



ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance -

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.33, No.6

February 21st, 1997

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: "The state of the world is the only hope for the world."

— G.K. Chesterton

THE ACCELERATING BREAK UP by Eric D. Butler:

A major feature of the break up of every Civilisation is that the great majority of people do not realise what is happening. A few more perceptive people, who have sometimes been described as prophets, have attempted in vain to warn their fellows of what is going to happen if they do not mend their ways. The story of Isaiah is well known to most Christians. God did warn Isaiah that he was not going to get too far with his warnings to his fellows. But God did refer to a remnant which was the hope for the future. There have been some brilliant descriptions of the break up of past Civilisations. Gibbon comes to mind. But Gibbon did not deal with basic causes. The genius of the man who gave the world what he described as "Social Credit", C.H. Douglas, correctly pointed out that the major cause of the collapse of Rome was the debt system of finance, along with high taxation and continuous monetary inflation, thus fostering an increasing centralisation of power in an attempt to deal with what in essence were effects. It was the centralisation of power which was the major cause of the ultimate collapse.

It is folly and wishful thinking to believe that the death of Western Civilisation can be avoided by still more centralisation, which is akin to attempting to cure alcoholism by increased consumption of alcohol. The creation of a united Western Europe was the first major attempt to reconstruct the world, ultimately leading to some type of a New World Order. Social Crediters, having studied social dynamics, correctly predicted that what is commonly known as the Common Market must ultimately prove disastrous. The evidence now pours in from all parts of Western Europe: The Common Market is rapidly disintegrating. Much to the consternation of the centralisers, the younger members of the Western European nations are becoming increasingly nationalistic. There is increasing violence as young Germans, for example, watch a flood of non Germans pouring into a country where unemployment is running at high levels. Increasing numbers of French electors are turning to the Le Pen movement. The massive electoral support this movement is recruiting is a reaction to the centralist programme. Clearly public opinion in the United Kingdom has become increasingly hostile to the Common Market concept.

Multiculturalism is in disarray everywhere. Most people have forgotten that a United Nations "peace-keeping" force has been operating for several decades now in Cyprus. In spite of this there are periodic outbreaks of violence between the Greeks and the Turks. A United Nations force has operated in the Middle East ever since the Zionist invasion took place back in 1948. Those who believe that the

Middle East is any closer to peace and stability because of numerous "summit" talks are deluding themselves. The Tamils in Sri-Lanka continue to make their violent protests against the Central Government. The less said about what is happening in Central Africa, the better. The euphoria concerning South Africa becomes weaker as growing violence takes place. The realists always insisted that this would be inevitable.

The increasingly militant Moslems in Indonesia are now openly engaged in an orgy of destruction against the Chinese minority, many of whom are Christians. Clearly there is worse to come. A major feature of growing conflict globally is the attempt to force nations to accept trade programmes at the expense of local communities. A feature of the current global scene is that the U.S.A. is being used as a major base by the Globalists to impose their policies internationally. The government of Taiwan has been bluntly told that they have to stop imposing protective policies against American food exports. Taiwan was led to believe over the years that it was a favoured ally of the United States. They are now learning that the policy makers of the U.S.A. have their own ideas concerning "allies". Australia's Minister for Trade, Tim Fischer, is currently starting to bleat about the threat of American exports to Australian markets. The reality is that a developing war programme, with the World Trade Organisation a major tool of the centralists, is producing one disaster after another. Those Australians who believe that the policy makers in the U.S.A. care two hoots about the much vaunted ANZAS alliance, are living in a world of complete make-believe. Tensions inside Australia continue to mount as the Howard Government doggedly continues to try to impose policies which must produce even greater social and other tensions.

