



ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance -

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.32, No.39

October 18th, 1996

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "In an order where the end governs the means it is man as consumer who is in charge of all of the economy. And since every man is a consumer, it is every man who contributes to orienting the production and distribution of goods. It is for man, the consumer, that every economic activity exists. Man, as a consumer, must therefore organise production himself. It is he the consumer, who must give his orders to the producers."

— Louis Even, *In This Age Of Plenty*

TREASURER COSTELLO PRAISED BY I.M.F. by Eric D. Butler:

It was the great Chinese sage and philosopher Confucius who warned that it was no use running harder if one were on the wrong road. Those running harder on the wrong road get to the wrong destination ahead of everyone else. Bigger is better and faster is defined as greater progress, according to the dominant philosophy in today's world. Since the end of the Second World War there has been a tremendous acceleration in the centralisation of all power. Not surprisingly, the Soviet leaders supported the establishment of two of the major instruments for centralising power globally, the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. These two institutions are today presented by the financially orthodox as the holy of holies. They are the equivalent of what Mecca is to the devout Moslem. Australians genuinely concerned about the future of their nation should take careful note of the fact that their Federal Treasurer, Mr. Peter Costello, has waxed eloquent about this reception by the I.M.F. and the World Bank.

Writing in the business section of *The Australian* of October 11th, financial writer Ian Henderson provides the following information about how highly regarded is their Federal Treasurer in the Financial Mecca of the world. "..... Costello thoroughly enjoyed the reception he received at the annual meetings of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank in Washington. The Treasurer has delighted in retelling the comment of the Managing Director Michel Camdessus, 'Mr. Costello, your economic programme is music to our ears'. The I.M.F. is the nerve centre of the worldwide push for fiscal consolidation policies and for labour market reform, and the Howard Government has built its Budget and its workplace relations legislation on those foundations."

Ian Henderson writes that "the I.M.F. is just the place to brag about tough budgets and de-regulating the labour market. Such a programme was again endorsed at the I.M.F.'s. annual meeting as it urged member nations to implement 'complementary and mutually reinforcing ... sound monetary, fiscal and structural policies' to attempt to prolong and strengthen the recent low-inflation global economic expansion".

Those who can submit themselves to the painful ordeal of reading the gobble-gook which pours from the financial witchdoctors at the I.M.F. and World Bank can readily see that these witchdoctors and their many devotees, including government treasurers like Peter Costello, are quite mad in the sense that they are divorced from reality. It was the forerunners of today's financial witchdoctors who were responsible for the Great Depression of the thirties. "Sound monetary, fiscal and structural policies" had to be imposed to avert the threat of inflation. "Stronger" financial institutions had to be created, like Central banks, these to be linked to The Bank of International Settlements. The inflation rate was temporarily slowed, but the price was mass unemployment, the bankruptcy of tens of thousands of small businesses, social dislocation and the establishment of nakedly totalitarian Communist, Nazi and Fascist regimes, these fostering programmes which led to the Second World War, and all that followed.

All the high sounding rhetoric of today's financial witchdoctors, and programmes for creating New World Orders, cannot avert the breakdown of orderly societies everywhere as attempts are made to continue centralising power. The greater the attempts to make an unworkable debt-ridden system work, the greater the disasters ahead. If the true purpose of production was accepted as being consumption, then Australians would only undertake production programmes which served their genuine requirements. One of those requirements is the ability to defend the country militarily if necessary. That requires an adequate manufacturing base. Australia has the natural resources to undertake such a programme. Most of Australia's young unemployed could be absorbed into such a programme, this in turn alleviating the growing social problems afflicting the nation. Independent M.P. Graeme Campbell had provided a vision of the erosion of Australia's river systems being reversed by re-forestation programmes. Effective national defence requires the upgrading of Australia's railway systems. There is adequate steel and other resources for the task.

