

A WEEKLY COMMENTARY

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Vol. 60 No. 40

18th October 2024

IN THIS ISSUE

The Psychology of Modern Cults By Arnis Luks	53
What is an Antivaxxer? By Judy Wilyman PhD	56
“Australia’s past is a foreign country” - How they wrecked Australia By Will Waite	58
I Smell Gingerbread By Neville Archibald	61

Thought for the Week: “A fundamental difference between modern dictatorships and all other tyrannies of the past is that terror is no longer used as a means to exterminate and frighten opponents, but as an instrument to rule masses of people who are perfectly obedient. Terror as we know it today strikes without any preliminary provocation, its victims are innocent even from the point of view of the persecutor. This was the case in Nazi Germany when full terror was directed against Jews, i.e., against people with certain common characteristics which were independent of their specific behavior. In Soviet Russia the situation is more confused, but the facts, unfortunately, are only too obvious. On the one hand, the Bolshevik system, unlike the Nazis, never admitted theoretically that it could practice terror against innocent people, and though in view of certain practices this may look like hypocrisy, it makes quite a difference. Russian practice, on the other hand, is even more ‘advanced’ than the German in one respect: arbitrariness of terror is not even limited by racial differentiation, while the old class categories have long since been discarded, so that anybody in Russia may suddenly become a victim of the police terror. We are not concerned here with the ultimate consequence of rule by terror—namely, that nobody, not even the executors, can ever be free of fear; in our context we are dealing merely with the arbitrariness by which victims are chosen, and for this it is decisive that they are objectively innocent, that they are chosen regardless of what they may or may not have done.”
— Hannah Arendt, *The Origins of Totalitarianism*

The Psychology of Modern Cults By Arnis Luks

September 11, 2001, multiple related incidents occurred in New York, in a forest in Pennsylvania, and the Pentagon, (located in Arlington County, Virginia, across the Potomac River from Washington, D.C.) USA, which will be embedded into most people's minds as an attack against the United States of America by

extremists. In 2004 the movie '9/11: In Plane Site' came out.

9/11 In Plane Site - Directors Cut

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=igX7Z8VstN4>

Three years after the actual 2001 events significant information was released into the public consciousness which generated an array of questions to be asked against the official version of those events from the United States Administration. An important point about this is the passage of time being approximately three years after the events occurred, and then the release of vital information to the public.

A close associate, back then in 2004, informed me that they had just gone to watch the movie, and their point of view had subsequently changed. I asked a simple enough question – 'okay, your view has now changed after watching the movie. What are you going to do about it?' The reply was most telling – 'well, nothing'. Their own 'line in the sand' against tyranny had not yet been reached, even though I considered them to be loyal and personally brave towards Australia and upholding our traditional rights and freedoms.

What this showed me, in psychological terms, was that even though the public can become informed about the 'misinformation and disinformation' emitted from official government circles, they will personally do nothing about it and continue life's journey as if nothing had changed. The psychology is the point. Life continues as if nothing has changed, even though the official narrative given was fictitious, for other's personal benefit of massive profits.

A similar phenomenon occurred in 2020 with Covid. An existential threat to the whole world supposedly occurred, the government's official narrative came through the WHO channels, as did the TGA response of the jab. Both these existential threats of 9/11 and Covid resulted in massive profits for the military industrial complex which includes big Pharma. More than three years has now passed since Covid, the lockdown and the jab, and vital information is again now being released into the public realm, Covid morbidity, the efficacy, or physical harm being inflicted.

The *modus operandi* is the same, in that the realisation of this knowledge of the contamination and potential injury from the jab will do little to change public perception of the events of 2020 (as being an insider run job for the benefit of the transnational corporations and central banks who are financing them). Life goes on – for some. This article is not for them. This article is for those others, whose line in the sand has been crossed and wish to do something positive to regain our ancient rights and freedoms from those who would impose tyranny over us.

Last week's *On Target* identified the important lesson of utilising the correct 'Rules of Association', being Devolution - placing legitimate power at the lowest level possible to achieve the best results for each individual concerned. This week I wish to emphasise the principal, or natural law of 'Unity amidst Diversity'. Lenin identified the importance of 'cells' of actionists, to the point where 'information of strategy' was only released based on 'those who need to know would be the only ones allowed to know'. The Rhodesian SAS, as recorded in the title 'The Elite',

demonstrated on the ground how important this principle of diversity (of action), and unity (of purpose or policy) can be in an environment of guerrilla warfare.

