



- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Print Post Publication Number 10000815

Vol. 54 No. 07

23<sup>rd</sup> February 2018

## IN THIS ISSUE

Conservatives, Social Welfare and Social Credit By Chris Knight	1
The Incredible, Fast Disappearing Rights of Australians By James Reed	2
What is Australia? By James Reed	3
A Spice a Day, Keeps the Cancer Away By Mrs Vera West	4
Letter to The Editor	4

**THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: Media Mind Pollution** By Peter Ewer

This is a good article summing up the sole point of the media today: to produce mind pollution, so that the masses can be controlled, and probably ultimately eliminated as useless eaters:

“The aim of the corporate-controlled media is to limit the expansion of your awareness and trap your mind in thought loops that play in your head like subliminal tapes, saying things like “Trump is evil” or “Communism is good.” These thought loops are engineered and scripted by experts in influence conditioning who invoke root emotions of fear, love, hatred, compassion or conformity to achieve socially-policed obedience to their agendas. All things they oppose, for example, are associated with fear and hatred (Trump, border security, military defense, etc.). Meanwhile, all things they want you to swallow are painted in the language of love or compassion (LGBT agenda, climate change, open borders, etc.).”

<https://www.naturalnews.com/2018-02-08-the-goal-of-the-media-is-to-poison-the-minds-of-the-masses-with-toxic-hatred-thought-loops.html>

I agree with this, but think one can go further, for almost all of ‘our’ institutions, such as the universities also suffer from this mind pollution. It is as if some giant virus has taken over the DNA of society and now the entire socio-genetic machinery works for it. If a movie was made about all of this, it would flop at the box office because the punters would find it too far fetched.

Houston, we have a problem.

\*\*\*

**CONSERVATIVES, SOCIAL WELFARE AND SOCIAL CREDIT** By Chris Knight

Conservative websites are celebrating Trump’s food boxes:

“The Trump administration is proposing to save billions in the coming years by giving low-income families a box of government-picked, nonperishable foods every month instead of food stamps.

White House OMB Director Mick Mulvaney on Monday hailed the idea as one that kept up with the modern era, calling it a “Blue Apron-type program” — a nod to the high-end meal kit delivery company that had one of the worst stock debuts in 2017 and has struggled to hold onto customers. Mulvaney said the administration’s plan would not only save the government money, but also provide people with more nutritious food than they have now....”

<http://www.occidentaldissent.com/2018/02/13/trumps-food-boxes/>

Correctly enough the “entitlement state” is going bankrupt across the West, with spiralling social welfare costs:

<http://www.amerika.org/politics/as-cities-go-bankrupt-the-entitlement-state-enters-its-deathbed/>

It is easy to sneer at “welfare bludgers,” until you are unemployed, or find yourself on an old age pension, like me, scrapping the bottom of the bin to get by. The conservative attack on welfare is an attack by an elite class whose real interests lay in globalisation, and who stand to benefit from flooding the West with migrants as a reserve army of the unemployed. We see this elitism in the Liberal party most clearly, although the Labor party better disguises it with their politically correct rhetoric.

One of the insights of social credit, as applied Christianity is that human beings are children of the creator, who are not to be reduced to mere things, or means to capitalist ends. An economy that does that, which our present one does, is morally evil, and needs to be replaced for human dignity to survive.

\*\*\*

# THE INCREDIBLE, FAST DISAPPEARING RIGHTS OF AUSTRALIANS

By James Reed

It is not too difficult to come up with a list of the many rights which Australians enjoyed in the past, but which have been taken away from us by the political class to serve their New World Order masters. Everyone has their personal list, but at the top must be the destruction of the Federal system by the High Court of Australia, and the centralisation of power in Canberra. This drive for centralism began immediately with the High Court's opening, and has continued to the present day, making the states completely dependent upon Canberra. Thus, Feds were easily able to force all states into the 1996 gun grab by using the financial threat. However, the Founding Fathers never intended for the states to be politically gutted in this way. As one of the leading law papers has said about this:

