



- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

IN THIS ISSUE

|   |   |
|---|---|
| A Genetic Argument for Preserving Virginity by Mrs Vera West              | 1 |
| Genetics Wins, Always by Brian Simpson                                    | 1 |
| No Connection Between these Careerists and our Ancient Traditions         | 2 |
| A Realistic Summary? Same Sex Marriage and Climate Change                 | 3 |
| International Law and the Australian Bombing of Syria by Ian Wilson LL.B. | 5 |
| Two New Revisionist Exposures of the Churchill Myth by Nigel Jackson      | 6 |
| The Chinese MFP by Richard Miller   | 7 |

**THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: MAYBE LECHEROUS OLD HENRY WAS RIGHT AFTER ALL?**

On reading the article (below) by Mrs. Vera West my mind flew to the importance ancient kings placed on the fidelity of their wives and the lineage of their offspring. Henry VIII had two of his wives beheaded for treason.

The royal line was important to ancient kings and an unfaithful wife was also a treasonous woman. When it comes to the Great Norm (monogamous marriage) one wonders did these people know something about such matters modern man has lost much knowledge of?

– Betty Luks, September 2015

**A GENETIC ARGUMENT FOR PRESERVING VIRGINITY by Mrs Vera West**

My thanks to a correspondent in Adelaide who sent me the reference to this article: Roosh V, "Research Suggests that a Woman's Body Incorporates the DNA from Semen of Her Casual Sex Partners". (Return of Kings.com, September 8, 2015) At first I thought that this was a joke from Adelaide, but I spent a day on the Internet investigating the topic of telegony, and now believe that it is no joke, and in fact supplies an excellent genetic reason for women to remain virgins until married - contrary to the 1960s libertarian sexual ideology. The telegony idea was advanced by the ancient Greek philosopher Aristotle, who claimed that a woman who had sex with different males retained "genetic" (blood) material that can influence the development of her offspring. Telegony was used in opposition, in 1361, to the marriage of Edward the Black Prince, to Joan Fair Maid of Kent, who had previously been married as it was thought that the offspring would not completely be of the Plantagenet bloodline.

This idea held until its criticism by modern genetics in the 1900s. However, recently scientists at the University of New South Wales found that in flies, the size of the young are determined by the size of the first male the female mated with, rather than subsequent males. This was thought, to be due to molecules in the semen of the first male being absorbed by the female's immature eggs.

That is flies (the object of this study), of course, but it has commonly been observed that a woman may have children from a second husband who resembled the first husband. Orthodox genetics usually explains this by reference to dominant and recessive alleles (genes) held by the female or male. But whether this is so or not is an empirical fact that needs to be ascertained. There is a non-PC observation that a white woman who has had black children, who then has children with a white man may produce children with "black" characteristics, which would not be due to dominant/recessive genes.

The telegony idea fits with other observations, such that male DNA has been found in female brains with the DNA probably being transferred during pregnancy - an exchange of genetic material known as "microchimerism": W. Chan (et al.), "Male Microchimerism in the Human Female Brain", PLOS One, vol. 7, 2012.

There is also a circulation of foetal progenitor cells within the blood of mothers: D.W. Bianchi (et al.), "Male Foetal Progenitor Cells Persist in Maternal Blood for as long as 27 years postpartum", Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, vol. 93, no.2, 1996, pp.705-708.

This has been taken as one mechanism for telegony: Y. Liu, "Foetal Genes in Mother's Blood, A Novel Mechanism for Telegony?" (2013) (<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gene.2013.03.061>). (continued on next page)

(continued from previous page)

Other biological mechanisms for telegony "include the penetration of spermatozoa into the somatic tissues of the female genital tract, the incorporation of the DNA released by spermatozoa into maternal somatic cells,... the incorporation of exogenous DNA into somatic cells, presence of foetal cells and foetal DNA in maternal blood and sperm (and) RNA-mediated non-Mendelian inheritance of epigenetic changes! : Y.S. Liu, "Telegony, the Sire Effect and Non-Mendelian Inheritance Mediated by Spermatozoa: A Historical Overview and Modern Mechanistic Speculations", *Reproduction in Domestic Animals*, vol. 46, 2011, pp. 338-343.

