



- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Print Post Publication Number 10000815

Vol. 55 No. 35

6th September 2019

IN THIS ISSUE

| | |
|---|---|
| The Reason for Australia's Existence: To Build up China's Military Machine! By James Reed | 1 |
| We Have been Saying this Since Eric Butler By James Reed | 2 |
| Proposals for Indigenous Constitutional Recognition Cannot be Justified By Nigel Jackson | 3 |
| White Death By Mrs Vera West | 4 |

THOUGHTS OF THE WEEK: “The conclusion is inescapable, that the Communists have in China and the Far East made a big stride towards their ultimate objective of world conquest. But it must never be forgotten that this stride was only made possible because of the treacherous activities of traitors in high places in the Western democracies — particularly America.”

Eric D. Butler – *The Truth about the Chinese Communists; “Agrarian Reformers” or Moscow Agents?* Leaflet First published c. 1956.

THE REASON FOR AUSTRALIA'S EXISTENCE: TO BUILD UP CHINA'S MILITARY MACHINE! By James Reed

It seems that Australian iron ore is being used by China to build subs and perhaps other weapons of war. And why not; it follows in the good old tradition of pig iron Bob Menzies, who was happy to supply iron to imperial Japan's war machine, that was in turn fired back at us!

<https://www.heraldsun.com.au/news/experts-fear-aussie-steel-being-used-for-chinese-submarines/>

“Australian iron ore is suspected of being used to help build China's next-generation nuclear-powered and ballistic-missile attack submarines, according to security and industry experts. Consignments from Australia's booming iron ore exports to China are likely being diverted by Beijing into the steel supply chain for a massive expansion of the People's Liberation Army Navy (PLAN), including its latest Type 096 and 095 submarines undergoing construction at Huludao Port. The revelations come as the debate over China's expansion has divided the Morrison Government following stinging criticism by Liberal MP Andrew Hastie. Maritime experts told the *Herald Sun* that while China has huge domestic iron ore fields, high-quality Australian ore would provide greater purity benefits for the specialised, high-pressure steel plating used in submarines.

The Australian government keeps an eye on which countries are taking its iron ore but has no policy of tracking which specific industries are using it because it is ‘not practical’. The Chinese fleet has grown over the past decade to become the second largest navy in the world, including dozens of new destroyers, frigates, conventional and nuclear submarines, a second aircraft carrier now under sea trials and a third in the works. Analysts estimate China is now producing one submarine every three months and, at the major sea port of Huludao, Australian iron ore sourced from Rio Tinto is believed to enter the on-site smelting process.”

As this story details, the US is now so weak in the Indo-Pacific that China would eat them alive, and that goes for Australia too, over in a matter of minutes:

<https://www.news.com.au/technology/innovation/military/us-so-weakened-in-indopacific-it-could-now-lose-war-to-china/news-story/>

“The US is so weakened in the Indo-Pacific region, it could now lose a short, sharp conflict started by Beijing in just ‘hours’, up-ending the military order in our region. Furthermore, Australia is no longer able to rely on Washington to come to its defence. That's the conclusion of a blunt new report that found years of spending cuts, an ‘outdated superpower mindset’ and ageing equipment mean US military installations in the region are vulnerable to being wiped out by China in a surprise battle. Many now warn that the US might fail to deter — or could even lose — a limited war with China, with devastating consequences for the region's future strategic landscape.”

Australia has set the new “Brisbane Line,” at the South Pole!

WE HAVE BEEN SAYING THIS SINCE ERIC BUTLER By James Reed

In the 'we told you so department,' here are excerpts from Paul Craig Roberts summing it all up:

<https://www.zerohedge.com/news/2019-08-24/>

what-globalism-did-was-transfer-us-economy-china-pcr

“The main problem with the US economy is that globalism has been deconstructing it. The off-shoring of US jobs has reduced US manufacturing and industrial capability and associated innovation, research, development, supply chains, consumer purchasing power, and tax base of state and local governments. Corporations have increased short-term profits at the expense of these long-term costs. In effect, the US economy is being moved out of the First World into the Third World.

