



ON TARGET

- NEWS HIGHLIGHTS
- BACKGROUND INFORMATION
- COMMONWEALTH AFFAIRS

The price of Freedom is eternal vigilance –

Print Post Publication Number 381667 00258

Vol.33, No.14

April 18th, 1997

THOUGHT FOR THE WEEK: *"There is no hope in a change of government. A new government inherits the excessive power of its predecessor; and in accordance with Lord Acton's law, is corrupted by that power. What is essential is a change in the distribution of power, of power between Government and citizens. Such a change will not be initiated by the Government: it must therefore be initiated by the citizens. We have not got democracy; we can only get it by being democratic – by limiting government."*

– Dr. Bryan Monahan in *An Introduction to Social Credit*

THE "REVELATIONS" OF DAVID GREASON by Eric D. Butler:

The latest contribution by "expert" on "Right Wing" movements enables David Greason in *The Australia-Israel Review* of March 27th, to re-state some fundamental aspects of the activities of The Australian League of Rights and to present the League's assessment of the contemporary Australian political scene. Greason is of little importance himself, but his service to a major Zionist journal which specialises in providing "intelligence" to the Australian media – I am informed that it is sent to all media outlets – provides some assessment of Zionist strategies. Zionist strategy over 30 years has been to try to minimise the influence of The League of Rights. We know this because Zionist leaders, like Isi Leibler, have on numerous occasions outlined their objective. At the appropriate time I will outline examples of how Leibler and associates have attempted to intimidate business and other public leaders whom they thought were sympathetic to the League or being influenced by it.

When Graeme Campbell, at the time a Labor M.P., agreed to present a Paper, *"The Flight From Responsibility"*, at the 1992 League of Rights National Seminar, one of the first to suggest to Campbell that such a decision could be politically unwise was David Greason. The essence of Campbell's Paper, widely circulated by the League, was that the policies of Australian political parties were an abdication of their responsibilities to the nation. Immigration received special mention. The High Court was criticised for its MABO decision.

As a service movement, the League of Rights has over its long history provided platforms for those whom it believes have a significant contribution to make concerning important issues. Through the Conservative Speakers' Clubs in every State, as well as at State and National Seminars,

the League continues to do this. In the March 27th issue of *The Australia/Israel Review* (the title of which is itself revealing) Greason contributes an article "Graeme's Little League", in which he "reveals" that a number of League of Rights supporters and members are supporting Graeme Campbell's "Australia First" movement. I would be disappointed if they were not supporting a movement which, with all its limitations, offers a means through which Australia might be moved off what is a disaster course. When former Queensland Premier Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen started to advocate the establishment of a State Bank and the restoration of the system of consumer price discounts in order to reverse inflation, the League of Rights supported Sir Joh **because it supported the policy he was advocating**. The League reserved the right to disagree with Sir Joh on some questions. Greason mentions Campbell's "often expressed atheism and humanism" as an example of where the League is in conflict with Campbell. Greason's observation merely reflects his shallow and narrow thinking. Dedicated and informed Christians have no difficulty in working with non-Christians on basic issues upon which there is agreement. As an ex-soldier I can assure David Greason that in times of defence of the nation, one does not refuse to co-operate with a fellow citizen because he does not completely agree with one's religious or political views. Although my anti-Communist views were well known, I had no difficulty in accepting the authority of an officer who held Communist views. One of my closest friends and League supporters, the late Sir Raphael Cilento, honestly said that he had difficulty in accepting the Christian Faith, although his wife, Lady Cilento, did.

I find the philosophy of Graeme Campbell, with its stress on individual freedom, the concept of service to his fellows, with government effectively controlled by the individual, much closer to practical Christianity than that of some professing Christians. As the time of Anzac approaches, it might be appropriate to point out that that famous symbol of Anzac, Simpson, who sacrificed his life saving wounded comrades with his donkey, was a non-Christian believer. This was a **practical** example of that type of love described in sacred writ: "Greater love hath no man than the willingness to lay down his life for his friend."

As David Greason introduces the subject of Social Credit – which he has admitted he does not understand – in his article concerning Campbell, it is appropriate to point out that the League of Rights completely rejects the view that money, economic, political and social problems cannot be solved by a further increase in government power. We cannot get figs from thistles. The Australia First movement has made a start towards facing this question with its advocacy of a constitutional mechanism which will give the individual effective control over his elected representatives. Like many others, David Greason makes the major mistake of attempting to assess the League of Rights in terms of seeking power. Malcolm Fraser makes the same mistake in expressing his fear that the League of Rights – with its "brilliant tactics" – might exploit the Pauline Hanson phenomenon to gain power. Greason's assessment is but a reflection of the power philosophy of the Zionists, whom he serves.

No movement can be adequately assessed without reference to its philosophy. Social Credit is the policy of a philosophy, said C.H. Douglas, the founder of Social Credit. In this necessarily brief comment, it is sufficient to say that Social Credit is that type of revelation that the famous philosopher Descartes had concerning the relations between what were then the separate sciences of algebra and geometry. The techniques of algebra made it possible for even a young student to

solve problems which previously had been unsolvable. Social Credit puts a point of view which makes it possible to comprehend relations between physical and economic problems. Politics has to do with the subject of power. With over 80 years of experiences, the Social Credit movement, of which the League of Rights is part, has amassed an enormous volume of knowledge and expertise concerning how power can be placed at the service of the individual.