It is now well known that a single protein in semen, the "sex peptide" affects gene expression in women, impacting on women's behaviour, immunity, libido, and eating and sleeping patterns.

All of this takes us back to the "one flesh" of Genesis, Matthew and Corinthians and the Christian ideals of sexual morality. Women, by having sexual partners may be changing their very genome by incorporating genetic material from past male sex partners. Although discussions on the net are mainly focusing on males being "cucked" by raising children with another man's genes, this is only partly true. The child still has 50% of the father's genes. But the woman may have substantially changed her genetics. This is a genetic argument for retaining virginity until marriage and fidelity thereafter.

### **GENETICS WINS, ALWAYS: FAMILY, MORALITY AND CUCKOLDING by Brian Simpson**

A fascinating article by David Robson, "Is Another Human Living Inside You?", at <http://www.bbc.com/future/story/20150917-is-another-human-living-inside-you>, discusses how our bodies are not isolated biological atoms, but are more like ecological structures such as rainforests, without sharp boundaries. The article uses the term "superorganism", an organism made up of sub-units of organisms.

It is known that humans possess a vast number of microorganisms that perform a wide number of tasks, both good and bad. In fact the average human body has on-board more viruses, bacteria and other microorganisms than its own cells. Although many help digestion, some such as the so-called "zombie" parasite *Toxoplasma gondi* can have a major impact upon human behaviour. *Toxoplasma gondi* can lead to rats engaging in risky behaviour so that they can get

beaten by cats - so the parasite can complete its life cycle in the cat. In humans the same parasite can lead to an array of mental illnesses.

During human development of twins, cells may be exchanged, and this can lead to twins having two blood groups: their own and another produced from exchange cells from the twin.

The ancient Greek philosopher Aristotle advanced this thesis of telegony, that offspring can inherit genetic material from previous sex partners. This idea was accepted in the West up until the age of modern genetics and was used to object to Kings marrying divorced women. Today the idea of telegony is being revived in the light of biological evidence indicating that females, probably of most species, may absorb genetic material from previous sex partners.

### **NO CONNECTIONS BETWEEN THESE CAREERISTS AND OUR ANCIENT TRADITIONS**

Peter Hitchens takes 'the people' to task in *The Mail on Sunday*, 20 September 2015 for whining: "You wanted honest leaders - so stop whining now that you've got one"

He was responding to the people complaining because the UK's new Labour leader didn't sing the national anthem (although he respectfully stood while it was sung) at a recent public gathering.

Hitchens wrote: "We say we want politicians who are open and honest. And then, when we get one, we angrily pelt him with slime until he cringes to the mob, starts hiding his real views, and hires a spin doctor just like all the others. So don't let me hear you complaining again that our leaders are too smooth and obsessed with their images.

I loathe and despise most of what Jeremy Corbyn stands for, but a reasonably long life has taught me

that quite a lot of people agree with him and not with me. We say we want politicians who are open and honest. And then, when we get one, we angrily pelt him with slime until he cringes to the mob, starts hiding his real views, and hires a spin doctor just like the others.

I think our wonderful laws and constitution thrive because of this difference. Nobody is right all the time. A fierce and principled opposition stops a fat, complacent government from making stupid mistakes. We all live in that inch or two of difference that ought to exist between the two main parties, but which recently vanished. And I might add, these freedoms were what the Spitfire and Hurricane pilots saved when they won the Battle of Britain. Some of them may have been unsure about the Monarchy, if they'd had time to think about it.

(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)

And I wonder how many of the soldiers who slogged doggedly through the Western Desert, Burma, Italy and Normandy were a bit Left-wing, too. The world's full of countries where you have to salute the leader and sing the party song in public. This isn't one of them, so to hell with all the superpatriots who condemned Jeremy Corbyn for not singing God Save The Queen. What are they patriotic for, exactly, if not the freedom to dissent, the crown of all our liberties and our greatest achievement? So don't let me hear you complaining again that our leaders are too smooth and obsessed with their images.