It can be predicted with absolute certainty that the Howard-Costello programme, based on "economic rationalism" and designed to meet the requirements of the witchdoctors of the I.M.F. and the World Bank, is doomed to failure. Unemployment must remain high. Mickey-mouse gimmicks, including the "re-training" of the unemployed for constructive work, which cannot be undertaken under present financial policies, can have no bearing upon reality. Large numbers of young Australians have lost hope and surrendered to the various drug cults. Increasing numbers commit suicide in despair. Unlike Camdessus of the I.M.F, large numbers of despairing Australians do not find the Costello programme like music in their ears.

Peter Costello has made much of the fact that public opinion polls appeared to indicate that his first budget was well received by Australians. As is now generally accepted, even by many in the Labor Party, the election results of March 2nd were a dramatic expression of the deep-seated detestation of Paul Keating. There was no mandate for the Howard-Costello Government, merely a hope that it could not be as bad as the Keating Government. Truth and reality are the great disciplinarians in the human drama. It is only a matter of time before the Australian electors discover that once again they have been "conned". But unlike in the past the emergence of representatives like Graeme Campbell will provide a constructive outlet for their anger. The story of the Costello-Howard programme being like music in the ears of international bankers will be recalled as a type of sick joke.

LESSONS FROM THE NEW ZEALAND ELECTION by David Thompson:

The results of the New Zealand election, held last weekend, should be closely studied by both Prime Minister John Howard and Labor leader Mr. Kim Beazley. New Zealand went to the polls with a completely new electoral system, which has not only altered the mechanics of how New Zealanders vote, but has perhaps changed forever the traditional party loyalties. In assisting in loosening the traditional party loyalties, the new system of voting (M.M.P.) also served as a pressure-release valve which has propelled the leader of the New Zealand First Party, Mr. Winston Peters, to the very centre of N.Z. politics.

Perhaps for the first time ever, New Zealanders felt constrained by neither party loyalties nor "politically correct" attitudes in the issues for which they voted. The basis of the New Zealand First policy platform, as its name suggests, is to begin to eliminate foreign ownership of New Zealand assets, and dramatically cut down an immigration programme which has begun to alter the racial demographics of the nation. Much as his political and ideological opponents shouted "racist" at him, the part-Maori Winston Peters' party won 17 crucial seats in the election, giving New Zealand First the balance of power in the new Parliament. This virtually makes Winston Peters the "king-maker" of New Zealand politics. He can decide who becomes Prime Minister, and which of the largest parties forms a government in coalition with him. Peters may be able to dictate policy terms on crucial issues, and even demand the Deputy Prime Ministership. Winston Peters is in a unique position to direct the course of history in New Zealand.

It is clear that the key elements in N.Z. First's success are not only the nationalist policies, but those of timing and opportunity. It is from this that Australian political leaders must learn. The ground has been prepared by Graeme Campbell, and brilliantly exploited by Pauline Hanson, to establish that not only are there **alternatives** to present "bi-partisan" policies on immigration, foreign ownership, multiculturalism, etc., but that **it is now socially acceptable to choose them**. All that remains for such alternatives to explode onto the Australian political stage are the elements of **opportunity and timing**. Can John Howard be quite certain that the unpredictable business of politics will **never provide the opportunity** for Campbell or Hanson to be placed in a similar position in Australia to that of Winston Peters in New Zealand? John Howard's long experience as a politician should provide the answer to this, but is Howard listening?

Instead of attempting to blot out Pauline Hanson's views by the sheer force of his inadequate personality, Labor leader Kim Beazley should be acknowledging that the social problems of Australia have changed, and A.L.P. policies must change to provide the answers. Beazley does not even have to abandon the A.L.P. heritage, or the A.L.P.'s core constituency. It was Arthur Calwell, former A.L.P. leader and immigration spokesman, who Pauline Hanson quoted as saying: *"Japan, India, Burma, Ceylon and every new African nation are fiercely anti-white and anti-one-another. Do we want or need any of these people here? I am one red-blooded Australian who says no, and who speaks for 90% of Australians."*