The primary policy for us all, to me, is quite clear: upholding our ancient rights and freedoms, and, shoring up the clearly defined limiting powers over the federal government (and bureaucracy) as recorded in our constitutional arrangements. I hold the view that the current Australian Constitution is the most superior, most thought through, with the greatest potential to, not only re-state, but uphold, the restoration of our ancient rights and freedoms.

The task set before us for all those whose line in the sand has been crossed, to my mind is this primary policy. Yuri Bezmenov offers some guidance in his *'Love Letter to America'*. Regaining influence over each representative is essential, so that the Parliament can perform correctly - as envisaged by the writers of our limiting constitution. Having a pocket edition of our Constitution always at the ready is a good start. Reading it regularly emphasises the balancing of differing powers across the three branches of government - the executive, the administration and the judiciary. The Federated relationship identifies further divisions of powers across the three levels of government - local, state, and Federal or Commonwealth. Further, each Parliament (except Queensland) consists of the lower house, the upper house (or Senate), and the monarch's representative as governor (or Gov general). Queensland dissolved its upper house as an act of state Parliament in 1922.

<https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/cx2kvewx8l9o>

<https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/c869x38lgn9o>

<https://labour.org.uk/change/serving-the-country/#constitutional-reform>

These articles from Britain show a consistent Labour desire to move away from hereditary peerage. Britain has been doing quite a bit of soul-searching in recent times, emasculating the house of lords from rejecting any Bill before Parliament, to now, at most causing a delay of little inconvenience - *1911 Parliament Act*.

The second stanza to this British constitutional soul-searching is the pursuit from Scotland, Ireland, Wales and now Cornwall requesting a greater say in the political processes – essentially a desire to achieve a federated relationship.

In the 1920s Queensland suffered from an appointed Upper house, as far as the lower house was concerned, being obstructionist. The appointed Upper House was strategically flooded by new Labour appointees to achieve a majority which readily voted for its own dissolution.

The following links show some political consideration into the re-establishment of the upper house in Queensland. While they are somewhat dated, the political machinations are important to consider in the light of the principles of divisions of power - *unity amidst diversity* - and *devolution* as a legitimate policy pursuit.

The ups and downs of the Legislative Council October 12, 2011 —

<https://www.brisbanetimes.com.au/national/queensland/the-ups-and-downs-of-the-legislative-council-20111010-1lhex.html>

LNP abandons upper house push - October 12, 2011

<https://www.brisbanetimes.com.au/national/queensland/lnp-abandons-upper-house-push-20111010-1lhot.html>

No current government dares to ever raise a voice against central banks and their financial-controlling policy (of purchasing government bonds). Where do they get their money from to purchase these bonds except by creating it out of nothing – thin air. Such is the inordinate financial and political power held by them, having already been surrendered by every nation.

Ukraine's Zelensky has handed over state banks for IMF control here:

<https://richardsonpost.com/howellwoltz/37517/ukraines-zelenskyy-the-worlds-greatest-traitor/>

Confessions of an Economic Hitman by John Perkins is available here:

https://alor.org/Storage/Library/PDF/Perkins%20J%20The_Confessions.pdf

However, our Commonwealth Constitution does provide some relief within the

Legislative powers of the Parliament - Sect 51:

...(xiii) Banking, other than State banking; also State banking extending beyond the limits of the State concerned, the incorporation of banks, and the issue of paper money:

Being a layman as I am but having some imagination as to the ramifications of those words ‘other than State banking’, allows my thoughts to identify the separate states as constitutionally able to re-institute (as was) their state banks to provide the necessary financial relief to operate their state budgets debt-free, providing the necessary creation of new credits is processed and spent within the limits of the State boundaries concerned. How fortunate our forebears have already thought this through, to mitigate against further centralising policy emanating from central banks (and being administered by our Commonwealth Parliament and the Canberra located bureaucracy). Much work to do while there is still some daylight.