And do you really think that the Blairite smoothies, who pretended to be patriots and monarchists, really were? Do you prefer liars to honest men? I'd much rather have a lone and awkward Jeremy Corbyn, respectfully staying silent during the singing of a song he didn't agree with, than the ghastly pretence of Anthony Blair's fake welcome to Downing Street in 1997, when Labour Party workers were bussed into Downing Street and ordered to impersonate a patriotic crowd. How most of them must have hated waving the Union Jack, a flag such people despise. Yet through such fakery, attacked at the time only by me, Blair came to office and was able to smash up much of our free constitution.

As for the rest of them, I have to note that Mr Rupert Murdoch, owner of the media keenest to harry Mr Corbyn, has pledged his own allegiance to the American Republic and said, in a Sydney lecture in 2008: 'If I were in a position to vote, it would be for a republic.'

Mr Murdoch, who kept a bust of Lenin in his rooms at Oxford, declared during Australia's last referendum on the Monarchy: 'The British Monarchy has become irrelevant to this generation of Australians.' Which brings me to Malcolm Turnbull, new leader of Australia's answer to the Tory Party, and another avowed republican.

### ***There's no organic connection between these careerists and our ancient traditions.***

As I survey the smarmy, modernising ranks of Mr Cameron's Blairite rabble, I feel pretty sure that they would abolish the Crown in a moment if they thought it would help them stay in office. I want Mr Corbyn to lose any Election he fights, but I want him to lose it to people who really disagree with him, not people who pretend to do so." (emphasis added...ed)

### **A REALISTIC SUMMARY? 'SAME SEX MARRIAGE' AND CLIMATE CHANGE?**

I thought that Brendan O'Neill in *The Australian*, 19 September 2015, summed up the real reason for the toppling of Tony Abbott: "Lesson for Tony Abbott: think like an elite or quit public life". "... A coup has two parts: the hidden skulduggery and the public justifications for such skulduggery. It's only by considering both that we may arrive at a clear-eyed understanding of what happened, and why. If we do this for the Malcolm Turnbull-Tony Abbott scrap, then something very interesting — and worrying — starts to emerge: a feeling that Abbott was dumped not because he was an ineffective leader but because his world view failed to conform with what political and media insiders consider to be proper and progressive.

There's more to this than Liberal infighting; it also feels like a chattering-class coup, the exiling of a leader for daring to think things that opinion-shapers consider heretical. If we look in front of the scenes of the Turnbull-Abbott drama, one consistent message takes shape: a key problem with Abbott was that he was "out of touch" on certain issues, most notably climate change and gay marriage. This has shaped the coverage of the coup around the world. Virtually every news piece on the drama Down Under prominently tells us that Turnbull supports gay marriage (though he seems keen to

stick with Abbott's idea of having a plebiscite) and that he is "far better" on climate change.

London's *Daily Mail* made a list of the battling leaders' attitude to issues. Turnbull, the Mail said, was a "firm believer in climate change" and a "vocal supporter of gay marriage", while Abbott "once said 'climate change is crap'" and would not allow a "free vote on same-sex marriage". The two men's thinking on the economy and international affairs came much further down the article. That the Mail referred to Turnbull as a "firm believer" in climate change confirms the pseudo-religiosity swirling around that issue.

In recent years, belief in climate change and support for gay marriage, have become chattering-class litmus tests. These are secular gospel truths you must embrace to gain entrance to polite society. Fail to embrace them and you're a "denier" and a "homophobe", to be cast out.

The judgment of Turnbull and Abbott via the green-gay gospel was repeated across the media, from CNN to *The Sydney Morning Herald*. CNN ran a piece headlined "Five things to know about Australia's new PM". No 1 was that he had challenged Abbott before. Guess what No 2 and No 3 were? Yep, "He's strong on climate change" and "He supports same-sex marriage".

(continued on next page)

(continued from previous page) The implicit message of this global obsession with how Turnbull differs from Abbott on those two issues is that he's someone we can do business with; he has embraced modern, PC orthodoxies. The mantra of "He supports same-sex marriage" — uttered everywhere — is the new way of saying: "He goes to church every Sunday." It marks him out as "one of us", unlike Abbott.

Pink News, Britain's most widely read gay magazine, went so far as to celebrate the "toppling" of Australia's "anti-gay marriage leader". Well, if he doesn't support gay marriage he doesn't deserve to run a country, right? Hound the heretic.

