A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

Print Post Publication Number 100000815

The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance —

Vol. 51. No. 44 **6th November, 2015**

IN THIS ISSUE

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: DO THESE PEOPLE HAVE MUSH FOR BRAINS TOO?

In a speech to the United Nations Vladimir Putin accused US officials of having "mush for brains" (*Express*, UK 14 October 2015). It seems such an appropriate question to ask of our politicians after reading Bob Katter's recent speech to Parliament. While we may not agree with all Bob has to say, under present rules of finance he is 'spot on'.

Bob Katter has warned us - as reported in Hansard, 30 October 2015:

"You are living in a country that is going broke at 100 miles an hour. You cannot buy everything from overseas when you have nothing to sell overseas. The people in this place with their market fundamentalism, their fanaticism, have imposed upon Australia a regime that no other country on earth has to suffer under…"

BOB KATTER DEFINES THE DOOM OF FREE TRADE AGREEMENTS: From Hansard

Mr KATTER (Kennedy) (17:50): I feel sorry for the members of the government, I really do. They get a brief and they have got to get up and tell us how wonderful the free trade deal is and how it is going to save the world. I was in this place and saw the then Prime Minister stand up and lead the clapping for Andrew Robb on the free trade deal with China and I thought, 'Maybe I know nothing about politics, but if this is getting you votes I am a Martian astronaut!' Four weeks later he was thrown out a window.

You think you are deceiving the people of Australia. You are not. When they hear 'free trade deal', they hate you. Understand that, because I might not be an expert in a number of fields, but after 41 years of straight wins in pretty hostile territory, I can tell you that I know a little tiny bit about politics. I sat at the feet of the great master, Bjelke-Petersen. So if you are not interested in governing the country, if you are not interested in helping your country, maybe you might just think about your survival.

I feel sorry for the LNP. They somehow think that Australia is this big, huge country and that it can produce a magnificent amount of agricultural production. It most certainly can produce a lot more than it is producing. But it is not a big, huge agricultural country at all. There is 53 per cent of Australia that is designated as desert and 23 per cent is designated as Indigenous Lands. Since the governments of Australia will not give title deed to those lands, they are sterilised. That is 76 per cent gone. There is seven per cent that is national parks. So, if you take out that 83 per cent, there ain't a lot left.

The concept that huge areas of land will produce huge areas of food - sorry; that is wrong. There are a few thousand hectares, maybe 30,000 hectares, of land that is producing about a quarter of Australia's beef production. They are called lot feeders. Basically the cattle do not wander around chewing grass. That is not the way beef is produced anymore in America or in Europe or in Australia. It is done in lot feeders. So you have a different concept altogether, where you do not need huge areas of land. Your competitive advantage is in that lot feeder. That is where the action comes. You have a competitive advantage in that area.

Somehow they think, 'There are millions of people in South-East Asia, and we're going to be able to sell all this food to them.' Mr Deputy Speaker, I would refer you to the statistics. In fact, there is a pretty good chance that we will be importing food from those countries. Let me be very specific. When I stood up in this place 15 years ago and said that this market fundamentalism, this free market rubbish, will destroy your country, I said that Australia could become a net importer of food. Every 10 years, the imports increase at 103 per cent and the exports increase at 21 per cent. You do not have to be Albert Einstein to figure out that the graphs will soon cross.

Mr Deputy Speaker, you must understand that, if every Chinese city had two 20-storey buildings with tanks on each storey, then they could produce all of the protein requirements for China. They do not have to buy any of our beef. They do not have to buy any of our seafood product. In fact, if you look at a graph of the increase in seafood production in China, if you extrapolate that graph on for about 30 or 40 years, in theory all of the world's protein would be coming out of the prawn and fish farms in China.