Further Reading: *Australia's Hydra - Undeclared, One-Sided Civil War Against Itself* By Arnis Luks OT Vol. 56 No. 07 - 28th Feb 2020

Restructuring of Australia By Arnis Luks - NTS Vol 21 No 02 – Feb 2020

What is an Antivaxxer? By Judy Wilyman PhD

An ‘antivaxxer’ is the derogatory word used by the government and medical industry to dismiss people who are critically thinking about the evidence for vaccines. They are people who are interested in seeing the type of evidence that governments are using to make claims of ‘safety, efficacy and necessity’ for each vaccine. Remember, just because you think one vaccine is beneficial doesn’t mean that every marketed vaccine has benefits that outweigh the harm.

Who is doing the risk assessment for each vaccine and the combination of 16+ vaccines in an infant? The pharmaceutical companies that profit from the these vaccines (PhD Ch 6).

The word ‘anti-vaxxer’ is used as a term of ridicule in the media. It is a form of bullying or hate speech, and it is used by the government to incite others against your opinions that are based on researched information. This is done to ostracise you in the community or workplace to prevent others from questioning the government narrative. They are manipulating your behaviour so you believe in vaccines - without viewing any evidence.

The government and powerful medical-industry lobby groups use this term in the media to stop people looking at the evidence (or lack of) supporting government claims about vaccines. They also use the label of ‘conspiracy theorist’ as hate speech to manipulate people’s understanding and use of vaccines.

When society is unable to have open and transparent scrutiny of the evidence in public debates it is no longer science. It becomes propaganda or a form of religion. The government wants you to trust the claims they are making so that you will believe in vaccination and they manipulate your behaviour with propaganda and by calling those that think critically - ‘anti-vaxxers’. This word has been weaponised.

The government’s narrative became a religion when they started vilifying parents/ professionals with name calling to attack their educated arguments three decades ago. Even the official channels for debate, the vaccination conferences, select against our arguments by claiming it is ‘anti-vaccination material’, instead of openly debating the evidence.

In Australia you are vilified if you say that you do not vaccinate. The Liberal government, in 2016, implemented policies in the Social Services Department (not the Health Department), that ensure people lose their jobs, their welfare benefits or are discriminated against in the community, if they have an educated view supported by university research, and do not vaccinate. These policies are being continued by the Labor Party.

So Do Universities Matter?

The New Anti-Vilification Laws in Australia

The Australian government is bringing in new Anti-Vilification laws and the state of Victoria has proposed that the offense of ‘inciting hatred against, serious contempt for, revulsion towards or severe ridicule of a person or group based on protected attributes’, will lead to up to five years in jail. These protected attributes include sex, gender identity, race, religion, sexual characteristics, sexual orientation and disability.

So if the new laws are properly applied anyone denigrating people for their beliefs about vaccines, with inciteful language, such as ‘anti-vaxxer’, will go to jail. In this case universities do matter.

However, if the Anti-Vilification Laws do not include vilification against scientific and political opinions, even when the government promotes these issues in a religious fashion, (that is, with propaganda and without scientific debate), then universities will no longer matter.

Currently, the vilification of professionals and academics with the words ‘anti-vaxxer’, ‘conspiracy theorist’ and many other labels, for example, telling parents to ‘grow a brain’ (WA Premier, Mark McGowan 2021), means that university degrees are worthless.

How is the Australian Prime Minister (or Premier-ed) going to enforce these Anti-Vilification laws with consistency when he and his ministers are using hate speech to create a religious belief, and not educated opinions, about vaccination?

My own journey of investigating vaccines at university for 10 years (2004-2015) demonstrates how degrees no longer matter because journalists, comedians and politicians are permitted to vilify and denigrate academics and professionals when they speak against the government narrative.

In 2004 I began researching the evidence supporting the government's vaccination program. However, when I graduated in 2015 with a Masters of Science Degree (Population Health) and a PhD analysing the evidence underpinning the government's vaccination program, I was not allowed to debate my university research in public forums or national conferences. I was ridiculed by government health officials as an 'antivaxxer' and a 'conspiracy theorist', and powerful industry lobby groups ensured that our events in council venues were cancelled by claiming 'anonymous complaints had been made' and by providing false information about us in the media.

The people who are pro-vaccine are trusting (blind faith) that the government is telling the truth and hence vaccinating has become a religion in our society. My book *Vaccination: Australia's Loss of Health Freedom* is based on my PhD research at Wollongong University and it describes the political strategies that have been used to prevent the public from having a voice in government vaccination policies ever since 1986 when the pharmaceutical companies gained indemnity for any harm that is caused by a drug called a 'vaccine'.