“Tariffs are not a solution. The Trump administration says that the tariffs are paid by China, but unless Apple, Nike, Levi, and all of the off-shoring companies got an exemption from the tariffs, the tariffs fall on the off-shored production of US firms that are sold to US consumers. The tariffs will either reduce the profits of the US firms or be paid by US purchasers of the products in higher prices. The tariffs will hurt China only by reducing Chinese employment in the production of US goods for US markets.

“The financial media is full of dire predictions of the consequences of a US/China “trade war.” There is no trade war. A trade war is when countries try to protect their industries by placing tariff barriers on the import of cheaper products from foreign countries. But half or more of the imports from China are imports from US companies.

“One has to wonder that there is not a single economist anywhere in the Trump administration, the Federal Reserve, or anywhere else in Washington capable of comprehending the situation and conveying an understanding to President Trump.

“In the financial media the question is: Will the Trump tariffs cause a US/world recession that costs Trump his re-election? This is a very stupid question. The US has been in a recession for two or more decades as its manufacturing/industrial/engineering capability has been transferred abroad. The US recession has been very good for the Asian part of the world. Indeed, China owes its faster than expected rise as a world power to the transfer of American jobs, capital, technology, and business know-how to China simply in order that US shareholders could receive capital gains and US executives could receive bonus pay for producing them by lowering labor costs.

“Off-shore production started in earnest with the Soviet collapse as India and China opened their economies to the West. Globalism means that US corporations can make more money by abandoning

their American work force. But what is true for the individual company is not true for the aggregate. Why? The answer is that when many corporations move their production for US markets offshore, Americans, unemployed or employed in lower paying jobs, lose the power to purchase the off-shored goods. “I have reported for years that US jobs are no longer middle class jobs. The jobs have been declining for years in terms of value-added and pay. With this decline, aggregate demand declines. We have proof of this in the fact that for years US corporations have been using their profits not for investment in new plant and equipment, but to buy back their own shares. Any economist worthy of the name should instantly recognize that when corporations repurchase their shares rather than invest, they see no demand for increased output. Therefore, they loot their corporations for bonuses, de-capitalizing the companies in the process. There is perfect knowledge that this is what is going on, and it is totally inconsistent with a growing economy.

“As is the labor force participation rate. Normally, economic growth results in a rising labor force participation rate as people enter the work force to take advantage of the jobs. But throughout the alleged economic boom, the participation rate has been falling, because there are no jobs to be had.

“In the 21st century the US has been de-capitalized and living standards have declined. For a while the process was kept going by the expansion of debt, but consumer income has not kept pace and consumer debt expansion has reached its limits.

“The Fed/Treasury ‘plunge protection team’ can keep the stock market up by purchasing S&P futures. The Fed can pump out more money to drive up financial asset prices. But the money doesn’t drive up production, because the jobs and the economic activity that jobs represent have been sent abroad. What globalism did was to transfer the US economy to China. How does a country recover when it has given its economy away to a foreign country that it now demonizes as an enemy? What better example is there of a ruling class that is totally incompetent than one that gives its economy bound and gagged to an enemy so that its corporate friends can pocket short-term riches?

“We can’t blame this on Trump. He inherited the problem, and he has no advisers who can help him understand the problem and find a solution. No such advisers exist among neoliberal economists. I can only think of 4 economists who could help, one of them is Russian.” How does a country recover when it has given its economy away to a foreign power that it now demonizes as an enemy?

PROPOSALS FOR INDIGENOUS CONSTITUTIONAL RECOGNITION CANNOT BE JUSTIFIED By Nigel Jackson

AUSTRALIANS MUST RESIST THE PRESSURE TO FRAGMENT OUR NATION

One of the greatest strengths of Australia in a world that is always more or less dangerous is its integrity as a nation. One continent, one people constitutionally and politically. It is an elementary fact of human existence that unity of a community gives strength, while disunity weakens it and may even eventually bring it to an end.