(continued on next page)

(continued from previous page)
I am fascinated by how this is going to help Australia. The last speaker, the member for Lyne, touted the beef industry. I do not know if he knows anything about it. I rather doubt that he does, but he touted the beef industry. Well, let us have a look at what this free trade deal does for the beef industry.
We sell our beef at the present moment at $2 a kilogram. If you look at the average price, it is a lot less than that, but I will take $2 a kilogram. Its 10 per cent tariff has been abolished, so that is a 20c advantage we get. The beef sells over there for $32 a kilogram. Those are the figures that have been given to me. But now the Australians are going to have a terrific advantage of 20c, so it is $31.80 now. Jeez, that will lead to a huge increase in the benefits for the beef producers of Australia!

A difference between $32 and $31.80, and the member of parliament who sits beside me here, the member for Lyne, seriously touted that as something that is going to help the beef industry? Why doesn't he do his homework? Why does he just take the drivel that comes from the frontbench? And the drivel that comes from the frontbench is dictated by the giant corporations that bankroll the mainstream parties.

Having dealt with the LNP, we will move on now to the ALP. If ever there was a day on which 'Red Ted' Theodore would turn in his grave and the founders of the labour movement would spit upon the people that sit in this House and call themselves Labor members, today is the day. When I walk out of this place, there is a magnificent portrait of a bloke called Charlie McDonald. Charlie McDonald was the first member for Kennedy, and every time I go out I salute Charlie.

Six of Charlie's first seven speeches in this place were railing against the importation of foreign labour. Well, this document opens the door to it. This man went out and helped form the Labor Party, the labour movement, of Australia. They fought and died, literally - there were three shearers shot dead at the strike, where Waltzing Matilda was written a couple of months later - and the entire executive of the AWU were jailed for three years with hard labour for having a strike. These men and their families went hungry.

What happened when they got arbitration was that the miners said, 'We're bringing the coolies in from China. Ha, ha. Take that, Buster Brown; take that.'
And the cane plantations said, 'We're bringing the Kanaks in to be cane cutters, so take that, Buster Brown; take that.'

So the first member for Kennedy stood up in this place and courageously fought to create the Labor Party - and the people who sit here on $200,000 or $300,000 a year, enjoying the benefits from the creation of that labour movement, sit here and betray every principle that was put forward by those people. Charlie McDonald would turn in his grave.

But I am proud to say that the people of Kennedy are still represented by people who are not sell-outs, who are not under the control of the big plantation owners or the big mining companies. No. We are under the control of the people of our area. That is who we are under the control of and proud to say it. This opens the door that the Charlie McDonalds died for. The ALP today sold them out - lock, stock and barrel. There is not a trade unionist in Australia who is not looking at the ground and being ashamed of his association with the labour movement.

Let me become very specific. I am fascinated. I am just a poor, humble, simple Cloncurry boy. Clearly, these wunderkind - over here and over there - have decided to have free markets. The honourable member over there, Mr Brough, is making faces; he thinks it's funny! I will tell you how funny it is, my friend. You have to buy everything from overseas. The last whitegoods factory, which is at Orange, closes this year. So you have to buy all your whitegoods from overseas. About 40 per cent of the steel in your house - the roofing on it, the reinforcing steel for your floor - comes from overseas. About 40 per cent of your cement comes from overseas. All your whitegoods and all the motor cars in your garage will come from overseas, next year. The clothes you wear will all come from overseas. Your footwear will all come from overseas. The petrol you put in your car comes from overseas. Everything we buy comes from overseas. Where are we going to get the money to buy all of these things?

The honourable member there, Mr Brough, laughed at me. People have laughed at me ever since I came into this place and started talking about this. I want it on record that he laughed at me, because the history books will pass judgement upon him.

They will say: 'Who are the people who destroyed this country?' We have to buy everything from overseas. Where are we going to get the money to buy all our petrol, to buy all our motor cars, to buy everything in our houses and to buy the clothes on our backs?

(continued on next page)

"ON TARGET" is printed and published by The Australian League of Rights,
Level 9, Suite 8, 118-120 Queens Street, Melbourne, 3000

Postal Address: GPO Box 1052, Melbourne, 3001. Telephone: (03) 9600 0677
Subscription $45.00 p.a.

