



- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS



The Price of Freedom is Eternal Vigilance

Vol. 61 No. 19

16th May 2025

IN THIS ISSUE

- If the Head is Rotten, Throw Out the Whole Fish! By Neville Archibald 01
Upon That Mountain: A Plot to Betray Australia's Independence By Jeremy Lee (1 of 2) 04

If the Head is Rotten, Throw Out the Whole Fish! By Neville Archibald

The media has focused on Peter Dutton, the liberals in general and even the smaller half of the coalition. Calls within both parties for a leadership change. The head is rotten, cut off the head! Never mind that the whole fish stinks. The machinations behind these changes started during the election campaign, they couldn't even work together effectively then, when it should have mattered. (Unless maybe they didn't want to be elected?)

Substack Link: Nation First, by George Christensen

<https://nationfirst.substack.com/p/canavan-or-collapse-the-final-choice>

Defections, slugging off at pensions (that all polities are entitled to) personal attacks, and the usual round of after election day hand wringing and scape goat roasting. Littleproud seems to have held his ground, despite what I see as a lacklustre performance compared to the old Country party. (but then the Nationals of the 70s were an entirely different breed, not very effective, but still knew their base supporters and went in to bat for them)

Oh dear, oh dear, where did we go wrong?

The panels are full of recriminations, after thoughts, policy challenging and, of course, comparisons. The Libs are making comments about previous leaders and hoping to garner support by using names they think might help the average liberal supporter to remember the 'good old years'. When they meant something. To see how far removed from reality they are now, makes me cringe. Bringing out these names of past leaders, who also sold out the Australian public, just makes me sick. The never ever GST man, the Lima agreement man, and the list goes on.

I get to the point that I no longer wish to watch them make their accusations and comparisons. Their attempts to colour between the lines of the great Liberal

picture to improve the outward projection, is still a colour by numbers project. Each one decided in back rooms, by power brokers who care about party, power and positioning. Do they care about public? Decades of policy show the picture they are creating.

Both sides of current politics have removed industry from our shores. Both sides have sold our power generation to the highest bidder, regardless of who would eventually own it. Both sides have presided over the destruction of our Australian way of life, barking all the time about fitting in on the world stage, or about being a part of Asia. Surely people can see this! All that we once thought was important has been relegated to a background soundtrack (probably recorded in some foreign warehouse at the lowest cost possible) playing quietly at important national events. The stuff of our 'dream-time' when we made or grew nearly everything we needed. It only takes a ship crash in the Suez canal shutting it down for a few weeks to show us how much we no longer make here. How fragile our country has become, due to this "offshoring" of industry. This is the very thing both majors (and some minors) voted for and continued to support. Do people not remember that incident, if they do, can they not connect it to that fundamental policy? The parties are effectively dead to the thinking Australian, they have not shown any indication of working for our family in decades, and they show no intention to do so in the future.

So now we are witnessing the Liberal party, gathering around the grave of Peter (but I'm not dead yet) Dutton, squabbling over the last will and testament, trying to be the beneficiary who receives the most. Like a bad movie, this plays out in the real world, not on a fictitious screen. Oh, they try to appear concerned, maybe some are, but I think I can safely predict what the outcome will be. It will not matter what colours they use, or whether they use crayon or texta, it will still look childish to me. Their action, their squabbles, their posturing, will all be for the party ultimately, for they realise they must get back in, to remain a part of the game. The play is more important to them than the games rules.

This is where I depart. This is where I no longer wish to watch. The people you have in your lives can determine how you react and how you think. You might be strong willed and set in your ways, but some rubs off, some of their colour smudges onto you. I would prefer to leave them to it, let them scribble away so hard that they rip through the paper or canvas of their creations. (which we can then legitimately throw in the bin) let them show you from a distance how bad their artwork is.

These two party preferred machines are seeing their own future, as the primary vote decreases (in the low 30% for each) and preference deals become more important. We have already seen how that works. They give each other preferences over other candidates, ones that you would think had a closer alignment to their own outward fictional presentation. If I am scathing it is because I have seen more of it than I thought was possible. I would have thought the decent people of this country would have called out the obvious bullshit they spew and voted against them, both of them!

Until we can see through, what I call, their cover stories. We will continue to be choosing to pick from only two teams, each with the same global agenda, rather than looking after the family business, that of OUR country.

