



A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance –

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

320.56
On 1



Vol.47, No.26

July 8th, 2011

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK:

A rather sobering look at Australia's *financial* debt: Never mind Greece and the other nations teetering on *financial* bankruptcy, instead let's look at Australia's "DebtClock" website. The site states it is "dedicated to delivering accurate information based on Australia's debt situation in a real time snapshot. Based on the data supplied by Federal and State (incl. Territories) Government, this debt is currently slated to hit in excess of \$273 billion by 30th of June 2012, the country's biggest debt in history, with some experts predicting it closer to \$400 billion... can we afford it ???"

The Australian League of Rights would respond: "No! Of course Australians cannot 'afford' such *financial* debt. But, there is every difference in the world between a man-made *financial* system, which bears no relation to the *real world* and Australia's *real wealth*."

Go to: http://www.debtclock.com.au/debtclock_blog/ and watch the debt clock ticking over. But don't stop there, listen to Jeremy Lee on MP3 explain "The New World Order and Global Debt" here... <http://www.alor.org/Media.html>

You will find a much more realistic answer to the 'black magic of the Money Cult' within the body of Social Credit ideas – and it is time such ideas were implemented!

Frances Hutchinson for Adelaide in August: Frances Hutchinson is coming over from the United Kingdom to speak at the League's South Australian State Seminar on the 13th and 14th August 2011. Economist Dr. Frances Hutchinson is also Chair of the Social Credit Secretariat and wants to contrast the Story of Social Credit with the reception by the mainstream political and academic establishment, with that of ordinary men and women in local farming and business communities. Throughout her talks a clear distinction will be drawn between the *real* and the *financial* economies.

"DE-CODING MAMMON: MONEY IN NEED OF REDEMPTION": Canon Peter Dominy of the Church of England (rtd.) writes: "This thesis is an attempt to understand the suspicion of money implied in Jesus' statement that it is impossible to serve both God and Mammon. I argue on the basis of Scripture, reason and tradition that problems associated with money do not arise simply from the way it is used, **but from the nature of money itself.** This is argued in three sections."

IN THIS ISSUE • *Thought For The Week* • *"De-Coding Mammon: Money In Need Of Redemption"* • *The Human Rights Delusion* • *Refugee Legal Funding & Asylum Seeker Madness* • *The Fall Of America* • *Tax Volcanoes Not Carbon* • *The Answer My Friend, Is Not Blowing In The Wind* • *The Beauties And The Machetes* • *Let Us Stay Or We Will Burn The House Down!* • *The Great Police Gun Sale Debate*

- 239
- First I consider the history of money and in particular of the commodity theory of money.
 - **Second I consider the issues of debt and interest, of central concern in the Christian Scriptures.**
 - Finally I consider money through four different lenses: justice, value, desire and power. The argument as a whole leads up to the last of these. (emphasis added...ed)

As was already suggested by Jacques Ellul fifty years ago, I argue that money must be understood as a cosmic power to which we are all subject and which is in need of redemption. In the second and third sections I make suggestions as to what the redemption of money might look like. I summarise the argument in a final section, 'De-Coding Mammon'."

The 250 page document "De-Coding Mammon: Money in Need of Redemption" is available online from the University of Exeter: <https://eric.exeter.ac.uk/repository/handle/10036/3065>

THE HUMAN RIGHTS DELUSION by Ian Wilson LL.B: In general, academic law journals seldom carry articles critical of core paradigm assumptions of the Establishment. Human Rights is one of the ruling ideologies in academic law today. Thus it is pleasing to see published Peter Quinlan SC, "The Human Rights Delusion: A Defence of the Narrative Tradition of the Common Law" (University of Notre Dame ALR, Vol 12, 2010). Previously in *On Target* (<http://www.alor.org/Volume47/Vol47No23.htm>) in my note "The Human Rights Myth" I mentioned his paper "On Witches and Unicorns, Part I" which contained the basics of the larger paper.