Whatever the internal Liberal machinations that led to the ousting of Abbott, the public mythologisation of his removal is revealing and terrifying. It speaks to the new intolerance, where anyone who refuses to buy into chattering-class orthodoxies can expect ridicule, and maybe even the termination of their careers. And the small matter that two years ago the Coalition got five million votes with Abbott as their leader, and with his views on climate change and same-sex marriage known? Never mind that. What does democracy matter in comparison with doing what the media and political elites consider to be right? And so have the parameters of public debate shrunk even further. It isn't only Abbott who has been given his marching orders. Through this coup we're all warned that if we hold views that the elite considers foul, or old-fashioned, we'll be marked "unfit for public life".

### A COUP FOR THE CHATTERING CLASSES?

Miranda Devine asked that question in *The Telegraph* 16 September, 2015, whilst believing it was such a coup. "This was a coup by the chattering classes. The insiders have installed one of their own in Malcolm Turnbull. They never accepted Tony Abbott, with his religious faith, his monarchist beliefs, his humility, his kindness, his old-fashioned notions of duty, honour and loyalty.

You could see it every week on the ABC's Q&A, the smug TV program that best captures their privileged leftist views. And on Monday night, when news of Abbott's decapitation was announced, the audience erupted with rapturous applause.

The inner city elites, increasingly preoccupied with symbolic issues, and out of touch with the unfashionable suburbs, never felt Abbott legitimately was Prime Minister. He embarrassed them. He didn't play their game.

On the totemic issues that bookmarked his leadership of the Liberal Party — on climate change and same sex marriage — he was starkly at odds with them. They saw him as representing an Australia they revile, full of unsophisticated, parochial, materialistic, misogynistic redneck bigots..."

But what caught my eye was Miss Devine's reference

to 'technocratic solutions to theoretical problems. The passage reads:

"For the leftists who dominate the media, academia, legal circles, who inhabit the Canberra bubble, and the stylish inner circle of Wentworth, Turnbull was more to their taste. He subscribes to all the symbolic "progressive" causes dear to their hearts: climate alarmism, "marriage equality", a republic.

They don't wince when he opens his mouth. They can imagine themselves being invited to dinner parties at his Point Piper mansion overlooking the glittering harbour. They anticipate with pride his bustling self assurance on the global stage, whether in New York addressing a UN conference or *swanning around a climate change conference in Paris, talking up technocratic solutions to theoretical problems...*"

Why have the Australian people not heard more about these "technocratic solutions"? I suspect they are part of the Agenda for this 21st Century but the people have to be led slowly to the Agenda. Too much exposure might set off the alarm bells and start a stampede.

(emphasis added...ed)

Read further here...

[http://blogs.news.com.au/dailytelegraph/mirandadevine/index.php/dailytelegraph/comments/a\\_coup\\_for\\_the\\_chattering\\_classes/](http://blogs.news.com.au/dailytelegraph/mirandadevine/index.php/dailytelegraph/comments/a_coup_for_the_chattering_classes/)

### CARBON CURRENCY? FIGMENT OF MY IMAGINATION?

Readers of On Target will remember Patrick Wood wrote about a planned 'Carbon Currency' to replace the money systems of the world. (Vol.46 No.39 8/10/2010). He wrote that, Carbon Currency is not a new idea, but has deep roots in Technocracy. The participants include many prominent global leaders, banks and think-tanks.

Today's goals for implementing Carbon Currency are virtually identical to Technocracy's original Energy Certificates goals. He rightly explained "a currency is merely a means to an end. Whoever controls the currency also controls the economy and the political structure that goes with it."

"Technocracy and energy-based accounting are not idle or theoretical issues. If the global elite intends for Carbon Currency to supplant national currencies, then the world economic and political systems will also be fundamentally changed forever. What Technocracy could not achieve during the Great Depression appears to have finally found traction in the Great Recession."

**Read further:** <http://www.alor.org/Volume46/Vol46No41.htm>

## SOCIAL CREDIT AND C.H. DOUGLAS WERE ALREADY ON THE SCENE

Long before the ideas of "Technocracy" gained public attention, Clifford Hugh Douglas in a 1920s address to students at Ruskin College, Oxford observed that "the individual in free association with others in the community is rightly the determinant of economic policy – not individual profiteers, 'the workers' or a centralised bureaucratic state... (Douglas proposed) It is a philosophy diametrically opposed to any form of authoritarian dictatorship or bureaucratic central planning".