The underdog here is the true independent, who holds no allegiance to anyone other than his/her electorate. If we don't want to be a part of that scrambling after "Daddy's money" groupings that occur each time a loss happens. If we want our politics to reflect OUR desires, we have to break from those "happy families" and realise our own family needs to be closer to us. Each electorate is small enough to be a family grouping, each has similar needs and desires. The "happy families" of lib/lab only cause division among us, as each tries to be the best footy team on the cricket pitch. That is OUR problem. They need to be playing the right game, for us. We need to be the umpires, calling out bad play and red carding or sending off players who don't abide the rules. That is why we Vote! We decide who plays!

Instead of importing players from other leagues or areas, we need to concentrate on our own. The local, who may not have that outward professional look, but can deliver a much closer to home result. One that has to live in the area, after politics! One that has to face the very people he represents. And WE need to be there to cheer them on, to discuss tactics, to coach and to actively support them. To be involved. Day to day! Politics is a tough job, especially as it stands now! The job for an independent will be harder than ever, as the entrenched mindset is slowly removed to make way for the true Australian to take over once again. An Australian who wants to be here, to improve his Australian family's lot, not to posture on the world stage, or feather his own nest.

Reforming this country, to truly represent the people who live in it, will only come about if each electorate stands up and sends a true son or daughter from their family into battle for them. And only if they get behind them. We can do this if we learn to concentrate on what we all want in common, not on our differences (which are largely a creation of the party system) and focus our energies on doing this for more than just one day, each three years.

The Liberal party may implode, hopefully it will be followed by Labor, and then every other vested interest group in politics. Regrowth can then be from the very grass roots that Eric Butler always said it would have to come from. It is up to us! ***

“

It is possible that there exists, somewhere upon this planet, a country which is satisfied with its government, but if this is so, the location of it has escaped me. The problem posed by this elusiveness is not new, but dates from the birth of society. The record of governments is a record of precarious and frequently inglorious tenure, terminated, or at any rate punctuated, by violent upheaval and modification, if not in fact, at least in name.”

C.H. Douglas

The Alberta Experiment (1937)

Upon That Mountain: A Plot to Betray Australia's Independence

By Jeremy Lee (Part 1 of 2)

(Originally Published by Heritage Publications. 273 Little Collins Street, Melbourne. Australia. 1978.)

INTRODUCTION

This booklet contains a submission to a parliamentary committee. There are many such committees, and they have, through the years, no doubt examined many submissions.

What is so different about one more?

The difference is profound. The Senate Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs and Defence is examining the implications of a proposal for World Government.

Such a proposal is not new, and has been a long time in the making. But for many years it has been hinted at, in vague, confusing terms. It has never before been an out-right proposition, but has been a “trend” - a progressive centralisation of power at both national and international levels.

For a long time, certain political parties have made a play of opposing centralisation. They paid lip-service, at any rate, to the idea that centralised power was inimical to individual freedom.

But their one-time ardor has died away, and objectives have been watered down to a point where the differences between all parties in the political spectrum are superficial indeed. This is true not only of Australia, but of all English-speaking nations. More and more the survival of the very parliamentary system itself is under question.

But the centralisation of power is not a “trend” at all. It is quite deliberate; it is the result of long-term planning; and it has come out into the open.

Such is the proposition before Australia, In accordance with a combination of invitation and pressure, Australia is now being coerced into dispensing with the trappings of sovereignty. and baring her bosom to the endearments of a one-world-order.

The invitation is an old one. The 4th chapter of St. Luke's Gospel records these words: “... *And the devil, taking him up into an high mountain, showed unto him all the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time. And the devil said unto him, All this power will I give thee, and the glory of them; for that is delivered unto me; and to whomsoever I will I give it. If thou wilt therefore, worship me, all shall be thine ...*”

It has been asked more than once that, if Christ Himself rejected such power, what politician could be entrusted with it? And yet the same temptation is being considered by Australia today.

Thirty years ago, such a suggestion would have received short shrift. Australians were proud of their sovereignty, and were not too timid to say so. But the change which has overtaken the Western world has not left Australia unaffected. It was well expressed by Solzhenitsyn in his B.B.C. address: “... *What we see is always the same,*

always the same as it was then; adults deferring to the opinion of their children; the younger generation carried away by shallow worthless ideas; professors scared of being unfashionable; journalists refusing to take responsibility for the words they squander so profusely; universal sympathy for revolutionary extremists; people with serious objections unable or unwilling to voice them; the majority passively obsessed by a feeling of doom; feeble governments; societies whose defensive reactions have become paralysed; spiritual confusion lending to political upheaval. What will happen as a result of all this lies ahead of us..."