(continued from previous page)
Let me turn to food - and people in this place laugh at me about this. This country is now a net importer of pork. It is a net importer of seafood. It is a net importer of fruit and vegetables. It is only a matter of time.
As I said, it is 103 per cent every 10 years, the last time I looked, and a 21 per cent increase in exports every 10 years. Inevitably - as the sun rises - we will become a net importer of food. You cannot eat live cattle or unprocessed grain, but if you take those two commodities out we are getting pretty close, in fact, to being a net importer of food. People in this place have laughed at me, but the people of Australia are passing judgement upon them, already, as we talk. Where are we going to get this money from?

We have only two things now that we export, and everyone knows that they are iron ore and coal. I am not here to denigrate those industries. In fact, I pray every night of my life to the good Lord that it does not come to pass, the continuation of what we are suffering in the thermal coal industry. But I would not like to be backing myself in what we are suffering in the thermal coal industry. What you have is what you have, in iron ore.

The country has to buy everything from overseas - and all they have to buy it with is iron ore and coal. A little bit of gold. Of course, aluminium is doomed. Aluminium is electricity. It came to Australia when we had the cheapest electricity in the world, in Queensland.

Australia now has the second highest electricity charges in the world. So it will be bye-bye aluminium. It will be bye-bye all mineral processing, because it all depends upon - and I am sick and tired, in this place, of hearing 'It's high wages that are killing us!' Wages look pretty bloody small when compared with the cost of mineral processing, which is the cost of electricity. It is due to the incompetence of the people in this place and of state governments who have taken electricity charges up 400 per cent in 10 years. That is what your free markets and privatisation have done: 400 per cent increase, in electricity charges, in 10 years. For 10 years before that, in Queensland, there was no increase at all. For 10 years before privatisation and a deregulation of the pricing mechanism we had no movement in price at all. My case rests. It dooms aluminium and it dooms mineral processing, so you are left with iron ore and coal.
The income from iron ore and coal - maybe $150,000 million or whatever it is - is not enough to meet our imports. It is nowhere near enough.

You are living in a country that is going broke at 100 miles an hour. You cannot buy everything from overseas when you have nothing to sell overseas. The people in this place with their market fundamentalism, their fanaticism, have imposed upon Australia a regime that no other country on earth has to suffer under. Every other farmer on earth gets 40 per cent of his income from the government. Our poor farmers get six per cent. I conclude on that note. So much for your free trade. (Time expired)

Website of Interest: http://www.openaustralia.org.au

GLOBAL WARMING CRUSADE IS ABSURD AND POINTLESS

On her website Joanne Nova posted a report on an English Translation of a French Mathematical Calculation Society paper. SCM was established in 1987, by University professor, Dr. Bernard Beauzamy. Their "first specialty" is mathematical modeling. Following are a few excerpts of this long paper…

Summary
All public policies, in France, Europe and throughout the world, find their origin and inspiration in the battle against global warming. The impact on the entire field of scientific research is particularly clear and especially pernicious. No project can be launched, on any subject whatsoever, unless it makes direct reference to global warming. You want to look at the geology of the Garonne Basin? It is, after all, an entirely normal and socially useful subject in every respect. Well, your research will be funded, approved and published only if it mentions the potential for geological storage of CO2. It is appalling.
The crusade has invaded every area of activity and everyone's thinking: the battle against CO2 has become a national priority. How have we reached this point, in a country that claims to be rational?

At the root lie the declarations made by the IPPC, which have been repeated over the years and taken up by the European Commission and the Member States. France, which likes to see itself as the good boy of Europe', adds an extra layer of virtue to every crusade. When others introduce reductions, we will on principle introduce bigger reductions, without ever questioning their appropriateness: a crusade is virtuous by its very nature. And you can never be too virtuous.
But mathematicians do not believe in crusades; they look at facts, figures, observations and arguments.
Part 1: The facts

Chapter 1: The crusade is absurd
There is not a single fact, figure or observation that leads us to conclude that the world's climate is in any way disturbed'. It is variable, as it has always been, but rather less so now than during certain periods or geological eras. Modern methods are far from being able to accurately measure the planet's global temperature even today, so measurements made 50 or 100 years ago are even less reliable.