**Read more:** [http://douglassocialcredit.com/resources/tsc/2008\\_winter.pdf](http://douglassocialcredit.com/resources/tsc/2008_winter.pdf)

### INTERNATIONAL LAW AND THE AUSTRALIAN BOMBING OF SYRIA by Ian Wilson LL.B.

While "refugees" are pouring into the West from the Syrian war the US and its allies have now been joined by Australia in bombing Syria, supposedly to destroy the Islamic state fighters in that war-torn country. What can be said about the legality of these actions under international law?

To even begin to answer this question we need to know why over 100,000 people have died and 2 million or more "refugees", or rather people getting out of the country, has occurred. The story is complicated and international/globalist politics weaves in and out of the story. What is indisputable though is that Syria under President Bashar al-Assad continued to have what we call "human rights violations" until an intensification in the wake of protests of the "Arab Spring" of 2011.

The government forces kidnapped, raped, tortured and killed activists and their families. Dead bodies were dumped on roadsides. Multi-ethnic Syria was a social time-bomb waiting to explode and explode it did in civil - almost uncivil war.

Armed opposition came from groups such as the Free Syrian Army, Islamic Front and Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL)/(ISIS) but fighting erupted between ISIS and other rebel groups such as the Army of the Mujahideen, the Free Syrian Army and Islamic Front with battles occurring from early 2014.

While the West and Israel have their own interests in the region of course, Syria would not have imploded with such chaos if it was not an artificial European colonial construct, forcing together diverse and utterly incompatible ethnic and religious groups, made worse through a minority rule by the Alawites.

What is occurring is the unravelling of a highly artificial construct that should not have been created, so it is "natural" that violence in Syria has unfolded along sectarian lines. Once things are wound up - or to change the metaphor - the genie is out of the bottle - it is difficult to see how the conflict can stop, especially by Western bombings.

There is no reason to believe that such bombings will shape the course of the war - beyond creating even more chaos, and more refugees! It certainly won't prevent any side from refraining from using chemical

weapons because someone who has descended to that level will not be scared of a few bombs dumped from the safety of planes.

Finian Cunningham, "Russia Should Ignore Washington's Blind Arrogance on Syria", at <http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/article42900.htm>, says that the West is blindly arrogant in expressing shock at Russia increasing its military support for the Syrian government, the raging of Bashar al-Assad.

No matter that Russia and Syria have been allies for almost 40 years, and sending military equipment is what allies do when one is being bombed and attacked.

As bad as al-Assad is, he is battling an even worse evil of Al Qaeda and IS-based terrorist groups. If al-Assad falls then the jihadist terrorist networks will rule the country. And as bad as al-Assad is, he was elected president in the 2012 elections, which had an opposition party for the first time. The West, Cunningham rightly observes, is being arrogant in demanding that the leader of a sovereign country step down.

Likewise the bombings of Syria by the West are contrary to international law lacking a mandate from the UN Security Council. To this it can be replied that Russia blocks such a mandate, and that is true.

However all the more reason for the West to back off and not create another Vietnam War, where the politically correct within their own nation will jump to the opportunity of wanting to import hundreds of thousands, and then millions of "refugees".

The endgame of this will ultimately be a Syria on every street of the West, as one of our contributors put it.

In a multi-cult world the best laid plans can go terribly wrong. The freedom fighters against the Russians in Afghanistan, supported by the Americans, down the track morphed into the Taliban.

The West should attempt to prevent its own societies from collapsing by "Fortress West" policies and accept that conflicts such as that of Syria are going to work through their own dynamics.

## TWO NEW REVISIONIST EXPOSURES OF THE 'CHURCHILL MYTH' by Nigel Jackson

A new book has been published in Britain casting further light on the vices of Winston Churchill. Entitled *No More Champagne: Churchill and his Money*, it has been written by David Lough and published by the innovative firm Head of Zeus in London.

