



ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance –

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.30, No.43

November 11th, 1994

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "Each generation imagines itself to be more intelligent than the one that went before it and wiser than the one that comes after it. This is an illusion ... one ought to stick to one's world view even at the price of seeming old fashioned ... for that world view springs out of experience that the younger generations had not had and to abandon it is to kill one's intellectual roots."
– George Orwell

IS PRINCE CHARLES FIT TO BECOME KING? by Eric D. Butler:

It is not surprising that the latest public opinion polls reveal that there has been an increase in support for an Australian republic. These polls were taken following the world-wide damaging publicity concerning Prince Charles. What we are seeing is an international psychopolitical war against the institution of the hereditary Constitutional Monarchy. A close study of how this war has been conducted tells us much more about the diabolical nature of those conducting it, than about the alleged moral defects in the character of Prince Charles.

It was the famous Jewish writer and philosopher, Dr. Oscar Levy, who made the profound comment that the ideal was the enemy of the real. Apart from the genuine Republicans, most of them collectivist power lusters, there are the Pharisaical self-righteous who claim that because Prince Charles has not handled his marital problems as well as he might have, he is therefore not fit to become King. The logic of this attitude is that no person is fit to hold public office, unless he is completely perfect. No such person except Christ has yet been born. The hypocrisy of some of the politicians concerning Prince Charles is breathtaking.

The most damaging of the allegations made against Prince Charles is that he did not love Princess Diana when he married her, and that he only did so after being ordered to do so by his father, the Duke of Edinburgh. Those and similar allegations are blatant distortions of what Richard Dimbleby writes in his biography of Prince Charles. Horrified by the manner in which his biography has

been mis-quoted by the mass media, Dimbleby, in a BBC interview with Sir David Frost, has bluntly said that sections of the media have lied. He challenges them to point out where they will find in his biography any evidence to support, for example, the sensational headline that Prince Charles was forced into a loveless marriage by his father. Not surprisingly, the Murdoch newspapers have been the worst offenders.

Dimbleby makes the revealing statement, based upon two years of following Prince Charles and researching his life, that it was the damaging media coverage which forced Prince Charles to take the unprecedented step of opening his life to the public. Dimbleby commented that "For many years his life was covered by particular tabloid newspapers on the basis of innuendo, concoction, and frequently downright lies..... I think the decision he made was a gamble. But if he had stayed silent forever, he was not just being slowly assassinated, he was being killed".

And what does Dimbleby himself think about Prince Charles? "He is a decent, honourable man and I think personally would make a good king." Those who have actually read the Prince Charles biography agree that it presents a very different picture from that portrayed by what might be described as "the yellow press".

Like most marriages, that of Charles and Diana was fraught with problems from the beginning. The man born and trained to be King found himself trying to cope with a young girl who did not share his interests and whom it is now known has had disturbing psychological problems. Neither in his "warts-and-all" television programme with Dimbleby nor elsewhere has Prince Charles tried to apportion blame for the final breakdown of his marriage. Many royal marriages of the past had major problems, but the institution of Constitutional Monarchy continued to operate successfully as part of a constitutional system which effectively kept power divided. But, unlike today, the media in the past had a code of ethics which ensured that the institution was not damaged by the type of campaign being run against Prince Charles.

The campaign against Prince Charles is not only a campaign against Constitutional Monarchy; it is a campaign based on the fear that Prince Charles is not content to be a passive royal ornament, that he is what pro-Zionist Gerard Henderson fears, an "interventionist". A study of his speeches and addresses confirm this. Prince Charles as King might well strike a new and constructive note.

Before the modern Pharisees condemn him because of his confession of adultery after his marriage had broken down, they might take out the New Testament and read what Christ had to say on the subject. Perhaps it is an appropriate time to point out that the great Solzhenitsyn has been charged with the responsibility of a failed marriage by his first wife.

Every decent person must feel for both Prince Charles and Princess Diana, particularly as the Mortons and others seek to make fortunes out of their miseries. As Dimbleby says, they are like pariahs. It should be recorded that Prince Charles is allocating his royalties from the Dimbleby biography to charities. Whether or not he made the right decision in "going public", only time will tell. But for the sake of the future of Constitutional Monarchy, it is to be hoped that Truth will eventually triumph.

(We are informed that the League of Rights Bookshops are making arrangements to obtain copies of the Dimbleby biography. We will publicise when copies are available.)

LIES, DAMNED LIES AND POLITICIANS by David Thompson:

The revelation by former Senator Graham Richardson in his biography *Whatever it Takes* that he told deliberate lies when he thought they were necessary to promote the interests of the Party would hardly be a surprise to anyone. It was Richardson's unrepentant attitude that irritates the electorate.