Thus it is surprising that such intense efforts are being mounted by a de facto coalition of idealists, corporate bodies, mainstream media and the major political parties to achieve what is euphemistically and misleadingly termed “indigenous constitutional recognition”, but which really amounts to a decisive step on the way to splitting Australia in two.

Indeed, it is so odd that it is reasonable to ask whether the power of this movement, at bottom, does not derive from an extra-national elite that has its own agenda which has little to do with Aboriginal welfare but a great deal to do with control of peoples and the corralling of wealth and power for ultimately selfish purposes.

The existence of the United Nations Organisation and its history since 1945 gives good reason for us to suspect such; and a number of studies of the world’s political order, such as Carroll Quigley’s *Tragedy and Hope* and Pedro Banos’s *How They Rule the World*, appear to confirm it. A divided Australia would be easier for an elite to manipulate than one united and of one mind to determine and ensure its survival, quality of life and future development.

The case against indigenous constitutional recognition has been well established by commentators such as Keith Windschuttle, Frank Salter, Gary Johns, Greg Sheridan and Andrew Bolt. Such a move would be inequitable towards all non-indigenous Australians. It would fatally jeopardise our national unity and thus both our internal stability and external security.

It would also be unjustified because the status of today’s indigenous Australians is not such as to ethically give them the standing from which to make a valid claim to what amounts to constitutionally endorsed favouritism and the insertion of racist privilege into a constitution which at present is free of such unfairness.

This issue must be viewed solely in terms of the present and future inhabitants of Australia. Thus John Wylie is engaging in irrelevance (“Indigenous call deserves response from the heart” *The Australian* 18/6) when he writes that by indigenous constitutional recognition we would honour “more than 60,000 years of continuous inhabitation of this country” by Aboriginals before British and European settlement.

It needs no alteration of our constitution to do that, but, more importantly, that history does not somehow, by magic or whatever arcane means, empower today’s indigenous Australians with some kind of special authority and entitlement. No part of this continent was ever taken from any living Australian and no living Australian today can claim to have been dispossessed of it.

That the High Court decision (by a 6 to 1 majority) in the Mabo case, whereby six judges plucked new “rights” from nowhere, flies in the face of those facts does not negate them. Nor does the definition of an Aboriginal established by the first Whitlam government bring into being any Aboriginal nation or nations which could be in a valid position to enact a treaty with the sovereign nation of Australia under Her Majesty the Queen.

The fact is that in the past the Aboriginal tribes living on this continent lost control of it and a new nation was established which cannot now be undone without massive injustice and chicanery. The majority of those identifying today as “indigenous” not only carry some non-indigenous blood but have also benefited hugely from the infrastructure built up here by Australians in the last two and a half centuries. Thus they can hardly complain of injustice resulting from the foundation of Australia.

It is thus clear that Australians – all Australians of whatever ethnicity – are under no obligation, legal, moral or spiritual, to engage in “a generous and respectful accommodation with indigenous Australians.” Indeed, the word “indigenous” is unsatisfactorily used by Wylie and others. From one aspect, most of those termed “indigenous” are only part-indigenous. There are few full-bloods on the continent. From another aspect, anyone born here, whether carrying Aboriginal blood or not, is indigenous.

Kenneth Wiltshire (“Voice to Parliament too important to get wrong”, *The Australian* 18/3) is disingenuous in asking “what all the fuss is about” regarding the proposals of the seductively named “Uluru Statement from the Heart”, when he makes no effort to counter the well-established case against constitutional entrenchment in any form.

Moreover, it is not just in parliament that “a full debate” is needed, with formal yes and no cases prepared before a referendum proposal is put to the people, but in the nation as a whole. As the Brexit logjam has shown, on a great issue of national policy a parliament may be unrepresentative of the people as a whole. ***

Nigel Jackson is a Melbourne writer and conservative political commentator.

