees

Armed with this function telling us the maximum equilibrium warming that the IPCC predicts from any given change in CO₂ concentration, we can now determine, robustly, the maximum equilibrium warming that is likely to be forestalled by any proposed cut in the current upward path of CO₂ emissions. Let me demonstrate.

All parties to Copenhagen Accord to report back by end of month: By the end of this month, according to the Copenhagen Accord, all parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change are due to report what cuts in emissions they will make by 2020. Broadly speaking, the Annex 1 parties, who will account for about half of global emissions over the period, will commit to reducing current emissions by 30% by 2020, or 15% on average in the decade between now and 2020.

Thus, if and only if every Annex 1 party to the Copenhagen Accord complies with its obligations to the full, today's emissions will be reduced by around half of that 15%, namely 7.5%, compared with business as usual.

If the trend of the past decade continues, with business as usual we shall add 2 ppmv/year, or 20 ppmv over the decade, to atmospheric CO₂ concentration. Now, 7.5% of 20 ppmv is 1.5 ppmv.

We determine the warming forestalled over the coming decade by comparing the business-as-usual warming that would occur between now and 2020 if we made no cuts in CO₂ emissions with the lesser warming that would follow full compliance with the Copenhagen Accord.

Where today's CO₂ concentration is 388 ppmv –

Business as usual:	$T = 5.7 \ln(408.0/388) = 0.29^\circ\text{C}$
– Copenhagen Accord:	$T = 5.7 \ln(406.5/388) = 0.27^\circ\text{C}$
= "Global warming" forestalled, 2010-2020:	0.02 °C

Continued in The Bulletin