(continued on next page)

(continued from previous page)
Concentrations of CO2 vary, as they always have done; the figures that are being released are biased and dishonest. Rising sea levels are a normal phenomenon linked to upthrust buoyancy; they are nothing to do with so-called global warming. As for extreme weather events – they are no more frequent now than they have been in the past. We ourselves have processed the raw data on hurricanes.

Chapter 2: The crusade is costly
Direct aid for industries that are completely unviable (such as photovoltaics and wind turbines) but presented as 'virtuous' runs into billions of euros, according to recent reports published by the *Cour des Comptes* (French Audit Office) in 2013. But the highest cost lies in the principle of 'energy saving', which is presented as especially virtuous. Since no civilization can develop when it is saving energy, ours has stopped developing:

France now has more than three million people unemployed – it is the price we have to pay for our virtue.

Chapter 3: The crusade is pointless
If we in France were to stop all industrial activity (*let's not talk about our intellectual activity, which ceased long ago*), if we were to eradicate all trace of animal life, the composition of the atmosphere would not alter in any measurable, perceptible way.
This just goes to show the truth of the matter: we are fighting for a cause (reducing CO2 emissions) that serves absolutely no purpose, in which we alone believe, and which we can do nothing about. You would probably have to go quite a long way back in human history to find such a mad obsession.

Source: http://joannenova.com.au/2015/10/french-society-of-mathematicians-global-warming-crusade-is-aburd-and-pointless/

***

NOAA REFUSE TO RELEASE EMAILS

"Get out the popcorn, this one could run and run" reports Paul Homewood of The Hill
URL: http://wp.me/p1R7BZ-4Fj
The federal government's chief climate research agency is refusing to give House Republicans the detailed information they want on a controversial study on climate change. Citing confidentiality concerns and the integrity of the scientific process, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) said it won't give Rep. Lamar Smith (R-Texas) the research documents he subpoenaed.

At the centre of the controversy is a study that concluded there has not been a 15-year "pause" in global warming. Some NOAA scientists contributed to the report. Skeptics of climate change, including Smith, have cited the pause to insist that increased greenhouse gas emissions, mostly from burning fossil fuels, are not heating up the globe.
Smith, the chairman of the House Science Committee, vehemently disagreed with the study's findings. He issued a subpoena for communications among the scientists and some data, leading to charges from Democrats that he was trying to intimidate the researchers.
Late Tuesday, NOAA provided Smith with some more information about its methods and data but refused to give Smith everything he wanted. NOAA spokeswoman Ciaran Clayton said the internal communications are confidential and not related to what Smith is trying to find out. "We have provided data, all of which is publicly available online, supporting scientific research, and multiple in-person briefings," she said. "We stand behind our scientists who conduct their work in an objective manner. It is the end product of exchanges between scientists - the detailed publication of scientific work and the data that underpins the authors' findings - that are key to understanding the conclusions reached.

Clayton also refuted Smith's implication that the study was political. "There is no truth to the claim that the study was politically motivated or conducted to advance an agenda," she said. "The published findings are the result of scientists simply doing their job, ensuring the best possible representation of historical global temperature trends is available to inform decision makers, including the U.S. Congress."
Smith defended his investigation, saying NOAA's work is clearly political. "It was inconvenient for this administration that climate data has clearly showed no warming for the past two decades," he said in a statement. "The American people have every right to be suspicious when NOAA alters data to get the politically correct results they want and then refuses to reveal how those decisions were made."

Smith also said NOAA's assertion of confidentiality is incorrect. "The agency has yet to identify any legal basis for withholding these documents," he said, adding that his panel would use "all tools at it's disposal" to continue investigating. Smith has been communicating with NOAA about the research since it was published in the summer, and their exchanges have grown increasingly hostile. It sounds like Climategate all over again, with climate scientists trying to cover up, obfuscate and frustrate all attempts by outsiders to get at the truth. What gives them the right to decide they are above the law? And what are they trying to hide?