A report on the damaging allegations in the book was published by *The Daily Mail* in the UK on 12 September and later by the *Mail's* Australian website on 21 September, under the heading 'Winston the Spendaholic.'

Readers of volume one of David Irving's *Churchill's War* will not be surprised at some of the reported facts – that Churchill teetered on the brink of bankruptcy and was saved by secret backers, that his beloved home of Chartwell and his London house had to be put up for sale in 1938 to reduce an overdraft of 35,000 pounds, and that he was financed by Sir Henry Strakosch, a wealthy Jew who regarded him as the one politician in Europe with the vision, energy and courage to resist the Nazi threat.

However, it seems that Lough has had access to data that was not available to Irving when he wrote his massively controversial book which both Macmillan (in Britain) and Doubleday (in the USA) declined to publish, though they were contracted to do so.

Lough has been able to study Churchill's bank statements, bills, investment records and tax demands which he left behind in his archive. These show that Churchill at one stage was spending 40,000 pounds a year at casinos and 54,000 pounds on alcohol. In 1940, just as he became prime minister, he received a secret gift of a million pounds. As for his rescue by Strakosch, neither man spoke publicly about it and Churchill kept knowledge of it to a very tight circle that did not include his bank or his lawyers.

### II

In its two most recent issues (Summer 2015, Fall 2015) the American revisionist enterprise, *Inconvenient History*, has published a long essay by Ralph Raico which originally appeared in the book *The Costs of War: America's Pyrrhic Victories*. Raico, a senior scholar at the Ludwig von Mises Institute, is the author of three books.

Raico notes that 'the Churchill legend has been adopted by an internationalist establishment for which it furnishes the perfect symbol.' (Sir Martin Gilbert is probably the leading promoter of this myth.)

While conceding that Churchill was an outstanding war leader, albeit most ruthless, Raico does not hide his overall contempt for the man. He suggests that he was 'a Man of the State, of the welfare state and of the warfare state', whose lifelong passion was war. 'A candid examination of his career', Raico concludes, shows that he 'was a Man of Blood and a politico

without principle, whose apotheosis serves to corrupt every standard of honesty and morality in politics and history.'

Raico's evidence is abundant. He reminds us how Churchill the self-professed anti-communist grovelled at the side of Stalin and proceeded to ruin the British Empire he claimed to serve. He was a materialist and a liar who during the 1930's vastly exaggerated the extent of German rearmament, his fabrications 'meant to demonstrate a German design to attack Britain, which was never Hitler's intention.'

As prime minister in 1940 Churchill resisted any suggestions from the sizeable peace party in Britain, led by Lloyd George and Lord Halifax, that he should negotiate with Hitler. It is scandalous that 'many of the relevant documents are still sealed – after all these years.'

Raico examines in detail the conspiracy of Churchill and US president Franklin Roosevelt to seduce the USA into war by an underhand co-operation that was nearly undone by Tyler Kent. One wonders whose interests these two conspirators were actually serving. Drily, Raico adds: 'A moral postulate of our time is that in pursuit of the destruction of Hitler, all things were permissible. Yet why is it self-evident that morality required a crusade against Hitler in 1939 and 1940, and not against Stalin? At that point, Hitler had slain his thousands, but Stalin had already slain his millions.'

Raico also notes that Churchill was effectively a war criminal, as shown by the British attack on the French fleet at Mers-el-Kebir, the terror bombing of German cities and the post-war handing over of the Cossacks to Stalin.

### III

It is personally encouraging for me to read these accounts. In Sydney in 1964 and 1965 I was introduced to the then startling idea that the 'great British PM' was actually a villain who had destroyed the British Empire and worked on behalf of other interests. My informants were George Miller, a Catholic conservative who ran the Music Hall in Neutral Bay and who introduced me to Eric Butler, Paddy Ulliyatt, the motoring correspondent for *The Sydney Morning Herald*, and Henry Fischer, a shadowy international activist whom I soon distrusted. Somehow I felt from the start that the critique of Churchill was valid.

Later, in 1993 and 1994 I put together my book *The Case for David Irving* (published by Veritas), important chapters of which deal with the ferocious attacks on the revisionist aspects of *Churchill's War* widely published in Australia, (continued on next page)

(continued from previous page)

including a review in *Quadrant* by Robert Manne to which I wrote a reply (included in my book) which that magazine refused to publish.