WHITE DEATH By Mrs Vera West

There is a very good article at the *New York Times* detailing the politics behind how the blame for ill health was shifted from sugar to fat. But now the truth is slowly starting to seep out:

www.nytimes.com/2016/09/13/well/eat/how-the-sugar-industry-shifted-blame-to-fat.html

“The sugar industry paid scientists in the 1960s to play down the link between sugar and heart disease and promote saturated fat as the culprit instead, newly released historical documents show. The internal sugar industry documents, recently discovered by a researcher at the University of California, San Francisco, and published Monday in *JAMA Internal Medicine*, suggest that five decades of research into the role of nutrition and heart disease, including many of today’s dietary recommendations, may have been largely shaped by the sugar industry.

“They were able to derail the discussion about sugar for decades,” said Stanton Glantz, a professor of medicine at U.C.S.F. and an author of the *JAMA Internal Medicine* paper. The documents show that a trade group called the Sugar Research Foundation, known today as the Sugar Association, paid three Harvard scientists the equivalent of about \$50,000 in today’s dollars to publish a 1967 review of research on sugar, fat and heart disease. The studies used in the review were handpicked by the sugar group, and the article, which was published in the prestigious *New England Journal of Medicine*, minimized the link between sugar and heart health and cast aspersions on the role of saturated fat.”

Here is the original scientific paper for all our peer review seekers. This goes to show the utter illusion of claiming that science is objective:

JAMA Intern Med. 2016;176(11):1680-1685. doi:10.1001/

jamainternmed.2016.539

“Early warning signals of the coronary heart disease (CHD) risk of sugar (sucrose) emerged in the 1950s. The SRF sponsored its first CHD research project in 1965, a literature review published in the *New England Journal of Medicine*, which singled out fat and cholesterol as the dietary causes of CHD and downplayed evidence that sucrose consumption was also a risk factor. The SRF set the review’s objective, contributed articles for inclusion, and received drafts. The SRF’s funding and role was not disclosed. Together with other recent analyses of sugar industry documents, our findings suggest the industry sponsored a research program in the 1960s and 1970s that successfully cast doubt about the hazards of sucrose while promoting fat as the dietary culprit in CHD. Policymaking committees should consider giving less weight to food industry-funded studies. multiple CHD biomarkers and disease development.

PUNISHING IRELAND'S ECONOMY WILL BACKFIRE ON UK BREXITERS

By D. McWilliams - Financial Times

... Far from being the poor, dependent outpost relying on British largesse - as depicted by Brexiters - the Republic of Ireland is an outward-looking, dynamic, trading entrepot ... Ireland has been far more successful in diversifying from the UK than the UK has been in diversifying from Ireland. Today, little Ireland remains the UK's fifth largest export market. Britain exports more to Ireland than it does to China ... Ireland buys more from Britain because Ireland is much richer. Rich people buy stuff. On a conservative estimate, the Irish are now over 25 per cent richer than their UK counterparts ... Ireland is growing nearly five times faster than the UK every year.

Full article: <https://on.ft.com/2Zg3hli>

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

A notice to THE PRIME MINISTER OF AUSTRALIA
and THE PEOPLE OF CANBERRA.

A delegation of people from waterless western NSW is planning to come to Canberra to demonstrate to the people of the ACT how they are destroying lives and businesses across the Murray-Darling Basin.

“We intend to drain Lake Burley Griffin as an environmental flow down the Murrumbidgee River. Just as the MDB Authority did with the Menindee Lakes.

“Then to add more volume to this environmental flow we will also drain the Cotter dam. Just as the MDB Authority did with Keepit and Burrendong Dams.

“Then when the people of the ACT have no water for basic needs we will try to get you some bottled water.

“You must make-do with bottled water until there is rain in the catchment.

“We are very angry people so please do not get in our way.”

Ron Pike, Sapphire Beach, NSW

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)’

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

Telephone: 08 8387 6574

On Target is printed and authorised by **K. W. Grundy**

13 Carsten Court, Happy Valley, SA.