Information Sources: https://judyp.substack.com/p/what-is-an-antivaxxer?publication_id=1731650&post_id=150244940&isFreemail=true&r=1h49yq&triedRedirect=true

Independent MP, Russell Broadbent, interviews Dr. Melissa McCann on the Class Action for thousands of COVID Vaccine Injured. This legal action for compensation is based on exposing the government lies about the safety and efficacy of COVID 'vaccines': <https://www.youtube.com/watch?app=desktop&v=j7PCEaXViHk>

Independent MP, Russell Broadbent, Vows to Revoke the No Jab No Pay No Play Policies (implemented by the Liberal party in 2016) that discriminate against healthy children: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iBvNedT5NKA>

My Interview on *Lies are Unbecoming* discusses the spread of false information by the mainstream media, about my research and reputation, and the control of political information on Wikipedia and other social media platforms by powerful industry lobby groups with vested interests:

https://unbekoming.substack.com/p/interview-with-judy-wilyman-phd?r=3wcfesz&utm_campaign=post&utm_medium=email&triedRedirect=true

A critical analysis of the Australian government's rationale for its vaccination policy University of Wollongong NSW PHD thesis available for download here:

<https://ro.uow.edu.au/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=5550&context=theses>

"Australia's past is a foreign country" How they wrecked Australia By Will Waite

This week is a follow-up on an article I wrote a couple of weeks ago called *Debt for Consumption*. In that article I explained how, since Douglas' day, the money creation scene has changed significantly. Before about the 1970s the heavy lifting of money creation was done by businesses taking on debt to fund production.

This is not the situation today. At least not in Australia. Rather than money creation coming through debt taken on by businesses producing things, in the last 50 years or so, debt is increasingly being taken on to fund consumption directly. This debt-for-consumption machine turns over in a couple of related ways.

Firstly, the government draws on its powers to tax and increase the national debt, spending money into circulation through infrastructure spending and growing the public service. We've seen plenty of this in the Albanese term. Since June 2022 the public sector has swollen by more than 570,000 positions roughly 320,000 of them in the so-called "care economy."

The second avenue of getting debt-dollars into circulation is through property debt and this has been the heavy lifter over the last couple of decades. This mortgage approach to growing the money supply is at the center of Matt Barrie's recent analysis of why the Australian economy is completely rooted.

Matt Barrie, businessman and tech entrepreneur, is worth listening to because of an unusual willingness to say the quiet part out loud. ¹ In an interview on the Equity Mates Podcast, ² Barrie does an admirable job of laying out the problem for us. He explains how over decades of mismanagement (and sabotage WW) the political class has facilitated the almost complete dismantling of our real productive capacity, except for a few primary industries, mining being one of them. We are, in truth, hardly an advanced economy at all. In its place successive governments have chosen the path, of what he calls "easy, relentless growth." By this he means "pumping the housing market to the mother of all bubbles."

Pumping up bank credit for residential purchases gets the prices up and insane levels of immigration is the strategy for keeping them there. Current levels of migration are completely out of step with historical rates. According to the ABS "In 2022-23, the number of migrant arrivals increased to 737,000, up from 427,000 the year before." ³ Migrants with ready deposits and students with daddy's money promise to keep demand in both sales and rental markets red hot and ensure "young Australians [are] permanently gazumped by new buyers from other countries." ⁴ This is especially true in an income to price environment where just to save a deposit can take twenty to thirty years.

But migration is not the only method for keeping the cash cow of real estate lumbering along. With soft money-laundering laws that don't require buyer identification; ⁵ unchecked bank greed which takes the income of prospective borrowers and just multiplies it by five to calculate borrowing limits; and the superannuation "fly-wheel" that has a percentage of the nation's wage bill routinely invested in bank stocks, with the increased equity going to underwrite more property lending, ⁶ there is no limit to how high property prices can go. Or is there?