It is to be hoped that the latest accounts by Lough and Raico receive a more measured assessment than that afforded first to Irving (who was subsequently unjustly banned from entering Australia) and then to me (no Australian newspaper, so far as I know, reviewed my carefully composed and professionally indexed book: it received the 'silent treatment' in undiluted form). The unpicking of the 'Churchill myth' will be an important part of the establishment of a new paradigm for 20<sup>th</sup> Century history, something necessary, among other things, to curb the activities of dangerous powers active today in world politics.

### **THE CHINESE MFP: The " Australian" Education City Concept by Richard Miller**

I first heard about the "Australian Education City" in the article "\$30 billion 'China City' to Tap into Student Boom" (*The Weekend Australian*, September 19-20, 2015, p.5). The proposal is for a high-tech city of 80,000 ( some other reports say 100,000) to be built on a 750 ha former research farm site near Werribee.

The project is said to be near approval, but as usual we people have heard nothing about it, nor have we been consulted.

The idea is to fill this city with Chinese Students, as if our universities at present have not already tapped into the Chinese education market.

Why present Australian universities can't meet this "demand" is not explained. It would seem to be a modern version of the failed Japanese Multifunction polis (MFP) project which also sought to build a "smart city".

The project was a failure, mainly because Japan had no intention of giving us technology. This project though fits in with China's drive to buy up land and the next logical step is to simply build cities here. Sure, the media talk about joint ventures and all, but my guess is that this will be a Chinese city.

How wise is this, concerns for colonisation aside? Mike Adams at Natural News.com September 7, 2015 has been advancing the idea that a war between China and the US is already underway. There have been four industrial explosions in China recently as well as an explosion which destroyed a military weapons depot in Tokyo.

Perhaps all of this is not a "coincidence". If so it is utter folly to build a Chinese city in Australia which would almost certainly become a military target. We need to know more about this \$30 billion "China City". And, we need to oppose it.

### **RUSSIA FIGHTING BACK AGAINST GMO by Chris Knight**

Natural News.com has given recent extensive coverage of a series of GMO (genetically modified organism) scams, where university academics have "prostituted" themselves to push GMO-based foods. Cutting to the case Big Agri/Biotech companies funded academics to travel the world acting as GMO and pesticide advocates. The issue even was given attention by *The New York Times*, September 5, 2015. We could go into details about who did what and said what, but that is not my particular concern.

The Russian government has banned GMO food production in Russia. Medicine and science may continue to use genetic engineering but for food production genetic engineering will not be used. I like the style of this, but defeating Big Agri, like Big Phama in the West will be difficult -although highly rewarding. It is not an impossible fight to win, with people slowly awakening to the dangers of scientists "playing God". Russia gives us the inspiration of what can be achieved.

### **DREAMTIME: A Cruel Delusion of British Anthropologists by Robert J Lee, investigative journalist *cairnsnews.org***

Aboriginal land claims, native title and land rights are based on a false anthropological premise and are totally fraudulent according to astounding new Australian archaeological discoveries and recent linguistic studies. The delusion of 40,000 years of dreamtime mantra is the product of untruthful anthropologists.

According to Alfred Cort Haddon, a turn of the century figure revered today as the 'founding father' of British anthropology, the aborigines were clearly "pre-Dravidian" people from South India. In Haddon's 1909 book, *The Races of Man*, he asserts that Australia was originally inhabited by Papuans, or Negritos, who wandered on the extreme south of the continent. Later, a pre-Dravidian race migrated to Australia and overran the continent, absorbing the sparse aboriginal population. Thus, said Haddon, the original aborigines were either "driven off, exterminated or even partially assimilated."

**Read further:** <http://cairnsnews.org/2015/09/25/dreamtime-a-cruel-delusion-of-british-anthropologists/#more-5076>

## LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

### THE AUSTRALIAN

Greg Craven derides the 'simplistic' republicanism of new republican leader Peter Fitzsimons ('If Fitzsimons is really the man to lead us to a republic, I'll eat my bandanna', 21/9), but what could be more simplistic - and unjust - than Craven's dismissal of that great achiever, Prince Charles, with the phrase 'inherent wackiness'?

