A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Print Post Publication Number 100000815

Vol. 54 No. 32 **17th August 2018**

IN THIS ISSUE

Dollar Bills Smother the Reef By Viv Forbes	1
Latham's Law: Universities Should Lose Public Funding By James Reed	2
In the End, it is Patriarchy or Bust! By Mrs Vera West	3
Time to Vote on Immigration By James Reed	4

THOUGHT OF THE WEEK: The affirmative intellect knows no dogmas, but creeds - acts of faith - are its very lifeblood; for without faith there is no effective thinking. In the words of Anslem: "I believe in order that I may understand" *(*AI 142)*. Into the old order of the passive nod to unchangeable law came in the Church proclaiming the Incarnation.

The Christian creed of the Incarnation leads to the democratic creed of Liberty. Henceforward, the last and least men knew himself to be no fodder for the state but That Which God Was: "The doctrine of the Trinity is the imperishable charter of human liberty, [whereas] the inner logic and inevitable social consequence of Unitarianism, or pure monotheism, is despotism" *(*AI 118)*.

Charles Ferguson : The Herald of Social Credit by Michael Lane **AI The Affirmative Intellect C Ferguson*

DOLLAR BILLS SMOTHER THE REEF By Viv Forbes

Australia's Great Barrier Reef has become a money magnet for those with green political agendas. The climax of this green racket was the sudden dumping of $444 million by the Australian Government into a small foundation controlled by big businesses and groups committed to one side of the man-made global warming debate. This gigantic green gift is designed to polish the green electoral credentials of the embattled Turnbull government but has prompted an Inquiry by the Australian Senate. (A couple of days later PM Turnbull announced $180 million for drought relief). Naturally the ALP Opposition wants the money returned so they can re-use it to buy green votes for themselves when they take power.

The Great Barrier Reef Foundation (whose Brisbane office is far from the Reef) has a huge board whose members have current or past ties to Commonwealth Bank, BHP, Esso, University of Queensland, Boeing, Qantas, Shell, Rio Tinto, Peabody Energy, Origin Energy, AGL, the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, Queensland Ballet, Suncorp, UNICEF and James Cook University. All are infected with the green religion or see it in their interests to polish their green halo. There is even an Al-Gore-trained climate alarmist on the board, plus a Director of Tilt Renewables Limited and a Partner of Affirmative Investment Management, the world's first dedicated green bond fund management company.

The board and senior management of this newly-rich foundation is so openly biased towards man-made global warming alarmism that the Chairman in a TV interview felt free to say "There are no climate sceptics here" (or words to that effect). And the Managing Director said that "without a doubt", climate change was the biggest threat to the reef. This tsunami of money will thus flow to the alarmist side of the climate debate - the Green Team is drowning in dollars. Where are the funds for the Blue Team?

The need to be seen to be doing things will now create a new threat to the reef – an invading army of day-tourists and resort residents - academics, students, reporters, UN busy-bodies, photographers, federal and state bureaucrats, doomsday merchants, company directors and politicians from all sides. The Great Barrier Reef has been "under threat" for at least 50 years. Each new "threat" brings a new flood of tax-payer money. The alarmist "science" changes but the reef remains.

Corals are the great survivors on planet Earth – for millions of years they have endured ice ages and global warming, mass extinctions, fluctuating sea levels, rivers of sediments, volcanoes, earthquakes, tsunamis and have even re-colonised the Bikini (Atoll) atomic testing site. They will certainly outlast the Turnbull government and the Great Barrier Reef Foundation. ***

DOES OBAMA BACK WHITE GENOCIDE IN SOUTH AFRICA? By Michael Ferguson

Hussein Obama, who most libtards would be happy to have as global emperor, is back, promoting racial harmony as never before; officially backing the grabbing of the land of Whites in South Africa:

http://www.neonnettle.com/

news/4707-obama-officially-backs-white-genocide-in-south-africa

"Former US President Barack Obama has officially endorsed South Africa's leaders for introducing new laws to seize land from White farmers. The South African Government amended the country's constitution this week, allowing for the seizure of farmland owned by White people, without compensation. On Tuesday, South Africa's President Cyril Ramaphosa vowed to confiscate farmland owned by the White farmers since 1600s, and "return" it to the country's Black population, by introducing a constitutional amendment in parliament. Race killings and violent land grabs have reached epidemic levels in the country, with some referring to the crisis as "White genocide." Following Ramaphosa's promise to take back land from the countries White minority and give it to Black citizens, thousands of South African farming families have arrived in Russia after fleeing their farms for fear of death as the government, and violent mobs, take land from White citizens. During a speech at the 2018 Nelson Mandela Annual Lecture in Johannesburg, Obama praised Ramaphosa for amending the constitution and legalizing the theft of land from White farmers without compensating them."