Barrie calls inflated real estate prices the "original sin" which is driving costs across the economy. Increased rents, interest rates and mortgage costs must all come out in inflated prices. The RBA gets around this uncomfortable fact by not counting interest rate increases in CPI. ⁷

I realise that many of my readers have heard variations on this theme over and over but there is every reason to believe that this debt-funded fiasco is coming to its logical conclusion. As Barrie says "the Maths just doesn't work." After the exorbitant price of housing and the cost of living there is little left for anything

else. We are already in the worst per capita recession since the depression ⁸ and it is difficult to see how things can go anywhere but backwards — rapidly.

It's impossible to predict what the outcome will be and what sort of shock treatment we are in for. To some extent we are in the middle of it now. These economic settings are causing serious social damage. The last 6 months has seen a record 6600 small businesses fail. ⁹ The National Suicide Prevention Australia community tracker ¹⁰ says that 74% of Australians are feeling “elevated levels of distress beyond normal levels compared with last year.” The top five stressors are:

- Cost of living and personal debt (49%)
- Family and relationship breakdown (24%)
- Housing access and affordability (24%)
- Unemployment and job security (22%)
- Social isolation and loneliness (22%)

Three of five are directly related to our topic.

What is going on here? The Australian project is now firmly in the grip of people who care nothing about the national project called “Australia.” To the monied, international set, national loyalties, laws, culture and values are an obstacle to the profits and access of internationalists in pursuit of a global order. There is simply no value which represents the culture, health, and wellbeing of Australian people in the calculus of bankers, politicians and international bureaucrats.

The truth is that there is an alternative to the decay inherent in a money supply rented from banks, and there will be no lasting solution until we can get some community consensus that a big part of the problem is our failure to confront the monopoly-of-credit.

References:

1 The title is the opening remark from: Barrie, M. 10.18.24. *Put another Aussie on the Barbie*. Available from: https://medium.com/@matt_11659/put-another-aussie-on-the-barbie-f298c21b5bf9

2 Equity Mates Investing Podcast. Expert: Matt Barrie - *Why house prices are the cause of today's cost of living crisis*. Available from Spotify.

3 Australian Bureau of Statistics. 2022-23-financial-year. Overseas Migration, ABS Website, accessed 14 October 2024.

4 Barrie, M. 10.18.24. *Put another Aussie on the Barbie*. Available from: https://medium.com/@matt_11659/put-another-aussie-on-the-barbie-f298c21b5bf9

5 Martini, M. 2017. *Doors Wide Open: Corruption and Real Estate in Four Key Markets*. Transparency International. Available from: <https://www.transparency.org/en/>

6 Barrie, M. 10.18.24. *Put another Aussie on the Barbie*. Available from: https://medium.com/@matt_11659/put-another-aussie-on-the-barbie-f298c21b5bf9

7 Waite, W. 2024. *Why Monetary policy doesn't and can't work for anyone but the banks*. Available from: <https://alternativesx.substack.com/p/why-monetary-policy-doesnt-and-cant>

8 Barrie, M. 10.18.24. *Put another Aussie on the Barbie*. Available from: https://medium.com/@matt_11659/put-another-aussie-on-the-barbie-f298c21b5bf9

9 Chambers, G. 08.10.24. *Small business profit crunch amid record insolvencies surge. The Australian*, Available from: <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/nation/politics/small-business-profit-crunch-amid-record-insolvencies-surge/news-story/da8851f14697b4b8a350008007f271de>

10 Suicide Prevention Australia. 10.09.24. *Young Australians struggling as Advice on the National Suicide Prevention Strategy released today*. Available from:

<https://www.suicidepreventionaust.org/young-australians-struggling-as-advice-on-the-national-suicide-prevention-strategy-released-today/>

I Smell Gingerbread By Neville Archibald

Any trip to the woods can be fraught with danger. If you are hiking on a journey in largely unknown territory and you do not stick to the map, the biggest danger is getting lost. Avoiding the snakes, drinking clean water and being careful not to twist your ankle when the going gets rocky is a good start. If the map reader of the group is not competent, or has a secret destination, he or she may misread the signposts or try to convince you that one mountaintop is the same as another. Imagine the group's surprise then, when your long trudge with full backpacks, ends in a clearing and the map reader welcomes you into her gingerbread cottage.