“Our contention in this paper will be that Australia's High Court, in deciding federal distribution of powers cases over the last century, culminating in the recent Work Choices case, has created an end product that looks not unlike one of Herbert's misleading cases, although of course the High Court's intentions have been something other than simply the reader's amusement. Such a contention, we readily acknowledge, will come as no surprise to those familiar with the constitutional jurisprudence of the superior courts of other countries. The Australian High Court has been by no means unique in its ability, over time, to interpret the Constitution in a manner widely at variance with the intentions and expectations of its founders. However, the techniques by which the High Court of Australia has done this are perhaps unique, for they have rested upon a rather unlikely foundation: a certain kind of textual formalism, the professed motivating reason for which has been the idea that by following this method the judges will avoid imposing their own subjective and idiosyncratic views upon the authoritative text of the Constitution. The ironic result — to adopt Herbert's terminology — has been a most uncommon body of constitutional law, generated by a most uncommon court, using what appear to be the most orthodox techniques of common law reasoning, applied to the text of the Constitution.

Before we attempt to support this contention, let us recall some of the outcomes produced in Herbert's Uncommon Law cases. In *Dahlia Ltd v Yvonne* (pp 314–319) a decision of the House of Lords is argued to be in the nature of an act of God, something no reasonable man could assess or predict in advance. In *Fardell v Potts* (pp 1–6) the notion of a reasonable man is held not to encompass or subsume that of a reasonable woman. In *Rex v Puddle* (pp 159–163) a Collector of Taxes is held to be a blackmailer. In *HM Customs and Excise v Bathbourne Literary Society* (pp

408–413) a lecturer who makes people laugh, and so is entertaining as well as informative, is held (against expectations) not to be subject to a heavy tax and not to be doing something illegal. In *Haddock v Mogul Hotels, Ltd* (pp 269–274) it is held that every waiter must know by heart the whole text of the Licensing Acts before being permitted, lawfully, to remove a patron's alcoholic beverage after closing time. In *Haddock v Thwale* (pp 124–129) motor cars are held to be subject to the same treatment, at law, as wild beasts (and in this case ordered to be put down). And so on, and so on.

Each time the conclusion reached looks laughably far-fetched, or at minimum implausible, when viewed from the initial vantage of the rules (statutory or case law ones) used to determine the outcome. The self-evident problem with each case — the point which enables Herbert to demonstrate the absurdity of the result — is that the enactors of those rules (or the earlier judges creating them in a previous case) would never have envisaged that they would be used or interpreted in this way.

It is precisely this claim that we will make in relation to the Australian Constitution and how it has been interpreted by the High Court in federalism cases since 1920. None of the Constitution's framers would ever have imagined, back in the 1890s or in 1901, that a century or so later the Australian States would be as emasculated as they are today: that they would be so dependent upon the Commonwealth for their governmental finances; and that their policy-making capacities would be so contingent upon political decisions taken by the Federal Government. More specifically, none of the framers would have anticipated that the 'corporations' power (s 51(xx)) would be held to allow the Commonwealth to take over the field of industrial relations; that the 'external affairs' power (s 51(xxix)) would be deemed to enable the Commonwealth to enact far-reaching environmental, human rights and industrial relations laws; or that the States could be cajoled into abjuring income tax powers, not least because four federal statutes — passed at the same time (during the Second World War) and consecutively numbered — were assessed or judged individually (and, of course, held to be valid) and not as part of a package. And this is merely to highlight some of the better known ways in which the competencies of the Commonwealth have waxed while those of the States have waned.

Nothing in the language of the Australian Constitution, or its structure, or the process that was used to adopt it, or the basis upon which its approval by the voters was promoted, or the likely

*(continued next page)*

(continued from previous page) original understandings of most of those voters, or anything else at the time would have suggested that the States would become the enfeebled, emasculated creatures they have become. Put slightly differently, no one, or almost no one, would have guessed or predicted that virtually all of the important division of powers cases would eventually go the Commonwealth's way — or at least there would have been no grounds at the time for thinking that Australia's political centre would do so much better at the hands of the judiciary than would be the case in Canada, Germany or even the United States."

<http://www.austlii.edu.au/au/journals/SydLRev/2008/15.html>

We have covered each week the contemporary drive to eliminate the rights of Australians. The TPP and other globalist economic policies will destroy traditional Australians by the backdoor, taking away the economic lifeblood of the nation, stripping away jobs, and allowing open border immigration. Of course, to keep the natives in line, the elites brought in racial and religious vilification laws, so people complaining about their

### WHAT IS AUSTRALIA? By James Reed

Perhaps readers, who like me, are critics of "our" decadent, decaying universities, may find this item amusing: a US teacher, in a US college, was sacked over a dispute with a student about whether Australia is a country:

"Southern New Hampshire University has fired a lecturer who insisted that Australia was a continent – but not a country – and took some time to conduct "independent research" into the issue before reviewing a student's paper.

