



# ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

*The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance*

Registered by Australia Post — Publication No. VBH 0999

Vol. 24 No. 14

April 15th., 1988

---

Thought for the Week: "Feminist goals are doomed to failure because they are based on the faulty premise that gender does not influence emotions, skills, or interests. In confusing discrimination with differences the feminists have built their educational programs on philosophical sand." - Alan J. Barron, in The Death of Eve (1986).

---

THE GROOM BY-ELECTION: "An unrepentant Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen yesterday claimed credit for the devastating 21 per cent swing against the Nationals in the Groom by-election which gave the seat to the Liberals." - The Australian, April 11th.

There are many reasons why the Nationals took the bad drubbing in Groom on Saturday, April 9th.

The State Director for Queensland, Mr. Chas. Pinwill, informs us that the "Joh Factor" was significant: the Groom electors reacted against the Nationals for what they see as the shoddy treatment accorded to Sir Joh at the time of his forcible retirement.

Another significant (and related) issue is the domination of the Nationals in Queensland by Sir Robert Sparkes: the Groom electors reacted against Sir Robert Sparkes. Furthermore, the attack by Sir Robert Sparkes (recently) on the League of Rights did alienate some electors from the National Party. We don't claim that this was a major factor; but it was a factor.

Again, the National Party candidate in Groom, Mr. David Russell, was seen as a "Sparkes man", and this was a significant factor. Sir Joh has predicted that the Queensland Nationals will lose the next Queensland State election unless they get their act together. The Fitzgerald Inquiry into crime and corruption is not doing the Queensland Nationals any good, although we don't regard this as a major factor in their Groom defeat, nor was the Consumption Tax a major factor.

Mr. Chas Pinwill assures us that Sir Joh is still a considerable force in Queensland politics, and his pre-election endorsement of the successful Liberal candidate, Mr. Bill Taylor, was probably decisive. There are also wheels within wheels: Mr. David Russell, the defeated National Party candidate, supported Mr. Ahern (Premier of Queensland) during the period leading up to Sir Joh's forcible retirement last year. Mr. Russell is also the son-in-law of the State Governor of Queensland, Sir Walter Campbell; the latter - rightly or wrongly - did not co-operate with Sir Joh during that same stormy period.

Where do we go from here? The Groom "news" isn't good for Sir Robert Sparkes nor for Mr. Mike Ahern, both of whom were keen to rid Queensland of Sir Joh. In fact, we have asserted more than once in these pages that Sir Joh walked into a trap; the "trap" being the Sparkes-endorsed (if not manufactured) "Joh for Canberra" campaign, which had the desired and intended effect: viz. a severe loss of credibility for Sir Joh, and this to an orchestrated anti-Joh campaign in Australia's mass media, turned up to screaming-point! Sir Joh had to go, pronto. Why?

Could it have had something to do with the World Heritage Listings for large areas of land in north Queensland? Sir Joh was implacably (and correctly) opposed to this, whereas Mike Ahern is all over the place on this issue. He won't stand up to the Canberra Fabians, nor the international financial organisations who stand behind them. Supporters who want to know more about this suppressed programme (a future World Conservative Bank to issue immense capital against the collateral security of vast tracts of land "frozen" by devious, if not actually subversive, governments) - should read - "World Heritage and the International Banks" (Enterprise, October 1987). Send \$1.00 to G.P.O. Box 1052-J, Melbourne, Vic., 3001, for a copy.

What politicians, particularly in Queensland have close connections with any international banks? This is a question which Sir Joh may well ask, although it may not be easy to receive an iron-clad answer.

THE CONSUMPTION TAX: "Yesterday's decision by the Federal Liberal Council to endorse a resolution allowing a future Liberal government to introduce a consumption tax spells trouble for Mr. John Howard."

- The Sun-Herald (Sydney) Editorial, April 10th.

Why all the froth and bubble about the consumption tax? Firstly, it is inevitable that taxation, generally, must rise. Governments are scraping the barrel now (have you noticed that your standard of living is gradually declining?!) Under the game of living we play with the rules of finance, escalating internal and external debt must grow. It's not "written in the stars", but written in the fallacious financial system under which the West is ground down. Inevitable, increasing government debt means inevitable, increasing

taxation imposes upon citizens. And this "game" has to be played by politicians (desperate to keep their snouts in the public purse) using the old pea-and-thimble tricks.

