



ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance —

Registered By Australia Post — Publication No. VBH 0999

Vol.27, No.39

October 11th, 1991

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "Consumption is the sole end and purpose of all production" - Adam Smith.

THE DR. JOHN HEWSON PROBLEM: It is becoming increasingly clearer that the question of the Consumption Tax is going to be one of the decisive issues at the next Federal elections, whenever they are held. One of the most revealing comments concerning the character of John Hewson comes from his own son, who said in the famous 60 Minutes T.V. programme concerning John Hewson's first wife, that John Hewson insists that he is always right. Like the traditional Marxists, John Hewson is the genuine ideologue, even though masked by the claim that he is an economic rationalist. John Hewson is an economic puritan: he claims to know what is best for his fellow man. In many ways John Hewson reminds us of the old-time Marxists in the Labor Party who insisted that it was much better for the Labor Party to continue in opposition indefinitely rather than compromise their beliefs. In essence, John Hewson is attempting to persuade the Liberal Party that if it cannot convince the Australian electors that the Consumption Tax is essential for the future of Australia, it does not deserve to be in government.

Speaking at the National Seminar of the Australian League of Rights, Mr. Bill Daly, National Director of the New Zealand League of Rights, presented a horrifying picture of what the consumption tax has done to New Zealand. Bill Daly documented how, contrary to the promise that the introduction of the General Services Tax would lower the total amount of taxation imposed upon the New Zealand people, exactly the opposite had taken place. Why should Australians believe John Hewson when he claims that the introduction of a consumption tax will be neutral in its effect on total taxation collected?

As C.H. Douglas pointed out in his address "Dictatorship by Taxation", the modern taxation system has nothing to do with providing necessary

revenue for conducting government; it is an instrument for controlling the individual. The only taxation reform of any value is a drastic reduction in TOTAL TAXATION, placing the individual in the position where he controls the spending of his own money.

Dr. John Hewson's basic problem is philosophical. He is the genuine totalitarian technocrat, a product of his own training. He must be rejected.

GATT COLLAPSING: The General Agreement On Trade and Tariffs (GATT) was commenced in 1947, soon after the founding of the United Nations. Since then, countless international GATT conferences have focussed on free trade and the elimination of protection as a global target. But the idea is just as far from its attainment as it was when GATT commenced - except for Australia. Since former P.M. Gough Whitlam started the dismantling of protection for Australian industries, Australian governments, both Labor and non-Labor, have presided over the destruction of more than half Australia's manufacturing industries, followed by the wholesale decimation of the farm sector. Rural industry leaders, such as Ian MacLachlan, have argued that reducing protection for secondary industries would reduce farm costs, thus pitting rural producers against manufacturers at a time when both should have been working together for common objectives.

Australians are now witnessing the farcical spectacle of figures such as Dr. Neil Blewett travelling overseas to Europe and America with threatening ultimatums that our competitors should emulate Australia in removing subsidies, tariffs and other protection for their industries. It is hard to imagine President Bush, or the new French Prime Minister, Mmmme. Cheysson, shivering with apprehension when Dr. Blewett appears.

The Advertiser (Adelaide, September 11th, 1991) reported:

"The world's major trading body regulator, The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, is on the brink of collapse, according to the Centre of International Economics Director, Dr. Andy Stoeckel. And unless it adopts effective sanctions for countries that behave badly, its demise will be imminent.

Dr. Stoeckel said GATT was failing because there was no world government and only limited ability to apply effective sanctions for breaking GATT rules"

HORRENDOUS SUFFERING BY TRADING BANKS: The Sunday Telegraph, October 6th, 1991, pointed out that Trading Banks this year will be making provision of between \$4 and \$5 billion for non-performing loans, leaving them with smaller profit margins. Westpac's profits will be between \$350 and \$400 million, A.N.Z. about \$250 million, while the N.A.B. will be round the \$700 million mark.

There is no other industry which could conceivably make any profits at

all after such provisions for bad debts. In fact, there is no other industry which could survive.

But then, there is no other industry allowed to manufacture credit out of thin air, exchange it for the title-deeds of borrowers, and charge up to 27% on the transaction.