Source: http://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/258375-agency-wont-give-gop-internal-docs-on-climate-research

STOCKHOLM SYNDROME

*(**Stockholm syndrome**, or capture-bonding, is a psychological phenomenon in which hostages express empathy and sympathy and have positive feelings toward their captors, sometimes to the point of defending and identifying with the captors.)*

…I think the problem some **Germans face already and many more will face soon, is that the keeping up of the doublethink becomes harder**.

The world they live in, perceive and can reason about, and the fake world constructed in their minds, through exposure to lifelong propaganda, peer-pressure, misinformation and, beneath the surface, self-loathing and fear, mismatch more and more as current events unfold.
Consciousness is a gift but can also be a burden. Especially if you realize that you are waking up to a terribly frightening situation, in which you are an insignificant pawn in a game of ruthless psychopaths, shoved around by agents of these psychopaths. The agents pretend to care only for you and tell you that they take their authority directly from you, the sovereign, while they turn your pockets over once more, to see if there might be something left. None of their actions back up their claims, but there is no one to turn to, no one who could keep these people in check.

Your government allows wars of aggression to be supported from your people's territory by foreign occupiers. Your government steers your people head on into a conflict with the only internationally and regionally important actor that might itself have an honest interest in your independence. Your government is OK with its people being spied on by the foreign occupiers, it actually helps with that.

Your government is itself spied on by the occupiers, but they could not do anything about it, even if they wanted to, because they are just corrupt puppets. So they have the media announce that they protest the spying and then… do…. Nothing. So one can wake up to that reality or keep on dreaming the dream.

Conveniently you do not even have to dream up something for yourself. The dream is available nonstop 24/7 on all major channels, in all the newspapers, you just have to submit and enjoy the soma. I think the German people is being held hostage and suffers from a severe case of collective Stockholm-Syndrome and an almost broken backbone. Probably not unlike many other peoples.
Ref: http://thesaker.is/germany-eu-sitrep-october-21st-2015-by-gepard-schroder/

***

OPINIONS vs FACTS by Viv Forbes

Climate is always changing, but luckily we live in an era with a stable, benign, warm climate and a healthy, abundant bio-sphere.

Alarmists who claim that today's climate changes are unprecedented have not checked climate history written in the rocks, the ice cores, the satellite registers and the tide gauges.

Ice core records show that current temperatures and sea levels are not extreme - they are more stable than they were as the last ice age ended just 12,000 years ago. At that time, global temperature increased quickly, the great ice sheets melted, sea levels rose rapidly (130 metres), and the warming seas expelled much of their dissolved carbon dioxide into the atmosphere.

As a result of this natural global warming and the additional moisture and carbon dioxide plant food in the atmosphere, plant life recovered and the great forests and grasslands were re-established.

Not one coal-fired power station, diesel truck or feedlot of belching bovines contributed to those massive climate changes; and ancient witch-doctors were unable to prevent flooding of coastal settlements by sacrificing humans. Then, as now, nature controls the climate.

More recent evidence from ice cores, sediment layers and even historical records show that for the last 7,000 years Earth's climate has been relatively stable. Even more recently, satellite records show that global temperatures have not risen significantly for 18 years.

The tide gauges surrounding the Pacific show that sea levels are barely rising and satellites show that there is little change in the average area of polar ice. Our climate is NOT changing rapidly, no matter how often alarmists and their media mates repeat this lie.

Today, witch-doctors wearing UN/IPCC head-dress are demanding that humans sacrifice their industry and jobs on the carbon altar in the hope of changing the climate. This sacrifice will enrich green vested interests but will fail to change the climate.

Alarmists should check the facts. Just one stubborn fact or careful observation will beat 97 pal-reviewed opinions.

They should heed Senator Moynihan's advice:
"You are entitled to your opinion. But you are not entitled to your own facts."

