



ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance —

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.29, No.39

October 8th, 1993

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "There is really only one major issue at stake in the world today. All others are derivatives. That issue is whether or not it is possible to impose a Utopia from above, a proposition which involves a standardised human being whom it would be incorrect to call an individual The opposite conception is that each human being is to some extent unique, and that the common interest is best served by assisting him to work out his own Utopia, and to discourage him from imposing it upon his neighbour..... The ideal of the Utopians was fully dramatised by Kipling in his story, As Easy as A.B.C. If the issues of life were decided by logic, his plan would go through. Fortunately they are not."

- C.H. Douglas

THE COURAGE OF FEDERAL M.P. GRAEME CAMPBELL: When it became public knowledge that Mr. Graeme Campbell, M.H.R., was to present a Paper at the Annual National Seminar of the Australian League of Rights, he was subjected to the type of standard pressure used by the anti-League lobby of totalitarians. It was the same lobby which attempted to have British historian David Irving banned from Australia. We are not surprised to learn that Mr. Graeme Campbell wrote to Immigration Minister Hand opposing the ban, pointing out that the banning of people like David Irving was contrary to what used to be traditional Labor Party policy. We have watched with interest over the years the attitude of Mr. Graeme Campbell on a number of issues, and while on occasions disagreeing with him, have come to the conclusion that he is a man who thinks for himself. His outstanding calibre was demonstrated in the Paper he delivered last Saturday to the League National Seminar. (The major part of this address will be published in the next issue of the League's monthly Intelligence Survey.) He gave his large and appreciative audience some real meat. It was refreshing to hear him say that he had changed his views on a number of issues, such as centralism and the Citizens' Initiative and Referendum concept. Graeme Campbell had been a strong critic of C.I.R. The revolutionary High Court decision on Mabo had helped to modify his views. He made the constructive suggestion that there should be a higher percentage of signatures to a petition for a referendum. Clearly Graeme Campbell is a big man in every way. He revealed that originally he had only received Labor Party endorsement for the vast

electorate of Kalgoorlie, the biggest in Australia, because the Party did not believe it could win the electorate. But in 1990 Graeme Campbell, a man with enormous practical experience as a pastoralist and one involved in mining, managed to win the electorate with a very slim majority. That majority has increased at every subsequent election.

Reacting to the criticism he received because of his appearance on a League of Rights platform, Graeme Campbell said that he could stand the heat growing inside his own Party. According to A.L.P. rules, any member who appears on the platform of a proscribed organisation is automatically expelled from the Party. The League of Rights has been on the proscribed A.L.P. list for many years. As there appears to be no suggestion as yet that Graeme Campbell should be expelled from the Labor Party, we can only speculate on whether the League has been removed from the proscribed list to avoid a major confrontation with Graeme Campbell.

Apart from his outspoken views on MABO, immigration and multiculturalism, Graeme Campbell is critical of economic rationalism and the policies destroying Australia's industrial base. His independence of thinking has even extended to publicly disagreeing with Prime Minister Keating on the Olympic Games. Mr. Graeme Campbell does not see the Games leading Australia out of the recession. In our assessment Graeme Campbell is injecting some hope into a demoralised Australian community. He could emerge as a major factor in the growing Australian crisis. His greatest attitude is courage, something desperately required at Canberra.

KEATING EMERGES AS REPUBLICAN ALBATROSS by David Thompson: The republican claim that the creation of the Australian republic is "quite inevitable" - a claim that has psychologically intimidated even many monarchists - has been dealt a series of heavy blows over the last week. A number of polls have indicated that, as the League has anticipated - that divisions of opinion about the republic are much deeper and more passionately held than Mr. Keating and his republican colleagues encourage us to believe.

Events have also dispensed with the politically motivated fiction that there is any such thing as "minimal" constitutional change. The inescapable impression that the Prime Minister, Mr. Keating, personifies the republican proposal means that as the political fortunes of Mr. Keating decline, so does the popularity of 'his' republican nightmare. Keating further jeopardises the republican objective by confirming his view that it would be natural for the Australian flag to change following the establishment of a republic. Recent polls have shown a hardening attitude to the retention of the flag, with a recent result showing that 59% of voters now say they never want the flag to be changed. By proposing such unpopular suggestions, Keating has become a strong republican liability.

OLYMPIAN MISCALCULATION: Perhaps the greatest Prime Ministerial

disaster (as far as the republicans are concerned) has been Mr. Keating's calculated attempt to cynically exploit the awarding of the Olympics to Sydney for the year 2000. His suggestions that someone other than the Queen should open the Games, and that the republican agenda should be brought forward so that the Games are hosted by a republican Australia have met with extremely strong opposition. A Herald-Sun poll last weekend indicated that 92% of those questioned opposed establishing a republic before the Games. And those wanting the Queen to open the Games outnumbered by almost seven to one those who wanted the head of a new republic to open the Games.