Perhaps the greatest tragedy is the attitude of the Church to such temptations as now lie before Australia. There is a wilful evasion of all political and economic responsibility by those who should be to the forefront in "wrestling with principalities and powers". The safe seclusion of the prayer group and the church bazaar has left the real battle-field without a Christian banner; consequently, those who lust for "power over all these things" seem to have a monopoly in the lists. The price to be paid in spiritual darkness before the light dawns cannot be estimated.

The greatest weapon of centralised power is money. Real history - the history which is seldom recorded in the textbooks and biographies, or in the social studies taught in schools - has more to do with the financial powers behind wars, revolutions, trade manipulation and subversion than anything else. On another occasion Christ stated that the love of money was the root, - the source, the beginning, the starting point - of all evil.

There is now enough documented evidence to show that - behind the rise of Nazism and Communism, and the massive growth of debt now enslaving the world - those who financed these movements, and who control the creation and the distribution of the world's money are the real power elite.

They are now making their final gambit. They have also viewed the kingdoms of the world from that high mountain, and have succumbed to the conditions which are the price of complete power.

Their task is made so much easier by the sapping of moral responsibility, the gross materialism and the evasion of reality which marks human society. In the latter half of the 20th century.

And yet there IS an awakening in some areas. There ARE young people who care for this country, There ARE a few Christians who see that the cross to be born has its social and economic aspects, which combine to complete spiritual responsibility, There ARE politicians - albeit a very small minority - who see the truth as more sacred than their salary, their superannuation, or obedience to the party Whip.

Perhaps in the crisis which is now almost upon us, such people will provide the few sparks from which the flames of regeneration are finally kindled, To such rare individuals, in the knowledge that they will continue to speak out, come what may, this booklet is offered as a tool. Its message is beyond question, for it is the message of the centralisers upon that mountain.

Can Australia be warned, and will she act in time?

BACKGROUND TO PROPOSALS FOR A NEW INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC ORDER (NIEC)

There are so many facets and implications in regard to proposals for a New International Economic Order that some background is necessary.

A 'Series of Developments over the period 1944 to 1974 provide the factors to be considered as a prelude to discussion of the United Nation's declaration for a new inter- national economic order on May 1st., 1974.

These were:

- (1) The establishment of the International Monetary Fund (I.M.F.) and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank) at Bretton Woods, July 1-22, 1944.
- (2) The formation of the United Nations, April 25 - June 26, 1945, San Francisco.
- (3) The Agreement for establishing Special Drawing Rights (S.D.Rs.) Rio de Janeiro, 1967.
- (4) Recommendation by the Joint Economic Committee in 1969 that the creation of S.D.Rs. be used as a means for transferring resources to the less developed countries.
- (5) The 1968 United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) in New Delhi, wherein it was decided to establish a multilateral non-reciprocal tariff preference scheme to favour imports from less developed countries of semi-processed and processed products into the markets of developed countries.
- (6) The suspension in August 1971 by President Nixon of the convertibility of the \$US into gold.
- (7) The Smithsonian Agreement, in December 1971, wherein it was decided to end any fixed parity between the \$US and gold - resulting in the devaluation of the \$US! and a widening of the margins of exchange rate fluctuations for members of the I.M.F.
- (8) The Lima Declaration on Industrial Development and Co-operation, made at the Second General Conference of the United Nations Industrial Development Organisation (UNIDO) on December 6th. 1973, which resolved, *inter alia*: "That special attention should be given to the least developed countries, which should enjoy a net transfer of resources from the developed countries in the form of technical and financial resources as well as capital goods, to enable the least developed countries ... to accelerate their industrialisation."
- (9) The United Nations Sixth Special Session on Raw Materials and Development, in April 1974, at which was produced by consensus - "A declaration on the Establishment of a New International Economic Order."