***

USING FOOD TO FIGHT CANCER by Mrs Vera West

Those of us concerned about either getting cancer ourself, or our loved ones, but who are also cautious about Big Pharma medicines and orthodox treatments often turn to nutrition as a first line of attack. If one searches the Internet, there is a bewildering amount of information to sift through. Where does one start?

I have just read Richard B**é**liveau and Denis Gingras, *Foods that Fight Cancer: Preventing and Treating Cancer Through Diet*, (Allen and Unwin, 2006). The book is written by two leading cancer researchers; Dr B**é**liveau is Chair in the Prevention and Treatment of Cancer at the University of Québec, Montréal and Dr Gingras is a researcher at the Molecular Medicine Laboratory of UQAM, Sainte-Justine Hospital Research Centre. Hence the authors have establishment authority to present scientific, evidence-based guide to how nutrition can prevent and treat cancer.

They state in the foreword to the book that currently available scientific studies "strongly suggest that certain types of cancers can be prevented by modifying our dietary habits to include foods with the power to fight tumours at the source and thus prevent their growth.

Nature supplies us with an abundance of foods rich in molecules with very powerful anti-cancer properties, capable of engaging with the disease without causing any harmful side-effects. In many respects, these foods possess therapeutic properties on par with those of synthetic drugs". (p.13) This is very good news indeed and indicates that one should adopt an anti-cancer diet as part of one's lifestyle.

I have noted that an anti-cancer diet, one based around colourful vegetables (and greens) and fruits - is also one which prevents cardiovascular disease, weight gain and diabetes. It is a total health diet. It is interesting to observe that Japanese people in the past had a diet low in animal fats and red meat, and based around small quantities of fish, but a rich amount of rice, other complex carbohydrates, vegetables and fruit. Today red meat consumption in Japan has increased by a factor of seven. Colon cancer was once very low, but over the past 40 years it has increased by a factor of five, and now equals that of the West.

The adoption of Western diets of high animal fats, red meat, high salt and sugar, has also resulted in immigrant populations, who at "home" had low rates of various cancers, catching up to the cancer rate of the West.

B**é**liveau and Gingras describe what they believe is the most promising way of treating all cancers: stopping angiogenesis, the process by which cancers stimulate the production of new blood vessels. This is done by the cancer releasing a protein known as Vascular Endothelium Growth Factor (VEGF), which upon making new blood vessels, allows the tumour to grow.

Even tumours such as the "liquid" ones causing leukaemia require vascularisation of bone marrow. Hence if tumours can be prevented from causing angiogenesis, and/or if this process can be interrupted, then there is an effective cancer treatment. As well, using chemicals to attack angiogenesis is generally less toxic than traditional approaches such as chemotherapy, and can be done on a continuous basis, what they call the metronomic approach:

"The prevention of cancer by angiogenesis inhibition is neither an illusion or a dream: it is already happening. Certain common foods constitute preferred sources of antiangiogenic compounds which when administered daily succeed in blocking the progression of tumours by blocking a tumours access to food. These foods act metronomically, continuously attacking new blood vessels… Cancer no longer has to be a fatal disease". (pp. 46-47)

This is indeed a modern application of the maxim of Hippocrates (460-377 BC): "Let food be thy medicine and medicine be thy food!" The standard food pyramid that puts grains on the bottom - to consume the most of, - is not correct. Our diet should be vegetable and fruit-based to obtain not only vitamin C and minerals, but phytochemicals and antioxidants. Some anti-cancer foods are grapes, blueberries, citrus, strawberries, garlic, onions, green tea, turmeric, cabbage, broccoli and tomatoes. These foods, and many others form the basis of the anti-cancer diet, as well, with exercise, giving us a pathway to health. We are, after all, what we eat.

***

HUMAN GENETIC CHIMERAS by Mrs Vera West

The liberal idea of the "individual" as some sort of social atom or building block continues to take a pounding from science. The Independent.co.uk, October 27, 2015 (happy 90th birthday Vera!) states that a US man failed a paternity test because as a foetus he absorbed his dead twin. The twin is the genetic father of the child as the man's genes in his sperm were different to those of his saliva. Thus the father of the child is the man's unborn twin!