We should not be surprised to find that Obama has come out in support of the new anti-white racist laws of South Africa. Again, White South Africans must vote with their feet, and hope that Vlad Putin is interested in taking in a race of hard working people. ***

LATHAM'S LAW: UNIVERSITIES SHOULD LOSE PUBLIC FUNDING By James Reed

Here is a good article slamming the universities and suggesting that they be stripped of public funding:

https://www.spectator.com.au/2018/07/lathams-law-105/

"Higher education has deteriorated so badly, so quickly we are now involved in a civilisational struggle to bring it back into the mainstream of society. This is critical work, requiring a new approach to university funding and staffing. Institutions that abandon the Australian values of freedom, pluralism and meritocracy can no longer expect to be funded by the Australian taxpayer. To earn the gift of public money they need to serve the public interest. The evidence suggests universities now serve themselves, having been colonised by mutant strains of left-wing activism. How can the scale of the takeover be measured? Fortunately there's a ready reckoner: the essays published daily on the Conversation website, billed by Australia's university sector as 'unlocking the knowledge of researchers and academics to (solve) society's biggest problems.' I've read this material for the first three weeks of July, a total of 122 items, reflecting the priorities of the nation's scholars. What type of issues are they interested in? By far the largest category is environmental advocacy, with 27 articles or one-quarter of the total. This includes a couple of global warming gems. Academics have discovered that 'instant coffee has the smallest carbon footprint' and 'artists can put us in touch with our feelings about climate change'. Mainly BS artists. I was fascinated by the findings of a Melbourne University research fellow on the 'psychology of meat eating'. As a keen carnivore, apparently I'm suffering from 'unconscious bias' against the 'mental lives of animals'. It sure doesn't taste that way. The other categories were predictable enough. There were seven essays on Aboriginal victimhood, three on refugees and ten on foreign policy, mostly Trump Derangement Syndrome. Left-feminism was also prominent, with ten items. My favourite was an explanation of 'Why couples sleep better in more gender equal societies.' I also found out how women have abortions because of 'male violence' and the way in which companies need to manage 'menopause in the workplace'. A key goal of neo-Marxist politics is to interfere in the nuclear family, to spread Safe Schools-style notions of gender fluidity. Universities are taking this a step further, shadowing the decisions of parents in how they raise their kids. One in nine of the Conversation essays were about children. A special section has been developed on 'evidence-based parenting'. The remaining essays focused on miscellaneous left-wing themes, such as supporting the ABC, re-regulating the economy, increasing education funding and legalising cannabis. None of them called for a cut to Big Australia immigration. Only one of the 122 articles advocated micro-economic reform as a way of lowering unemployment (via greater labour market flexibility). The brave fellow who wrote it now has a job security matching my tenure at *Sky News*. The university system is a striking example of Insider/Outsider politics. As taxpayers, the Outsider majority of Australians are forced into funding the wacky, self-indulgent research of an Insider minority. This is one of many ways in which we have become a divided nation."

The universities continue to fall further from the ideal of supporting Enlightenment values . ***

IN THE END, IT IS PATRIARCHY OR BUST! By Mrs Vera West

A convincing case for the inevitability of patriarchy was made by Steven Goldberg in his book, *Why Men Rule: A Theory of Male Dominance*, (Open Court, 1999), which argued that ultimately, male physiology, such as higher testosterone levels, lead to greater male dominance, and hence to men ruling most areas of life. I am quite happy with this, so long as men strive to be men, and not cucked wimps. On this topic, I notice this:

http://www.mankindquarterly.org/archive/issue/58-3/2

> "If a theory recently presented by two female researchers from Britain is correct, then patriarchy only evolved because of the male need to give women what they wanted, females are literally evolved to like and accept the patriarchal system, and, by implication, we'd have no civilization if it hadn't developed.
>
> Zoologist Dr Rachel Grant, of the University of Northampton, and biologist Dr Tamara Montrose, of University Centre, Hartpury, presented their explosive findings in the Spring 2018 issue of the "racist" and "sexist" journal *Mankind Quarterly*. In their study, entitled *It's a Man's World: Mate Guarding and the Evolution of Patriarchy*, they argue that there is fundamental conflict of interest between men and women. Men have nothing to lose from a sexual encounter, so they want to have sex with as many good-looking (and thus genetically healthy) and young (and thus fertile) women as possible. But women have a great deal to lose from a sexual encounter, because they can get pregnant and they produce a far smaller number of gametes than men. They and their offspring are more likely to survive if they get a man who will invest in them and look after them.
>
> So the rigours of Darwinian selection have made women far pickier than men when it comes to who they're prepared to have sex with. They are attracted to high status males—and, indeed, are prepared to have extra-marital affairs to obtain a child by an even higher status male than their husband—so that their more limited number of offspring, compared to what a male can achieve, has better genetic qualities and is more likely to survive. And among our pre-modern ancestors there'd be severe punishment—from brothers or the girl's father—if you tried to force yourself upon her.
>
> Therefore, argue Grant and Montrose, it was Strike One for the Sisterhood. Men had no choice but to invest their resources, and signal commitment through marriage, if they wanted to have sex with a desirable female."

The social system of patriarchy evolved because human females, the authors argue, are not monogamous, but polyandrous, who will marry the lower beta male, but will get pregnant by the higher ranking alpha male if possible. Patriarchy is a system that seeks to control this female reproductive strategy. A parallel argument about the human female hypergamous nature is F. Roger Devlin, *Sexual Utopia in Power: The Feminist Revolt Against Civilization*, (Counter-Currents, San Francisco, 2015).