Beazley does not even need to revert to Calwell's language. If he has not the stomach for it, because Hanson has shown that she has massive support for views articulated by Calwell, one of Beazley's more illustrious predecessors. But it is clear that Beazley or Howard (or both) need to give close attention to what might now occur over the Tasman, and consider how they too could easily be swept into the dustbin of history if they refuse to address the frustrations of large numbers of Australians, and represent their views. As the New Zealand experience shows, those views will eventually find expression, and if John Howard, Kim Beazley or their successors wish to remain relevant to Australian

politics, they need to begin to listen to what the big majority of Australians are saying, not dismiss such sentiments as offensive, immoral, or politically incorrect. To do so is to remain a victim of the disease of (small "l") liberalism.

QUESTIONS ABOUT THE "STOLEN" GENERATION: The attention now given to the "stolen generation" inquiry ignores a number of basic questions concerning the Aboriginal children who were forcibly removed from their parents in the past. The fact that the enquiry is taking place at all gives rise to the first questions: does it continue to enforce the culture of "victim-hood" which has surrounded Aboriginal people of this present generation? No-one who knows Aboriginal people would deny that some Aborigines are disadvantaged Australians. But to continue to explain away such disadvantage as being the result of racial discrimination, deaths in custody, dispossessed of land, the erosion of culture, or having been separated from families, eventually begins to sound like the deliberate assumption of the permanent status of victim-hood.

The long-term effect of children being separated from their parents, for whatever the reason, should not be underestimated. But nor should it be overstated in order to preserve the cloak of victim-hood, which the Aboriginal industry might be tempted to do. The removal of children was not confined to Aborigines, as is often implied in the context of this enquiry. Ron Brunton, of the Indigenous Issues Unit at the Institute for Public Affairs, makes the following point (*Weekend Australian*, 12/10/96):

"Up until the 1960s there was a widespread belief that children from 'disadvantaged backgrounds' should be 'given a chance in life' by removing them from their families and placing them in what were thought to be more supportive environments. A great many working-class British children were shipped to Australia and other countries in the belief that others could do better for them than their rightful parents. The trauma that they and their families suffered is unlikely to have been any less than that suffered by Aborigines affected by separation. So why should the enquiry be confined to Aborigines? Why not invite the lost children of the Empire to recount their experiences? The same kind of ardent busy-bodding lay behind the misery of both Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal children."

By describing as "Aboriginal" the children who were removed from their parents, one of the possible motives for this programme could be obscured. Were the removed children "Aboriginal", or were they mainly part-Aboriginal? Could one of the reasons for their removal lie in the well-known contempt in which full-blooded Aborigines held the part-Aboriginal offspring of marriages or liaisons between Aborigines and others? This question is difficult to discuss. The fact that part-Aboriginal children were removed from their parents implies a "racist" attitude that European culture was "superior" to Aboriginal culture. It is much less acceptable to regard full-blooded Aborigines as "racist" for their contempt for part-Aboriginal offspring. And yet, the motive of removing part-Aboriginal children from this attitude of powerful contempt has never been discussed.

Will the enquiry recover Cabinet and other documents to re-examine the motive for removing children from parents? Is it a fact that an attempt at "assimilation" of Aborigines was the reason for removing children, or was it a genuine desire to benefit those who might have clearly been destined for a life of disadvantage? As a form of social engineering, such a policy would be anathema today, but judging past policies on contemporary social standards achieves nothing. But as Brunton remarks, the fact that some Aborigines acknowledge that they benefitted from being removed from their parents should not be dismissed out of hand.

Recommended reading: "Hasluck Versus Coombs", by Geoffrey Partington; \$15.00 or \$18.00 posted, from all League book services.

"ON TARGET" is printed and published by The Australian League of Rights,
145 Russell Street, Melbourne. Telephone: (03) 9650 9749, Fax: (03) 9650 9368.
Subscription \$30.00 p.a.