Our journey through this pandemic has been much the same, it is crucial to find the best way forward, charting the dead ends and dangers we have encountered will allow us to make a map which could help us through the next one (for they keep telling us there will be more). In making this map we have to debate the many issues we encountered and while there have been some forums of discussion since the pandemic's beginning, most have been severely restricted in what is allowed to be discussed. The guides or in this case the cartographers pushing for this map have been part of the gingerbread conspiracy, or they have shares in the bakery.

Now, there are many more groups/forums taking place as the haste, due to a sense of urgency, eases off and allows time for considered reflection. People are looking for justification for the restrictions and controls they perceive as having gone too far. These discussions are wide ranging and focus on so many things that it is possible that the true problem will be lost; we will lose sight of the forest for all the trees. Very few of these debates focus solely on the correct question. We need to remember that this whole debacle started somewhere and rapidly led to a world wide implementation of an untested technology. What has been said to be the biggest drug trial in history. It has been done and we can't undo it. The question now is, was it a success? What are the trial results, scientifically considered, double checked, compared to a placebo or control group! Was it worth the pain!

All through this shamaozzle we heard the deafening cries of, "follow the science", the insistence on rigorous double-blind testing for other potentially helpful drugs was demanded. (Hydroxychloroquine, Ivermectin, vitamin D) Well respected and previously safe drugs with a long history of use, suddenly became the target for exemplary trials while the preliminary trials being conducted on the novel new ones were being fudged. Fast forward to the present day and the test results of the world's biggest trial are being found to be so badly lacking in accurate data, that a control group doesn't even exist. The only potential group of people who could be this group, are maligned and condemned as anti-vaxxers or covid deniers. In what scientific reality are these "vaccine safety researchers" living?

Legitimate questions about the true effectiveness, side effects and long term dangers are treated with contempt, scorn and an attitude of disbelief that we can even

consider asking these things. Their novel new mRNA technology didn't have any existing history of use(able) safety data behind it, nor does it seem that they have set in place adequate provision for recording their trial data. A lot of the debate going on is as much about the quality of the data recorded as it is about what was actually recorded. Getting a clear picture of the trial's outcomes is almost impossible, and vague, "it would have been worse without them", declarations ring hollow. The first real question to be asked is whether or not the trial was a success, not how we can do it faster or better next time.

We have seen the push for this truth in many forms, the COVID inquiries that are taking place around the world are opening up debate. The recent Stanford Pandemic Policy Conference, opened with remarks about the disappointment many felt about the shutting down of debate in science during the COVID pandemic. A laudable sentiment. The president of Stanford University, John Levin, said in his introduction that he wished to bring together people with different views to discuss the outcomes of COVID. He was disappointed that even now getting participants to agree to come to the forum was difficult and how the conference was attacked in some media before it even began. After four years, feelings are raw and views are divided, but he expressed the need for Universities to be a model of how to come together and have robust and thoughtful debate, (as they were conceived for) especially if this is what is expected of the students. I am paraphrasing his remarks and I agree with his expressed sentiment, for if we cannot discuss openly the outcomes of actions taken we can never hope to find truth.

"Jay" Bhattacharya, a professor with some forty years at Stanford, who was outspoken through the pandemic, then spoke. Saying that the management of the pandemic was a tragic disaster, he went on to say there was a need to foster dialogue and not to destroy those who disagree with you, that no one has a monopoly on truth. All these opening remarks sound great.

I have watched these sessions, as I have watched many other forums, and have not been entirely comfortable with the discussions. Many who speak believe that the vaccines were a good thing, openly suggesting that in the next pandemic they will be able to develop and roll out new ones, faster. Little comment is made of the actual harms created by these trial vaccines. Little discussion centers around the results of this vaccine trial. It is like they have fully accepted this technology without waiting for the breakdown of the results, without even asking for them. Where are the peer reviews? The whole concept of it being, in effect, a trial is being swept aside and no consideration taken of the damages inflicted by adverse reactions. I guess this is not too surprising to me, since I have found comments of many prominent "alternative researchers" of the pandemic, to be more focused on better methods of implementation of controls, rather than, do we need them? Were they safe? They seem to deny the long term damage and lay much of the ongoing issues people have, at the feet of "long covid". I may be wrong in this assessment, but to me they seem more of apologists for vaccines and rather more critical of the other parts of the

control regime.