Ashley Arnold, 27, who is studying toward an online sociology degree at Southern New Hampshire University (SNHU), was "shocked" to learn she had failed an assignment, part of which required students to compare social norms between the United States and any other country – in her case Australia. Arnold was downgraded because her professor believed "Australia is a continent; not a country."

<https://www.rt.com/news/418447-university-lecturer-australia-not-country/>

The issues here take a bit of thought to get around. First, the American teacher was clearly wrong, for Australia is both a country and occupies a continent, as the student demonstrated. Failing the student over this point is quite "over the top"; even if it was true, maybe it would be justified to award a lower grade depending upon the question the paper asked. But, it was not true.

What about the sacking: was that justified? Was it "over the top" Well, on that, people will have different opinions. On this one I am with the American university, because the lecturer 'did go berserk in marking', and

dispossession can be silenced by the iron fist of the law.

In summary, the modern Australian state seeks to destroy everything good and worthwhile that traditional pre-World War II Australia created. It is really the anti-state and the anti-Australian institution. Name any worthwhile right, such as freedom of speech and due process, and it is under attack. There have been no positive developments where new laws have created protections for us; every new law is a taking-away of something important.

For example, the new firearms regulations, while looking as if being concerned with "safety," are really using safety requirements to put gun owners under a further squeeze, by requiring new safes, CCTV and security arrangements, far out of proportion to the necessity of protecting one's guns. It was thus never about safety at all, that was just the surface smoke screen for a quiet agenda of gun grabbing.

Hence, the modern state is not "our" friend, but the problem to be overcome, with varying responses being given to this issue:

[www.amazon.com/Tyranny-Politically-Correct-Totalitarianism-Postmodern/dp/1910881333](http://www.amazon.com/Tyranny-Politically-Correct-Totalitarianism-Postmodern/dp/1910881333) \*\*\*

this hardly creates confidence in the system. But, cases like this probably happen everyday, especially in the politically correct topics. I recall one case of a MA thesis which nearly failed because it was critical of Australian immigration policy, and then there was the attack on the PhD thesis which was critical of vaccinations:

<http://ro.uow.edu.au/theses/4541/>

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Judith\\_Wilyman\\_PhD\\_controversy](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Judith_Wilyman_PhD_controversy)

Overall I am highly suspicious of the goings on in the university system, and for Australia, believe that a Royal Commission would be a good start in a necessary spring cleaning and ultimate pack-up, closure and replacement. The US professor, a female with a PhD in philosophy, has not had her name released. If I had a PhD in philosophy, and did all that, neither would I. \*\*\*

#### YOUNG PEOPLE'S WEBCAST FORUM

The time has come for the next generation to 'pick up the baton' that their elders have been carrying for most of their adult lives. To assist this objective we are starting a WebCast Forum for young people to discuss the issues of the day and work through to provide practical Christian/Social Credit answers. All they need is commitment and a reasonable internet connection.

**Do you know of a likely candidate amongst your immediate family and friends for this forum?**

**Email: [info@thecross-roads.org](mailto:info@thecross-roads.org)**

Have a peek online at what we have achieved so far on the 'seniors' Webcast Forum. Go to the YouTube channel: <https://www.youtube.com/user/arnisluks13>

## SARGON OF AKKAD. WHO?

By Chris Knight

While he is no Jordan Peterson, Sargon of Akkad (Carl Benjamin), has been making waves on YouTube, attacking political correctness, feminists and all matter of things. Readers who are in the younger set, may like his earthy style.