Mr. John Elliott, the Liberal Party President - and representing Big Business (and the New Right) is all for a broadly based consumption tax. Why? To shift the tax burden down even more onto the small salary and wage earner and so leave the "corporate sector" be. Putting it plainly; slug the small bloke; leave the big boys alone! Well, there are the Wets and there are the Drys. The Drys say - slug John Smith; leave me alone/the Wets say - no consumption tax; it will put us out of office. More correctly; we won't gain office if we are seen to be favouring the big boys at the expense of the small wage and salary earner.

The Nationals? They are supposed to be representing the men and women on the land, who, generally, are having a pretty rough trot. The Nationals are opposed to the consumption tax, for the protection of the majority of the people on the land. Fair enough.

Where does "Labor" stand?

Mr. Paul Keating would certainly be in favour of a consumption tax, and so would the Treasury boffins behind him, but the Lefties like Mr. Brian Howe and Mr. Stuart West are against the small people being slugged for the benefit of "Labor's" rich mates.

Where will it all end? It will end in a consumption tax, almost certainly, sooner or later. It will have to be "sold" to the electorate as something which the elector has always wanted.

We recall that the late Sir Billy Snedden, in perhaps an unguarded moment, stated that the electorate can be "sold" almost anything if it is dressed up in appealing language and presentation. Mr. Neville Wran, former "Labor" Premier of New South Wales, chose to convince his State electors that the measures his Government wished to introduce, radical or otherwise, were the ideas of the electors themselves. An old trick; but it still works.

However, more and more Australians are rousing from their long sleep and are becoming aware that there are Fabian socialists who control the "Labor" Party (and that they are in other parties as well) - whose loyalties are not primarily to Australia, but to an International Ideal, and that they'll sell Australia out, in the belief that they are ushering in a Better World. (The Road to Hell is Paved with Good Intentions;) More and more Australians are aware that none of the foregoing would be possible, without the connivance of the International Banks.

We recall that C.H. Douglas observed at the speech he gave in Belfast in 1936, that - for the hundred years, at least, prior to that time - there had been only one party: and that was the Financial Party. All parties represent the interests of Finance, and particularly International Finance. If they try to buck the system, the sanctions are applied.

C.H.Douglas elsewhere observed that "control of the news, and control of finance are concentric". One is used to control the other; and both are controlled by the same forces. These forces - we guarantee - will be implacably opposed to the Swiss system of Initiative and Referendum, which we'll deal with in the accompanying On Target Bulletin.

SENATOR GARETH EVANS' PRIVATISATION/AMALGAMATION FLOPS: "The Federal Government last night abandoned a proposal to merge Qantas, Australian Airlines, and Air New Zealand in the face of overwhelming financial obstacles and growing opposition in the A.L.P."

The Age (Melbourne), April 11th.

Senator Gareth Evans told a Fabian Society Conference (please note!) in Melbourne last Saturday (April 9th) that the Government could not provide the money, so that a minority share would have to be privatised.

Moreover, "Labor's" privatisation proposals were set back at the meeting of the Victorian Labor Unity faction which opposes now privatisation of public sector enterprises. Interestingly, Mr. Simon Crean, President of the A.C.T.U. (Australian Council of Trade Unions) moved a (failed) amendment to allow the merger of the three airlines. It is now likely that the National Conference of the A.L.P. will reject privatisation proposals.

What are we getting at? Well, we'll tell you. The Fabians (Evans and Crean and others, of course) - who no doubt believe in the efficiency of "bigness" (usually fallacious, incidentally) - are really ideologically motivated. What appeals to them is centralisation of the operations of the three airlines, and in particular, the centralisation of interests of two sovereign nations (Australia and New Zealand) - leading, they hope, eventually, to many further amalgamations and centralisations - and at the end of that road, the Fabian Socialist ideal of World Government, to which, as Fabians, they are sworn. The Fabian Socialist mind "likes" bigness, fusions, amalgamations, centralisations: good stuff.

This set-back won't deter the Fabian Brothers: they'll keep on trying whilst they have their hands on the levers of power. Mr. David Lange, another Fabian Brother, was all for the amalgamations, naturally.

---

"ON TARGET" is published and printed by The Australian League of Rights, 145 Russell Street, Melbourne. Subscription rate \$20 p.a. posted.