The implications of this far-reaching Declaration - the issue now being considered by Australia, in conjunction with other member nations of the International

Monetary Fund - can be summarised thus:

- (1) The establishment of a new world monetary order, with the elevation of the I.M.F. into a “world central bank”, and the introduction of an international monetary unit to be known as BANCOR.
- (2) The reduction of industrial and manufacturing expertise in the developed nations, to concur with a build-up of industrial resources in less developed nations, by transfer from the developed countries.
- (3) The establishment of international commodity boards to control the production and distribution of raw materials which include a number of Australia’s principal export commodities, e.g. wheat, coarse grains, rice, sugar, bauxite, iron ore, copper, lead, zinc, tin, cotton and wool: and to establish buffer stocks round the world, to be financed by a “Common Fund” with the power to create the means of payment for its own activities.

The implications of these proposals for Australia’s economic stability, foreign policy and defence are staggering. They could be summed up as follows:

- (1) Australia would cede its present sovereignty over its own industry, production, distribution and exchange, in favour of an international institution with power over all but legal accountability to none. Although nominally, the right to withdraw exists, in practice such a right - once commencement of the proposals was effected - could not be exercised without the loss of all trade earnings incurred between the time of commencement and the time of withdrawal.
- (2) Any suggestion that Australia’s industrial resources be ‘transferred’ to less-developed nations, at a time of existing unemployment and stagnation, could only have the gravest implications for internal stability and the well-being of the Australian people.
- (3) The anticipated use of S.D.Rs. to “transfer industrial resources” from nations like Australia to less developed countries would in essence be a form of arbitrary aid-giving bearing no relationship to any domestic ability to sustain it, and at a rate and with consequences over which Australia would have no control. The escalation of debt - and the consequent escalation of inflation and unemployment - would annihilate Australia’s productive heritage and viability. National self-reliance, on which effective foreign policy and defence must be based, would be destroyed.

THIRD WORLD DEBT

By the middle of 1976, Third World countries had incurred debts of \$US 100,000 million to the rest of the world - excluding private and short-term debts. Over 15 percent of all export earnings in the Third World were going in debt service. The fastest growing area of debt was to the private banks.

In addition, international reserves worldwide - held in the form of S.D.Rs. from

the I.M.F. - increased by \$100,000 million between 1970 and 1974.

In 1974 and 1975, non-oil developing countries had to find \$US 80,000 million to finance their external deficits and to service existing debt. Of this, some \$36,000 million was raised privately, according to the Morgan Guaranty Trust Co's. publication "World Financial Markets" (January 1976).

By the end of 1976, according to The Far Eastern Economic Review's special feature on Banking (April 8, 1977) the combined external debt of non-OPEC Less Developed Countries (L.D.Cs.) totalled \$US 180,000 million, of which about \$75,000 million was owed to private banks.

In the next four years, non-oil L.D.Cs. face a period of huge debt repayment - well beyond existing capacity to pay. As a result, there is an urgent and concerted pressure from the private banks - headed by Rockefeller's Gargantuan Chase Manhattan -

on the I.M.F. to introduce its new money system in order to re-schedule or even cancel Third World debts. The international private banks are anticipating that this step will remove the danger of collapse which their own lending policies have generated.

The Lima Declaration under the auspices of the United Nations Industrial Development Organisation (UNIDO) in December, 1973 formulated this very proposal. Because, it said, of "the effects of the inflationary increase in the import costs of developing countries, the pressures exerted on their balance of payments particularly by such factors as foreign debt servicing, the aggravation of the international money crisis, and the transfers resulting from private investment ... urgent consideration (should be given) to the question of the re-scheduling of debt-servicing of long outstanding debts, and their conversion, if possible, into grants ..."

To summarise: The debts of non-oil L.D.Cs. in the Third World are now so great that they are unrepayable. Already new loans are being negotiated where possible to service old ones; a large proportion of this debt is owed to international private bankers; it is proposed that these debts be transferred to the I.M.F., which would use the real credit of the advanced western nations as backing for a new international money system to effect that transfer. The private banks would be paid, not by their original debtors, but by the West. They would be enabled to continue their investment programmes in the future, but this time under the guarantee of an international institution using the collateral of the western world to safeguard such investment.

At the end of December 1977, M. Jacques de Larosiere de Champfeu, top civil servant in the French Treasury, and considered most likely to succeed Johannes Witteveen as Managing Director of the I.M.F. claimed that the role of the I.M.F. will have to grow, "Because the private banking system alone will not be able to handle the accumulation of official debt." *(See next issue for Part 2)* ***