In addition to this, the implications for Government in general are important. If the title of his book is to be taken literally (and it appears that it is) then perhaps the Party has been elevated into **an end in itself**. Any means are justified if the good of the Party is advanced. This, of course, is classical Marxism. To the trained communist, there is no such thing as murder if death happens to be in the interest of the Party; murder becomes execution. Lies become "truth". Black becomes white. Richardson obviously comes out of this mould; anything can be excused if it is for the good of the Party!

Does the electorate, then, wonder what else Richardson and his former colleagues were/are prepared to do for the good of the A.L.P.? Is vote rigging, or electoral roll fraud acceptable? It would almost appear that it is. The old A.L.P. adage "Vote early, and vote often" is not entirely a joke, and not entirely restricted to the A.L.P. Are other means to electoral victory acceptable, like blackmail? Whatever it takes, according to Richardson.

THE WESTMINSTER SYSTEM: Perhaps the most damaging Richardson assertion is that lying is compulsory **under the Westminster system of government**. The "Westminster system" refers to the concept of the division of powers as developed by the British in the Parliament at Westminster. That is, the Executive must account to Parliament for the way in which it governs. This means Ministers must be accountable to a) the Crown (they are **Ministers of the Crown**), b) to the Senate, and c) to the House of Representatives.

Why is it compulsory to tell lies under this system? If anything, **the reverse** is the case. A convention has grown into the Australian system that any Minister who misleads the Parliament **must resign**. The factor that corrupts the Westminster system is, as Independent M.P. Ted Mack points out, **the political party**. Once the "party line" on any issue is determined in the Party Caucus, every member of the Party is required to espouse this particular position – even those who argued strenuously against it in the Party room. There is no room for the truth in Party politics. It is not the Westminster system that requires lies, but Party politics. If there is no room for the truth in Party politics, then there is **no room for Party politics in the Westminster system**. At least the grip on the minds of M.P.'s. by the Party machine must be broken. Parliament can still work even when no Party has an absolute majority, as has been shown in N.S.W. over the last four years.

FINED IF YOU DO, FINED IF YOU DON'T:

In preparation for next March's N.S.W. State Election, the major factor that dominates the political parties in N.S.W. is a severe lack of funds. Both main parties are contemplating going into debt to the banks, borrowing up to \$1 million each. Are they concerned by the debt? No, not particularly. **The electorate will pay it**, although quite involuntarily – even against our will. Public funding of political parties is to be increased by the Commonwealth: each Party will be paid \$1 for every Senate vote, and \$1.50 for each House of Representatives vote. Not only do they deliberately lie to us, but they force us to pay them to do so. The immorality of it is momentous. If one refuses to vote at all, the State fines the laggard \$50. If you do vote (at least for a Party) they fine you \$13.50 (12 Senators as well as a M.P.). The only answer seems to be to vote for someone with no chance of qualifying for public funding!

N.S.W. STATE BANK TO BE FLOGGED OFF:

N.S.W. A.L.P. leader Bob Carr is proposing that the lottery be used to raise funds for drought-stricken primary producers. He claims that as much as \$10 million could quickly be raised. Premier Mr. Fahey is most derisive and demands that Mr. Carr tackle his 'mate' the Prime Minister, if he really wants to do something for farmers. The Commonwealth should be forced to do more, Fahey claims, than the paltry \$164 million offered so far.

As Alfred Deakin once prophesied, the Constitution left the States legally free, but financially bound to the chariot wheels of the central government. State Premiers have been tempted to demand that the Commonwealth exercise functions that the States themselves should be exercising. The problem of drought-relief is within the means of the States to solve. Each State could use its constitutional banking powers to issue primary producers credit on the necessary terms for survival, but will they do it?

In N.S.W. the State Bank has loaned about \$770 million to farmers, of which \$100 million are regarded as troublesome. Parliament could direct its Bank to accommodate farmers, and alter loan agreements, if this is regarded as socially, economically or politically desirable. But the N.S.W. Government **proposes to sell the Bank!** National M.P. Gerry Peacock (Dubbo) is asking for guarantees that new owners of the Bank would not ruthlessly remove farmers regarded as "bad debts".

"The Government has guaranteed faulty loans and bad debts, and that could be a trigger for a ruthless new owner to put the squeeze on these people . . . Very few banks these days understand rural finance. they got rid of the old-style managers who knew their customers well, and now they have kids with degrees and calculators who only look at the bottom line," he said. Each State needs its own independent bank.