But let's do a bit of analysis of this. The assumption here is that an individual is a biological atom with a genetic integrity so that saliva genes (soma) and the gene line are the same. But this is not necessarily so as this case shows. However, the individual is what he is, and if the genes came from a twin, there never was a twin after the assimilation. The genes are now those of the man's. It is only because we have been brainwashed by the philosophical worldview of the methodological individualism of liberalism that examples such as this cause conceptual difficulties. Humans and their bodies are more like ecosystems than the "atoms" of utilitarian liberals such as Jeremy Benthem (1748-1832). The liberal's world is a metaphysically false one. ***

THE US IS CONDUCTING A WAR AGAINST SAND by Peter Ewer

What has desert sand ever done to the US? The head of the Russian parliament's international affairs committee, Alexei Pushkov has said that the US has spent the past year deliberately bombing the desert instead of Syrian terrorist targets. (*New Observer.com*, October 24, 2015)

"The US-led coalition spent a whole year pretending they were striking ISIL targets, but where are the results of these strikes? The Americans have been "pretending" all along. It's the intensity that is important. The US coalition pretended to bomb Daech for a year, but there have been no results. If you do it in a much more efficient way, the results will be seen". This is one more piece of "evidence" supporting the conspiratorial view of the Syrian conflict, a continuation of the same game played out from 9/11 onward.

WILL YOU HAVE SAUCE ON YOUR HUMAN DOG, SIR? by Brian Simpson

You are what you eat, but did Americans know, prior to present revelations, that when they were tucking into a hot dog at the "game" they may have been consuming human DNA? Yes, by eating hot dogs, Americans may have been "cannibalistic".

Clear Food Labs in its *Hot Dog Report* (http://www.clearfood.com/food_reports/2015/the_hotdog_report) analysed 345 hot dogs and sources from 75 different brands. It was found that human DNA was present in 2% of the samples! Two thirds of the samples with human DNA were actually vegetarian products.

So, did some worker fall into the mincer and get made into a hot dog? It is likely that the DNA comes from human bodily fluid secretions (your imagination here). All the more reason to grow your own veggies and have some chooks. Who knows what is in the foods dumped on Aussies from Asia.

JOE HOCKEY – LAUGHING ALL THE WAY TO THE US AMBASSADOR ROLE by Richard Miller

Former Treasurer Joe Hockey may have been tossed out of his former job, but he has certainly landed on his feet. Yes, now the cost-saving ex-Treasurer will be able to "double dip" by drawing on his political pension and earning over $450,000 a year. As *The Sunday Telegraph* of October 24, 2015 points out, Joe was opposed as Treasurer to mothers claiming both paid maternity leave from the government and employers - and maybe he had a point on that one.

The average Australian like myself will feel that politicians have it too good for doing what they do to us. Far better would it be to have no salary at all for any politician, only funds for travel et cetera. US presidential candidate Donald Trump, for example, will not accept a salary as US president. Perhaps only then would we attract the type of person who would govern and represent us in the spirit of representative democracy.

TURNBULL TURNS THE WELFARE KNIFE by Tom North

Turnbull continues the Abbott/Hockey tradition of slashing welfare, hitting family welfare payments with a near $5 billion budget smack. He plans to axe two Family Tax Benefit supplements - Family Tax Benefit A and B - and offered a compromise proposal to cross bench senators where the benefits stop when the youngest child turned 13.

Many, if not most families depend on these benefits just to get by. The money-based capitalist party, that the Liberals always have been, just don't understand this because few of them have ever suffered and been hungry. Sadly, poor working class people will get no satisfaction from the Labour Party, a party long-ago hijacked by politically correct Leftoids.

There is a need for a party combining values of the old Left on economy (protection, economic nationalism, pro-working class) with social credit policies on Finance and Economic Life, with cultural nationalism and anti-immigration-ism. Otherwise there is no hope, not even a "Bob Hope".