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Carl\\_Benjamin](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Carl_Benjamin)

<https://www.youtube.com/channel/UC-yewGHQbNFpDrGM0diZOLA>

Nevertheless various Alt Right sites have attacked the “sceptics,” seeing them as insincere, and not radical enough, limited in their scepticism:

[www.counter-currents.com/2018/02/overton-window-warriors/#more-79585](http://www.counter-currents.com/2018/02/overton-window-warriors/#more-79585)

While there are elements of truth in this critique, still in these hard times we need to be thankful that people are doing anything at all, and it takes courage today to stand against the flow. That is why we need to be tolerant of people doing good work, even if it is not exactly what we would like. After all, we can always take a stand ourselves! \*\*\*

## A SPICE A DAY, KEEPS THE CANCER AWAY By Mrs Vera West

Here, for the scientifically minded is the abstract to a study that showed evidence of the protective effects of spices on DNA:

“Spices are rich sources of antioxidants due to the presence of phenols and flavonoids. In this study, the DNA protecting activity and inhibition of nicotine-induced cancer cell migration of 9 spices were analysed. Murine fibroblasts (3T3-L1) and human breast cancer (MCF-7) cells were pre-treated with spice extracts and then exposed to H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> and nicotine. The comet assay was used to analyse the DNA damage. Among the 9 spices, ginger, at 50 µg/ml protected against 68% of DNA damage in 3T3-L1 cells. Caraway, cumin and fennel showed statistically significant ( $p < 0.05$ ) DNA protecting activity. Treatment of MCF-7 cells with nicotine induced cell migration, whereas pre-treatment with spices reduced this migration. Pepper, long pepper and ginger exhibited a high rate of inhibition of cell migration. The results of this study prove that spices protect DNA and inhibit cancer cell migration.”

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0308814612005845>

By way of translation, use spices, and as many as possible because almost all of them have health benefits. Black pepper, ginger and turmeric have anti-cancer properties, with few, if any side effects:

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/health/article-4726136/How-curry-spice-helped-dying-woman-beat-cancer.html>

<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/health/article-5230201/Pensioner-used-turmeric-fight-blood-cancer.html>

\*\*\*

## LETTER TO THE EDITOR

To THE AUSTRALIAN On the matter of Shakespeare’s *Hamlet* it seems from Barry Gillard’s review of Rhodri Lewis’s *Hamlet and the Vision of Darkness* (“The madness of knowing thyself”, 10-11/2) that Lewis, far from having broken free of the ‘many confines, wards and dungeons’ of the ‘solely scholarly or academic’, has become trapped there. A few simple corrections are in order. It is untrue that in Elsinore ‘no distinct framework for genuine virtue is apparent.’

We have the integrity of Hamlet himself, shown repeatedly in his behaviour, though spoiled by his psychological illness (which he labels as being ‘passion’s slave’). We also have the sterling fidelity of Horatio, the loyalty of the common soldiers and the memory of the excellent kingship of Hamlet’s father.

Secondly, we cannot ‘cease to view the play as a tragedy based around a young man’s inability to make decisions’ without ignoring central segments of the drama. Shakespeare emphasized the delay by contrasting Hamlet’s soliloquy in Act Two with his later one in Act Four. Ernest Jones has provided the best and most comprehensive case study of the character, though his ‘solution’ of Freud’s dubious ‘Oedipus complex’ need not be accepted.

Shakespeare was not ‘intolerant of late 16th century humanist conventions’; in his work as a whole he honours both kinds of knowledge of oneself mentioned by Gillard. In *Hamlet* he wrote with admirable understanding and compassion of a young man’s nervous breakdown, clearly precipitated by his mother’s infidelity. That, of course, is the ‘tragic flaw’ of this particular play.

NJ, Belgrave, Vic

\*\*\*



**THE LEAGUE'S WEBSITE: — alor.org**

blog.alor.org thecross-roads.org

**Subscription to On Target \$45.00 p.a.**

**NewTimes Survey \$30.00 p.a.**

and **Donations** can be performed by **bank transfer:**

A/c Title Australian League of Rights (SA Branch)

BSB 105-044

A/c No. 188-040-840

or by cheques directed to:

‘Australian League of Rights (SA Branch)’

or on the **Veritasbooks.com.au** website:

<https://veritasbooks.com.au/cat/subscriptions>

“On Target” is printed and authorised by K. W. Grundy.

13 Carsten Court, Happy Valley, SA.

**Postal Address:** PO Box 27, Happy Valley, SA 5159.

**Telephone:** 08 8387 6574

**email:** [heritagebooks@alor.org](mailto:heritagebooks@alor.org)

**Head Office Hours** - Mon., Tues., Wed. 09.00am - 3.00pm