It appears that David Greason, like his fellow pro-Zionist Phillip Adams, fears the League, not because of numbers, but because of its unique concepts of how the individual might be progressively freed from all artificial restraints. Phillip Adams has said that I am the most dangerous and evil individual in Australia. But Adams has never defined what this "evil" is. Perhaps David Greason could help out with more of his "revelations".

BANKING REVOLUTION ROLLS ON by David Thompson:

The long-awaited "Wallis Report" on the Australian banking and financial industry is so far a mystery to most Australians, yet it will affect almost all Australians deeply if the Treasurer moves to implement Stan Wallis' recommendations.

The main recommendations of this Report appear to be to end the Keating/A.L.P.'s. "six pillars" policy, in which the four trading banks and the two biggest insurance companies must remain intact, and to alter the structure of institutions which supervise what is left of financial regulations. While Treasurer Costello has declined to go as far as Wallis recommends **at this stage**, he has lifted the restriction on foreign takeovers, which means that one of Australia's four trading banks could be taken over by an overseas bank.

That the Wallis recommendations further threaten Australian national sovereignty is nowhere even discussed, let alone disputed. This is merely taken for granted in an environment where the decision has already been taken to "globalise" the Australian economy. Longer-term **On Target** subscribers will recall that then Treasurer Keating's stated reason, to a Fabian Society meeting, for permitting competition from foreign banks in Australia, floating the dollar and generally deregulating the financial sector, was to **internationalise the Australian economy**. There is no evidence of which we are aware that Mr. Howard and his administration are uncomfortable with this objective, let alone consider policies to reverse it.

It is clear that the Wallis report is merely the next step in the globalising of Australia. The extent to which the report is implemented depends upon how far Mr. Costello thinks he can go without losing too many votes for the Coalition. But what will it mean for consumers?

The effect of the Wallis report will be to reduce the service banks and other financial institutions offer clients. Whatever services remain will be much different, and more likely to be electronic than personal. In the future, financial affairs will be conducted by telephone, computer, or "smart cards". Banking as we know it will be further centralised, with many more branch closures. There will, however, be many more institutions which can perform normal banking functions, such as building societies, credit unions, insurance companies, and perhaps post offices, and other companies with many consumer outlets.

The risk of consumers losing their money, however, will not be reduced. If anything, the risks will be substantially greater, as Wallis recommends that the Reserve Bank lose its "prudential powers". At present, under the Banking Act, depositors have some protection from bank failure, in that a bank that may not be able to meet its obligations must inform the Reserve Bank. The Reserve can then step in and take control of the bank, and continue to run its business until the problem is solved, or the bank in trouble is merged with another. This protects depositors' funds without actually guaranteeing deposits. Wallis recommends that this protection be removed.

Other effects of the Wallis report can only emerge with time, such as the likely abolition of bank accounts without fees. However, it is certain that the report's recommendations were not shaped to respond to the needs of consumers, but to the requirements of **The Market**. In his *Weekend Australian* column last week, B.A. Santamaria reminds us that the former secretary of the Campbell Committee, which last inquired into the financial system, Mr. Fred Argy, has since warned that following deregulation the Australian economy is "dangerously exposed to world financial shocks and destabilising speculation . . .".

Argy warned that governments must defy the **Market**, where its expectations threaten social stability. *"Our national sovereignty and way of life may well depend on it,"* he said. In our view, there is no comfort from the Wallis report for concerns such as those of Fred Argy.

"ANTI-SEMITISM" IN SWITZERLAND:

News reports indicate, with some horror, that the levels of "anti-Semitism" expressed in Switzerland have been rising alarmingly. This follows the Zionist demand that Swiss banks should compensate Jewish victims of German persecution, because much Jewish wealth eventually finished up in Swiss bank accounts, which the banks have kept. Originally a senior Swiss diplomat declared that this was akin to a public relations war between Switzerland and the World Jewish Congress, and should be treated as such. His career evaporated when the Swiss Government negotiated the establishment of a \$300 million fund for Holocaust victims.

It is clear that the arrogance of the World Jewish Congress and its Chairman, Edgar Bronfman, has irritated the Swiss, and resentment is being expressed. This, of course, is defined as "anti-Semitism", and condemned. But it is clear that the World Jewish Congress tactics of extortion have rebounded badly on the Jewish rank and file, whose interests appear to be ignored by their leadership.

We also note that Deputy Prime Minister, Tim Fischer, has had his status of "anti-Semite" lifted. Fischer had irritated Zionists by condemning Israeli treatment of Arab groups in the Middle East, particularly the Israeli military bombing Lebanese villages. Who has decided that Fischer is not an "anti-Semite"? Mr. Isi Leibler. Such judgements appear to be the preserve of Jewish leaders, who alone will decide who is "anti-Semitic" and who is not.

NATIONAL LIBRARY

- 6 JUN 1997