NORTHERN ITALY AND GUNS: WAY TO GO! by John Steele

Italy, like much of Europe is an artificial construct where people of different ethnic groups, through various historical processes have been flung together. Across Europe there are devolution movements aiming for ethnic separatism. One may not like this, but it exists. In Italy, the major division is between the North and the South, with the North seeking to split from the South. The Northern League champions this cause of devolution.

The Northern League Mayor of Borgosesia in Piedmont, northern Italy, Gianluca Buonanno, plans to pay citizens €250 towards the cost of a gun to "defend themselves from delinquents, who the government is privileging". (*Daily Mail.co.uk*, October 22, 2015) He accused the Italian government of failing to protect "honest Italians" with its "jail-emptying laws". Unlike much of Europe around 12% of Italians owned guns, making the number of firearms owned at around 7 million. Good work Italy, showing us the way! A good social credit measure would be a national gun dividend, giving each honest citizen a meaty dividend, based on the nation's productive ability and wealth, to be able to buy a gun and ammunition. Or maybe two.

of THE AUSTRALIAN
Shireen Morris and Noel Pearson are wrong ('Obstacles put in way of recognition', 24-25/10) to claim that the 'three-part definition' of Aboriginality (self-identification, descent and community acceptance) 'has operated for decades with little controversy.' Intelligent criticism of this ad hoc arrangement made under the Whitlam government of 1972-74 has been strongly voiced from the start; and there is a widespread public awareness that many who claim to be Aboriginals have dubious title to that name.
Thought needs to be given to what is best in this context for all Australians, those living and those to come, and not just for one small ethnic group. The answer is that national unity and justice trump sentimental proposals to give 'recognition' or restitution to that group under the misleading and arbitrary term 'reconciliation.'

Nigel Jackson, Belgrave, Vic

of THE AUSTRALIAN
Disproportionate space is being given to supporters of the campaign to achieve constitutional recognition for Aboriginals and Torres Strait Islanders ('Shorten backs recognition "as real as the rock"', 26/10). Despite this, they appear quite unable to show why such recognition has to involve changes to the Constitution.
Bill Shorten claims that indigenous Australians (a misleading phrase: I am one myself, having been born here) deserve an 'empowered say' in their destiny and a 'place of honour on our national birth certificate.'
Why one small ethnic group and not other Australians? Is a policy of dispossession in play that will lead to the partition of this continent into two nations? And who, really, stand to benefit from that? Certainly not most Australians.

Nigel Jackson, Belgrave, Vic

of THE AUSTRALIAN
Janet Albrechtsen is right to argue ('PM should champion free speech on race', 28/10) that 'the current balance in Australia around so-called hate laws is entirely out of kilter.'
To right the balance, however, more needs to be done than merely remove the words 'offend' and 'insult' from section 18C of the Racial Discrimination Act. Laws designed 'to protect feelings' are inherently unjust because of their inescapable subjectivity and slipperiness of definition; and the word 'hatred' has too often been used to justify censorship of dissident views on matters involving race and ethnicity.

Moreover, it is not just 'anti-freedom crusaders on the Left' that are responsible for the present mess. Too many commentators in the Centre and on the Right have failed to adequately defend the rights of historical revisionists and opponents of political correctness on race, fearing no doubt the loss of respectability and income. Even Albrechtsen engages in a comfortable slide from 'so-called hate laws' to 'real hate speech'.

Nigel Jackson, Belgrave, Vic

of THE AGE
Kevin Donnelly has brought out a cannon to fire on a gnat (28/10). Allowing Shiite Muslim students to give precedence for a few weeks to their sacred month of mourning, Muharram, does not mean that they are being encouraged to turn their backs completely on our national anthem and current Australian values.

I'm not happy, either, with his pronouncement that 'all students must be taught' a particular interpretation of the Australian political order' or with the UK prime minister's assertion that all who live in the UK 'must accept British values.' Each new generation should be given freedom to decide for itself about such matters, or else we'll end up with the painful contradiction of a sort of fascist authoritarianism masquerading as a defender of freedom.

Nigel Jackson, Belgrave, Vic