Australia's only hope of survival is an acceptance of the fact that the human drama is dominated by absolutes. These absolutes can be violated but at a price. As centralism grows, social disorder grows. It can end in violence. Salvation depends upon an acceptance of the reality of absolutes. Decentralisation of power is a basic essential. Defeat of all policies of centralism slows down the growth of the tension and dislocation. In order to understand fully the world scene as currently developing, it is essential to draw attention to the Zionist Jewish domination of the Clinton Administration in the U.S.A. Following the last American elections, with the re-election of President Clinton, over 50 percent of all major appointments in the field of policy making have been Jews. Although hushed up for a period, the background of Clinton American Secretary of State, Madeleine Albright, has now been revealed. Her father was a prominent Jewish official in the Czech Communist Government before it collapsed.

It was the distinguished anti-Zionist Jewish writer and philosopher, Dr. Oscar Levy, who along with other courageous Jews warned the world of the consequences of over 2,000 years of Talmudic Madness, the concept of a Chosen Race. Levy said that every honest thinker had to face this reality. The madness, which is world wide, must produce its own bitter fruits. The rank and file of the Jewish people must be major victims of the growing backlash against the programme of those who claim to speak in their name. As G.K. Chesterton said, the only hope for the world is the plight of the world and acceptance of the reality of absolutes. If those absolutes did not exist, mankind's plight would be hopeless.

But it is not hopeless. The immediate future is going to be turbulent. Events have reached such a momentum that this truth must be accepted. This is not an expression of negative hopelessness but one of realism. We were told a long time ago that the truth will make us free. We must hold firmly to that faith as the storm clouds become increasingly more turbulent.

The above are the notes of a series of addresses the author has been giving in northern New South Wales and southern Queensland.

AUSTRALIAN INDUSTRY: THE FINAL BETRAYAL by David Thompson:

As the deadlines approach for the scaling down of the industrial tariff barriers that protect domestic industries, the increasing nervousness of those responsible for this process becomes apparent. Government leader in the Senate, Senator Hill, in whose State two motor manufacturers presently struggle to survive, has suddenly discovered that the elimination of tariffs costs jobs, specifically, the jobs of thousands of motor industry workers, jeopardising entire suburbs or satellite cities, like Elizabeth.

Industry Minister Moore is also now suggesting that perhaps the Government should not be bound by the productivity Commission's recommendations to reduce motor industry tariffs to 15% in 2000, and 5% by 2004. And Employment Minister Vanstone, suddenly realising that eliminating protection will blow unemployment figures beyond redemption for the term of this and the next Parliament, now thinks it is "folly" to axe the tariffs solely on "pure ideology". "Pure ideology" seemed sufficient for Mr. Howard and his colleagues to campaign upon before the last election, but reality is now looming closer.

How long will Howard and his colleagues go on paying lip service to the "pure ideology" of the economic rationalists, while it progressively strips away the incomes of ordinary Australians? When will the looming reality of "the global market" force them to change policy in order to preserve Australia's (tenuous) status as a democratic Western **industrialised** nation? When will the commitment to small business become serious, **rather than just theoretical tinkering around the edges?**

As yet, no-one is prepared to discuss the next and perhaps final betrayal of Australian industry. It was the Keating A.L.P. that committed Australia to obey the new global trading policeman, the World Trade Organisation (W.T.O.). Not a **murmur** from the Howard/Fischer Opposition. Naturally, not a squeak from the new Howard/Fischer Government, which has had nearly a year to "discover" the reality behind the W.T.O. But now the W.T.O. has another brilliant globalist idea to make the New World Order a stone cold reality, rather than a goofy theory. The W.T.O. proposes a new, deadly agreement called the **Multilateral Investment Association (M.I.A.)**.

The proposal for the new M.I.A. has only been mentioned in a few obscure press reports in the financial pages of the world news, and by B.A. Santamaria sounding a warning note in his *Weekend Australian* column (8/2/97). The provisions of the M.T.O. are relatively simple. They consist of the W.T.O. forcing agreement on all its members, including us, to permit **any foreign company** to invest **in any sector** of Australian Industry without any impediment of any sort. That is, a completely open-door investment policy, and an undertaking to cease discriminating in favour of "Australian-owned" or "Australian-made" in any way whatsoever.