Such indications are a magnificent shot in the arm to the monarchists, who have seen the major press organs declare for the republic, and the most outrageous misrepresentations of the historical record committed by Mr. Keating. Even the selection of Sydney for the 2000 Games provides some indication that other countries regard Australia as a clearly identifiable nation in its own right, sure of its identity, and sufficiently confident in that identity to challenge and defeat the Chinese bid for the Games. The Herald-Sun poll, while only an indication, suggested that a massive majority of Australians would be proud for the Queen to open the 2000 Games under the Australian flag.

As we go to print, the recommendations of the Republican Advisory Committee are still unknown, but it is clear that even if Australia was manipulated into a republican future, there is no guarantee that the States can be forced to follow suit. There is every chance that a number of States could remain monarchies. If N.S.W. was one of these monarchist States, it is still possible that the Queen of N.S.W. could open the Sydney Games!

As we have often predicted, the support for a republic must wane as the real issues are debated. If the republican tide is now ebbing, monarchists, being heartily encouraged by the trend, must redouble efforts to demonstrate the weaknesses of the republican argument, and capitalise upon the complacency and arrogance of many of the key republican figures.

UNITED NATIONS PUSHES PRIVATISATION: With government budget deficits burgeoning round the world as the debt machine grinds on, a position of impasse has now been reached. Normal methods of revenue-raising are now incapable of funding public debt-levels. The most ingenious methods of tax-extortion are attempted and discarded with monotonous regularity. Propaganda camouflage is unable to hide the true position.

President Clinton's much-publicised 'deficit-reduction' programme, pledged to reduce the United States deficit by \$500 billion over the next five years, involves a massive hike in the debt ceiling. At the beginning of April 1993 the debt ceiling set by Congress was \$4.145 TRILLION. It was then raised "temporarily" to \$US4.37 TRILLION. In the most recent Clinton Budget, narrowly passed by Congress (218 votes to 216) the debt ceiling has been raised to \$US4.9 TRILLION, which is supposed to prevail until September 30th, 1994.

In other words, the debt ceiling has been raised by \$489 billion in ONE year, to fund a "Deficit-reduction" programme to extend over FIVE years!

The U.S. media is now claiming that the "Deficit-reduction" programme won't actually REDUCE the debt level, but will limit its INCREASE to a \$US1 TRILLION level over the next five years. But simply projecting this year's increase to the same period shows a minimum debt increase of \$2.5 trillion!

All industrial governments are struggling with unmanageable deficits. Australia's current \$16 billion Federal deficit is a case in point, having its counterparts throughout the world.

In a statement carried in the New Zealand Herald (September 19th, 1993) the United Nations has tacitly acknowledged the dilemma:

"... Governments now find themselves on the horns of a dilemma," says the report by economists at the Geneva-based organisation (i.e. the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD). An expansionary fiscal stance would reduce unemployment but raise government deficits and debt even further, whereas fiscal consolidation will lengthen the dole queues. Inaction would put more people out of work and boost government borrowing, it says. The dilemma between deficits and the dole is sharpened because national policy-making is taking place without international co-ordination," the report says. In order to reflate the global economy and counter global deflation, it proposes OECD countries together apply a fiscal stimulus.

"The most promising way to deal with deficits, debt and deflation is a one-time capital levy combined with privatisation to reduce debt, alongside one-off spending increases to sustain private incomes," the report says....."

This proposal is, in reality, quite devilish. Translated into the commonsense English which seems beyond the capabilities of most economists, the report proposes that governments must join together in selling off all State assets; they must confiscate a proportion of all financial savings, a form of theft blandly described as a one-off capital levy, and additional government spending.

Not dealt with is the fact that a small, rapacious number of multi-nationals, in many cases owned by the money-lenders, are poised to take advantage of the privatisation programme by becoming the owners of what were once national assets.

National Treasurers seem incapable of recognising or resisting this takeover. The price to be exacted on normal, unsuspecting people, if the programme goes ahead, is horrendous.

THE BASIC FUND MOVES FORWARD: Last week the basic fund moved forward again, bringing the total to over \$15,000. We are inspired by some of the contributions of rural supporters, all suffering badly under the Keating programme. They are a real inspiration. All contributions to Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne, 3001.

"ON TARGET" is printed and published by The Australian League of Rights, 145 Russell Street, Melbourne. Subscription \$30 p.a.
Telephone: (03) 650 9749 Fax: (03) 650 9368