Craven's analysis of the 1999 referendum result in terms of popular resentment towards republican celebrities and bigmouths is itself wacky. The vast majority of the 54% of Australians who voted No surely did so out of positive feeling for the monarchy - there is no evidence to the contrary. If Malcolm Turnbull is wise, he will work positively and fruitfully with whoever is on the Australian throne, and leave the republican dream to ALP losers.

*Nigel Jackson, Belgrave, Vic*

**THE AGE** Amanda Vanstone is right to note ('The Queen, Angela Merkel: great role models', 14/9) that 'the pomp and circumstance that so fits the British system [of monarchy] is out of place here.' One reason for that is that much of the British royal ceremonial procedure pre-dates the foundation of Australia. However, it would not be impossible to establish an independent Australian crown with a more appropriate public iconography. We successfully created a national capital; and we can create our own royal house if we really want to. And who says that Australians reject 'hereditary privilege'? What about the Packer, Murdoch and Fairfax dynasties! The real issue is not ancient carriages or 'undemocratic' inheritance, but quality of government. An up-to-date Australian monarchy could provide the security and stability we presently enjoy under the Queen, while satisfying the popular wish for us to have our own head of state.

*Nigel Jackson, Belgrave*

### THE AUSTRALIAN

Tony Abbott's downfall reminds me of the ancient Chinese saying: 'Everyone is eager to help push over a falling wall.' Australians have to ask themselves what kinds of wind are likely to blow in as a result, for walls have a protective function.

Conservative and traditional-minded folk must be feeling especially apprehensive now, with the transition to a small-L Liberal prime minister. What to do? The answer is that we must not abandon the struggle to defend our heritage and free way of life. Abbott himself can play a major role in this by remaining active and energetic in federal politics and continuing as a major spokesman for the monarchy. And let us hope Malcolm Turnbull grows in office - as Bill Hayden did as Governor-general.

*Nigel Jackson, Belgrave, Vic*

**AUSTRALIAN LEAGUE OF RIGHTS  
NATIONAL WEEKEND  
30<sup>th</sup> – 31<sup>st</sup> OCTOBER 2015  
IN ADELAIDE  
Public Schools Club  
207 East Terrace,  
Adelaide, SA 5000  
Phone: 08 8223 3213**

**ACCOMMODATION : The following accommodation addresses are within reasonable motoring distance.**

**Chifley, 226 South Tce. Ph. 8223 4355**

**Country Comfort, 215 South Tce. Ph. 8223 2800**

**Rydges, 1, South Tce. Ph. 8212 1277**

**800 YEARS OF MAGNA CARTA**

**SEMINAR SPEAKERS**

**Mr. Philip Benwell OAM**

**Mr. Robert Balzola**

**Mr Bernard Gaynor**

**BOOKINGS FOR THE SEMINAR DIRECT TO  
DOUG & JEAN HOLMES**

**Hancock Mews  
10/308 Hancock Rd.,  
Surrey Downs, SA 5126  
Phone 08 8289 0049  
M0421 925 557**

**THE LEAGUE'S BOOK SERVICES: — <http://alor.org/>**

**When ordering journals, 'On Target' and 'New Times Survey' – Please make Cheques/Money Orders payable to --  
'ALOR Journals'**

**For educational books, videos and DVDs, etc. please make Cheques/Money Orders payable to --  
Heritage Bookshop Services'**

**For donations to the League please make payments to--  
'Australian League of Rights' or 'ALOR'**

**Books are available at meetings, at our Melbourne bookshop or by mail order from the following addresses:**

**Victoria, Tasmania:  
Heritage Bookshop,  
Level 9, Suite 8, 118-120 Queens Street,  
Melbourne, 3000  
(G.P.O. Box 1052, Melbourne, 3001).  
Phone: (03) 9600 0677**

**South Australia  
Heritage Book Mailing Service,  
P.O. Box 27, Happy Valley, 5159.  
Phone: (08) 71237131;**

**All Other States:  
To either Victorian or South Australian addresses.**

**VERITASBOOKS ONLINE:  
<http://veritasbooks.com.au/>**