The overall feeling I get is one of groups of people trying their best to come out of a bad situation with as little taint as possible. Some are quite open about mistakes made, but seem content to brush them off as being caught unprepared. I find this strange, as most nations had some form of pandemic response policy already in place. The global action of throwing these out the window left a world littered with previous policy as they looked to the WHO and global think tanks to give them advice instead. No boy scouts here!

I wonder if this global regime has set up many of these forums or at least infiltrated them to be the navigator, the guide to direct answers for those who want the excesses of the pandemic controls addressed. By bringing what appears to be both sides of the argument together (even a little biased towards the critical element), they can pretend to look at the problems and derive some solutions. The underlying issue, that of a failed, and dangerous, to my mind, new technology for vaccines, is not really addressed. Did the trial in question create more damage than it did defend? Is it a safe and effective solution going forward? Just saying so, over and over, does not constitute proof. I know many whose lives have been changed forever by severe reactions, and the evidence of long term damage, being touted as “long covid” fits the vaccine reactions better than the disease spread itself.

To my mind, we are looking at a problem similar to that which we saw in the recent floods, where the flood enquiries (I attended one and read others) focused almost exclusively on response and what could be done better next time. There was little focus on why previous flood control strategies were ignored in allowing storages to be so full as to have no ability to act as the buffer they were also designed for. The core problem is not being addressed in either case.

Apart from success or not of the vaccine, the other issues of gain-of-function, or whether science should be dabbling in the weaponization of a virus in the first place, are being virtually ignored. It has been brought up but is still being defended by some as research critical in combating the rise of the deadly new diseases, in some cases it would appear ones they have helped to create. This too becomes a moral issue worthy of open discussion in public and another serious reason to question our leaders intentions.

Free speech and allowing science to be debated was a session in the Stanford forum, where there was a push by one participant for a specific piece of legislation dealing with elements of this. Legislation, ever the answer of the bureaucrat, is restrictive in nature and not something that is needed in free speech. Underlying these comments was the desire of most participants to re-establish trust in the medical system and public health in general. It was admitted that this had taken a beating, dropping in the USA to only 30% confidence now. The biggest reason for this, seemed to be the insistence that, in the next pandemic (and all seemed to agree it was going to happen) it will be crucial for us, the public, to have trust that what is proposed is going to be good for us. i.e. more rapidly developed mRNA vaccines.

“Oh yes we did things wrong, we realise this, but we can now do it better and roll out injections faster and without any testing really needed,” at least that is my impression of the way many of the participants spoke. Not everyone mind you, but most appeared to have one foot in the accepted narrative to retain the confidence in what I see as a dangerous new conclusion, that we will become pincushions for under-tested and dubious value drugs when there is a whiff of possible virus in the air.

I look at the continued scare mongering going on with bird flu and other animal diseases that they keep flogging us with, and wonder just how far they will go to implement these things. There are mRNA factories being built to produce designer vaccines for everything and mandatory use on farm animals is currently under discussion. Do we really want widespread use of this technology in our foods while we are still waiting for proof that it actually worked, or proof that it did no long term damage? With the lack of proper safety data and no real long term overview, this rush to make more is beyond reckless in my view. If the complete over-reaction and wiping out of huge numbers of animals that goes along with this disease control ideology, is indicative of their thinking, I hate to think how some of these people view us poor plebs.

The real issue at hand is not the pandemic preparedness and response they seem to believe they need to tweak, but the catastrophic damage inflicted on a world population with the roll-out we have just been through. The dust has yet to settle and the accounting not even started, and they are (already) looking towards how to do the next one better. There does not seem to be any real analysis of the effectiveness or otherwise of the vaccine, let alone any remote indication that the excessive deaths from side effects is anything other than normal. In a post pandemic world, where the sick and elderly have been thinned out already, the excess death figures should drop below expected norms for several years following. This has not happened and in fact the deaths from “turbo” cancers, heart attacks in the younger age groups, and strange calamari like clots in the circulatory system, noticed by many embalmers around the world, are being quietly swept under the rug. In a previous time these things would have raised considerable concern and much investigation. The fact it has not, only reinforces my view that there is more to come and they do not want us to realise just what it is they are up to. Mistakes can be made and people often try to cover their tracks, but the magnitude and vehemence with which they defend their actions and promise to repeat them is the biggest admission of guilt yet.