Are Australian Ministers considering such an agreement as the M.I.A.? Our information is that, **yes, they are!** Why are they not discussing such a proposal openly. Because some way needs to be found to prepare Australians to accept it. At the present time, any such suggestion as permitting every multinational corporation free entry to the Australian economy would produce a revolt.

What is the answer to the continual betrayal of Australian sovereignty? To uphold the principles and the terms of the Australian Constitution. That is, to force our Parliamentary representatives to do just that – **represent our views** rather than imposing some grandiose global master-plan upon us, which most of our Parliamentary Members themselves don't understand. How many of them understand the M.I.A. proposal! Write to your M.P., and ask him!

UNEMPLOYMENT AND CENTRALISED POWER: The Howard Government's "work-for-the-dole" proposal has attracted widespread support among those who find themselves, by virtue of the fact that they have an income, supporting those who do not have incomes. As one journalist pointed out last week, the prevailing philosophy behind unemployment benefits for most of the post-

335-405
DNT

war period has been that it is an entitlement – compensation for the community not being able to provide work for all those who want it.

This philosophy is basically accepted by B.A. Santamaria in his *Weekend Australian* column (15/2/97) headed "State has a duty to create work". He offers a novel, if not new, suggestion for the State to achieve the "creation of work". He points out that there are always highly beneficial infrastructure (or public works) projects that the State could undertake, if only they could be financed. Santamaria points out, quite correctly, that at one time the Commonwealth Bank **did finance** some public works without huge residual debts, such as the transcontinental railway, completed in 1917.

Santamaria suggests then, that the private Australian banks should be stripped of their monopoly of the credit creation process, and that the Reserve Bank use this facility to finance new infrastructure to offer employment.

On the face of it, Santamaria's proposal, although radical, could offer huge potential for economic revival, until one goes back to basic principles. For example, he writes "*but naturally any fit person who will not accept a permanent full-time job in his own State should not remain eligible for unemployment benefits*". Therein sound the first notes of totalitarianism that is basic to the Santamaria proposal. Is this wise and well-respected Catholic layman suggesting that an unemployed young man living, say, in Cairns should be forced to uproot himself, and move to Brisbane if a job washing dishes is available? Why draw the line at employment within the State? Why not send the boy from Cairns to Darwin (it is actually much closer). Or why not send him to Auckland, Madrid, or Tel Aviv if there is "work" there?

The Santamaria principle of State-controlled credit creation to facilitate the direction of armies of workers was actually **originally proposed by Karl Marx**, and can be found in the 10 principles he enunciated for the destruction of the free society. A similar proposal was advanced by the Citizens Electoral Councils. But the Santamaria proposal can be adapted to **increase** individual freedom, rather than restrict it if a few basic questions are asked. To whom does the "credit creation" mechanism belong? To the banks? To the State? **Or to the Australian people**, whose assets and industry provide the collateral for all new credits?

Do the Australian unemployed really want **work**? Many of them do. But if they were offered the choice between **work** and **money**, which would they accept? Obviously money! Is this possible? Mr. Santamaria outlines how it was once done, and could be done again. Is it desirable? Santamaria has campaigned long and hard over the years on the family. If his new credits could be made available for mothers to remain in their homes, and paid to **individual families** for the purpose, it frees the workplace for others who need the **incomes** provided by employment. Mothers of families **do not need more work!** Ask one. But they **do need financial assistance** to be available to care for their families.

If Mr. Santamaria could also extend his new credits to offer incentives for earlier retirement for **every-one**, employment could be more readily available for young Australians who need the discipline of working, and the sense of achievement and contribution that it brings. "Work-for-the-dole" schemes will be treated with the contempt they deserve from young Australians who recognise "tokenism" when they see it.

Full employment is desirable only in so much as it provides all Australians with **incomes**. If the production system is not able to do this, then other mechanisms can. If the purpose of production is consumption, then Santamaria's new credits could just as usefully be directed towards consumption of what the Australian production system provides so efficiently.