A "WORLD COURT" AND THE NEW WORLD ORDER by D. Thompson: As we have previously reported, the drive toward the world state - a 'new world order' - inevitably must be accompanied by an international "peace-keeping" or police force, as suggested by British Prime Minister Major. It is also implied that even with an international "peace-keeping" force, like President Bush's military coalition that subdued Saddam Hussein, a world court is necessary to try such as Hussein.

Lord Shawcross, the chief British prosecutor at the Nuremburg war crimes trials after World War II, argues the case in an article in "The Australian" (3/10/1991):

"There is one important lesson to be learned from what has happened in the Gulf, and from the failed Moscow coup: the need for a standing international court with criminal jurisdiction. Had such a court been in existence, the allies could hardly have ignored their legal duty to bring Saddam to trial

"However, the Nuremburg process was regarded by some - including Goering - as "victors' justice", and the establishment of such a tribunal to deal with Saddam might have been viewed with anxiety in the Islamic world. This objection, like those which could have arisen in Russia had the coup succeeded, could hardly have arisen if an appropriate international tribunal already existed....

"Given goodwill between the great powers, such a court could be set up now to deal with such well-established crimes as waging aggressive war, genocide, and so on. Without it - and perhaps eventually an international police force - the new world order some have bravely talked about will remain a mirage."

HUMBUG FROM PRESIDENT BUSH: Meanwhile, President Bush, addressing the U.N. General Assembly, called for the repeal of the U.N. resolution equating Zionism with racism adopted in 1975, in order to minimise a bruising conflict with the Zionist over his refusal to guarantee \$10 billion for housing the flood of Soviet Jews on occupied territories. Having received a mauling from the Zionist pressure-groups, Bush assured the U.N. that rather than strive for a "Pax Americana", the U.S. would seek a "Pax Universalis", based on common values and responsibilities for all countries. He urged the U.N. to "choose a new world order based on respect for national sovereignty, for the rule of law, not force, for the peaceful settlement of disputes, and for human rights".

In the context of an international police force, and the international court system now being constructed, any talk of national sovereignty is pure humbug.

KENNETT GRASPS THE NETTLE: Victorian Opposition leader, Jeff Kennett, has adopted a collision course with Dr. Hewson by questioning the haste of tariff elimination, and the concept of radical free trade. As the country's manufacturing base continues to be wiped out, with the car, footwear, clothing and textile industries facing certain destruction, Victoria's unofficial unemployment rate is topping 14%. Kennett, referring to the "level playing field" on international trade as "the flat earth policy", is reported in The Australian (3/10/1991) as saying:

"The fact is the economic debate is one-sided. Anybody who questions the flat-earth policy is quickly deemed unacceptable. My concern is where the debate on tariffs and quotas and the implementation of the flat earth policy will lead to by the year 2000. What if the advocates of this policy are wrong? If they are, we will find ourselves looking at massive levels of unemployment...This could turn out to be not just a flat earth policy, but a scorched-earth policy with scorched people. The time has come for an important public debate on present industry policies, he said."

Kennett, who appears genuine in defying Dr. Hewson's radical free-market policies, should be taken seriously. The New Zealand Government, under relentless pressure from a large, unstable back-bench, and massive manufacturing and rural devastation, has been forced to slow the pace of tariff elimination. Reality - even in politics - is the great disciplinarian.

WAR CRIMES TRIALS AND THE NEW WORLD ORDER: Many Australians are aware that the "trial" of four elderly men for so-called "war crimes" will commence in Adelaide: they may have commenced by the time supporters read these lines. Most people are well and truly "puzzled" by the persistence which the instigators of "war crimes" trials are displaying. Old men; half a century ago; in other parts of the world, not this country. How can fair trials be guaranteed in such vague circumstances? Indeed, should such "trials" be pursued at all? Is it just vengeance? And many other questions in similar mould puzzle the minds of many.

Is there something arcane beyond all these things? Yes; we believe so. Then what? Where does the "New World Order" fit into this scenario?

Possibly the main purpose of war crimes trials is to have established as a legal principle, convention, throughout the world, the practice of the trial of any one national of any one country in any other country. World justice, so to speak, by a World Government. The "war crimes" trials are just the thin edge of the wedge to have this issue exposed to "world justice" in "World Court"...This, anyway, we believe, is one ulterior motive pushing the nasty, evil, programme along.

It has no possibility of success whatsoever. The shadowy players behind the scenes will bring horrific retributions upon themselves: but that won't stop the sufferings of many caught up in the processes.