This is a departure from Steven Goldberg's hypothesis, but not necessarily inconsistent with it, that is to say, it is complementary. The really interesting question is: what is the future of human society when these basic evolutionary universals are deliberately broken down in a grand social experiment? Many believe that civilisation itself will fall apart, ultimately, like a badly glued box. ***

THE UK AND RISING SHARIA LAW By Mrs Vera West

This has created a precedent: a UK court recognising sharia law in a judgment:

http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-6018133/Landmark-ruling-sees-British-court-recognise-sharia-law-time.html

> "In a legal first, a British High Court judge has recognised a shariah marriage when ruling on a 'divorce' petition of a Muslim woman, likely setting a precedent on the acceptance of Islamic marriages and divorces in the UK. Mr Justice Williams ruled that an estranged Muslim couple's Islamic marriage does fall under the scope of the 1973 *Matrimonial Causes Act* and that they could, therefore, 'divorce' — despite the couple never having had a legal civil ceremony, reports *The Guardian*. Nasreen Akhter and Mohammed Shabaz Khan, both of Pakistani heritage, had 'married' in an Islamic nikah ceremony conducted by an imam in 1998 in West London, and Mr Khan, a businessman, was said by Ms Akhter to have "always introduced me as his wife".

Ms Akhter attempted to file for divorce, which her partner rejected, with Mr Khan saying that they were not legally married, but only under Islamic law.

From this small step, the legal elite will march on to incorporating sharia law into British law. After all, isn't that the multicultural thing to do? You see, multiculturalism was never about mass immigration plus migants keeping their culture, consistent with the host culture; it was always about undermining and fundamentally changing the host culture.

If the host culture is too weak to resist, then naturally society will change in the direction dictated by mass immigration. Have feminists thought much about this one, what will happen further down the track?

https://gellerreport.com/2018/08/fgm-essential-2islam.html/ ***

TIME TO VOTE ON IMMIGRATION By James Reed

Why has she taken so long to get moving on this? Still, beggars can't be choosers. Pauline Hanson, whom I have not heard much from lately, has called for Australians to be given a vote on the immigration intake, by moving a Notice of Motion for a plebiscite at the next general election on Australia's immigration levels, the Plebiscite (Future Migration Level) Bill 2018:

The Notice says:

"Did you know that about 60% of Australia's population growth is driven by our high migration numbers? Did you know the Government has projected that over the next 4 years they will bring in around 1,000,000 extra migrants? If you were given the option of voting to end mass migration into Australia what would your answer be?" https://www.macrobusiness.com.au/2018/08/pauline-hanson-give-australians-vote-immigration-intake/

It will be interesting to see how this goes, because the bill is up against the big Australia economic rationalists, who want to make the capitalists richer from immigration, and then there are the politically correct Leftoids, who had adopted immigration as a new religion.

Nevertheless, in all of these articles, and especially this one on voting, remember the Immigration Write on campaign which will allow you to express your righteous anger about this: https://reduceimmigration.wordpress.com ***

CREATING A MUSLIM STATE WITHIN AUSTRALIA ON YOUR DOLLARS! By Peter West

Readers who may feel that the message from Europe about the failure of multiculturalism is not relevant for Australia, need to consider this article:

http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-4258692/The-shocking-secret-plan-Muslim-state-Australia.html

"Muslim Imam Shaikh Mohammad Tawhidi has warned that an independent state within Australia is the agenda of radicals, according to an upcoming interview on *Today Tonight*. The Muslim leader, who has openly spoken out against ISIS and extremists, is interviewed on Seven's *Today Tonight* and claimed radicals would 'create a country within your country'. 'The agenda is to create a country within your country,' Imam Tawhidi told *Today Tonight*."

None of this should be in the least surprising, since the real aim of multiculturalism, from the very beginning, was to create a nation of tribes, as Professor Blainey warned against:

https://www.amazon.com/All-Australia-Geoffrey-Blainey/dp/0454008287 ***

TARGET FOR THE WEEK

Three cheers for Pauline Hanson! She is calling on Parliament to hold a plebiscite in conjunction with the next election, on the level of Immigration. What a sensible plan! Australians have been denied the chance to have a formal say on immigration since the 1970's. Both major parties have not wanted to have our views confirmed.

Make sure this happens by writing to encourage Pauline Hanson. Also write to papers and contact your own federal MP and senators urging for the plebiscite to be established. *–ND*

National Weekend Oct 5th-6th : mark in your diary

EVERY AUSTRALIAN IS ENTITLED TO A PORTRAIT OF THE QUEEN

An interesting fact reported by the *Daily Mail:*

"Australians are legally entitled to decorate their homes with a portrait of the Queen. The largely unknown program is free and as simple as **emailing your local MP** to receive the portrait. We tested the program and received a portrait of the Queen and complimentary Australian flags, three weeks after emailing a request - despite the local office being initially out of stock. The portrait of Queen Elizabeth II is tailored for Australians as she is wearing her 'wattle spray' brooch and a lapel pin with the Australian coat of arms." ***

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

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