"Jay" Bhattacharya seems to be one of the key figures involved in bringing the Stanford group together and in that aspect he has done well to get them. Maybe his real view of the mRNA vaccines is kept quiet to so as not to scare anyone away. Or perhaps he has not had the chance to look at the true death or disablement figures arising from the vaccine use. If he has not compared those with the true Covid death figures, then maybe it looks better to him than the many others doing the leg work to find the real truth.

The actual death tolls from Covid, are inclusive in many cases, of people who died without any proper identification of actual cause. Excess death figures for many countries show no real rise in deaths before vaccine introduction, something that should have spiked early, given all the hype; with footage of people dropping like flies before-hand, the insistence on how deadly it was supposed to be being spouted at every turn. These excess deaths, according to actuary observers (insurance actuaries keep a close eye on these things), only started to rise dramatically after the roll out of the vaccines. The narrative tries to cover itself here by blaming the rise of variants. This again leads to something that goes against standard practice, that of a vaccine of different variants. Each year flu vaccines are supposedly ineffective or not as effective as they thought due to a different strain of flu occurring than that predicted. Never once did the variant difference seem to concern the push for more jabs, the same original variety was used. Now perhaps this new technology eliminates this problem, but the conversation around the vaccines inability to stop infection, often included this uncertainty as to it's value for each variant, but the push still went on. Rising deaths and adverse reactions were gas-lighted and kept quiet for the most part, the word 'rare' developed a new meaning and the fight for recognition still goes on today.

As for the rapid spread, the instance of faulty testing with a reliance on a not fit for purpose PCR test, whose inventor came out early in the piece and declared just that, that they were abusing the test's parameters to find something that couldn't really be said to be there. Standard medical diagnosis went out the window and asymptomatic disease became the flavour of the day. In many cases simple symptoms or no symptoms at all, just a positive test result became the virulent disease running amok. The absence of colds, flu and other similar outbreaks for that whole period is something that stands out as remarkable. Never before has the incidence of these diseases dropped so completely off the radar. I smell a fish market here, does gingerbread go off?

A thorough investigation into all these anomalies must take place and the truth of the world-wide response must come out. Far too many died of things other than the supposed pandemic for it to be otherwise. People were actively suppressing legitimate questions from day one. If ever there was a case for calling something a conspiracy, it was this whole sorry mess. Many of the behind the scenes players (and many of those out front) have a global agenda, have an admitted depopulation desire and a bent for instituting controls over populations for a "better world". It is no small wonder that confidence in the establishment is so low. What more do you need to see?

There is the smell of gingerbread on the breeze and the trees are thick here, but I see a faint path and a few people who, like me, are all for escaping the fumes. I can pick the guides I wish to follow, their maps are not upside down.

League Objectives

- (a) To promote loyalty to the Christian concept of God, to the Crown, and to the Country.
- (b) To advocate genuine competitive individual enterprise and personal initiative.
- (c) To defend private ownership and advocate its extension in order that individual freedom with security shall be available to all.
- (d) To attack and expose government-by regulation and bureaucratic interference with economic and social activities.
- (e) To take steps designed to secure to the individual very definite rights which no government can take away, and especially steps which defend the written constitution.
- (f) To defend the Rule of law which makes all equal before the Law.
- (g) To stress the value of our system of Common Law, originally built up in Great Britain, to protect the rights of the individual; and to that end, to expose corruption and partiality in all their forms.
- (h) To expose the manner in which the safe guards of individual rights and liberties are being destroyed.
- (I) To emphasise the value of the Senate and of Legislative Councils.
- (j) To expose and oppose all anti-British propaganda and actions, irrespective of their origin.
- (h) To take such other actions as may be deemed desirable to promote the policy of the League.

Annual Subscription to '*On Target*' \$75.00 pa which includes an Insert, the *On Target* and the *NewTimes Survey* journals - **printed and posted monthly.**

Donations & Subscriptions can both be performed by **Direct Bank Transfer to:**

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

BSB 105-044

A/c No. 188-040-840

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

Telephone: 08 8322 8923 eMail: heritagebooks@alor.org

Online Bookstore : <https://veritasbooks.com.au/>

Our main website of the Douglas Social Credit and the

Freedom Movement "Archives" :: <https://alor.org/>

On Target is printed and authorised by Arnis J. Luks

13 Carsten Court, Happy Valley, SA.