Quinlan examines the philosophical basis of human rightism and finds it lacking, and a failure as a *lingua franca* of public debate about justice and social ethics. The question therefore explored is whether law/justice comes first and rights second, or rights come first and law/justice second. In brief Quinlan argues for the priority of law against measuring law against the rights of individuals. Proposing, as human rightism does, that some person, such as an asylum seeker has a right, "does not, ultimately say whether the exercise of that right is a good thing or a bad thing; all it identifies is a freedom of action or choice on the part of that person". Further, human rightism is based upon viewing individuals as self contained liberal atoms and this ontology undermines a healthy civic culture: "It leaves each member of the community... as an atomised unit, alone to determine what is 'good', 'fair' or 'just' with no bridge for arriving at shared values or agreed 'forms of life'".

Human rightism then is a form of liberalism that ultimately undermines the shared values necessary for a fully functioning civic culture. The alternative philosophy and jurisprudence, derived from the common law tradition is based upon principles of "social and cultural standards", or the *narrative tradition*. Unlike the simplistic positing of "rights", "these principles and standards, in our tradition, are developed by a close analysis of the ends of a particular relationship (be it economic, nurturing, healing, conflict resolution or some other end), the texture of that relationship (be it equality, mutuality, vulnerability, power, control, disadvantage or impartiality) and how that relationship intersects with other relationships".

The common law tradition thus supplies a superior jurisprudence to human rightism.

Indeed an article in *The Advertiser* (June 18, 2011, p.67), "Shock at Immigrant 'Abuse' of Rights Law" begins by saying: "Human rights law is demolishing every aspect of Britain's immigration controls", according to UK government papers. Labour's *Human Rights Act* is used each year by thousands of foreign criminals and failed asylum seekers, to gain entry into Britain. Section 8 "the right to a private or family life" is used as the aliens quickly get a partner who then has a child. In the first three months of 2010, 99 foreign prisoners used this clause to defeat deportation; "One Bolivian was allowed to remain to care for his pet cat". This is a legal culture which has rolled out of control – thanks to the *ideology* of human rights.

REFUGEE LEGAL FUNDING & ASYLUM SEEKER MADNESS by Ian Wilson L.B: **The League Immigration Special:** Here is food for thought ("Refugee Lawyers Relying on Federal Funds", *The Australian*, May 5, 2011, p.5). The Melbourne Refugee and Immigration Legal Centre, the "legal centre behind last year's High Court decision clearing the way for more litigation by asylum-seekers", gets 68% (\$1.29 million) of its revenue from the Department of Immigration. The High Court ruling has generated a massive wave of new migration challenges, which will cost the bleeding tax-payer millions of dollars.

The article continues: "Together, Victoria and the Commonwealth provide 83% of the revenue that was available to the legal centre last year – or \$1.58 million out of total revenue of \$1.9 million. And while the centre provided help to 4178 people, it also engaged in an ambitious lobbying and advocacy program aimed at liberalising asylum laws, criticising government policy, changing public perceptions about asylum-seekers and running test cases. A representative of the centre flew to Geneva for a retreat and consultations organised by the UN Commissioner for Refugees."

Need anything more be said! Lobby for the elimination of all their government funding! If the legal profession wants to achieve the aims listed above, let them pay for it out of their own pocket.

THE FALL OF AMERICA by Brian Simpson: By 2040, non-whites will become the majority in the United States. The Hispanic population in particular is exploding, growing by 43% over the past decade to reach 51 million. *New York Post* columnist Michael Goodwin recently stirred up dust on this issue when he expressed the very un-politically correct thought (through "a friend") that black and Hispanic students, most from single-mother homes, cannot make the grade in education despite billions of dollars spent on incentives. He suggests vocational and commercial education for these students. However he does not go on to consider whether even that will work. What happens to a nation when its core population component faces such a problem? Clearly, America will go the way of South America and Mexico.

Part of this failure has been due to the dominance of environmentalism over geneticism. A recent book by Bryon Caplan, "Selfish Reasons to Have More Kids", based on twin studies and adoption studies, has concluded that nature wins over nurture. Applied to the national demographic question we can already see that American decline is forthcoming.

TAX VOLCANOES, NOT CARBON! by James Reed: While volcanoes continue to spew forth carbon emissions and stop plane flights, Gillard continues to press ahead with her carbon tax. Economic modelling (where would we be without it) predicts that eight black coalmines will close, resulting in 4,100 job losses in regional NSW and Queensland: and that is only in the first three years. Ross Garnaut's proposals, Gillard's climate policy guru, has been criticised by Gillard's own energy commission for being ineffectual and too bureaucratic. (*The Australian*, June 16, 2011, p.1) But that is the real point of the whole exercise: centralisation of power through making a bigger government, a bigger bureaucracy and more money extracted from the productive economy to be put into government hands, to be wasted on politically correct policy agendas.

THE ANSWER MY FRIEND, IS NOT BLOWING IN THE WIND by James Reed: Wind farms have become sacred sites for the modern urban greenie. The frantic concern for "feel good", quick fix "solutions" to complex environmental problems has led them to ignore the ill-effects of wind farms on the health of humans and the environment. People living near wind farms often suffer from sleep deprivation. Then there are the effects of low-frequency noise, or infrasound. Some medical experts believe that infrasound could in the future be found to be the cause of a number of fatal diseases. (*The Australian*, June 15, 2011, p.1) Wind turbines, ironically, could be the new asbestos, or cigarettes.

All of that then would have been to make green urbanites feel good. Never mind the scores of politically correct native bird and insect life meeting their end of days at the end of rotor blades.

THE BEAUTIES AND THE MACHETES by Peter Ewer: Shapely African girls in Melbourne were strutting their stuff for Melbourne's Miss South Sudan. ("Far from the War, Beauty Pageant Sparks Violence", *The Weekend Australian*, April 30-May 1, 2011, p.13) But the men-folk had other ideas and two African groups decided to hack into each other with machetes, before turning on police and attacking two officers.

But don't be too concerned as it's just a cultural thing. Deputy Police Commissioner Ken Jones said, "The youngsters coming out of there have known little else [but fighting] and it does take them a long time to make the transition". If so, why couldn't the process of adaption have taken place in Africa, first?

A Miss Africa contest in Adelaide last year saw over 100 Africans brawling in the City of Churches' main entertainment precinct. But again, don't be too concerned, it's all just a multicultural thing and in the end everything is just going to be peaches and cream.

LET US STAY OR WE WILL BURN THE HOUSE DOWN! by James Reed: Ah! – the Villawood riots – it's not all bad. What else is an asylum seeker to do after having an application for refugee status rejected twice? Surely not return "home" on a flight. Why, just burn down the "house" and throw roof tiles at firemen trying to extinguish the flames – after all they may have intended to "come up here on the roof and steal our blankets, our water and everything". So what's good about this? Well the chattering class is now saying that it will take a political miracle to save Julia Gillard's government from defeat at the next election. People are also openly questioning that holiest of holies, the 1951 Refugee Convention. And the refugee lobby is giving us funnies: like at Easter wanting to deliver Easter eggs to detainees at the Curtin detention centre, even though most of them are Muslims. Could chocolate eggs be the new symbol of multicultural peace?

THE GREAT POLICE GUN SALE DEBATE by John Steele: South Australian police formerly used as a sidearm Smith and Wesson .357 calibre revolvers. In 2009 the police changed to the Smith and Wesson M&P40 semi automatic pistol. The revolvers were sold to the American public via trade-ins to Smith and Wesson. Victorian police did the same. But various anti-gun groups had objected to the ethics of this, arguing that it is contrary to the spirit of Australia's strict gun laws. Rather, these guns should have been melted down, these groups argue.

On the contrary, it is a pity that these guns were not available to the *Australian* public. Statistics have shown that "more guns, less crime holds" true. And where are the police when you need them? A group of youths gathered by the side of a friend's place in the side-street, drinking and urinating on his property. The police did not show up until after the event. Rather, it was his Alsatian dog in the backyard that scared them away. What if they decided to rape his wife and daughter? Fight them off with his fists? The gun-ban crowd *never* answer the pro-gun argument about how one is to be protected if police don't make it in time, due to lack of resources or whatever. Presumably one is to die. Defending oneself – which for women and older people requires an equalising firearm – seems beyond their worldview. Until, of course, it happens to them.